

### 6.3 Dr P. Dodd

590, Yarm Road,

Eaglescliffe,

Stockton-on-Tees.

TS16. 0DF.

2 June 2016

Dear Julie,

Re: Proposals for parking restrictions around Eaglescliffe Station.

We live on Yarm Road, though park in Albert Road and hence have an interest in the above. We have lived here for 22 years and have seen some of the parking issues. When we park in Albert Road, unless it is an urgent, we park outside those houses with their own parking or places where there are no houses, such as Victoria Park. However not everyone knows where this is possible and there is a modern desire to park outside one's own house. We need to recognise that these are public streets, not private parking spaces.

This parking problem has been exacerbated by Northern Rail deciding to charge £2 per day to park in their enlarged car park. I fully support rail travel and I believe that Northern Rail are being short sighted and selfish neighbours in doing so. However, as a commercial organisation, they have decided to cause their neighbours an issue. I would hope that these measures are not to assist in Northern Rail's efforts to make money. (At the Witham Avenue end of the area, I hope that Stockton Borough Council aren't doing the same to encourage people to pay for parking within Preston Park.) I have never seen the Station car park full, probably because people are choosing to park in neighbouring streets so there is capacity.

Swinburne Ave, Beachwood, Pinewood and Elmwood Roads have a fundamental problem that there are too many resident's cars for the pavement frontage available. I suspect the number of cars parked in these areas are rarely rail users since they remain densely parked all day. Rail users like to park where it is easy and that is Albert, Dunnotar and Witham. As steward of Eaglescliffe Methodist Church on Witham Avenue, I know this to be the case for Witham and Albert. Before we lived here, I used to park on Albert to use the station. Some rail users do use the old Witham House car park, set out when the Station car park upgrade started. This was a good addition to the area. However, 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. (We have family experience of an identical station car parking project in London where the annual residents parking permit is now £180 per car, though it started as being free, then £30 and it just keeps going up because it is a revenue project.) Is this a good thing to do for the area? Stockton High Street charges for car parking and Teesside Retail does not. Which is the most successful commercial venture? Some people have space to concrete over gardens to create space but is this the best way forward for the area? Economics bring about change, it may be slow, but it will happen.

I know that the parking restrictions allow for 2 hours parking, no return within 2 hours between 9 and 5. This makes policing it very difficult. Any compliance check requires two visits. In London, a better way is to have a nominated 1-hour slot, where the parking restrictions apply, say 11 until 12 am 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.

It is important the council then makes sure that fines are collected. I am aware of people who break the rules in swanky cars, do not pay and even laugh about their non-compliance. If rules are made, they do need enforcement. If the council wishes to be against rail users, this one-hour slot is a cleaner and more efficient way to achieve the result. Obviously residents would need to cover the cost of the council running the permit scheme. (Personally, I don't think this is worth the effort.)

In my view, I would call Northern Rail's bluff and remove all but safety parking restrictions and convert the Witham House plot fully to nylon matted grass car parking. This saves the council in setting up the restrictions and its enforcement. This creates more space for Preston Park event days which is a plus for Stockton. Charging for parking keeps people away. Charging for services at the point of use such as admission or parking at Witham House on event days is directly linked to attendance. This saves the residents the cost of permits, the fine when a child removes a permit from the dashboard and the visitor suddenly appearing and not able to park legally. This may make Northern Rail reconsider its charges which if zero would alleviate the problem being solved any way. It would not help those on over parked streets but nothing can, except the use of one's legs to walk a bit further, as we do. Walking of course is a healthy thing for the council to be encouraging.

I do object to the general principle because it is a sledgehammer to crack a nut that can only get worse, once implemented.

There are some specifics to the double yellow lines proposed that do not make sense and appear to have been applied without a site visit.

- 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. Only once in 22 years have I seen this stupidity. Let's save the paint and get the police to deal with the obstruction if it happens.
- 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 me to be much more sensible than having 20 feet of road width clear of parked cars because of double yellows.
- c) As steward of Eaglescliffe Methodist Church, (and I suspect this applies to All Saints in Dunnotar Avenue), Sunday morning and weekday evening times are quiet times for parking in these two streets. (Other streets are heavily parked at these times.) 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?

It is not clear whether the parking permits are for the area or for specific roads. Hopefully the former otherwise there is further complexity for residents and compliance officers.

I do hope our local parish councils have had prior chance to comment on these proposals because they do look as if they have been applied relatively remotely and academically. We understood that the local poll did not achieve a suitable majority and the scheme had gone away. Hence this letter.

I am happy to go through any points, if you so wish. I will copy this to the Parish Councils and local Borough councillors. Let's be good neighbours and be a vibrant community, growing rail travel and being healthy. Let's save the paint and gardens and increase freedom.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Peter Dodd





My Ref: TS.T.5.4  
Your Ref: -  
Please ask for: Gillian Spence  
Tel:  
Email: EGDS@stockton.gov.uk

PO Box 229, Kingsway House,  
West Precinct, Billingham  
TS23 2YL  
Tel: (01642) 526709  
Fax: (01642) 526713  
DX 60611  
Postcode for Sat Nav purposes:  
TS23 2NX

9 June 2016

Dear Dr Dodd

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to your correspondence with regard to the above advertised draft traffic Order.

I should start by advising that 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. This would enable you to continue to park in Albert Road, although a permit does not guarantee a space, as you have indicated this is not practicable for the Council to do on adopted public highway where no one has specific rights even outside of their own property, it would allow parking in any of the streets within the zone. 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.

As you state, following completion of the works at the station, parking charges of £2 all day now apply in the station car park. The car park is privately owned and managed by Network Rail and 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.

Cont'd.....

Dr P. Dodd  
590 Yarm Road  
Eaglescliffe  
Stockton-on-Tees  
TS16 0DF.

The car park at Quarry Road will remain operational and free of charge to encourage its use as a viable alternative for rail patrons, site checks have observed spare capacity to be available and as you suggest it is within a reasonable walking distance.

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. 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 actually backed by a traffic Order. The opportunity to convert the white markings on Witham Avenue to yellow 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.

I confirm your local Ward Councillors and Parish Council were consulted on the proposals. 74% of respondents from the 'immediate station area' supported the proposed residents parking scheme achieving the threshold level (at 66%) of support for the scheme to be progressed to this stage.

Given the above, the next stage is to ask you to please consider your letter, whether you wish it to be upheld as a formal objection or withdrawn. Should you wish your objection to be upheld, the item will be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. The Committee is independent to the Traffic Order process, as an objector you would be given every opportunity to address the Committee if you wish. I should make you aware that your correspondence will form part of the Appeals and Complaints Committee papers and it will therefore become a public document at that stage. The alternative is to withdraw your objection.

I would be grateful if could you please indicate your intentions by 24 June 2016, by completing the attached reply slip and returning it in the enclosed pre-paid envelope.

Yours sincerely,

**Anthony Wilton**  
**Principal Engineer - Network Safety**

Encl: reply slip and envelope.

Copy: Sue Wilkinson, Legal Services, Municipal Buildings.

## 6.5 Mr C Wilson

590, Yarm Road,  
Eaglescliffe,  
Stockton-on-Tees.

TS16. 0DF.

24 June 2016

Dear Anthony,

Re: Proposals for parking restrictions around Eaglescliffe Station. (Your ref TS.T.6.4)

Thank you for your letter of 9<sup>th</sup> June and I have considered your points made at length.

I welcome your confirmation that we are included in the Residents Permit scheme which would be universal for all the affected streets and you also value the Witham House car parking area which I still think could be developed further as an area parking resource.

