

Report to the Cabinet

Meeting to be held on Thursday, 7 October 2021

Report of the Head of Service - Highways

Part I

Electoral Divisions affected:
Brierfield & Nelson West;
Chorley Central; Chorley North
Chorley Rural East; Fleetwood
East; Fleetwood West &
Cleveleys West; Fylde South;
Fylde West; Leyland Central;
Lostock Hall & Bamber Bridge;
Lytham; Mid Rossendale;
Nelson East; Pendle Hill;
Penwortham East & Walton-le-
Dale; Preston Central East;
Preston Rural; Skelmersdale
East; South Ribble East; West
Lancashire East; Wyre Rural
East;

**Lancashire County Council (Various Roads, Various Locations, Chorley, Fylde, Pendle, Preston, Rossendale, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre)
(Revocations, Amendment to Permit Parking and Various Parking Restrictions,
March 20 (No1)) Order 202***
(Appendices 'A' - '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 to address anomalies in parking restrictions and to clarify, simplify and remedy a number of discrepancies that have been identified in the Pendle, Preston, Rossendale, and Wyre districts to allow for effective enforcement.

In addition, new restrictions are proposed in the districts of Chorley, Fylde, Pendle, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre.

These proposals are to address safety concerns of vehicles parking causing serious problems with regard to safe and expeditious traffic movement and obstruction of drivers' visibility impeding access and egress to adjacent properties in particular for emergency service vehicles and larger deliveries and refuse collection vehicles.

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, Pendle, Preston, Rossendale, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre districts, as detailed within this report and as set out in the Draft Order (Appendix 'A2'), Plans (Appendices 'B' to 'I') with revised Site Notice (Appendix 'B1' 'G1' and 'H1') and Statements of Reasons (Appendices 'J' and 'J1').

Background and Advice

It is proposed to introduce a number of Prohibition of Waiting restrictions to address potential road safety issues following concerns of:

- Vehicles parking causing serious problems with regard to safe traffic movement and obstruction of driver's visibility impeding access and egress to adjacent properties in particular for emergency service vehicles and larger deliveries and refuse collection vehicles.
- Unnecessary and inconsiderate hospital parking that is causing serious problems for residents with regards to safe traffic movement and obstruction of driver's forward visibility.
- Significant verge damage predominantly caused by HGVs parking in the locations and too close to the junctions.

The proposals also include a provision of limited waiting parking places in Preston to improve the general amenity of the area along with formalising residential Disabled Parking Places that are currently being misused in Wyre, and to clarify, simplify and tidy up a selection of orders that have been identified with discrepancies in Pendle, Preston, and Rossendale to allow for effective enforcement.

The published proposed order included the following items identified by district:

Chorley

New parking restrictions are proposed at the junction of Bolton Road and Grimeford Road, Anderton to improve access to Grimeford Road and to preserve sightlines for drivers turning on to Bolton Road along with a length of Grimeford Road to allow HGV access to the Grimeford industrial estate.

It is proposed to extend the existing waiting restrictions on The Grove, Chorley where there are reports that the current level of parking is presenting difficulties for access by refuse collection vehicles and emergency vehicles. The problem is reported to be due to staff and visitors to the hospital.

To allow the occupants of 28/30 St. Thomas's Road access to the rear of the property for parking it was necessary to move the existing permit parking bays, on Royle Road south towards its junction with St Thomas's Road. This would allow the marking of an H-Bar denoting the required access whilst maintaining the lengths of residents permit parking.

Fylde

An 18-metre extension to the current single yellow line Restriction of Waiting Mon – Fri 11am to 2.30pm on Lytham Road is proposed to address a problem that has been brought to the attention of local traffic engineers. This work will extend the restriction to the point where the double white lines commence. Rule 240 of the Highway code states that you must not stop or park on roads marked with double white lines (an offence which is prosecutable by Lancashire Constabulary). As a result, this will remove parking which is causing a problem in this area.

Following reports of junction sightline issues in the vicinity of the primary school due to parking close to the junction of Clitheroe Road with Boston Road, it is proposed to introduce short lengths of double yellow lines,(no waiting at any time). This is common junction protection that will improve sight lines for drivers and assist turning for larger vehicles making deliveries to residential properties.

