

## Report to the Cabinet

Meeting to be held on Thursday, 5 September 2019

## Report of the Head of Service - Highways

### Part I

Electoral Divisions affected:  
Chorley Rural East; Clayton with Whittle; Fylde East; Hoghton with Wheelton; Lancaster Central; Lancaster East; Lancaster Rural North; Lancaster South East; Longridge with Bowland; Lytham; Morecambe South; Ormskirk; Preston Central West; Preston City; Skelmersdale Central; Skerton; South Ribble East; St Annes North; St Annes South; West Lancashire West;

### **Lancashire County Council (Various Roads, Chorley, Fylde, Lancaster, Preston, Ribble Valley, South Ribble and West Lancs) (Revocations and Various Parking Restrictions November 2018 (No1)) Order 201\***

(Appendices 'A' to 'J' refer)

Contact for further information:

Chris Nolan, Tel: (01772) 531141, Highway Regulation – Highways and Transportation  
chris.nolan@lancashire.gov.uk

### **Executive Summary**

Following investigations and formal public consultation it is proposed to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to address anomalies in parking restrictions and to clarify, simplify and tidy up a number of discrepancies that have been identified in the Preston and Ribble Valley districts. In addition, new restrictions are proposed in the districts of Chorley, Fylde, Lancaster, Preston, South Ribble and West Lancashire. These restrictions will improve safety on the highway for all users and also provide some amenity parking.

This is deemed to be a Key Decision and the provisions of Standing Order C19 have been complied with.

## **Recommendation**

Cabinet is asked to approve the making of a Traffic Regulation Order introducing the parking restrictions on the various lengths of road within the Chorley, Fylde, Lancaster, Preston, Ribble Valley, South Ribble and West Lancashire Districts as detailed within this report and as set out in the schedules and plans attached at Appendices 'A' to 'J'

## **Background and Advice**

It is proposed to revoke some existing restrictions that no longer serve the purpose for which they were introduced and to introduce waiting, loading and disabled bays, and restriction and prohibition of waiting and loading/unloading restrictions as detailed within the Appendices 'A' to 'H' within the districts of Chorley, Fylde, Lancaster, Preston, Ribble Valley, South Ribble and West Lancashire to improve the safety of all highway users whilst providing parking amenities. A detailed statement of reasons for each proposal is contained within Appendix 'I'.

## **Consultations**

Formal consultation was carried out between 23<sup>rd</sup> April 2019 and the 24<sup>th</sup> May 2019. This was advertised in the local press. Notices were displayed on sites for all areas where the new restrictions were proposed. Divisional county councillors were consulted along with the council's usual consultees and the consultation documents posted on the council's website.

Notices were not placed at the locations of the existing restrictions where no material change to the restrictions as currently indicated on site are proposed.

During the consultation period 44 objections along with 7 queries and comments were received in response to this proposals as set out below:

## **Objections to the Proposal**

### **1 – CHORLEY Objections against 2 proposals Back Lane, Clayton-Le-Woods and Horrobin Lane, Rivington**

#### **Back Lane, Sheep Hill Brow and Town Brow, Clayton-Le-Woods – Schedule 2 Items a), b), c), d), aa), and qq) of proposal -**

The proposal is to extend parking restrictions at the junction of Back Lane with Sheep Hill Brow and Town Brow along with restrictions round a bend in Back Lane, please see page 1 of appendix 'B' for plan of proposal - A total of 21 Objections have been received in relation to this proposal.

As a result of the level of concern regarding this restriction further discussions are presently underway between the school and the trust that presently manage two carparks in close proximity to the school. The results of these consultations are likely to have an impact on the extents of any parking restrictions that may be required in the area.

## **Officer Response**

As the discussions are continuing with regard to parents using the pay and display car parks at school start and finish times and that the most serious parking problems are also around these times the engineer has asked for decisions on this element of the order to be deferred for a decision at a later date. Should this be agreed we will be looking to seal a new draft of the proposed order excluding these measures. It is intended that these measures will be brought back to the Cabinet for a decision at a later date. Please see appendix 'J' for revised order without these measures.