However on balance, there are several issues that, whilst we may disagree, I feel that I need to register as an objection and therefore feel that I cannot withdrawal my previous letter. I am aware that the letter will go public, together presumably with this one. This is democracy and I feel these points need to be aired.

- The principle of setting up residents parking permits is a lot of effort and loss of freedom, (and gardens) 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 would like to see a test of Northern Rail or Network Rail's (whichever it is) resolve to persist with undesirable parking charges for their car park. If they did not charge, this problem goes away and all this effort is saved. (Network Rail is publically owned.)
- If the principle is accepted that rail users must not park in residential areas, a one hour a day absolute compliance of residential parking permits only is much easier that the proposed 2 hour limit. The prosal requires more effort to discover non- compliance and offers more freedom for those visiting the area for other reasons. (Station Road businesses, church activities and visitors to residents.) Stockton would need to enforce the restrictions. I object to the principal that law abiding citizens will attempt to comply and those who do not care, get a benefit because there is no enforcement. Yellow lines are legal requirements not guidance and should be used only where essential.
- Your reply to the £10 administration fee is currently true but of course there can be no commitment to its value in the future. Economics brings about change and especially now that we are leaving the EU with uncertainty. Car parking charges are a legitimate source.
- The specific points on double yellow lines were unanswered.

I am sorry if this causes you problems but I am trying to be constructive. I have not copied in the others at this point to allow you chance to clarify anything. Thank you.

Yours sincerely,

Dr Peter Dodd

01642648481

Mr C Wilson  
618 Yarm road  
Eaglescliffe  
Stockton-on-Tees  
TS160DQ

Project: Eaglescliffe Station

Content: Proposed resident Permit Parking and limited waiting restrictions.

Dear Sirs.

Objections r.e. The above proposal.

After the recent consultations regarding the proposed implementation of residents parking, I was dismayed to receive the revised proposal from the Council and feel that the Council is acting unconstitutionally.

The original proposal put to the residents of the surrounding streets was "do you want residents permit parking?" This was a simple yes or no.

This was voted **NO** by the residents.

Not happy with this, the Council saw fit to ask the residents again, THE SAME parking proposal.

This time there was a greater response in favour of the residents permit parking FOR THE ORIGINAL PROPOSAL. Neither proposal mentioned a 'wider station area' or 'immediate station area'

My objection is not to the introduction of the parking scheme, BUT to the fact that the scheme now being proposed IS NOT the scheme that was voted upon.

The new scheme excludes residents of Clarence Road and removes restrictions on Victoria Road. This would affect myself and the residents of 608 to 618 Yarm Road as these roads are used by these residents, for both our vehicle parking and visitors.

The proposal says

*"The 'wider station' area was removed from the original scheme due to lack of support (40%). 73% of 'immediate station' area respondents supported the proposals via a second consultation and the required level of support (66%) was thereby achieved in order for a scheme to be progressed"*

The 'wider station area' (including Clarence Road) was NOT removed from the second proposal that was voted upon, it was removed AFTER the second vote. Just because some residents vote against a scheme doesn't mean they should be removed from that scheme. Clarence Road and Yarm Road are part of the current temporary scheme and should be included in the full scheme proposal.

As I see it, this is the council acting undemocratically.

The current parking situation is a compromise that suits all residents of Clarence Road, Albert Road (south) and residents of Yarm Road.

Implementation of the proposed permit parking and increased double yellow line restrictions, will, in my opinion, result in parking chaos in this area.

There is also a very real possibility that residents of Albert Road who don't want to pay, won't pay and park on Victoria Road for free, adding to, what will already be an overly congested area.

I find these proposals both Unfair and ill thought out by the council. The proposal has been amended WITHOUT a further vote by the residents and I feel that the council is trying to penalize those that voted against the proposal by removing the permit parking and installing the double yellow restrictions in that area.

I hope that the appeals department will take my representations into consideration.

Yours sincerely,



Mr. C Wilson -

31<sup>st</sup> May 2016

My Ref: TS.T.5.4  
Your Ref: -  
Please ask for: Gillian Spence  
Tel:  
Email: EGDS@stockton.gov.uk

PO Box 229, Kingsway House,  
West Precinct, Billingham  
TS23 2YL  
Tel: (01642) 526709  
Fax: (01642) 526713  
DX 60611  
Postcode for Sat Nav purposes:  
TS23 2NX

9 June 2016

Dear Mr Wilson

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to your correspondence with regard to the above advertised draft traffic Order.

The second consultation with the 'immediate station' area was appropriate because the level of support from the first consultation was only very slightly (3%) below the threshold level for progression but most importantly around a quarter of respondents to that first consultation were incorrectly assuming that the temporary system with free waivers could continue. The re-consultation was therefore needed to ascertain that residents fully understood that the temporary scheme would be removed so that their views and responses on the matter were fully informed.

If the second consultation had not achieved two thirds support from respondents the scheme would not have been progressed. However, 74% of respondents supported the proposed residents permit parking scheme thereby achieving the threshold level (at 66%) of support from respondents, for a scheme to be progressed. After the two consultations concluded, an update was then sent to all residents previously consulted advising that Victoria Road and Clarence Road would not be included within the residents permit parking scheme and that the next stage would be to go direct to this Statutory consultation.

The recommendation to remove Clarence Road from the scheme is in accordance with local residents' wishes. The 'road by road' 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 a number made comments objecting to charges of £10 per year 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. 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 are therefore not prohibited from parking in Clarence Road or Victoria Road which I note are locations where you currently park. Parking there would for the most part continue to be unrestricted with the exception of proposed restrictions on Victoria Road at the junctions where parking should in any case not occur.

Cont'd.....

Mr C. Wilson  
618 Yarm Road  
Eaglescliffe  
Stockton On Tees  
TS16 0DQ.



The scheme would not completely exclude non-permit holders from parking within the zone. The proposed parking controls in the area would not apply on a Sunday or after 5pm, therefore you may park in Albert Road during the hours of control albeit limited for up to 2 hours (you should not park in the area again within 2 hours during the controlled hours which are Monday to Saturday between 9am and 5pm).

I note you refer to the current parking situation and I must remind you that the existing temporary scheme involving free waivers was implemented under temporary legislation and is not a practicable long term option since the temporary legislation is no longer appropriate now the station car park is now fully operational. However, it has been kept in place whilst the consultation on a permanent scheme was concluded.

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. If it would be preferable to you I am willing to add your address to the list of properties eligible to purchase a zone 'E' permit to enable you to park in any of the marked bays within the zone.

Given the above, the next stage is to ask you to please consider your letter, whether you wish it to be upheld as a formal objection or withdrawn. Should you wish your objection to be upheld, the item will be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. The Committee is independent to the Traffic Order process, as an objector you would be given every opportunity to address the Committee if you wish. I should make you aware that your correspondence will form part of the Appeals and Complaints Committee papers and it will therefore become a public document at that stage. The alternative is to withdraw your objection.

I would be grateful if could you please indicate your intentions by 24 June 2016, by completing the attached reply slip and returning it in the enclosed pre-paid envelope.

Yours sincerely,

**Anthony Wilton**  
**Principal Engineer - Network Safety**

Encl: reply slip and envelope.

Copy: Sue Wilkinson, Legal Services, Municipal Buildings.

RECEIVED  
22 JUN 2016

To: Principal Engineer – Network Safety  
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council  
PO Box 229  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor Kingsway House  
West Precinct  
Billingham  
TS23 2YL.

Ref: TS/T/5/4

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

With reference to my letter of objection to the above draft Order.

I wish my objection to be considered by the Council's  
Appeals and Complaints Committee

YES  NO\*

I wish to withdraw my objection

YES  NO\*

(\* Please delete as appropriate).

