Report to the Cabinet
Meeting to be held on Thursday, 7 April 2022

Report of the Head of Service - Highways

Part I

Electoral Divisions affected: Burnley Central East; Burnley Rural; Burnley South West; Chorley South; Hoghton with Wheelton; Leyland Central; Lytham; Nelson East; Padiham and Burnley West; Pendle Hill; Penwortham East & Walton-le-Dale; Poulton le Fylde; Preston Central East; Preston City; Preston East; Preston North; Preston Rural; Preston South East; Skelmersdale West; South Ribble East; Wyre Rural East;

Corporate Priorities:
Delivering better services;

Lancashire County Council (Various Locations, Burnley, Chorley, Fylde, Pendle, Preston, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre) (Various Parking Restrictions 21-22 (NO1)) Order 202*
(Appendices 'A1' to 'J1' refer)

Contact for further information:
Tracey Price, Tel: (01772) 538098, Highway Regulation - Highways and Transportation
tracey.price@lancashire.gov.uk

Brief Summary

Following investigations and formal public consultation it is proposed to make a Traffic Regulation Order to address safety concerns in relation to vehicles parking causing serious problems with regard to safe traffic movement and parking that is obstructing driver's sightlines, impeding access and egress at junctions and access to some businesses. Some of the measures are proposed to ensure access for emergency service vehicles, refuse collections and larger deliveries to properties.

The proposal looks to introduce new restrictions in the districts of Burnley, Chorley, Pendle, Preston, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre whilst removing current

Lancashire County Council

restrictions that are no longer required and correcting inconsistencies with the current Order in the districts of Fylde, Pendle, Preston and South Ribble.

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 Burnley, Chorley, Fylde, Pendle, Preston, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre districts, as detailed within this report and as set out in the Modified Draft Order at Appendix 'A2', which includes the removal of the proposals for Great George Street, Preston as previously advised in Appendix 'F' and amendment to Mill Street, Padiham in Appendix 'B1'.

Detail

It is proposed to introduce a number of 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, refuse collections and larger deliveries.

In addition to the introduction of restrictions the proposal looks to remove current restrictions that are no longer required and provide additional unrestricted on-street parking where appropriate for residents and visitors to nearby properties, shops and businesses whilst correcting inconsistencies within the current Traffic Regulation Order to clarify and simplify the order to correctly reflect the restrictions as they are marked out on site with no material change.

The published proposed order includes proposals in the districts of **Burnley, Chorley, Fylde, Pendle, Preston, South Ribble, West Lancashire and Wyre** as shown on the plans at Appendices 'B' to 'I' for the reasons outlined in the Statement of Reasons at Appendices 'J' and 'J1'.

Consultations

Formal consultation was carried out between 7 December 2021 and 7 January 2022 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.

Following the end of the consultation objections were received regarding the extent of the No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow line) restriction on Mill Lane, Padiham in relation to the cottages Nos.25-29 and as a result of this a further consultation on a modification was carried out between 27 January 2022 and 17 February 2022.

Details of this consultation are contained within the Plan (Appendix 'B' Drawing '21-22(1)/MB-B7a') and Appendix 'B1' Modification Site Notice, the modified statement of reason is included as Appendix 'J1'.

Objections
As a result of both consultations, 21 objections and 3 correspondences of support with additional comments, were received. A further two letters of support were received with regard to the proposed limited waiting on Spendmore Lane Coppull, there were no objections to this section of the proposed order.

The comments were regarding the items in the proposed order as follows along with the engineer's comments as they are relevant.

BURNLEY

Blackburn Street, Burnley – Appendix 'B' – Drawing No.21-22(1)/MB-B2)
"Following concerns from local businesses regarding their access being obstructed by parked vehicles officers are proposing to introduce a Prohibition of Waiting on the entrance to Calder Mill. The purpose of these proposals are to ensure that access can be maintained at all times".

