

## Report to the Cabinet

Meeting to be held on Thursday, 12 March 2020

### Report of the Head of Service - Highways

#### Part I

Electoral Division affected:  
Accrington South; Brierfield & Nelson West; Burnley Central East; Fleetwood East; Fylde East; Fylde South; Great Harwood, Rishton & Clayton-le Moors; Leyland Central; Lytham; Mid Rossendale; Moss Side & Farington; Pendle Hill; Penwortham West; Poulton le Fylde; Preston City; Preston Rural; Preston South East; Preston South West; Preston West; Rossendale South;

### **Lancashire County Council (Various Roads, Burnley, Chorley, Fylde, Hyndburn, Pendle, Preston, Rossendale, South Ribble and Wyre) (Revocation, Amendment, And Various Parking Restrictions March (No1)) Order 201**

(Appendices 'A' to 'K' refer)

Contact for further information:

Chris Nolan, Tel: (01772) 531141, Highway Regulation - Highways and Transportation  
[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 Wyre districts. In addition, new restrictions are proposed in the districts of Burnley, Chorley, Fylde, Hyndburn, Pendle, Preston, Rossendale, South Ribble 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:

- (i) Consider the proposals for parking restrictions on the various lengths of road within the Burnley, Chorley, Fylde, Hyndburn, Pendle, Preston, Rossendale, South Ribble and Wyre Districts as detailed within this report and as set out in the Appendices 'A' - 'K' including the draft proposed order statement of reason and plans.
- (ii) Approve the proposed Traffic Regulation Order for parking restrictions on various lengths of road within Burnley, Chorley, Fylde, Hyndburn, Pendle, Preston, Rossendale, South Ribble and Wyre districts at Appendix 'A-2'.

## **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 'K' within the districts of Burnley, Chorley, Fylde, Hyndburn, Pendle, Preston, Rossendale, South Ribble and Wyre to improve the safety of all highway users whilst providing parking amenities. A detailed statement of reasons for each proposal is contained within Appendix 'B'.

## **Consultations**

Formal consultation was carried out between 25 September 2019 and 25 October 2019 which was advertised in the local press and notices displayed on sites for all areas where the new restrictions were proposed. 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.

Due to an administration error in the original consultation of restriction length on Normoss Avenue a modification was consulted upon between 14 October 2019 and 11 November 2019 with a letter drop being undertaken to the properties affected and site notices being posted on site.

Divisional county councillors were consulted along with the council's usual consultees and the consultation documents posted on the council's website for both the formal consultation and the modification.

In addition the consultation period was also extended until 6 December 2019 due to notices for the Burnley, Pendle, Rossendale and Hyndburn areas not being posted on site.

## **Objections and Correspondence**

As a result of the formal consultation 40 responses were received concerning different aspects of the proposal. For the ease of reading the correspondence will be detailed together with the aspect of the proposal to which they relate along with the engineers comments in reply to any objections.

Two comments were received from the Police and one from United Utilities as statutory consultees noting that they had no objections to the proposals one of which positively supported the changes.

### **Admiral Way/Nelson Way, Preston**

Eight objections were received from members of the public that were employed at the industrial units on Admiral Way, all of which expressed concerns that by introducing the waiting restrictions they would not be able to park close to their place of work. Some of the objectors were concerned that the loss of parking would result in them having to look for other places to work and/or increase their daily expenses due to having to pay for parking or be required to use public transport at extra expense. Other points raised were that the inability to park close to their employment would cause stress and that by losing their job they would need to claim benefits.

### **Engineers Response**

Presently the parking on Admiral Way is causing problems for the businesses operating out of Riversway Motor Park. Despite business owners raising the issue of excessive and obstructive parking at this location, evidence suggests that they are the cause of the issue by using the footway as a location to park vehicles for advertisement and by restricting the available parking for their staff within the confines of their business properties. This has resulted in the road safety issue that now presents itself and it is considered that it is the driver's responsibility to find appropriate parking arrangements ensuring that they park safely and that this should not negate the need to ensure road safety at this location.

### **Crompton Street, Preston**

Two similar objections were received from the two companies that operate on the south eastern side of Crompton Street. The objections stated that the removal of the existing single yellow line will cause difficulties when larger vehicles required access to their properties. They are requesting that the proposal to remove the waiting restriction is not approved.

### **Engineers Response**

The waiting restrictions were initially introduced to support a business that has since ceased to operate from the Crompton Street site. For a number of years the waiting restrictions have not been enforced due to a lack of road markings, during this period there were no problems reported to highways. As the present businesses have operated successfully whilst the restriction was not being observed it is the opinion that the restrictions are not required and their removal will not create any new, or exacerbate any existing issues for the businesses.

### **Tulketh Road/Winmarliegh Road, Ashton on Ribble**

One objection was received on behalf of an elderly resident of Winmarliegh Road expressing concerns the restrictions would prevent parking outside the property and that the changes would cause difficulties for the resident, visitors and carers. The objector suggests that the junction is very quiet and that there is plenty of room to drive through.