From: Mr C Wilson

Address: 618 YARM ROAD  
EAGLESCLIFFE  
STOCKTON-ON-TEES

Postcode: TS16 0DQ

Date: 20/6/2016



**Please return reply slip by 24 June 2016.  
Thank you for your response**

GSpence.

## 6.7 My Dentist Team

STOCKTON ON TEES BC

17 MAY 2016

LAW + DEMOCRACY

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

Monday 18<sup>th</sup> May 2016

To whom it may concern,

With reference to your letter proposing resident parking.

As a company with 8 employees who travel to and from work on a daily basis we would like to object to the current proposals. We all feel that we are being penalised for providing a service to the public. If these proposed plans go ahead we have the following concerns.

- 1) Where would the staff be allocated to park
- 2) How would it affect our practice/patients as we have a duty of care to follow.

We have complaints on a daily basis regarding the parking situation as it stands to which we are losing a lot of patients who do not want to return to the practice. As the majority of our patients are elderly and if they are unable to park on station road and having to walk quite a distance as it is.

We have calculated the cost of parking if we had to pay in the station car park. For half that work 4 days will cost in the region of £384 and for the half that work 5 days in the region of £480. As you can imagine this is a considerable amount to pay over the year just to come to work and we all feel like we are being penalised. Would you pay to park every day just to come to work? Do you think is acceptable?

Another matter that is concerning us is that the majority of the employees here are women so for us all to park further afield especially as the dark nights are dawning us is worrying.

We hope you take this into consideration and this letter will make a difference for the other businesses.

Yours Sincerely

My Dentist Team

My Ref: TS.T.5.4  
Your Ref: -  
Please ask for: Gillian Spence  
Tel:  
Email: EGDS@stockton.gov.uk

PO Box 229, Kingsway House,  
West Precinct, Billingham  
TS23 2YL  
Tel: (01642) 526709  
Fax: (01642) 526713  
DX 60611  
Postcode for Sat Nav purposes:  
TS23 2NX

9 June 2016

Dear Sir / Madam

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to your objection to the above advertised draft traffic Order.

I am aware the Dental Practice was consulted on the proposals from the outset so you are aware of the background information on how and why the proposals were developed.

As you know 74% of respondents within the immediate station area supported the proposed residents permit parking scheme thereby achieving the threshold level (at 66%) of support from respondents, for a scheme to be progressed.

The proposals are to implement designated places for parking on street, which will be indicated by a white box, for use by zone 'E' permit holders, or as free parking limited to 2 hours, no return within 2 hours, Monday to Saturday between 9am and 5pm inclusive. These restrictions would not apply to Blue Badge holders who may park for as long as they wish providing a Blue Badge is correctly displayed, in accordance with the Blue Badge Scheme. Therefore, in response to your query regarding parking for patients I suggest this would be improved upon from the current arrangement 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.

In response to your query regarding staff parking, this is also possible for up to 2 hours without a permit and the car park at Quarry Road will remain operational, capacity there is 23 spaces. As you will be aware 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. Staff may use the scheme and move their vehicle from the car park at 3pm and park on street in the area for 2 hours without a permit.

Cont'd.....

My Dentist  
13 Station Road  
Eaglescliffe  
Stockton on Tees  
TS16 0BU

The station car park is owned and managed by Network Rail and the Council has no control over charges imposed by them, 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 also affect patients' ability to park near to the practice. 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. Quarry Road car park is to remain free of charge.

Given the above, the next stage is to ask you to please consider your objection, whether you wish it to be upheld or withdrawn. Should you wish your objection to be upheld, the item will be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. The Committee is independent to the Traffic Order process, as an objector you would be given every opportunity to address the Committee if you wish. I should make you aware that your correspondence will form part of the Appeals and Complaints Committee papers and it will therefore become a public document at that stage. The alternative is to withdraw your objection.

I would be grateful if could you please indicate your intentions by 24 June 2016, by completing the attached reply slip and returning it in the enclosed pre-paid envelope.

Yours faithfully,

**Anthony Wilton**  
**Principal Engineer - Network Safety**

Encl: reply slip and envelope.

Copy: Sue Wilkinson, Legal Services, Municipal Buildings.

To: Principal Engineer – Network Safety  
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council  
PO Box 229  
1<sup>st</sup> Floor Kingsway House  
West Precinct  
Billingham  
TS23 2YL.

21 JUL 2016

Ref: TS/T/5/4

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

With reference to my letter of objection to the above draft Order.

I/We wish ~~my~~/our objection to be considered by the Council's  
Appeals and Complaints Committee

YES  NO \*

I/We wish to withdraw my/our objection

YES / NO \*

(\* Please delete as appropriate).

From: Practice Manager - Hannah Gneves

Address: mydentist Eaglescliffe  
13 Station Road  
Eaglescliffe  
Stockton on Tees

Postcode: TS16 0BU

Date: 20/07/16

**Please return reply slip by 24 June 2016.  
Thank you for your response.**

GSpence.

**Spence, Gillian**

---

**From:** Economic Growth and Development Services  
**Sent:** 18 July 2016 14:07  
**To:** Spence, Gillian  
**Subject:** FW: THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016

This email was classified as : OFFICIAL

---

**From:** Lesley Douglass [mailto:████████████████████@stockton.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 18 July 2016 13:41  
**To:** Economic Growth and Development Services  
**Subject:** Re: THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016

Good Afternoon Gillian

Many Thanks for your email.

I hadn't received the previous email. It appears not have been directed straight to my junk email, so many thanks for your reminder email.

I would still like my objection to stand as even with the modifications proposed I still feel that it would cause a lot of problems with the already stretched parking situation in the area.

Also as mentioned in my initial email I don't feel this has been adequately consulted. Many of my neighbours were still unaware of the proposals so will probably welcome another opportunity to discuss the proposals.

Many Thanks  
Lesley Douglass

Sent from my iPhone

On 18 Jul 2016, at 11:50, Economic Growth and Development Services <[EGDS@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:EGDS@stockton.gov.uk)> wrote:

This email was classified as : OFFICIAL

Dear Lesley Douglass

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to our exchange of e-mails regarding the above draft traffic Order, no response from you has been received to date.

In my previous e-mail it was suggested to remove the proposed 5 metres length of restrictions to the front of your property. Myrtle Road and Beechwood Road are through routes serving many properties and since this crossroads was specifically highlighted via local residents through the consultation I am unable to remove those restrictions completely from the scheme.

I would be grateful if you could consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you wish your objection to stand, the item must at this stage be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. A meeting is likely to be convened in September to avoid the Summer holiday period. If no response is received it must be assumed that your objection remains.

I would be grateful if you could indicate your intentions in writing by Monday 25 July 2016.

Regards,  
Gillian

Engineer – Network Safety  
**Economic Growth and Development Services**  
**Stockton-On-Tees Borough Council**  
PO Box 229  
Kingsway House  
West Precinct  
Billingham  
TS23 2YL  
Tel: 01642 526709  
e-mail: [EGDS@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:EGDS@stockton.gov.uk)  
web: <http://www.stockton.gov.uk>

<image001.jpg>

Dear Lesley Douglass

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to your objection to the above advertised draft traffic Order, in particular the proposal to cover all sides of the crossroads at Elmwood Road/Beechwood Road/Myrtle Road with no waiting at anytime restrictions.

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 2 vehicles to the side of your property where parking would not be restricted.