### **Horrobin Lane, Rivington Lane and Sheep House Lane, Rivington – Schedule 2 Items s), t), y), z) and bb)**

The proposed restrictions in Rivington on Horrobin Lane, Rivington Lane and Sheep House Lane in the vicinity of Rivington Foundation Primary School received 12 Objections and a petition with 42 names. The objections were from the primary school, parents of children attending the primary school, the parish council and a county councillor. The details of the proposed extensions to the present no waiting at any time restrictions can be seen on page two of appendix 'B'.

Many of the communications covered a number of individual points and this could be grouped as follows:

- Lack of alternative parking in the vicinity of the School and Church resulting in extended walking distance and displacement of parking to sections of highway which do not feature footways.
- Reduction of natural traffic calming effects of parked vehicles resulting in increased speed in the village.
- The markings will not be effective and drivers will continue to park with the potential to obstruct footways.
- Issues are present at other schools in the area which should be addressed in the same manner to ensure fairness.
- A fear that the present car park that is operated by united utilities may become unavailable due to the implementation of pay and display conditions.

The objectors raised a number of alternative proposals as listed below:

- The provision of term-time permit parking along the causeway, between 8am – 9am and 2:45pm to 4pm and issuance of permits for school traffic use only.
- Retain parking along the series of bends and install a shorter section at the bowling green entrance or introduce staggered restrictions to create a passing area for conflicting vehicles.
- Introduction of timed restrictions around the bend which would allow parking during school start and finish times.
- Requested meeting with Highway Officers at the site to discuss alternative options.

## **Officer Response**

The proposal was submitted following the receipt of concerns regarding parking behaviour in the area and as a result, highway officers had undertaken a number of observations at

the location. The studies revealed the presence of parking along the series of bends near the school and also at the junction with Sheep Hill Lane with Rivington Lane which directly contravenes Highway Code rules 242 and 243. This is prevalent during school start and finish periods at which time the increased parking results in an obstruction hazard to normal traffic flows.

All of the correspondents were contacted after the end of the formal consultation period with a single response from the engineer who proposed the scheme. This e-mail message covered all of the points raised by objectors. The engineer had waited for further feedback but only one message was received requesting clarification on a point that had been covered.

In response to the objections the following points should be noted:

- Whilst there is a need for availability of parking near the school at school start and finish times, some of this practice has been observed around the series of bends. Such parking directly contravenes the Highway Code and as a result represents both a hazard and obstruction to other road users by deflecting vehicles into the path of opposing traffic at points where there is limited forward visibility. Vehicular conflicts have been observed that have resulted with vehicles resorting to driving along the footway. This action is an unacceptable hazard to vulnerable highway users (such as children) within this popular pedestrian focused locality.

As much as the additional waiting restrictions will result in a relocation of parking to points that will be further away from the intended destination, it would be anticipated that when drivers choose an alternative parking location they will respect their responsibility to do so in a safe and appropriate manner to ensure that they do not cause a hazard.

These proposals have been raised after taking into account an appropriate level of protection for all highway users whilst, where possible, minimising the impact for residents, businesses and visitors to the area.

- The objection that removing the parking will also remove a traffic calming measure may in some areas be correct. However, this area is subject to a 20mph speed limit and so traffic calming in this way is not considered necessary.

The presence of parked vehicles within the village appears to be irregular in nature with the exception of during school start and finish times where it experiences a significant short term increase. Because of this any natural traffic calming effect provided by parked vehicles is inconsistent and during busy periods outweighed by the potential for vehicle conflicts and incursion into the footway. Three injury incidents have been recorded along this section within the past five years which have been related to restricted sightlines resulting from parked vehicles rather than excessive speed.

- With regard to the new restrictions not being observed by drivers the County Council's Parking Services Team endeavour to enforce all restrictions within the county, however it is appreciated that in outlying areas there are some difficulties. The objectors have been informed that individual instances of non-compliance can be reported directly online using the website or by email. When such details are

reported the incidents will be investigated and if possible penalty charge notices issued. The police also retain powers to undertake enforcement or removal of vehicles where they determine they are parked so as to cause an obstruction.