Objections
Objections from two local businesses were received on the grounds that they are the only two businesses on Blackburn Street with vehicle entrances and believe that if the introduction of 'no waiting at any time' (yellow lines) were brought in to force, that this could cause both companies major issues and slow down the process for people exiting the yard or wagons being able to wait at the top of the street until it is safe to get into the yard. One of the objectors also states that they currently have problems with people parking on their private car park to avoid car parking fees and believe that these proposals would cause more issues with their private parking areas.

A statement from the objector was that the main area of concern on Blackburn Street is actually at the bottom corner access from their gates that people park on the corner and obstruct cars, wagons and customers leaving the yard and suggested that the main focus should be on this area.

Officers Comments
An Officer attended the location to discuss the objections. During this meeting it quickly became apparent that there was some confusion regarding the extent of the proposed restrictions. The officer illustrated the extents of the proposed restrictions on site and subsequently, both objectors have withdrawn their objections in writing.

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented.

Plumbe Street, Burnley – Appendix 'B' – Drawing No.21-22(1)/MB-B3)
"The purpose of these proposals are to remove sections of the existing daytime restrictions on Plumbe street which would provide unrestricted on-street parking spaces for residents in the area. It will also seek to introduce junction protection restrictions to ensure that access is maintained into side streets. Additionally, the remaining daytime restriction period would be reduced to provide an extended period for unrestricted parking in the evening and overnight".

Objections
An objection was received from the manager of a local business situated on Plumbe Street. He explained that his facilities are often used on impulse and that business users regularly park on Plumbe Street outside the business address when attending the training centre. He stressed future enforcement may have a detrimental impact on his business both financially and on the business's reputation.

Officers Comments
An officer attempted to visit the business on two occasions to discuss the objection further but was unable to contact the manager. Officers have subsequently written to the objector but have not received a response. There are existing waiting restrictions outside the property although during the site visit it was noted that a parking plate was missing off the signpost which will be replaced. The proposal reduces the duration of the restrictions from 6.30pm to 6.00pm outside the objector's premises so there would be a slight benefit over the current arrangement.

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented.

Wheat Street, Padiham – Appendix 'B' – Drawing No.21-22(1)/MB-B5)
"Reports and evidence suggest that vehicles frequently park on Thompson Street up to the junction with Wheat Street which was making it difficult for road users to exit Wheat Street.

The purpose of this proposal is to provide junction protection at the Wheat Street/Thompson Street junction to prevent vehicles parking close to the junction and ensure that road users can navigate the junction without obstruction and with unobstructed visibility".

Objections
During the informal consultation a resident raised an objection to the proposal, raising concerns that the proposal was not for the benefit of residents but for road users seeking to use Wheat Street as a cut through to avoid traffic. They also explained that residents' vehicles had been damaged by road users navigating along Wheat Street. The resident suggested that the council consider making Wheat Street a one-way street and to implement restrictions on Wheat Street that would prevent HGVs using this section of carriageway.

Furthermore, the resident alleged that concerns about HGVs connected to the business on Thompson Street unloading in the early hours of the morning were being overlooked by the council and that road users, including buses operating in the area, were regularly speeding along Thompson Street. These issues are however not within the scope of the proposed measures and will be considered separately outside of the Traffic Regulation Order process.

Officers Comments
As the objector did not provide any contact details, officers have been unable to initiate any contact to discuss their concerns. The junction protection type waiting restrictions have been proposed to improve driver visibility when exiting Wheat Street onto Thompson Street following complaints to the local Councillor. Officers are not aware of damage to vehicles from HGV movements although manhole covers in the footway on Thompson Street have recently been damaged and officers

have installed bollards to protect the footway area. Officers have considered the request to make Wheat Street one-way but are concerned this will lead to undesirable increases in vehicle speeds.

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented.

Scott Street, Padiham – Appendix 'B' – Drawing No.21-22(1)/MB-B6)
"There is an increased demand for parking in this area due to a café being present at the junction. Vehicles frequently park up to the junction which is obstructing road users accessing and exiting Scott Street to the detriment of road safety.