It is proposed to address reported problems at the junction of Beach Street with Rear 23-35 Church Street. The proposal is intended to improve sightlines for vehicles exiting Rear 23-35 Church Street and ensure that vehicles can access the same area.

Pendle

It is proposed to extend the current no waiting at any time restrictions on Earby Road, Salterforth, following restrictions introduced in 2014. The extension is required to address problems of parked cars on a narrow road that is also a bus route. In a similar manner a new length of no waiting at any time on A682 Gisburn Road, Higherford is proposed to relieve congestion due to parking on the bus route and to improve safety for vehicles exiting Rockville.

On three roads, work is included to revoke and reintroduce restrictions to ensure that the provisions are in line with the road markings on the ground allowing the orders to be effectively enforced. The roads affected are Dam Head Road, Barnoldswick where the traffic regulation order indicates a waiting restriction of no waiting Monday to Saturday 9 am - 6 pm but the markings on the road indicate no waiting at any time. This order proposes to correct this to no waiting at any time. Wheatley Lane Road, Fence where there is a combination of No waiting and School Entrance Markings but the lengths of the markings in place do not match the order. It is proposed to correct the lengths to match the markings on the highway. Brook Street, Nelson has a number of different orders covering the road, creating difficulties with enforcement. Removing all the short length of restrictions and reintroducing the same provisions in two lengths will enable effective enforcement.

The proposals for Pendle also include the revocation of two Disabled Bays that are no longer required, one on Castle Street, Brierfield and one on Walton Lane, Nelson.

Preston

After recent development of land within the vicinity of Broomfield Mill Street and Southgate, Preston, the current parking provisions have not been amended, and are no longer suitable. This proposal formalises the current restrictions on Broomfield Mill Street and amends the restrictions and bays on Southgate in order to maintain the amenity of previously existing parking spaces on the new road layout.

Rossendale

The proposal for North Street, Rawtenstall is a correction of a Road Name, due to an administration error in the recent Order covering the restrictions around the new bus station. This will enable enforcement of restrictions that are currently in place.

South Ribble

A proposal for the junction of Service Road Fronting 72a to 84 Turpin Green Lane, Leyland has been raised to allow safe access and egress from the road and to ensure that vehicles are prevented from parking across dropped crossings that are important to ensure routes are available for disabled highway users.

No waiting at any time restrictions are proposed at the junction of Cuerdale Lane and Spring Lane with A677 Preston New Road. The restrictions have been proposed following reports that parking in the area is causing obstructions, and heavy goods vehicles causing damage to grass verges by either parking or moving around parked vehicles.

Reported problems that parked cars at the junction of Lourdes Avenue and St Gerard's Road, Lostock Hall, were causing difficulties for drivers negotiating the junction. This Order proposes to introduce double yellow lines to improve sightlines and to help vehicles turning into and out of St Gerard's Road.

No waiting at any time was proposed for the full length of The Cawsey and Carrwood Road, from Leyland Road to London Way, and at the junctions of the side roads along the route. The proposal was considered to be a means of improving sightlines at all the junctions and to improve traffic flows on this new through route. It was considered that the work would not affect local residents as no homes fronted the new proposal, but it was acknowledged that it would prevent walkers parking on the road.

West Lancashire

A proposal has been created to address reported problems with access to properties on Holland Court due to inconsiderate parking by neighbours. The work involves the introduction of no waiting at any time restrictions intended to keep the access road and the junctions sufficiently clear to allow access for emergency and service vehicles.

Proposals have also been raised for Pinfold Road, Merchant Road and Mulberry Close, Ormskirk, to address hospital parking. This area has been subject to a number of previous proposals that have failed to meet the needs of the local residents and were not sealed.

Wyre

No Waiting At Any Time (double yellow lines) restrictions are proposed to preserve the sightlines at the junction of Broadway and Melbourne Avenue, Fleetwood. This proposal will also assist the operation of a school crossing patrol.

It is proposed to formalise two disabled bays that are currently being abused on Carr Road, Fleetwood, and Warren Street, Fleetwood. The Bay on Carr Road was presented to Cabinet on 12 February 2015 when the objections were not upheld but the order was not sealed. The two-year time limitation results in a need to re-advertise the work.