I refer to the Highway Code which advises motorists not to park opposite, or within 10 metres of a junction and highlight that the proposals are in accordance with that practice although to maximise capacity the length proposed here is slightly less than that recommended. I should also inform you that the aforementioned roads are all adopted public highway over which there are no specific rights to park a vehicle including outside of your privately owned property. I must highlight that requests for restrictions to prevent parked vehicles obstructing sight lines and improve the turn in/out at this location were specifically requested by some residents during the public consultation exercise. Restrictions are also proposed at the Elmwood Road / Yarm Road junction to keep crossing points across the junction clear of parked vehicles for pedestrians 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. I trust this explains the rationale behind the proposals.

I note you refer to the public consultation exercise regarding residents parking although a reply was not returned from your address. The update letter sent out following conclusion of that consultation advised that residents parking was not going to be progressed for this 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 would follow.

In view of your objection I am willing to propose a modification to the proposed order to remove the proposed 5 metres length of restrictions to the front of your property only. I base this on the western end of Elmwood Road being a short cul-de-sac serving around 10 properties. As I have stated parking to the side of your property is already maintained within the proposals and you should park away from the junction, the restrictions to the side are already less than the length recommended in the Highway Code. Myrtle Road and Beechwood Road are through routes serving many properties and since the crossroads was specifically highlighted via local residents via the consultation I would insist on keeping those restrictions within the scheme.

Any suggested modification to the proposed order may be subject to further consultation and cannot be guaranteed and if the order is referred to the appeals and complaints committee as set out below it is subject to their recommendations. Your comments on that modification are now sought before being proposed.

Given the above, the next stage is to ask you to please consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you wish your objection to stand, the item will be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. The Committee is independent to the Traffic Regulation Order process, as an objector you would be given every opportunity to address the Committee if you wish. I must make you aware that your correspondence will form part of the Appeals and Complaints Committee papers and it will therefore become a public document, at that stage. The alternative is to formally withdraw your objection.

A reply by e-mail is acceptable to Legal Services using the following address [sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk) I would be grateful if could you please indicate your intentions in writing by 27 June 2016.

Thank you for your assistance.  
Regards,  
Gillian.

**Gillian Spence**  
Engineer – Network Safety  
Economic Growth and Development

---

**From:** Lesley Douglass [mailto:[lesley.douglass@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:lesley.douglass@stockton.gov.uk)]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, June 01, 2016 08:32 PM GMT Standard Time  
**To:** Wilkinson, Sue; Butcher, Julie  
**Cc:** Dennis, Phil; Tunney, Laura; Houghton, Stefan  
**Subject:** Proposed Eaglescliffe double yellow lines

Good Evening

I am writing to object to the proposed plans in the Eaglescliffe area to add double yellow lines to areas of the road.

I currently live at 46 Elmwood Road. 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. If this goes ahead, where do you suggest we all park? As I estimate approx 10 less cars will be able to park at the Elmwood/Myrtle/Beechwood area.

Stockton council held a consultation last year regarding residents parking in the area, which, from the feedback document I received, it was quite clearly decided that there was no need for any changes in the parking situation in the Myrtle/Elmwood Road area. Also there was absolutely no suggestion that double yellow lines were to be considered. Please can you advise the rationale for the proposed double yellow lines?

I also feel that there has been a woeful lack of consultation in these most recent proposals, I feel that one notice tied to a lamppost is insufficient for the scale of these proposals and the detrimental impact it will have on myself from a daily living and financial point of view and also that of my neighbours.

I know very few of my neighbours were aware of these proposals, so I would suggest a full consultation is undertaken, with full engagement of the residents in the area.

Kind Regards  
Lesley Douglass

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Any opinions or statements expressed in this e mail are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Stockton-on-Tees Council/Tees Active Limited.

This e mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you receive this in error, please do not disclose any information to anyone and notify the sender at the above address.

Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council/Tees Active Limited's computer systems and communications may be monitored to ensure effective operation of the system and for other lawful purposes.

Although we have endeavoured to ensure that this e mail and any attachments are free from any virus we would advise you to take any necessary steps to ensure that they are actually virus free.

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

**Spence, Gillian**

---

**From:** Economic Growth and Development Services  
**Sent:** 18 July 2016 12:37  
**To:** Spence, Gillian  
**Subject:** FW: THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016

This email was classified as : OFFICIAL

---

**From:** Peter Hutchison [mailto:████████████████████]   
**Sent:** 18 July 2016 12:27  
**To:** Economic Growth and Development Services  
**Subject:** Re: THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016

Hi Gillian, I would like my objection to remain with the proposed changes to the area. In terms of the appeal meeting, would it be possible if this could be held early September. I will be on annual leave from September 9th, I'm assuming persons who disagree with the proposal would be entitled to attend?  
Regards, Peter

Sent from my iPhone

On 18 Jul 2016, at 11:44, Economic Growth and Development Services <[EGDS@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:EGDS@stockton.gov.uk)> wrote:

This email was classified as : OFFICIAL

Dear Mr Hutchison

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to our exchange of e-mails regarding the above draft traffic Order, no response from you has been received to date.

In my previous e-mail it was suggested to remove the proposed 5 metres length of restrictions to the front of your property. Myrtle Road and Beechwood Road are through routes serving many properties and since this crossroads was specifically highlighted via local residents through the consultation I am unable to remove those restrictions completely from the scheme.

I would be grateful if you could consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you wish your objection to stand, the item must at this stage be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. A meeting is likely to be convened in September to avoid the Summer holiday period. If no response is received it must be assumed that your objection remains.

I would be grateful if you could indicate your intentions in writing by Monday 25 July 2016.

Regards,  
Gillian

Engineer – Network Safety  
Economic Growth and Development

Dear Mr Hutchison

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to your objection to the above advertised draft traffic Order, in particular the proposal to cover all sides of the crossroads at Elmwood Road/Beechwood Road/Myrtle Road with no waiting at anytime restrictions.

The restrictions proposed would cover the front of your property, approximately 5 metres measured from the junction and to the side of your property by approximately 6 metres back 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 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, the proposals are in accordance with that practice although to maximise capacity the length proposed here is less than recommended. I should also inform you that the aforementioned roads are all adopted public highway over which there are no specific rights to park including outside of your privately owned property. I must highlight that requests for restrictions to prevent parked vehicles obstructing sight lines and the turn in/out at this location were specifically requested by some residents during the public consultation exercise. Restrictions are also proposed at the Elmwood Road / Yarm Road junction to keep crossing points across the junction clear of parked vehicles for pedestrians 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 sent to all residents originally consulted following conclusion of that consultation advised that residents parking was not going to be progressed for this area although requests for double yellow lines had been received and were being considered. Furthermore, the letter highlighted the additional waiting restrictions requested included the crossroads of Elmwood Road / Beechwood Road. The update letter also advised that Statutory advertising would follow.

In view of your objection I am willing to propose a modification to the proposed order to remove the proposed 5 metres length of restrictions to the front of your property only. I base this on the western end of Elmwood Road being a short cul-de-sac serving around 10 properties. As I have stated parking to the side of your property is already maintained within the proposals and you should park away from the junction, the restrictions to the side are already less than the length recommended in the Highway Code. Myrtle Road and Beechwood Road are through routes serving many properties and since the crossroads was specifically highlighted via local residents via the consultation I would insist on keeping those restrictions within the scheme.

Any suggested modification to the proposed order may be subject to further consultation and cannot be guaranteed and if the order is referred to the appeals and complaints committee as set out below it is subject to their recommendations. Your comments on that modification are now sought before being proposed.