The purpose of this proposal is to provide junction protection at the junction of Scott Street and Padiham Road to prevent vehicles parking close to the junction and ensure that unobstructed access is maintained".

Objections
During the informal consultation, the owner of a café on Padiham Road raised an objection to the proposal along with two other members of the public. The owner raised concerns that the proposal would limit parking availability for their customers which may have a detrimental impact on their business. They explained that the closest alternative parking was not in close proximity and that the lack of parking as a result of the proposal would encourage their customers to use alternative cafes.

The owner explained that they had been significantly affected over the 18 month period leading up to the proposal and that the loss in custom may lead to further additional stress and anxiety for the business owner. Officers were also made aware that the business requested support from their customers on a social media platform which may have prompted further objections. The other two objections raised concerns that the proposals would have a detrimental effect on the café business and that people with mobility issues need to be able to park close to the business.

Officers Comments
An officer visited the café to discuss the request in person. It quickly became clear that there was an element of confusion about the extents of the proposed restrictions. The officer marked out the restrictions on site to show exactly where the proposed markings would start and finish. As a result, the cafe owner agreed to withdraw the objection and this was confirmed in writing.

The officer contacted the other two objectors and explained the extent of the measures and that the café owner had withdrawn their objection. One objection was subsequently withdrawn in writing. The other objector did not respond to the correspondence and therefore their objection remains in place.

It was pointed out that the proposal would offer protection to the existing dropped kerbs at this junction and that this would ensure that the junction and pedestrian access points remained clear for members of the public and customers of the café.

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented.

Mill Street, Padiham – Appendix 'B' – Drawing No.21-22(1)/MB-B7)
"The purpose of the proposed order is to create several unrestricted parking spaces for residents and visitors in the area. The proposal would see the existing daytime restrictions removed and the introduction of lengths of No Waiting at Any Time restriction to ensure that road users are still able to navigate along Mill Street without obstruction".

Objections
Objections were received to the proposal, expressing concern about the extent of the No Waiting At Any Time restrictions outside the resident's properties Nos 25, 27 and 29. Originally a divisional county councillor had visited properties and put forward a scheme which didn't have any restrictions outside the properties. However, there is a yard entrance opposite No 27 which requires access and therefore officers originally proposed a scheme which protected vehicle movements in and out of the yard.

The two objections from residents in the area stated that they did not want any restrictions outside their properties and the divisional county councillor also expressed concerns over the extent of the No Waiting At Any Time restrictions outside the properties.

Officers Comments
Following concern from residents, the proposed measures have been modified to maintain the existing restrictions outside the properties numbered 25-29 Mill Street instead of the proposed No Waiting At Any Time restriction as indicated on Appendix 'B1'.

This modification was consulted upon between 27 January 2022 and 17 February 2022 with a letter drop being undertaken to the properties affected and site notices being posted on site.

Only one of the original objectors has written in again objecting to the proposed revised scheme requesting the restrictions are removed altogether to allow parking. As there is a gateway access to a business yard opposite the properties which will require daytime access, removing the restrictions could result in access difficulties. The objector states the business does not get deliveries however officers have observed delivery vehicles in the yard and there is a forklift truck on site.

The proposed restrictions outside the objector's property in the revised scheme are the same as are currently outside therefore there is no material difference in the parking restrictions at their property. However, the proposal removes long sections of current restrictions adjacent to the properties which will allow unrestricted parking for residents and visitors.

Officers recommend the revised measures are implemented.

CHORLEY

Quaker Brook Lane-Hoghton Lane and The Straits, Hoghton – Appendix 'C' – Drawing No.21-22(1)/KP-CH1)

"Following receipt of concerns regarding vehicles parking in the direct vicinity of the Quaker Brook Lane/Hoghton Lane/The Straits junction compromising sightlines traffic officers are proposing the introducing of a Prohibition of Waiting to protect sightlines and improve road safety. "The purpose of these proposals are to facilitate the passage of vehicles along on the road and improve overall road safety by preventing parking which is causing serious problems with regard to safe traffic movement and obstruction of driver's visibility along these roads".