- It is recognised that all areas around schools experience a similar short term increase in traffic flow and parking activity during start and finish periods. Predominantly this is undertaken appropriately and does not result in problems on the highway network. Where concerns are identified the county council will consider the individual location circumstances when proposing any remedial action. Each area will present differing problems dependant on its unique characteristics and therefore cannot be compared directly to the circumstances on Horrobin Lane.

In respect to the alternative proposals that were submitted aimed at reducing the area of prohibition or providing alternative arrangements to accommodate school parking the following points should be noted:

- As the highway authority we are unable to reserve parking space within the highway for use by any particular establishment in this manner and as a result we are not in a position to consider the request for allocated parking along Horrobin Lane for exclusive use by the school. Any such scheme would be a permit parking scheme that is only used for residential properties. There is no indication that long term parking results in restricted access for visitors and the area appears to generate a regular turnover of short term parking throughout the day.
- The proposed extensions to the no waiting at any time is only at locations where it has been identified that parking is causing an obstruction or significantly reducing sight lines. Rule 243 of The Highway Code prescribes that vehicles should not park on a bend and this is supported by Rule 242 which makes it an offence to leave a vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road. To retain the parking except for lengths to provide passing places would contravene these rules by inferring that certain sections of the bend represent an acceptable parking location.
- The introduction of no parking except at school start and finish times would again directly contravene Highway Code rules by communicating that highway regulations directed at maintaining safety for all road users are dependent on the accessibility requirements of particular establishments. This would only restrict parking during periods where activity is naturally lower whilst preserving the increased parking which prompted the initial concerns.
- Although officers are always receptive to meeting requests from stakeholders with the goal of acquiring local views and limiting the impacts of proposals in this instance the area characteristics, issues observed and regulatory requirements do not allow an alternative parking solution to those included in the proposed order. Should alternatives be delivered it is considered that these would result in further infringement of the applicable Highway Code rules and therefore a meeting regarding the current proposal at this point would not be able to provide an achievable alternative.

## **2 – FYLDE Objections against North Promenade/Todmorden Road, St Annes**

### **North Promenade and Todmorden Road, St Annes – Schedule 2 Items x), ee) and ff) –**

The proposal is to introduce a length of no waiting at any time to replace a combination of no waiting at any time and no waiting 9am -10pm. See page 4 of appendix 'C' for plan of proposal. During the period of consultation two objections to the proposal were received.

The first objector made three points as follows:

- The changes would lose more than 100 parking spaces that are usually used by day trip visitors to Lytham St Annes. The concern is that, on a sunny day, as the car parks are all full this will increase parking on Kings Road and on certain days this is already difficult.
- People will think twice before coming to St Annes. Day trippers enjoyed parking for free and easy access to the beach with their chairs, tables, picnics, buckets and spades etc. It is a family resort and without this input the cafes, bars and restaurants will also suffer.
- The kite festival attracts thousands of people every year where will all these people park? The New splash pool has made the town even busier too and that's great but not when cars are left everywhere.

The second objection was to the extent of the proposal. The concern is that the hotels in the area do not have sufficient parking and that the changes will have a detrimental effect on the hotels between St Annes Road West and Beach Road. The objector agrees that northwest of Beach Road is a Residential area and the proposal would be correct for that length.

### **Officer Response**

The proposed order does not change the present restrictions between 9am and 10pm but will extend the restriction overnight.

Parking restrictions are introduced to allow the safe movement of traffic on the roads, however at present the current 9am-10pm restrictions has become unenforceable due discrepancies with signage and the current Traffic Regulation Order.

The proposed order retains the unrestricted parking and limited waiting 8am-6pm 2 hours no return in 2 hours on the south-west side, whilst removing obstructive parking and assisting with the general movement of traffic along the road, its junctions and property access on the north-west side.

### **3 – LANCASTER Objections against Morecambe Road/Hadrian Road (outside McDonalds), Lancaster proposal**

#### **Queries/Comments relating to Emesgate Lane, Silverdale**

#### **Morecambe Road, and Hadrian Road, (outside McDonald's), Lancaster – Schedule 1H - Schedule 2 Items q), u) and w) – Schedule 3**

One objection has been received to each of these proposals.

The first objection is to the no waiting at any time on Hadrian Road along with the restaurant access road, see page 2 of appendix 'D' for plan of the proposal.