Given the above, the next stage is to ask you to please consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you wish your objection to stand, the item will be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. The Committee is independent to the traffic Order process, as an objector you would be given every opportunity to address the Committee if you wish. I must make you aware that your correspondence will form part of the Appeals and Complaints Committee papers and it will therefore become a public document, at that stage. The alternative is to formally withdraw your objection.

A reply by e-mail is acceptable to Legal Services using the following address [sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk) I would be grateful if could you please indicate your intentions in writing by 27 June 2016.

Regards,  
Gillian.

Gillian Spence  
Engineer – Network Safety  
Economic Growth and Development

-----Original Message-----

From: Peter [mailto:██] ]  
Sent: 01 June 2016 22:13  
To: Butcher, Julie  
Subject: Parking Objection

Hi Julie, I am writing to object to the parking restrictions which are proposed between Elmwood Road and Myrtle Road in Eaglescliffe.

I am surprised there has been no consultation with residents regarding the proposed parking restrictions. The area is already poor for parking, this will further compound the problem and cause issues amongst residents.

I would really appreciate it if you could write back to me and explain the following:

- 1) Who has proposed the parking restrictions and why?
- 2) Why has there been no clear consultation with residents. (A small sign on a lamp post is not good communication in my opinion.)
- 3) Has there been any thought by the council what this may do to house prices in the area if you cannot park outside your property.
- 4) If there has been thought about the house prices, what was the conclusion and who came to this conclusion.

For communities to work in the most effective way, there needs to be good communication between all parties. I have previously been a community councillor, I know how the process works. I have had brief conversations with neighbours close to me, they knew nothing of the proposed change. Councillors are elected to represent and make decisions to improve the community, I personally do not see this as a positive change. The decisions you make must be appropriate and you must listen to your constituents.

Regards,  
Peter Hutchison  
46 Elmwood Road  
Eaglescliffe

Sent from my iPad

\*\*\*\*\*  
\*\*\*\*\*

Any opinions or statements expressed in this e mail are those of the individual and not necessarily those of Stockton-on-Tees Council/Tees Active Limited.

This e mail and any files transmitted with it are confidential and solely for the use of the intended recipient. If you receive this in error, please do not disclose any information to anyone and notify the sender at the above address.

Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council/Tees Active Limited's computer systems and communications may be monitored to ensure effective operation of the system

Spence, Gillian

---

**From:** Spence, Gillian  
**Sent:** 18 July 2016 09:53  
**To:** Economic Growth and Development Services; Wilkinson, Sue  
**Subject:** THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016

This email was classified as : OFFICIAL

Please could you send this out to [REDACTED] and copy in Stefan Houghton from the outlook system.

Sue – for your file.  
Thanks  
Gillian

Dear Joanne Lambert

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES, STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to our exchange of e-mails regarding the above draft traffic Order, I note your response indicating you wish to uphold your objection. However, I would like to inform you that further amendments to the restrictions have been proposed, these are;

- The restrictions on Dunottar Avenue were advertised at 17 metres. In my e-mail to you of 13 June 2016, the 17 metres originally proposed was suggested to be reduced to 10 metres. It is proposed that is reduced further, to 6 metres of double yellow lines on the east side from the access going partly across the frontage of the church and 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.

To summarise; this constitutes a reduction from the originally advertised proposals of; 11 metres on the east side of Dunottar Avenue, 12 metres on the west side of Dunottar Avenue, 3 metres on the east side of Swinburne Road and 11 metres on the west side of Swinburne Road.

There is clearly a balance to be achieved between demand for parking and road safety considerations, the Council must consider all highway users and as outlined, to mark bays on the carriageway, indicates an area where it is considered acceptable to park which may not be where parking already occurs. On that basis the above is regarded as an acceptable compromise on this matter.

In my previous e-mail I also proposed the removal of the restrictions from both sides of the southern end of Swinburne Road which would maintain current parking practices and it would be unrestricted (no markings laid). I also previously proposed the removal of the restrictions along the south side (adjacent to number 24) of the access road to the church car park, again that area would be unrestricted.

Given the above, I would be grateful if you could again consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you still wish your objection to stand, the item must at this stage

be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. A meeting is likely to be convened in September to avoid the Summer holiday period.

I would be grateful if you could indicate your intentions in writing by Monday 25 July 2016.

Regards,  
Gillian

Engineer – Network Safety  
Economic Growth & Development

---

**From:** Jo Lambert [mailto:[jo.lambert@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:jo.lambert@stockton.gov.uk)]

**Sent:** 14 June 2016 20:31

**To:** Economic Growth and Development Services

**Subject:** Re: THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016

In response to your email I wish to uphold my complaint and encourage a more open consultation in this matter

Joanne Lambert

Sent from my iPad

On 13 Jun 2016, at 03:43, Economic Growth and Development Services <[EGDS@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:EGDS@stockton.gov.uk)> wrote:

This email was classified as : OFFICIAL

Dear Joanne Lambert

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES, STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to your objection to the above advertised draft traffic Order, in particular the proposal to implement no waiting at anytime restrictions, represented on the ground as double yellow lines.

I note you state you were consulted on the proposals from the outset so you are aware of the background information on how and why the proposals were developed. I also note your support for the residents permit parking scheme. The plan accompanying the first consultation indicated the new yellow lining, that plan as you may recall, 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 as described in the first letter. 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.

In residents parking schemes, the bays for permit holders are marked out with a long white dashed box and it is usual for the remainder of kerbside space to be restricted, with yellow lines, to prevent parking by non permit holders potentially being displaced to those areas, where it may be obstructive.

The proposed double yellow lines are therefore to protect the areas in between the white bay markings. Their purpose is to facilitate traffic movements, assist road safety and in some cases they were requested through the consultation by residents to address ongoing obstruction issues.

The length of the proposed yellow lining should not remove available capacity because they are proposed in areas where parking should really not occur, if the area was left unrestricted it could potentially attract opportunist parking.

In regard to Swinburne Road, the restrictions on the east side will assist visibility for drivers looking left and right as they leave the Church car park by preventing parking right up to the

access, they will also prevent parking along both sides of the access to the car park itself which is adopted public highway. On the west side the restrictions will prevent parking opposite the access. The traffic Order process is lengthy and costly so to include restrictions to address potential future parking issues arising following implementation of the permanent scheme is a standard approach.

As you know parking surveys were carried out as part of the study, the maximum number of vehicles recorded during those surveys on Swinburne Road can still be accommodated under the proposed residents parking scheme. I would remind you that permit holders would not be limited to parking only in their own road, they may park in any bay throughout the whole zone.

The temporary arrangement to which you refer is not a practicable long term option since the temporary legislation is no longer appropriate because the station car park is now fully operational. However, it has been kept in place whilst the proposals for a permanent scheme are concluded. The temporary scheme will be removed and it only remains in place pending the outcome of this consultation.

I consider restrictions at the Dunottar Avenue / Swinburne Road end are necessary to assist visibility at the access, particularly if use of the car park is to be encouraged for non permit holders who will otherwise be unable to park for longer than 2 hours on street. I consider the extent of restrictions proposed on Swinburne Road at that location is in accordance with the Highway Code and has road safety benefits when leaving the access.

I am willing to propose a modification to the proposed order to reduce the extent of lining, on Dunottar Avenue (both sides) from the advertised 17 metres to 10 metres which would still improve visibility when leaving the access. I would extend the parking bay marking into that area so it would be subject to the residents permit parking controls. I am prepared to remove the restrictions from the southern end of Swinburne Road which would maintain current parking practices at this location. However, given the proximity to the alleyway I would prefer not to extend the parking bay markings there although it would be unrestricted (no markings laid) so parking may occur. I am also prepared to remove the restrictions along the south side of the access road itself which would also be left unrestricted, the access is simply not wide enough for a parking bay to be marked so that is not a practicable option there.