Objections

An objection was received from Hoghton Parish Council stating that they have previously suggested a traffic management scheme incorporating a mini roundabout at the junction of Quaker Brook Lane and believe that the proposed parking restrictions do not solve the problem of traffic movement on Blackburn Old Road (A675).

Officers Comments

The proposals have been put forward as a result of the identification of vehicle parking within 10 metres of the junction which represents a contravention of Highway Code directions and a hazard for vehicles entering and exiting the road. Their presence will serve as both a visual deterrent to future recurrences and allow for appropriate enforcement activity where vehicles disregard the restrictions.

Whilst officers appreciate the concerns regarding traffic movement around the junction it is officers understanding that an assessment was carried out during October 2021 regarding this element following contact by the Parish Council which, in conjunction with Lancashire Constabulary records for the area did not establish the presence of any demonstrated road safety concerns related to the operation of the junction. To date officers are not aware of any change in these circumstances, however the removal of the potential for parking in close proximity to the junction will provide a positive improvement for all vehicles using the road. As with all new restrictions the changes will be monitored and should further measures be seen as necessary these will be investigated.

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented.

PRESTON

Acregate Lane – Canterbury Road, Preston – Appendix 'F' – Drawing No.21-22(1)/MI-PR1)

"The proposed restrictions for the Acregate Lane / Canterbury Road junction were in response to complaints from residents that parked vehicles close to the junction were affecting general access and obstructing sightlines for exiting drivers.

The proposals are for the immediate junction area only and reflect the requirements of the Highway Code at rule 242 *"You **must not** leave a vehicle or trailer in a dangerous position or where it causes any unnecessary obstruction of the road"**.*** Rule 243 then lists examples of such locations under the heading *"**Do not** stop or park":* One of which is "O*pposite or within 10.00m of a junction."*

The actual extent of the proposed restrictions is slightly less than the 10.00m quoted by the Highway Code.

Objections

Two objections have been received to the proposals for Acregate Lane and Canterbury Road.

Objection 1

The objector lists a number of grounds for his opposition to the proposed restrictions as follows; -

1. *The objector states that he requires continuous easy access to his car as he has family members who need regular care and hospital appointments, and the proposed double yellow lines will impact them and me.*

2. *The proposed double yellow lines would disproportionately affect my property. It would therefore devalue my property which the Council is offering no monetary value for this.*

3. *The proposals will displace vehicles to other locations such as Acregate Lane where there are already parking issues with residents struggling to park their cars due to a lack of space. This will result in residents having to park in front of other properties, with the potential for conflicts and damage to his vehicle.*

4. *The objector also cites that many of the issues and congestion is due to a number of white van and lorry drivers parking their vans on Canterbury Road. The objector notes that the council is not proposing restricting the whole of the cul-de-sac but only on Acregate Lane / Canterbury Road corner. This won't impact the white van drivers who park slightly further up, and therefore not remedy the issue the council is trying to solve, but instead impact and affect car drivers such as himself with no driveway and a single car.*

5. *The proposed double yellow lines go across a dipped curb to the side access to my property and also the front access.*

6. *The council could resolve the problem by issuing resident permits instead.*

7. *The council are unfairly targeting the objector's property whilst leaving other locations in the area unaffected.*

Objection 2

This objector opposes the proposal for parking controls to be installed at the junction of Acregate Lane and Canterbury Road as this is an area used by himself to park his vehicle due to the proximity to his address. Also parking spaces in the area are very limited, with barely any spaces for residents to park their vehicles.

The objector also indicates that he requires this nearby parking due to family members who need additional care.

Officers Comments

The various issues that the objectors have raised are commented on below; -

1. The objector's position in relation to his family members is understandable and accepted, unfortunately, it does not alter the situation that parking on the public highway close to a road junction has been raised by other residents and is causing problems for other road users. In addition, the highway code specifically requires drivers not to park in these locations.