### **Engineers Response**

The restriction is required to ensure that the sightlines are preserved for vehicles leaving the junctions and that the side roads are sufficiently clear of traffic for vehicles to enter the road even when other vehicles are waiting to leave. The restriction will improve safety for all highway users whilst aiding traffic flows on Tulketh Road.

### **Tanterton Hall Road/New Rough Hey, Fulwood**

Four letters of support were received with regard to this restriction.

### **Kew Gardens Penwortham**

A communication was received from the divisional county councillor. Officers met with the county councillor on site and the councillor expressly confirmed that their comments were not to be regarded as an objection to the proposal. No other comments were received.

### **Bath Street, Lytham**

Three objections were received regarding the proposal to introduce a loading bay on Bath Street this provision will replace a length of kerb line on the west side of Bath Street. The proposal will replace the present "KEEP CLEAR" markings that are incorrectly used to form an informal loading bay. All three objectors were local residents who complained that the present facility was causing problems due to the large vehicles blocking the road and causing congestion. They mention that the bay blocks access to the carpark for the historic Chapel House Building. Objections included complaints that the early morning deliveries to the hotel were disturbing sleep. It was also suggested that the loading bay allowed the hotel to leave their bins on the street and when these were over filled there were problems with sea gulls.

The objectors suggested that the loading for the hotel should be on A584 Central Beach.

### **Engineers Response**

The proposal is to introduce a legally enforceable Loading Bay to prevent the current misuse of the length of kerb line on the west side of Bath Street replacing the present "KEEP CLEAR" markings that are incorrectly used to form an informal loading bay which will assist in the facilitation of the free flow of traffic where previously misuse prevented any goods vehicles from accessing the area. With the correct enforcement deliveries to the Queens Hotel should be less problematic and this in turn should reduce some of the noise and congestion that is presently encountered whilst deliveries are completed at the hotel.

The present informal provision extends across the entrance to the car park for the Chapel House Building. The proposed order will be positioned in such a manner that this is no longer the case and access to the Chapel House Building car park will be indicated by the marking of an "H-Bar".

The possibility of providing a loading bay for the hotel on Central beach has been considered but as there is presently a no waiting at any time restriction at the front of the hotel this restriction was put in place as a safety measure to improve the sightlines for both drivers and pedestrians at an uncontrolled crossing point. It is considered that it would be incorrect to remove this provision.

With regard to comment received around the equipment that is left on Bath Street, in particular the industrial waste bins for the hotel. This is a matter best addressed by Fylde Borough Council. The objector has been given the information with regard to this matter.

### **Normoss Road, Poulton le Fylde**

2 responses were received with regards to the proposal to extend the prohibition of waiting at the junction of Normoss Avenue, Newton Drive East, Normoss Road and Newton Drive (Blackpool).

The first correspondence was on the basis that the length of restriction on the south-west side of Normoss Avenue was longer than was indicated in the informal consultation. In response the proposal was checked and confirmed that an administration error had occurred in the drafting of the schedule/plan for Normoss Avenue which was therefore amended to reflect the correct length. This modification was consulted upon between 14 October 2019 and 11 November 2019 with a letter drop being undertaken to the properties affected and site notices being posted on site.

The second correspondence was with regard to the proposal to extend the prohibition of waiting for the junction of Normoss Avenue, Newton Drive East, Normoss Road and Newton Drive (Blackpool). The comments were not an objection to the proposal but requested that consideration was given to a resident's only parking scheme in the area. There are problems with parking in the area due to the proximity with Victoria Hospital (Blackpool).

### **Engineer Response**

The problems in Normoss Road are particularly difficult as the surrounding streets, which are within the administrative area of Blackpool Council, all have residents only parking. Under Lancashire's current assessment criteria for Residents Parking Schemes this length of Normoss Road and the surrounding streets would not meet the criteria for residents only parking due to the number of homes with access to off street parking.

### **Town Hall Street, Great Harwood**

One response was received in relation to the proposals on Town Hall Street on the basis that the proposal is a step in the right direction, however, whilst not an objection, they feel that the proposed restrictions are not sufficient to deter poor parking and so they request parking restrictions for the whole square.

### **Engineer Response**

The proposal only relates to the extent of the publicly maintained highway. The remaining area of the Town Square is owned by Hyndburn Borough Council and it is considered that it is for them to decide on the most appropriate form of control for that areas and it is therefore outside the remit of this proposal.

### **Bamford Crescent / Manchester Road, Accrington**

Two objections were received on the basis that there is presently a problem caused by residents of Manchester Road parking their vehicles on the side streets preventing the residents of the side streets being able to park outside their properties. Concerns

raised were that the additional proposed restriction would limit the available parking outside the Manchester Road properties meaning that they would need to park in the side streets, further adding to the amount of vehicles and may also be problematic to any one with mobility problems.

### **Engineers Response**

The restrictions on Bamford Crescent/Manchester Road, Accrington are being proposed to improve sightlines for vehicles exiting Bamford Crescent.