Any suggested modification to the proposed order may be subject to further consultation and cannot be guaranteed and if the order is referred to the appeals and complaints committee as set out below it is subject to their recommendations. Your comments on that modification are now sought before being proposed.

Given the above, the next stage is to ask you to please consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you wish your objection to stand, the item will be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. The Committee is independent to the Traffic Order process, as an objector you would be given every opportunity to address the Committee if you wish. I must make you aware that your correspondence will form part of the Appeals and Complaints Committee papers and it will therefore become a public document, at that stage. The alternative is to formally withdraw your objection.

A reply by e-mail is acceptable to Legal Services using the following address [sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk) I would be grateful if could you please indicate your intentions by 27 June 2016.

Regards,  
Gillian.

**Gillian Spence**  
**Engineer – Network Safety**



**Economic Growth and Development Services**  
Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council

Direct Line: 01642 526709  
Email: [egds@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:egds@stockton.gov.uk)

---

Stockton-on-Tees Borough Council  
Kingsway House  
Billingham  
Stockton-on-Tees  
TS23 2YL (TS23 2NX sat nav)  
Main Switchboard: 01642 393939

[www.stockton.gov.uk](http://www.stockton.gov.uk)

-----Original Message-----

From: Jo Lambert [mailto:[jo.lambert@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:jo.lambert@stockton.gov.uk)]  
Sent: 23 May 2016 23:07  
To: Wilkinson, Sue  
Cc: Butcher, Julie; James WHARTON  
Subject: Double Yellow lines

Hi

I am writing to object to the proposed plans in the Eaglescliffe area to add double yellow lines to areas of road.

I currently reside at 4 Swinburne Road. When Stockton Council consulted on the residents parking scheme twice at no point in the consultation documents did it mention addition of double yellow lines. If I have been mistaken in this please forward me the consultation documentation where it made clear there would be addition of double yellow lines to the area.

I voted in favour of the residents parking scheme because I genuinely believed it would enable easier parking which was demonstrated in the temporary scheme.

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 proposals for double yellow lines.

I suggest that an appropriate consultation is run to engage the residents opinions instead of sneaking amendments through on the back of an entirely different matter and attached to a lamppost!

Kind regards

Joanne Lambert

Sent from my iPad

Spence, Gillian

---

**From:** Spence, Gillian  
**Sent:** 18 July 2016 09:54  
**To:** Economic Growth and Development Services; Wilkinson, Sue  
**Subject:** THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES, STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016

This email was classified as : OFFICIAL

Please could you send this out to [REDACTED] and copy in Stefan Houghton from the outlook system.

Sue – chase up e-mail for your file.  
Thanks  
Gillian

Dear Nicola Boyes

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES, STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to our exchange of e-mails regarding the above draft traffic Order, no response from you has been received to date.

However, I can inform you that further amendments to the restrictions have been proposed, for your information these are;

- The restrictions on Dunottar Avenue were advertised at 17 metres. In my e-mail to you of 13 June 2016, the 17 metres originally proposed was suggested to be reduced to 10 metres. It is proposed that is reduced further, to 6 metres of double yellow lines on the east side from the access going partly across the frontage of the church and 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.

To summarise; this constitutes a reduction from the originally advertised proposals of; 11 metres on the east side of Dunottar Avenue, 12 metres on the west side of Dunottar Avenue, 3 metres on the east side of Swinburne Road and 11 metres on the west side of Swinburne Road.

There is clearly a balance to be achieved between demand for parking and road safety considerations, the Council must consider all highway users and as outlined, to mark bays on the carriageway, indicates an area where it is considered acceptable to park which may not be where parking already occurs. On that basis the above is regarded as an acceptable compromise on this matter.

In my previous e-mail I also proposed the removal of the restrictions from both sides of the southern end of Swinburne Road which would maintain current parking practices and it would be unrestricted (no markings laid). I also previously proposed the removal of the restrictions along the south side (adjacent to number 24) of the access road to the church car park, again that area would be unrestricted.

Given the above, I would be grateful if you could consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you wish your objection to stand, the item must at this stage be referred to

the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. A meeting is likely to be convened in September to avoid the Summer holiday period. If no response is received it must be assumed that your objection remains.

I would be grateful if you could indicate your intentions in writing by Monday 25 July 2016.

Regards,  
Gillian

Engineer – Network Safety  
Economic Growth & Development

Dear Nicola Boyes

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES, STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to your objection to the above advertised draft traffic Order, in particular the proposal to implement no waiting at anytime restrictions, represented on the ground as double yellow lines, on Swinburne Road.

In residents parking schemes, the bays for permit holders are marked out with a long white dashed box and it is usual for the remainder of kerbside space to be restricted, with yellow lines, to prevent parking by non permit holders potentially being displaced to those areas, where it may be obstructive.

The proposed double yellow lines are therefore to protect the areas in between the white bay markings. Their purpose is to facilitate traffic movements, assist road safety and in some cases they were requested through the consultation by residents to address ongoing obstruction issues.

The length of the proposed yellow lining should not remove available capacity because they are proposed in areas where parking should really not occur, if the area was left unrestricted it could potentially attract opportunist parking by non permit holders.

In regard to Swinburne Road, the restrictions would not cover any part of the frontage of number 18. On the east side the restrictions will assist visibility for drivers looking left and right as they leave the Church car park by preventing parking right up to the access, they will also prevent parking along both sides of the access to the car park itself which is adopted public highway. On the west side proposed the restrictions will prevent parking opposite the access. The traffic Order process is lengthy and costly so to include restrictions to address potential future parking issues arising following implementation of the permanent scheme is a standard approach.

Parking surveys were carried out as part of the original study, the maximum number of vehicles recorded during those surveys on Swinburne Road can still be accommodated under the proposed residents parking scheme. I would remind you that permit holders would not be limited to parking only in their own road, they may park in any bay throughout the whole zone.

I consider restrictions at the Dunottar Avenue / Swinburne Road end are necessary to assist visibility at the access, particularly if use of the car park is to be encouraged for non permit holders who will otherwise be unable to park for longer than 2 hours on street. I consider the extent of restrictions proposed on Swinburne Road at that location is in accordance with the Highway Code and has road safety benefits when leaving the access.

I am willing to propose a modification to the proposed order to reduce the extent of lining, on Dunottar Avenue (both sides) from the advertised 17 metres to 10 metres which would still improve visibility when leaving the access. I would extend the parking bay marking into that area so it would be subject to the residents permit parking controls. I am prepared to remove the restrictions from the southern end of Swinburne Road which would maintain current parking practices at this location. However, given the proximity to the alleyway I would prefer not to extend the parking bay markings there although it would be unrestricted (no markings laid) so parking may occur. I am also prepared to remove the restrictions along the south side of the access road itself which would also be left unrestricted, the access is simply not wide enough for a parking bay to be marked so that is not a practicable option there.

Any suggested modification to the proposed order may be subject to further consultation and cannot be guaranteed and if the order is referred to the appeals and complaints committee as set out below it is subject to their recommendations. Your comments on that modification are now sought before being proposed.

Given the above, the next stage is to ask you to please consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you wish your objection to stand, the item will be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. The Committee is independent to the traffic Order process, as an objector you would be given every opportunity to address the Committee if you wish. I must make you aware that your correspondence will form part of the Appeals and Complaints Committee papers and it will therefore become a public document, at that stage. The alternative is to formally withdraw your objection.

A reply by e-mail is acceptable to Legal Services using the following address [sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk) I would be grateful if could you please indicate your intentions by 27 June 2016.

