### Report to the Cabinet

Meeting to be held on Thursday, 9 July 2020

# Report of the Head of Service - Highways

# Part I

Electoral Divisions affected: Chorley Rural East; Cleveleys South and Carleton; Clitheroe; Fylde East; Ormskirk; Poulton I Fylde; Preston East; Preston Central West; Preston East; Preston North; Preston Rural; Preston South; Preston West; Rossendale East; Rossendale West; St Annes South;

Lancashire County Council (Various Roads, Various Locations, Chorley, Fylde, Ribble Valley, Rossendale, West Lancashire and Wyre Boroughs and Preston City) (Various Parking Restrictions June - August 2019 (No 1)) Order 201\* (Appendices 'A' to 'I' 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 to address anomalies in parking restrictions and to clarify, simplify and tidy up a number of discrepancies that have been identified in the Fylde, Ribble Valley and West Lancashire districts. In addition, new restrictions are proposed in the districts of Chorley, Fylde, Preston, Rossendale 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 proposals for parking restrictions on the various lengths of road within the Chorley, Fylde, Preston, Ribble Valley, Rossendale, West Lancashire and Wyre Districts, as detailed within this report and as set out in the Draft Order (Appendix 'A'), Plans (Appendices 'B' to 'H') and Statement of Reason (Appendix 'I').



# **Background and Advice**

It is proposed to introduce prohibition of stopping, limited waiting, restriction of waiting and prohibition of waiting as detailed within Appendices 'A' to 'H' within the districts of Chorley, Fylde, Preston, Ribble Valley, Rossendale, Wyre, and West Lancashire, to improve the safety of all highway users whilst providing parking amenities. A detailed statement of reasons for each district is contained within Appendix 'I'.

#### Consultations

Formal consultation was carried out between 26 November 2019 and 27 December 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.

# Correspondence

As a result of the consultation 14 responses were received, three indicated that they supported the changes, four responded to indicate that they did not object to the proposals, one required the clarification of part of the order, one response did not register an objection but made adverse comments and there were five objections to the proposals.

# **General No Objection Replies**

United Utilities, Lytham St Anne's Cycling Group and two responses from the Police all indicated that they had no objections to the proposals.

#### Fleetwood Road, Primrose Way and Peck Place

Two responses were received with regard to this part of the proposed order. Though the responders were in support of the proposal, one suggested that in order to address congestion the no waiting restriction could be continued down the full length of Primrose Way, and that as much as the double yellow lines will be welcome they would prefer for no waiting Monday to Friday 8am – 6pm as this is the only time that there is a problem. The other response supporting the proposal asks for enforcement of the new order to ensure that the changes make a difference.

# **Engineers Response**

The work involved with this part of the proposal is junction protection therefore it would not be advisable to place a time limited restriction on these lengths that gave an indication that parking would be safe at certain times. As with all changes to traffic regulation orders the changes will be monitored and assessed. Should the changes be found to not resolve the issue or, by displacing parking, create new hazards then the waiting restrictions in the area will be reviewed.

### **Green Lane, Ormskirk**

One objection was received regarding the proposal to place double yellow lines on Green Lane, Ormskirk. The objection was that the restriction would be close to Ormskirk Rugby Ground and the area was popular with team members and visiting teams. By limiting parking in this area the parking would be pushed onto nearby streets.

The objector made a suggestion that the length of grass verge between the carriageway and the footway could be removed to allow parking.

# **Engineers Response**

The proposal in this order with regard to Green Lane, Ormskirk is to clarify the existing road markings. Double yellow lines have been on the ground in Green Lane for a number of years but the details of the order were incorrect. This resulted in restrictions that were unenforceable. The proposed order will correct this situation without adding any further restrictions.

The suggestion of removing the grass verge to allow parking would be outside the scope of this report. Such work would involve extra funding that at present is not available.

### Station Road and Rawlinson Street, Wesham

Two objections have been received with regard to the corner protection that is proposed for the junction of Station Road with Rawlinson Street, Wesham on the grounds that parking in this area is already difficult due to people accessing the train station and by introducing these restrictions it will make it more difficult for residents to park outside their properties and impact on available parking for disabled drivers.

The objectors suggest that the traffic engineers visit the area to see the significant problems with parking due to cars being left by people using the train services and suggests consideration of permit parking for the residents.

# **Engineers Response**

The corner protection proposed in the order at the junction was requested by highway users in the area expressing concern that parked cars are causing sightline problems when entering and leaving the junction. This will not impact on any existing parking regulations including disabled parking places. Some of the problems would seem to be related to the nearby train station but it is also noted that Rawlinson Street is a narrow road that is an access to many residential properties as well as an industrial unit. Therefore it is considered that the corner protection is necessary.

With regard to providing residents their own parking bay the only option is to introduce a resident's only parking scheme which are not being proposed by the council at this time.

#### Rawlinson Lane, Heath Charnock.

With regard to the proposal to introduce waiting restrictions on the bridge over the canal that is part of Rawlinson Lane there were two objections received along with a reply from the parish council expressing concern.

One objection was from a business owner close to the canal who expressed concern that if the proposal is approved vehicles will start parking on the short stretch of road from the junction to the proposed restrictions meaning that it will be almost impossible to get larger vehicles into the businesses at The Boatyard and that vehicles turning left from Adlington will collide with more parked cars than presently park there.

The objector believes that the problems in the area have been made worse by the Canal and River Trust permanent moorings. This is where people are allowed to live aboard the boats without any facilities, alongside the number of people using the day boats and the bus café. They are concerned that the proposal will create more of a problem than it solves unless it is amended to include the whole junction and the canal bridge itself.

The second objection was from a resident in a nearby property who expressed concern that the proposal would reduce the already limited available kerbside parking.

The objector was also concerned that although the proposal was dealing with a problem on the canal bridge there was regularly accidents at the junction of Rawlinson Lane with Westhoughton Road and that the removal of vehicles parking on the bridge would simply allow speeding vehicles.

In addition to the two objections there was a response from the Parish Council which expressed concerns that the restriction will cause problems for residents of the terraced properties west of the bridge. This was not an objection to the proposal but a request that once any changes were completed that these would be correctly monitored and should further action be required then this would be followed through.

#### **Engineer's Response**

The need for the restriction was pursued following concerns from drivers that the parked vehicles on the bridge were causing sightline problems at this point where the road narrows. The situation was checked by the local traffic engineers and this was found to be the case. The length of the restriction over the bridge went through a process of informal consultation. At that time the length of the proposal was broadly accepted by the residents of the terraced properties west of the canal bridge.

The restrictions have not extended to the junction with A6 Westhoughton Road as any parking in this area would be causing an obstruction and therefore can be dealt with by the Police. There will be a limited amount of parking available between the bridge and the junction but it was also considered that the introduction of excessive restrictions on Rawlinson Lane could result in encouraging drivers to park on A6 Westhoughton Road. Parking on this length of the A6 would be seen as undesirable.

As requested by the Parish Council a period of monitoring will be undertaken following the installation of the restriction and where additional concerns are identified further restrictions may be proposed.

Implications:		
This item has the following implications, as indicated:		
Financial		
The costs of the Traffic Regulation Order will be funded from the 2020/21 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