Consultations

Formal consultation was carried out between 27 April 2021 and 28 May 2021 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 objections were received regarding the extent of the Merchant Road proposal on the grounds that the plans posted on site did not match those that were contained within the informal consultation. This highlighted that an error had been made when drawing up the proposal for formal consultation and as a result of this a further consultation on a modification was carried out between 19 May 2021 and 16 June 2021. Details of this consultation are contained within (Appendix 'H' Drawing 'KL/20-21-1/WL2(A)' Plan and Appendix 'H-1' Modification Site Notice, the modified statement of reason is included as Appendix 'J-1').

Following the end of the consultation period a further query was received in relation to the proposals on Royal Road in relation to the vehicle crossing and relocation of the permit bays. Initial measurements undertaken by the highway maintenance team were found to be incorrect. To avoid vehicles protruding onto the footway a vehicle crossing can only be installed where there is a minimum of 4.8 metres from a boundary wall to the footway edge of where the highway boundary starts. New measurements resulted in the dropped crossing being reduced by 4 metres allowing for an extension of 4 metres to the proposed permit bay. This modification to the proposal was advertised on site from the 2 June 2021 to 20 July 2021 (Appendix B1). No further objections were received in response to this modification; however, responses were received from those who had already objected confirming that they wished for their objections to remain.

Objections

As a result of both consultations, 37 objections, 7 correspondence in support, 3 correspondence confirming no objection, 5 correspondence making additional comments and 6 correspondence requesting additional information were received. The comments were regarding the items in the proposed order as follows along with the engineer's comments as they are relevant.

General

Two replies were received from the Police and United Utilities expressing that they had no objections to the proposals.

Chorley

The proposal to extend the current parking provisions on The Grove, Chorley, received 4 objections, one message of support but requesting Residents Parking, and a message of support for the changes. The objectors all claim that the changes will not address the problem of hospital parking but will move the problem further down The Grove. The objectors and one of the support messages also requested a residents parking scheme.

Four objections were received with regard to the splitting of the residents permit parking place on Royle Road, Chorley. The objectors are concerned that the changes to provide vehicle access to the rear of 28/30 St. Thomas's Road will not be safe. The owners are currently accessing the land crossing a footway to park cars at the rear of the property, however due to the location of the current Residents Permit Parking Place, vehicles parking in the bay are restricting access. There are concerns that the parking is causing vehicles to cross the footway and once parked one vehicle regularly protrudes beyond the building line into the footway. A further

complaint was that whilst using the area to park one vehicle has damaged a gable end of No2 Royle Road. Objectors also expressed concerns that the proposal is to move parking on Royle Road south, closer to the junction with St. Thomas's Road to a point that is currently restricted with double yellow lines. The point raised is that the change will cause problems for vehicles entering and leaving Royle Road.

One objection was received on the grounds that parking in this zone is already at a premium and the proposed changes will reduce the space available for residents to park. There were also complaints regarding enforcement where vehicles are parking on the existing double yellow lines and vehicles parking in the permit bays without a parking permit.

Following the re-advertisement of the new length of the permit parking bay no further objections were received. However, responses were received from those who had already objected confirming that they wished for their objections to remain.

Officers Comments

Following objections to an informal consultation, the proposed restrictions on The Grove were reduced to exclude the turning heads and south east end of the road. It is considered that the restrictions included in the proposed order accurately reflect the comments to the informal consultation and should be approved. As with all new restrictions the changes will be monitored and should the problems migrate to the areas without restrictions then a new proposal may be considered.

There is a set of agreed criteria with regard to the introduction of Residents Parking Schemes. One of the requirements is that less than 50% of the properties within the scheme have access to or the possibility to have off street parking. As the majority of properties on The Grove have such provision the area will not be eligible for a Residents Parking Scheme.

With regard to the proposal for Royle Road. The work is to permit the occupants of 28/30 St. Thomas's Road to access the rear of their property. The proposal will move the current Permit Parking Bay south towards the junction with St. Thomas's Road. This will include removing a length of double yellow lines but preserve sufficient restriction (10 meters) to protect the junction as included in the Highway Code, whilst preserving the overall length of permit parking on Royle Road.

With regard to vehicles crossing the footway. Should these proposals be accepted then there will be a vehicle crossing formed at the rear of 28/30 St. Thomas's Road in the similar manner as would be in place with any property with off street parking. This will allow vehicles to cross the footway.

