

## Report to the Cabinet

Meeting to be held on Thursday, 8 August 2019

### Report of the Head of Service - Highways

#### Part I

Electoral Divisions affected:  
Brierfield & Nelson West; Chorley Central; Chorley North; Chorley South; Clitheroe; Euxton, Buckshaw & Astley; Fleetwood East; Fylde East; Great Harwood, Rishton & Clayton-le-Moors; Houghton with Wheelton; Lancaster Central; Mid Rossendale; Morecambe South; Ormskirk; Oswaldtwistle; Pendle Central; Penwortham West; Preston City; Rossendale West; Skelmersdale East; South Ribble West; West Lancashire East;

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

(Appendices 'A' - 'M' refer)

Contact for further information:

Chris Nolan, Tel: (01772) 531141, Network Control - Community Services

[chris.nolan@lancashire.gov.uk](mailto:chris.nolan@lancashire.gov.uk)

#### **Executive Summary**

Following investigations and formal public consultation it is proposed to make a Traffic Regulation Order 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 Rossendale districts. In addition, new restrictions are proposed in the districts of Chorley, Fylde, Hyndburn, Lancaster, Pendle, Preston, Ribble Valley, Rossendale, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre. 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, Hyndburn, Lancaster, Pendle, Preston, Ribble Valley, Rossendale, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre Districts as detailed within this report and as set out in the schedules and plans attached at Appendices 'A' to 'L'.

## **Background and Advice**

It is proposed to revoke existing restrictions that no longer serve the purpose for which they were introduced, to redefine some restrictions that need clarification to ensure successful enforcement and to introduce waiting restrictions and prohibition of waiting and loading/unloading restrictions as detailed within the Appendices 'A' to 'L' within the districts of Chorley, Fylde, Hyndburn, Lancaster, Pendle, Preston, Ribble Valley, Rossendale, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre to improve the safety of all highway users, including pedestrians and cyclists whilst providing parking amenities. A detailed statement of reasons for each proposal is set out in Appendix 'M'.

## **Consultations**

Formal consultation was carried out between 26 February 2019 and 26 March 2019 and advertised in the local press. Notices were displayed on site for all areas where 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 a number objections were received in response to the proposals as set out below:

## **Objections to the Proposals**

### **Rossendale Burnley Road Rawtenstall**

There were eight replies with regard to the proposals to introduce new waiting restrictions on A682 Burnley Road, Rawtenstall and an unnamed road leading to Leebrook Road. Three of the replies indicated support for the changes but five were objecting to the new restrictions as they feared that the changes would cause parking problems in the area once the new restaurant opened in the former public house. Concerns included worries regarding parking being displaced to un-adopted streets and outside properties with off street parking in such a manner that these parked vehicles would block driveways.

## **Officer Response**

The order was raised to address concerns that parked cars were restricting sight lines for vehicles entering Burnley Road from Leebrook Road and that cars parking on the unnamed road were narrowing this point of access and egress to a single lane. This in turn means that vehicles have to wait on Burnley Road for the cars on the unnamed road to clear but in doing so they add to the problems with the sight lines. This indicates that there is a safety issue that can be addressed by the introduction of these proposed restrictions.

The proposal has been discussed at a recent Traffic Liaison Meeting where it gained support from the Police, representatives from the borough council and local traffic engineers.

To address the concerns of residents of Burnley Road who have off street parking it has been indicated that should a driver block access or egress to a drive then this would constitute an obstruction, being an offence that could be dealt with by the Police, but to aid this they could request, free of charge, a H-Bar that would be marked across their drive indicating the access that is required for their property.

## **Chorley Colyton Road and Plymouth Grove, Chorley**

Two letters of objection to this proposal were received from the same address and a further email was received from a different address supporting the proposal but expressing concern with reference to the possibility of displaced parking. The objections were that there was not a problem during the middle of the day as at this time the demand for parking is low. As this is the case they could not see that access for refuse collection would be a problem. The e-mail in support identifies that the present situation with parking could cause a problem should a larger emergency vehicle require access but does not think that this arises from the fact that parking spaces are at a premium.

The introduction of No Waiting at Any Time restrictions at the junction of Colyton Road and Plymouth Grove, Chorley has been proposed following concerns raised by Chorley Borough Council who have experienced regular obstructions whilst undertaking refuse collection services as a result of vehicle parking primarily around the junction. This also represents a concern for emergency service and delivery vehicles attempting to enter the road. Guidance regarding parking in the vicinity of junctions is contained within Highway Code rule 243 which states that vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a junction and the planned restrictions will serve to provide an additional visual indicator of the need to keep this area clear.

## **Ordnance Road and Buckshaw Station Approach, Buckshaw Village**

There have been five responses to this proposal one of which is an objection and the others have passed comments generally requiring increased restrictions in the area and requesting that the parking for the railway station is increased so removing commuter parking from on street.

The introduction of No Waiting at Any Time restrictions at the junction of Ordnance Road and Buckshaw Station Approach are in response to concerns raised regarding parking around the junction which resulted in restricted sightlines for exiting vehicles. The Highway Code provides clear guidance for parking in the vicinity of junctions and the new restrictions will provide a visual representation of the area required to be kept clear and a defined enforcement route for future contraventions.

The proposal to implement the corner protection no waiting at any time is the initial stage of regulating parking in the area. As land on both sides of Buckshaw Station Approach is still to be developed, the waiting restrictions in the area will be formulated to reflect the land usage as the development progresses. The area is continually being monitored and should further restrictions be identified as necessary these will be formally proposed.

### **Fylde Marquis Street, Kirkham**

A single letter of objection, covering a number of points, has been received from the proprietor of a local car sales and service garage who objects to the proposal as the extended lengths of "No Waiting At Any Time" will encroach on to a length of road that is used by customers to his business in a number of ways. In the letter of objection the usage covers customers leaving vehicles for service prior to the business opening, vehicles being left on the road by recovery vehicles when this has occurred overnight and customers parking whilst visiting the business.

The objector does not consider that there is a problem sufficient to warrant the extension of the waiting restrictions as the problem was with HGV deliveries to another business. The deliveries were very infrequent and were limited to just once or twice each week. Should the existing waiting restrictions be enforced there would be no need for the additional work.

### **Officer Comments**

There are parking problems in the area due to commuters using the nearby Kirkham Railway Station and therefore it has been considered necessary to propose corner protection at a number of junctions in the area. As part of this work it is proposed that the junction of Marquis Street with Station Road also should have the present no waiting restrictions extended for a distance of 30 metres on the north west side of Marquis Street and 12 metres on the south east side. This was brought to the county council's attention following a number of complaints of difficulties using the junction received from local residents and a business. The business operates using longer vehicles and therefore is experiencing difficulties accessing Marquis Street due to parked cars.

It is considered that the restrictions will be required to maintain safe traffic flow and preserve adequate sight lines and should be supported.

**Implications:**

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

**Financial**

The costs of the Traffic Regulation Order will be funded from the highways revenue budget for new signs and lines at an estimated cost of £5,000.

**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