The second is with regard to the fact that present school entrance markings on Morecambe Road will be replaced with a combination of no waiting at any time and No Loading at any time, see page 4 of appendix 'D' for plans of proposal.

#### **Hadrian Road and Access Road**

The objection regarding the no waiting at any time restriction on Hadrian Road and the access road covers three points;

- The objector visits McDonalds quite often and on the occasions when the car park is full they would park on these lengths to eat their meals prior to traveling onto their next destination;
- The objector also believes that there is no reason to put double yellow lines as this does not affect safety, however McDonalds employees use these lengths of road to park when there are no other options for staff parking and believes that's a safety concern for an employee to be walking that far. The objector says he has seen youths following young girls in their car and giving them problems;
- The objector confirms that they understand that the drive way to Stanhope should be clear however believes that unless Stanhope should provide a car park for McDonald's employees or another arrangements can be made does not see an issue.

#### **Officer Response**

The no waiting at any time restriction was implemented as part of the orders connected with the construction of the "Bay Gateway" road. On inspection of this order it was noted that there were some discrepancies in the description of lengths of the restriction.

This proposal does not introduce any new restrictions but seeks to revoke the present restrictions and re-instate the restrictions with descriptions that will allow the order to be enforced.

#### **Morecambe Road**

The objection regarding the school entrance marking on Morecambe Road was received from Lancashire Police expressing concern that the new no waiting at any time and no

loading at any time will be, in part, replacing school entrance markings. The Police cannot support the removal of any school entrance markings. The main points of the objection were as followed;

- The police attended a Road Safety Group meeting at which parking at this location was discussed. It was understood No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow lines) restriction along with a Prohibition of Loading at any time would be introduced but the School Keep Clear Markings would be retained. The proposed order does not reflect this and the school keep clear markings will be removed and replaced with No Waiting at Any Time and No Loading at Any Time restrictions.
- The concern of the police is that if the School Keep Clear markings are removed and replaced with double yellow lines and a loading ban it will be widely abused so will compromise child safety outside the school that specialises in children with learning difficulties. These children are possibly more vulnerable than children going to 'mainstream' schools. Generally drivers do not wait even for short periods of time on the current School Keep Clear markings at this location.

The police suggest an option to retain the School Keep Clear markings and introduce the prohibition of waiting and loading on the sections of Morecambe Road before and after the existing School Keep Clear.

### **Officer Response**

The No Waiting and No Loading is necessary as investigations have indicated that HGV's and staff from the Drive through takeaway, that is between the junction and the school, regularly park on Morecambe Road. This parking is causing visibility problems and problems for vehicles merging into one lane.

It is accepted that School entrance markings are generally better respected than double yellow lines and loading bans but they are also time limited. Should the present school entrance marking be retained then this would retain a parking opportunity at this key point outside the hours the markings are operational.

### **Emesgate Lane, Silverdale – Schedule 9 - See page 1 of appendix 'D' for plan of proposal**

Correspondence was received from both a County Councillor and the Parish Council for the proposed loading bay in Emesgate Lane Silverside both supporting the proposal however suggesting that changes be considered to both the extent of the bay and the times of operation.

With regard to the extent of the order it was considered that the period could be limited to 7:00am – 9:30am rather than the proposed 7:00am – 10:00am so that the normal parking can be opened up sooner. The manager of the store has confirmed that the deliveries are completed by 9:00 am so the shorter time would meet the business need for the bay.

The parish council have noted that the delivery lorry reverses to the position for making the deliveries. As they are continually looking to improve road safety, it was considered that this would be an opportunity to remove this hazard. The suggestion is that should the proposed bay be extended slightly further northwards removing the need for reversing, whilst not

significantly impacting on availability of general parking spaces due to the early morning limited times of the delivery,

### **Officer Response**

The order that is proposed is a standard restriction that is used within the county to deal with problems of this type. It is considered that the proposed order is close enough to the needs of the area to be the correct to use in Silverdale and will allow for late deliveries along with a facility that can be used by deliveries to other shops within the area.

The length and position of the bay has been selected to support the Co-Op store in the village that is seen as vital to the community. The position of the bay has been selected to reflect this. As with all new provisions the changes will be monitored and should problems be noted then revisions can be made at a later date.