The other comments regarding incorrect parking should be reported to parking services using the Lancashire County Council website. With regard to the damage to the property as no evidence has been submitted, we are unable to comment as to whether such damage was caused by the parking.

Fylde

One objection was received with regard to the proposal to extend the current "No Waiting Mon - Fri 11:00 am – 2:30 pm" on A584 Lytham Road, Warton. The objection was that the current restriction had been in place for some time but the objector was not aware of anyone ever being penalised for such parking. Therefore, the objector believes that the proposed extension to the restriction would be a waste of the county council's funds and suggests that the funds should instead be spent on filling potholes.

The proposed "No Waiting At Any Time" double yellow lines at the junction of Clitheroe Road with Boston Road, Lytham received one communication supporting the restriction and a second agreeing with the changes but requesting an "H Bar" marking to protect access to their properties.

Three objections were received regarding the proposed restrictions on Beach Street and Rear 23-35 Church Street, Lytham. One objection was regarding the extent of the proposed restrictions on Beach Street. Two other objections were regarding the length of the restrictions on Rear 23-35 Church Street as they requested a longer restriction on the south side of the road. The Reason for requesting longer restrictions was to ensure access to their garages. One of the objectors noted that there was a situation where a parked car prevented them from using their vehicle for two days and as a result, they missed important medical appointments. The objector also felt that the restriction was insufficient to allow access for emergency vehicles.

Officers Comments

Incidents had been brought to our attention with regard to anomalies in the parking restrictions on A584 Lytham Road close to the entrance to the large works. The waiting restriction is to prevent employee parking on the A584 whilst preserving, as far as possible, such facilities for local amenity and residents. The short extension will link up with the double white lines that also prohibit parking.

The comments regarding enforcement of the restrictions have been noted and to address these concerns, should this proposal be approved, this will be passed to our parking services team. In addition, any further parking concerns can be reported to parking services through the Lancashire County Council Website.

The client on Boston Road, Lytham, requesting a H-Bar has been contacted and given advice on how to apply for such a facility. This also included the limitations of such a provision.

The concerns regarding the loss of parking on Beach Street have been addressed as far as reasonably possible by reducing the proposed length of restriction and still maintaining sufficient sightlines for vehicles exiting rear 23-35 Church Road. In addition, it must also be noted that double yellow lines will still allow vehicles to stop to load and unload heavy or unmanageable goods, however the objector has confirmed that they still wish for their objection to remain on file.

The concerns regarding that the restriction on Rear 23-35 Church Street is insufficient to address the problems in the area. The emergency services have been consulted and replies were that the fire vehicles will get to where they need to be and the ambulance service remarked that they were trained and equipped to park away from an address and carry the necessary equipment.

Where there is a problem with parking causing an obstruction. Such a situation is a matter that the police would deal with. We would not be looking to introduce regulations to address obstructive parking unless the situation was seen to be a particular safety problem as this often reduces the options for legitimate parking.

Pendle

Three items received objections, Brook Street, Nelson, Gisburn Road, Barrowford, and Castle Street, Brierfield. After replying to the individuals, the two objections regarding Castle Street, Brierfield have been withdrawn.

One letter of objection was received by a business owner located on Brook Street, Nelson. The objection stated that there is a problem with long term parking availability on Brook Street, with an additional comment to make a section of the restriction 1 Hour Parking, with loading/unloading being permitted. Furthermore, the objector stated that the No Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm should be amended to a No Waiting At Any Time, prohibiting parking along the section of Chapel House Road where it intersects with Brook Street, extending along to Larch Street. This is suggested to alleviate potential parking issues with articulated wagons turning and accessing businesses in the area.

The proposal to introduce a new length of No Waiting At Any Time on Gisburn Road received one objection. Initially this was due to an error on the published plan that indicated the lines extending to outside a residential property. Following the correction of this error the correspondent did not wish to remove the objection as they expressed that the new restriction was not necessary and would encourage visitors to the area to park outside the resident's homes.

Officers Comments

The items in the proposed order that relate to Brook Street, Nelson, do not include any new proposals. The proposals will allow businesses to undertake loading and unloading operations and therefore it is not seen that including any provision for short term parking on the current lengths of unrestricted parking provide a necessary facility for employees working in the area and local residents.