Regards,  
Gillian.

Gillian Spence  
Engineer – Network Safety  
Economic Growth and Development

-----Original Message-----

From: Nicola Boyes [mailto:[nicola.boyes@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:nicola.boyes@stockton.gov.uk)]  
Sent: 23 May 2016 20:30  
To: Wilkinson, Sue  
Cc: Butcher, Julie  
Subject: Parking

>  
> Hi sue,  
>  
> I am writing in concern to the introduction to double yellow lines which will be enforced on to Swinburne Road, Eaglescliffe.  
> 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. I strongly object to these induction of these.  
>  
> Regards,  
> Nicola Boyes  
> 18 Swinburne road  
>  
> Sent from my iPhone

Spence, Gillian

---

**From:** Spence, Gillian  
**Sent:** 18 July 2016 09:55  
**To:** Economic Growth and Development Services; Wilkinson, Sue  
**Subject:** THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES, STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016

This email was classified as : OFFICIAL

Please could you send this out to ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ and ~~XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX~~ and copy in Stefan Houghton from the outlook system.

Sue – chase up e-mail for your file.  
Thanks  
Gillian

Dear Mr and Mrs Hill

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES, STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to our exchange of e-mails regarding the above draft traffic Order, no response from you has been received to date. However, I can inform you that further amendments to the restrictions have been proposed, for your information these are;

- The restrictions on Dunottar Avenue were advertised at 17 metres. In my e-mail to you of 13 June 2016, the 17 metres originally proposed was suggested to be reduced to 10 metres. It is proposed that is reduced further, to 6 metres of double yellow lines on the east side from the access going partly across the frontage of the church and 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.

To summarise; this constitutes a reduction from the originally advertised proposals of; 11 metres on the east side of Dunottar Avenue, 12 metres on the west side of Dunottar Avenue, 3 metres on the east side of Swinburne Road and 11 metres on the west side of Swinburne Road.

There is clearly a balance to be achieved between demand for parking and road safety considerations, the Council must consider all highway users and as outlined, to mark bays on the carriageway, indicates an area where it is considered acceptable to park which may not be where parking already occurs. On that basis the above is regarded as an acceptable compromise on this matter.

In my previous e-mail I also proposed the removal of the restrictions from both sides of the southern end of Swinburne Road which would maintain current parking practices and it would be unrestricted (no markings laid). I also previously proposed the removal of the restrictions along the south side (adjacent to number 24) of the access road to the church car park, again that area would be unrestricted.

Given the above, I would be grateful if you could consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you wish your objection to stand, the item must at this stage be referred to

the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. A meeting is likely to be convened in September to avoid the Summer holiday period. If no response is received it must be assumed that your objection remains.

I would be grateful if you could indicate your intentions in writing by Monday 25 July 2016.

Regards,  
Gillian

Engineer – Network Safety  
Economic Growth & Development

Dear Mr and Mrs Hill

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES, STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to your objection to the above advertised draft traffic Order, in particular the proposal to implement no waiting at anytime restrictions, represented on the ground as double yellow lines, on Swinburne Road.

In residents parking schemes, the bays for permit holders are marked out with a long white dashed box and it is usual for the remainder of kerbside space to be restricted, with yellow lines, to prevent parking by non permit holders potentially being displaced to those areas, where it may be obstructive.

The proposed double yellow lines are therefore to protect the areas in between the white bay markings. Their purpose is to facilitate traffic movements, assist road safety and in some cases they were requested through the consultation by residents to address ongoing obstruction issues.

The length of the proposed yellow lining should not remove available capacity because they are proposed in areas where parking should really not occur, if the area was left unrestricted it could potentially attract opportunist parking.

In regard to Swinburne Road, the restrictions would not cover any part of the frontage of number 17. On the east side the restrictions will assist visibility for drivers looking left and right as they leave the Church car park by preventing parking right up to the access, they will also prevent parking along both sides of the access to the car park itself which is adopted public highway. On the west side proposed the restrictions will prevent parking opposite the access. The traffic Order process is lengthy and costly so to include restrictions to address potential future parking issues arising following implementation of the permanent scheme is a standard approach.

Parking surveys were carried out as part of the original study, the maximum number of vehicles recorded during those surveys on Swinburne Road can still be accommodated under the proposed residents parking scheme. Permit holders would not be limited to parking only in their own road, they may park in any bay throughout the whole zone. The car park at Quarry Road is to remain operational and free of charge, capacity there is 23 spaces.

I note your household did not respond to either of the two consultations carried out directly as part of development of the proposals. However, I hope you noted that a speed limit reduction to 20mph throughout the area is also being progressed. I am sorry to hear of the personal injury you suffered and I would urge you to forward the vehicle details, if you obtained them, to the Police as a moving vehicle offence for appropriate action to be considered.

I consider restrictions at the Dunottar Avenue / Swinburne Road end are necessary to assist visibility at the access, particularly if use of the car park is to be encouraged for non permit holders who will otherwise be unable to park for longer than 2 hours on street. I consider the extent of restrictions proposed on Swinburne Road at that location is in accordance with the Highway Code and has road safety benefits when leaving the access.

I am willing to propose a modification to the proposed order to reduce the extent of lining, on Dunottar Avenue (both sides) from the advertised 17 metres to 10 metres which would still improve visibility when leaving the access. I would extend the parking bay marking into that area so it would be subject to the residents permit parking controls. I am prepared to remove the restrictions from the southern end of

Swinburne Road which would maintain current parking practices at this location. However, given the proximity to the alleyway I would prefer not to extend the parking bay markings there although it would be unrestricted (no markings laid) so parking may occur. I am also prepared to remove the restrictions along the south side of the access road itself which would also be left unrestricted, the access is simply not wide enough for a parking bay to be marked so that is not a practicable option there.

Any suggested modification to the proposed order may be subject to further consultation and cannot be guaranteed and if the order is referred to the appeals and complaints committee as set out below it is subject to their recommendations. Your comments on that modification are now sought before being proposed.

Given the above, the next stage is to ask you to please consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you wish your objection to stand, the item will be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. The Committee is independent to the traffic Order process, as an objector you would be given every opportunity to address the Committee if you wish. I must make you aware that your correspondence will form part of the Appeals and Complaints Committee papers and it will therefore become a public document, at that stage. The alternative is to formally withdraw your objection.

A reply by e-mail is acceptable to Legal Services using the following address [sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk) I would be grateful if could you please indicate your intentions by 27 June 2016.

Regards,  
Gillian.

Gillian Spence  
Engineer – Network Safety  
Economic Growth and Development

---

**From:** Aimee Mackay [mailto:[aimemackay@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:aimemackay@stockton.gov.uk)]  
**Sent:** 25 May 2016 18:45  
**To:** Wilkinson, Sue; Butcher, Julie  
**Cc:** [aimemackay@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:aimemackay@stockton.gov.uk)  
**Subject:** Planning Swinburne Eaglescliffe

Dear Julie & Team,

Please can we have on record that we strongly object to additional double yellow lines on or near Swinburne Road in Eaglescliffe. (Suggested station and witham avenue).

Im addition we would like on record that the church congregation and railway users are causing extreme speed and traffic. In my personal opinion we need further designated free parking and wardens not restrictions.

My strong views derive from my experience of extreme car damage due to the church congregation lack of respect of local home users. I am sure you are as shocked to read this as I was to find my brand new car ruined due to an individual squeezing into a tight space. If they had a space in the church this would not of occurred. Unfortunately in our road this is a daily occurrence..

In my second experience a driver utilising the railway 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.