## **4 – PRESTON Objections and Queries/Comments against Earl Street, Preston**

### **Earl Street, Preston – Schedule 11 -**

The proposal is to improve the loading bay facilities for market traders, by extending the times of a small section of the current loading facilities on Earl Street from 7am-10am and 3.30pm-6.30pm to 7am-6.30pm, please see page 2 of appendix 'E' for plan of proposal.

During the period of formal consultation four objections were received, two from Preston City Council and two from market traders.

The objections from Preston City Council were that the original decision to introduce the short 7am-6.30pm loading bay would be time limited to only 15 minutes. Unfortunately the time limited loading was not included in the advertised proposed order. The engineer has accepted that a mistake has been made and after discussions it was decided that the best way forward would be to request that the order is allowed to progress without the 15min time limited restriction on the understanding that a new order will be raised, and advertised as soon as possible to correct this error. Error will also provide an opportunity to check if a 15 minute restriction is correct to serve the short term delivery operation that it is intended to provide.

The market manager also suggested further alterations to the times that the loading bays should be operating. The new suggested times were considered to better reflect the needs of market traders and disabled parking requirements.

The two objections from the market traders indicated that they were concerned that the proposed changes would reduce the opportunities for traders to service their businesses. The points raised by the traders are as follows.

- The proposal reduces the amount of loading time which will have a detrimental effect on my ability to run my business;
- Current loading restrictions are minimal enough without an additional reduction of 1.5hours - specifically in relation to changes to the current 10:30am to 10am;
- Somewhere is needed to unload and load for market traders and the proposal is making it impossible to attract new traders to the market let alone the traders that stood all through the building work and are still here.

## **Officer Response**

The engineer who looks at waiting restrictions in Preston has given an undertaking that he will revisit this matter with a view to proposing a limitation to the loading period to the previously requested 15 minutes time limit. In addition investigations will be undertaken to see if the times that the loading bays operate should be changed to reflect new trading patterns.

In light of the above both Preston City Council objections have been withdrawn.

With regard to the objections raised by the market traders. There is nothing in the proposed order that will reduce the opportunity to load or unload goods vehicles on Earl Street. The proposed changes remove the gap between the current 7am-10.30am and 3.30pm-6.30pm to allow additional loading/unloading from 10.30am-3.30pm. Presently there will not be a time limit on this length but following further consultation it is proposed that this bay will have a limit of 15 minute per stop to ensure a fast turnover of vehicles, allowing all market traders the opportunity to load/unloading throughout the day. It is considered that the objections from Market Traders were due to a misunderstanding of the proposal as the order is increasing the ability to load/unload for traders.

## **5 – RIBBLE VALLEY Objections against Clitheroe Road, Waddington and Queries/Comments against Waddow Grove/Clitheroe Road Junction, Waddington**

### **Clitheroe Road, Waddington – Schedule 2 Item I) –**

The proposal was to make a formal waiting restriction to allow a length of double yellow lines that had been placed on the road following resurfacing in late summer 2018 see page 2 of appendix 'F' for plan of proposal.

Following formal consultation three objections were received covering the following points.

- The objectors were concerned that we were proposing to remove much needed parking in a part of Waddington where few properties had available off street parking.
- The objectors believe that the restrictions were placed in error when the road was resurfaced and pointed out that although there had been some restrictions placed on this length at a time when there were works being carried out on the carriageway, these were as a result of a temporary traffic regulation and were removed once the works were completed.
- Councillors believe that there are other more hazardous locations on the main road through the village where parked cars are causing problems for passing traffic and pedestrians where double yellow lines would be more effective particularly as in this area there is not only a pavement, but the road is not at its narrowest.

## **Officer Response**

These restrictions have recently been marked on site and this proposal was to introduce a traffic regulation order to enable enforcement. However after further investigations due to receiving objections it appears that the restrictions were only introduced as a temporary measure for works relating to the strengthening of three bridges in Waddington in 2004 and should not have been refreshed.

In light of the above this proposal is being withdrawn from the order - Please see appendix 'J' for revised order without these measures.