The comments regarding access to Brook Street from Larch Street were not seen to be valid. Currently the access is covered by a combination of no waiting at any time and no waiting Mon – Sat 8am – 6pm. This allows for deliveries within normal business hours. Converting any of the lengths of No Waiting Mon - Sat 8am - 6pm to that of no waiting at any time would not make any difference as the order would still allow loading and unloading. In addition, the two other larger companies that use Brook Street as their main point of access have not expressed any problems.

It is considered that the waiting restriction on Gisburn Road across from Rockville is required as parking along this length is causing vehicles travelling south west towards Nelson to pass using a more central position on the road. This is in turn causing vehicles travelling North East towards Gisburn to take a line close to the north west kerb line removing the option for vehicles to edge out of Rockville to observe a safe time to exit on to this major road.

South Ribble

With regard to proposals for Carrwood Road and The Cawsey, seventeen pieces of correspondence were received, two supporting the proposals and fifteen objecting. In the main the objections were concerned that the removal of all the parking on these roads would encourage visitors that would like to use the Old Tram Road for recreation on to the residential roads and encourage higher road speeds.

Officers Comments

Having considered all the comments received and following discussions with the local county councillor who had first requested the work, officers have decided that the best course of action would be to remove the proposals for Carrwood Road, and The Cawsey along with all the roads off the route including Millwood Road, Clough Avenue, The Oaks, Valley View, Carrwood Way, Loxwood Close, Firs Drive, Eagleton Way, Handshaw Drive, and Saxon Place. This area will be reviewed by the area engineers with the view of preparing new proposals where appropriate, permitting parking on one side of the road whilst keeping congestion to a minimum. It

is hoped that the new proposals will maintain as much parking as possible whilst ensuring that traffic will be able to move freely on the important new through route at a suitable speed.

As this is a significant change to the original proposal the decision to remove the proposed restrictions here has been published by notices placed on Carrwood Road and the Cawsey inviting comments before 10 September 2021 (Appendix G1). One comment was received that requested parking be retained for walkers and visitors to the area the intention of the modification is to defer the work so that such provision can be assessed.

West Lancashire

Three objections were received regarding the proposal for Holland Court. The objections indicate that the work was initiated due to problems on the road around one resident that was causing problems, along with reduced space for off street parking. The objectors were concerned that the proposals will result in parking being moved on to Crawford Road where there is already pressure on the available parking. Claims indicate that due to changes in residents' behaviour and the formation of additional off-street parking there is no longer a need for the proposed restrictions as the Emergency vehicles and the service vehicle are now able access all properties.

Three objections were received to the proposals for Merchant Road, Mulberry Close Pinfold Road and Warpers Way. The objections expressed concerns that making changes will move problems further into the estate and that introducing restrictions would impact on the residents. It was noted in two of the objections that restrictions on both sides of Merchant Road would cause difficulties for Residents. One of the objectors claimed that the only solution for the area would be a Residents Only parking scheme. Two further responses were received supporting the additional restrictions on Pinfold Road.

Officers Comments

The initial advertised proposal for Pinfold Road/Merchant Road contained an error in the extents of the proposed No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow line) restriction to the north side of Merchant Road, and as a result a number of local objections were received regarding this aspect and the predicted impact this would have on parking availability for the area. This error was addressed by undertaking a re-advertisement of the proposal featuring an amended location plan and site notice and all affected residents were contacted by letter to outline the change.

As all objections were received prior to the formal advertisement of the amended proposal all respondents were further contacted to enquire whether they wished to revise their comments in view of the updated proposal. A single response was received in return confirming that residents continued support for the changes.

The revised proposals have reduced the No Waiting At Any Time to short lengths at both ends of Merchant Road as necessary to provide junction protection. This will free up a little more parking. With regard to Pinfold Road the properties have off street parking. The proposals on Pinfold Road only regulate parking on one side in an aim to preserve as much parking as possible for residents.

Residents parking for this area would not be considered as most of the properties have dedicated off street parking. The budget available to provide residents parking schemes is very limited and one of the main criteria is that at least 50% of properties do not have access to off street parking.

Implications:

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

Financial

The costs of the Traffic Regulation Order will be funded from the 2021/22 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		
-----	--	--