Best Regards  
Aimee & Nick Hill  
17 Swinburne

Spence, Gillian

---

**From:** Spence, Gillian  
**Sent:** 18 July 2016 09:55  
**To:** Economic Growth and Development Services; Wilkinson, Sue  
**Subject:** THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES, STATION ROAD AREA, EAGLESCLIFFE, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016

This email was classified as : OFFICIAL

Please could you send this out to [georgina.burke@stockton-on-tees.gov.uk](mailto:georgina.burke@stockton-on-tees.gov.uk) and copy in Stefan Houghton from the outlook system.

Sue – chase up e-mail for your file.

Thanks  
Gillian

Dear Georgina Burke

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES, STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to our exchange of e-mails regarding the above draft traffic Order, no response from you has been received to date. However, I can inform you that further amendments to the restrictions have been proposed, for your information these are;

- The restrictions on Dunottar Avenue were advertised at 17 metres. In my e-mail to you of 13 June 2016, the 17 metres originally proposed was suggested to be reduced to 10 metres. It is proposed that is reduced further, to 6 metres of double yellow lines on the east side from the access going partly across the frontage of the church and 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.

To summarise; this constitutes a reduction from the originally advertised proposals of; 11 metres on the east side of Dunottar Avenue, 12 metres on the west side of Dunottar Avenue, 3 metres on the east side of Swinburne Road and 11 metres on the west side of Swinburne Road.

There is clearly a balance to be achieved between demand for parking and road safety considerations, the Council must consider all highway users and as outlined, to mark bays on the carriageway, indicates an area where it is considered acceptable to park which may not be where parking already occurs. On that basis the above is regarded as an acceptable compromise on this matter.

In my previous e-mail I also proposed the removal of the restrictions from both sides of the southern end of Swinburne Road which would maintain current parking practices and it would be unrestricted (no markings laid). I also previously proposed the removal of the restrictions along the south side (adjacent to number 24) of the access road to the church car park, again that area would be unrestricted.

Given the above, I would be grateful if you could consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you wish your objection to stand, the item must at this stage be referred to



the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. A meeting is likely to be convened in September to avoid the Summer holiday period. If no response is received it must be assumed that your objection remains.

I would be grateful if you could indicate your intentions in writing by Monday 25 July 2016.

Regards,  
Gillian

Gillian Spence  
Engineer – Network Safety  
Economic Growth and Development

Dear Georgina Burke

**THE COUNCIL OF THE BOROUGH OF STOCKTON-ON-TEES, STATION ROAD AREA,  
EAGLESCLIFFE, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2016**

Further to your objection to the above advertised draft traffic Order, in particular the proposal to implement no waiting at anytime restrictions, represented on the ground as double yellow lines, on Swinburne Road and Dunottar Avenue.

In residents parking schemes, the bays for permit holders are marked out with a long white dashed box and it is usual for the remainder of kerbside space 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.

The proposed double yellow lines are therefore to protect the areas in between the white bay markings. The length of the proposed yellow lining should not remove available capacity because they are proposed in areas where parking should really not occur.

In regard to Swinburne Road, the restrictions would not cover any part of the frontage of number 16. At the northern end, on the east side the restrictions will assist visibility for drivers leaving the Church car park by preventing parking right up to the access, they will also prevent parking along both sides of the access to the car park itself which is adopted public highway. On the west side the restrictions will prevent parking opposite the access. The restrictions at the southern end of Swinburne Road, approximately 5 metres measured from the alleyway, also assist traffic movements by preventing parking right up to the access. The traffic Order process is lengthy and costly so to include restrictions to address potential future parking issues arising following implementation of the permanent scheme is a standard approach.

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

Parking surveys were carried out as part of the original study, the maximum number of vehicles recorded during those surveys on Swinburne Road can still be accommodated under the proposed residents parking scheme. Permit holders would not be limited to parking only in their own road, they may park in any bay throughout the whole zone therefore residents of Swinburne Road may park in Dunottar Avenue as in current practices. Capacity provided on Dunottar Avenue is three times the maximum number of vehicles observed during the survey.

I consider restrictions at the Dunottar Avenue / Swinburne Road end are necessary to assist visibility at the access, particularly if use of the car park is to be encouraged for non permit holders who will otherwise be unable to park for longer than 2 hours on street. I consider the extent of restrictions proposed on Swinburne Road at that location is in accordance with the Highway Code and has road safety benefits when leaving the access.

I am willing to propose a modification to the proposed order to reduce the extent of lining, on Dunottar Avenue (both sides) from the advertised 17 metres to 10 metres which would still improve visibility when leaving the access. I would extend the parking bay marking into that area so it would be subject to the residents permit parking controls. I am prepared to remove the restrictions from the southern end of

Swinburne Road which would maintain current parking practices at this location. However, given the proximity to the alleyway I would prefer not to extend the parking bay markings there although it would be unrestricted (no markings laid) so parking may occur. I am also prepared to remove the restrictions along the south side of the access road itself which would also be left unrestricted, the access is simply not wide enough for a parking bay to be marked so that is not a practicable option there.

I note your comments regarding Elmwood Road/Pinewood Road although I trust you will appreciate any restrictions in this area are likely to receive objections from affected residents along similar opinions to those of yourself and other residents on Swinburne Road who are keen to maximise parking capacity on street. The restrictions around Elmwood Road/Beechwood Road were specifically requested through the original consultation hence they have been included in the advertised proposals although as expected objections to their imposition have also been received. I hope you can thereby appreciate the difficulties when trying to maintain road safety and also maintain on street parking capacity to satisfy residents requirements.

Any suggested modification to the proposed order may be subject to further consultation and cannot be guaranteed and if the order is referred to the appeals and complaints committee as set out below it is subject to their recommendations. Your comments on that modification are now sought before being proposed.

The next stage is to ask you to please consider your objection, whether you wish to formally withdraw it, or uphold it. Should you wish your objection to stand, the item will be referred to the Council's Appeals and Complaints Committee. The Committee is independent to the traffic Order process, as an objector you would be given every opportunity to address the Committee if you wish. I must make you aware that your correspondence will form part of the Appeals and Complaints Committee papers and it will therefore become a public document, at that stage. The alternative is to formally withdraw your objection.

A reply by e-mail is acceptable to Legal Services using the following address [sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk](mailto:sue.wilkinson@stockton.gov.uk) I would be grateful if could you please indicate your intentions by 27 June 2016.

Regards,  
Gillian.

Gillian Spence  
Engineer – Network Safety  
Economic Growth and Development

-----Original Message-----

From: Georgina Burke [mailto:[georginaburke@me.com](mailto:georginaburke@me.com)]  
Sent: 02 June 2016 13:54  
To: Wilkinson, Sue  
Cc: Butcher, Julie  
Subject: Parking proposals, Swinburne Road, Eaglescliffe

Dear Sue,

I am writing to express my concerns about the proposed parking restrictions on Swinburne Road and the surrounding area.

In particular, 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 residents' 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. Your proposals will result in the loss of at least six or seven spaces, which is contrary to one of the aims this scheme, which is to IMPROVE the parking on Swinburne Road.

I am also concerned that there are no parking or waiting at all 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. Please could some thought be given to improving this situation before someone is seriously injured? I know the school is doing everything it can to make things safer but as long as cars are allowed to park on the corners of that junction, there is a very high risk of injury to pedestrians. We should be encouraging people to walk to school but it is so dangerous to cross the road at that point, I know that some parents prefer to drive to make it safer for their children, thereby worsening the situation.

I hope you find this information helpful.

Kind regards,

Georgina Burke  
Resident, 16 Swinburne Road