### **Clitheroe Road and Waddow Grove junction, Waddington – Schedule 2 Items k) and hh) -**

The proposal is to make a formal order for lines that have been in place for some time but have not been enforceable as the traffic regulation order regarding the makings could not be located, see page 1 of appendix 'F' for plan of proposal. We are not looking to extend any unmarked provisions at this time.

Comments were received regarding the northeast side of the junction of Waddow Grove with Clitheroe Road, where there is a cycle-by-pass which allows cyclists to avoid having to comply with a requirement to give priority to oncoming traffic. This facility is often blocked by parked vehicles. Therefore the objector suggests that the current proposal of no waiting at any time be extended by around 5 metres northwards to ensure that the by-pass is always available for cyclists.

#### **Officer Response**

The requested extension to the restrictions in the manner requested by the objector is seen as necessary at this time. We will however keep the situation under review and should it become apparent that an extension to the restrictions would be required then a new traffic regulation order will be advertised.

### **6 – SOUTH RIBBLE Objections against Brierley Road, Bamber Bridge**

#### **Brierley Road, Bamber Bridge – Schedule 2 Items g), h), i) and j) –**

The proposal is to extend the present no waiting at any time restrictions to eliminate indiscriminate parking that is causing problems to the free flow of traffic in this industrial estate including HGV movements, please see appendix 'G' for plan of proposal.

One objection was received expressing concern that the extended restriction will only have the effect of moving the parking problem further into the industrial estate. The objector was concerned that there had already been measures put in place to protect pedestrians and that these were not being maintained.

#### **Officer Response**

Walton Summit Road Has been experiencing a significant amount of footway obstruction which we requested the Police to investigate. They did so successfully, but this has resulted in the offending vehicles parking fully on the carriageway, causing issues which could not be effectively enforced due to the lack of waiting restrictions.

During the informal consultation we were contacted by some businesses on Brierley road who reported problems with displaced vehicles causing issues with HGV movements to and from their business. This proposal is intended to address this situation.

Whilst the extent of the proposed extension to the waiting restriction would appear substantial, presently the parking problem is only on one side of the carriageway and therefore the actual number of vehicles that will be displaced is only minimal. It was decided to introduce the restriction on both sides of Brierley Road to ensure that the problem is not immediately moved to the opposite side without restrictions causing the same current problems.

It is considered that this order will not cause a significant displacement of traffic further into the estate, however, as with all new traffic regulation orders the changes will be monitored and should further restrictions be required these will be raised and advertised as a proposed order at a later date.

## **7 – WEST LANCASHIRE Objections against Derby Road, Ormskirk**

### **Derby Road, Ormskirk Proposal – Schedule 2 Item m) –**

The proposal is to extend the present no waiting at any time restriction on the north side of Derby Street to a point 25 metres east of the centreline of Bath Springs to assist with access and egress for Bath Springs, please See page 2 of appendix 'H' for plan of proposal.

One objection was received expressing concern that whilst the proposal will help resolve the current access and egress of traffic across Greetby Hill and Derby Street, this does not resolve the issue of vehicles parking on both sides of the top of Bath Springs creating access problems for emergency service and refuse collection vehicles.

The objector suggests that additional No Waiting at Any Time restrictions are required on the east side of Bath Springs from its junction with Derby Street down to where the road bends to the right (opposite the entrance to Bath Springs Court) to stop vehicles parking on both sides of the road.

The objector has subsequently said that he does not want to remove his comments but sees his communication as that of an observation rather than raising an objection.

### **Officer Response**

No waiting restrictions extending into Bath Springs were not deemed to be required as the site had been inspected on numerous occasions and at these times parking on both sides of Bath Springs was not observed. As with all changes to waiting restrictions the area will be monitored and should there be a problem with parking on both sides of Bath Springs then a new proposal will be considered.

### **Implications:**

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

## **Financial**

The costs of the Traffic Regulation Order will be funded from the 2019/20 highways budget for new signs and lines at an estimated cost of £10,000.

## **Risk management**

Road safety may be compromised should the proposed restrictions not be approved.

## **List of Background Papers**

Paper	Date	Contact/Tel
-------	------	-------------

None

Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate

N/A