The proposed Prohibition of Waiting on Manchester Road Accrington, north of its southerly junction with Bamford Crescent included 5 metres into an area that is utilised for parking by residents of the area as detailed in Schedule 2 item jj) of Appendix 'A-1 Consulted Proposed Order' and Drawing 'CH/06-19/HY1-1' of Appendix 'F'.

Having considered the objections, it is agreed that a reduction of the Prohibition of Waiting on Manchester Road to retain this parking amenity would not have a significant impact on the sight lines for drivers exiting Bamford Crescent. It is therefore proposed that item ii) of Schedule 2 be modified as set out in 'Appendix A-2 Modification of Proposed Order' and Drawing 'CH/06-19/HY1-1(modification)' of Appendix 'F'.

### **Market Street, Edenfield**

Two objections were received with regard to the proposal to introduce no waiting on Market Street, Edenfield. One objector was concerned that the proposal would remove the no waiting at any time on Heycrofts View.

The second related to the fact that the net proposed changes will reduce the length of restrictions to the south of junction with Heycrofts View. The objection states that proposed changes will not allow for sufficient sight lines for vehicles exiting Heycrofts View. Previously there had been provision with a restriction initially introduced in 1999 and consolidated in to the borough wide 2009 order that extended the no waiting at any time to extend across the frontage of No 42 Market Street. The objector claims that original order was as a result of consultations with the police and is concerned that the proposed order will over rule this consultation. Other points raised were that there are more vehicles on the road and that these are as a generalisation faster vehicles and therefore it is their opinion that the waiting restriction should be longer rather than shorter to make it easier to exit from Heyscroft View. The objector claims that his views are backed up with the number of minor collisions not recorded on county council statistics that have occurred at the junction.

### **Engineers Response**

The proposal does not affect the present provisions on Heyscroft View. The restrictions on Heyscroft View were not shown on the Traffic Regulation Order plan because the proposal is not changing these restrictions.

The second objection is on the grounds that the proposal does not allow safe egress from Heycrofts View on to Market Street. The proposal seeks to confirm the existing road markings currently present on site to the south of Heycrofts View which have been in place for at least 10 years. A study of the recorded personal injury data at the

junction for the period 1 January 2013 to date revealed there have been no recorded personal injury collisions.

The reason for the objection is that the proposal does not extend the lines far enough south. The proposal seeks to confirm the extent of markings currently on site which have been there for a period of at least 10 years. It is often assumed that a failure to provide visibility at priority junctions will result in an increased risk of injury collisions but nationally accepted research has shown there is no evidence of this and that it will not necessarily lead to a significant safety problem. This is reflected in the good injury collision record at this location and at other junctions along Market Street. Given the existing safety record and the national guidance, officers did not believe there was a safety justification for extending the current marked restrictions.

The objector says that the Statement of Reasons does not reflect the fact or give a reason why the existing Traffic Regulation Order is being revoked. The Statement of Reasons describes a Traffic Regulation Order to provide waiting restrictions which mirror the existing road markings on site to prevent parking and maintain sight lines and road safety which is what is proposed. It is necessary to revoke the original Traffic Regulation Order as it has not been marked correctly for over ten years and is therefore not representative.

The police have been consulted both prior to the advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Order through the Rossendale District Traffic Liaison Meeting on 13 February 2019 and as part of the statutory consultation process. The police have raised no objections to the proposal.

### **Old Hall Street, Burnley**

One Objection was received with regard Old Hall Street. This item had been removed from the proposed order prior to advertising and therefore does not impact on the work covered in this report.

### **Engineers Response**

Notices were placed on this street in error as the work had been previously removed from the proposal. It is intended that a full review of parking in the area of Old Hall Street and Elm Street will be completed in 2020. The Objection will be reviewed at that time.

### **Carr Lane, Chorley**

One communication was received regarding the new no waiting at any time restriction on Carr Road, Chorley that supported the proposal but also requested that the order be extended into the cul-de-sac, as the road is used as a car park for people attending the nearby school for training. This parking is often on the footways and across from drives making leaving the driveways impossible. The respondent considered that the present situation would be likely to get worse with the additional housing in the area.

### **Engineer Response**

The proposal has been designed to address the problem as they are presently seen. Whilst deciding on the extent of the new additional restrictions consideration was given to the directions of the Highway Code with regard to parking on or close to bends in the road. Although no safety concerns have been observed away from the

junction to date we will be monitoring any relocation of parking following installation to determine if further concerns arise.

### **Reedley Road, Reedley**

Nine responses of support were received with regard to the proposed waiting restrictions in Reedley Road close to Reedley Primary School. The comments were from a mixture of parents and staff with one containing 36 letters from pupils at the school. The comments included reference to a collision in October 2018 when a five year old child was "run over" by a car. There were comments that referred to the new restrictions giving support to work that staff complete on a daily basis trying to control the parking in aim to keep the pupils noting that whilst undertaking these duties staff were subject to abuse from drivers.

### **Engineers Response**

The comments indicate that it the additional restrictions will be welcomed by the school.

### **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   |      |             |