2. Investigations into highway complaints / issues etc. does not include what impact on, or how this will affect the value of adjacent residential properties. The primary concerns are directed to road safety and providing practical solutions to the various situations that are raised.

3. It is often the case that when parking controls are installed that some vehicles are displaced to other areas. It is therefore accepted that in this instance the objectors view is most likely correct that a few displaced vehicles will have to seek alternative parking.

4. This is a common situation, and many people have vans as part of their work and often take these home as they may be on call, or their job is mobile in nature. However, it is not these vehicles specifically that the proposals are directly aimed at. The proposals are confined to the immediate junction and reflect the requirements indicated in the Highway Code for Drivers not to park within 10.00m of a junction.

5. The proposed restrictions extend for 9.00m along the side and for 2.50m across the front of the objector's property. The presence of a dropped section of kerb and private access do not have any bearing on the use of or extent of the restrictions. The provision of the proposed restrictions will keep the area clear for access and available for safe use by pedestrians.

6. The current situation with residents parking is that this type of parking control is only used in areas where the majority of the residents have no nearby alternative to parking on the road. This is usually in the high-density terraced streets in the older areas of towns and cities. Canterbury Road is a relatively new development of 36 properties all of which have off street parking available for 1 or more vehicles and does not meet the primary criterion for Residents Parking to be

considered. In any case, even if this were considered possible the need for parking controls at the junction, as currently being proposed, would still apply.

7. The reasons for the proposals at this junction have been set out above and are not directed at singling out any particular property, they are fully directed at the junction area to improve access and sightlines for emerging drivers and reflect the requirements as set out in the Highway Code.

The proposals for Acregate Lane and Canterbury Road will effectively remove parking at the junction that is currently affecting access and egress for residents and restricting sightlines. It is therefore, recommended that the proposals be installed as advertised.

Kinsella Close, Preston – Appendix 'F' – Drawing No.21-22(1)/MI-PR4)
"The proposals for Kinsella Close were put forward in response to complaints from residents and city councillors that parking both at the junction with St Paul's Road and along the length of the road was affecting access / egress to and from their properties. In addition, this issue has also been directly raised by Preston City Council's Refuse Collection Department which has asked for assistance due to this parking making access for refuse collection vehicles very difficult resulting in numerous bin collections being missed.

The proposal, as consulted on, consists of No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) on both sides for 8.00m, at the immediate junction with St Pauls Road and a daytime restriction (Single Yellow Line) prohibiting waiting Monday to Friday, 8am to 6pm applied the remainder of the cul-de-sac so that displaced vehicles don't just merely move to other positions in the road".

Objection
One objection has been submitted to the proposals for Kinsella Close and whilst the objector acknowledges the difficulties that the parking has with access and bin collection's they express concerns regarding access to emergency vehicles. They also mention that some residents from Meadow Street use Kinsella Close for parking and ask if residents only parking could be considered?

Officers Comments
With regard to the objectors concerns for "access by emergency vehicles", the proposals will remove the parking on Kinsella Close during the period of operation and will make access much easier, safer, and quicker than at present.

The current situation with residents parking is that this type of parking control is only used in areas where the majority of the residents have no nearby alternative to parking on the road. This is usually in the high-density terraced streets in the older areas of towns and cities. Kinsella Close is a small new development of 5 properties all of which have off street parking available and do not meet the primary criterion for Residents Parking to be considered.

The proposals for Kinsella Close will effectively remove the parked vehicles that are currently affecting access and egress for residents and disrupting refuse collection processes. It is therefore recommended that the proposals be installed as advertised.

Great George Street, Preston – Appendix 'F' – Drawing No.21-22(1)/MI-PR7)
"The proposal for the provision of parking controls for Great George Street was in direct response to complaints of highway parking abuse and to tackle the repeated vandalism/theft of the yellow time plates that impeded the enforceability of the current daytime Single Yellow Line restrictions that currently exist and should be observed by road users.

The main reports of the issue came from some of the businesses whose access to premises was being affected. This was confirmed by the council's parking services which was receiving these complaints and when trying to carry out enforcement, reported that the sign plates, when replaced, would disappear or be vandalised within 24 hours.

The proposal to change the existing restrictions to No Waiting at Any Time Double Yellow Line was chosen as this does not require any associated signs, thereby removing the situation described above with missing or defaced sign plates rendering the restrictions unenforceable".

Objections
Five objections to the proposals for Great George Street have been received from several business and also from Preston City Council. These generally put forward the same or similar comments as grounds for their objection, such as -

- Lancashire County Council has already erected poles in readiness for the Traffic Regulation Order, this makes the consultation exercise a complete sham.
- This is all to do with making life easier for the articulated vehicles that Askew's and Holts use for their collections.
- Parking by "others" is taking up the unrestricted sections where the business customers could park which means they have to use the Single Yellow Line.
- Detrimental impact on business.

Officers Comments
On the particular issue that Lancashire County Council has pre-empted the situation and has already installed signs for the proposed Traffic Regulation Order. The new signs that have recently been installed at the three entry points onto Great George Street are associated with and indicate the times of operation of the existing single yellow line, daytime restriction that is already in place. Signing the restriction in this way removes the need for the smaller repeater sign plates within the area. These signs, which are not related to the new proposal for Double Yellow Lines, were provided as an interim measure to allow enforcement of the existing Single Yellow Line restrictions to be carried out.

On the objector's overall comments, having considered these and the potential impact on the businesses it is considered that a less onerous solution could be used instead of the full No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) restrictions being proposed.

To this end it is recommended that the proposal for Great George Street be withdrawn and that the alternative way of signing the existing Single Yellow Line

daytime restrictions, as described previously be kept in place. This would not require any further consultation as nothing has legally changed. If problems continue with the operation of these restrictions, then we would have to look again at the options available.

SOUTH RIBBLE

Carrwood Road – The Cawsey and surrounding Street, Penwortham/Walton-le-Dale Appendix 'G' – Drawing Nos. 21-22(1)/HR-SR3A and 21-22(1)/HR-SR3B and 21-22(1)/HR-SR3C)

"These restrictions are being proposed following receipt of significant road safety concerns regarding compromised sightlines at junctions and free flow of traffic on this strategic route. "The purpose of this proposed order is to facilitate the free flow of traffic by removing parked vehicles which have been compromising sightlines at specific junctions along the strategic route whilst improving access to the residential properties and improve general road safety for all highway users".

Objections

One objection from a resident of Loxwood Close was received in relation to the new proposals on the grounds that there needs to be balance, car parking in the immediate entrance to adjoining roads such as Loxwood Close and across the T junctions in some cases is dangerous, car parking on certain sections of the road benefits many people but ultimately, the problem being moved to side streets is unviable and needs to be managed in conjunction with the present proposal.

The objector states that while they recognise that the revised parking restrictions scheme opens up certain sections of the road for parking, they believe that these are in areas which are impractical and also a little senseless as they are proposed at points where there are no pavement provisions or opposite bus stops.

In addition, photographs of inconsiderate parking within the vicinity of the side road were supplied along with a suggestion that whilst car parking restrictions along certain parts of Carrwood Road/The Cawsey and in the adjoining road entrances are supported, roads such as Loxwood Close also need to be made and sign posted as “Except for Access” to prevent unwarranted pressure on smaller adjoining roads.

Officers Comments

No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions were originally 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. In response to these proposals 15 objections were received in the main concerning 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. Having considered all the comments received the original proposals in these areas were removed from the earlier order to allow officers to review the area for appropriate restrictions that would allow parking on one side of the road whilst keeping congestion to a minimum.

It is appreciated that some parking restrictions are necessary on this route to ensure that traffic flows are maintained. This proposal will provide some parking for visitors

to the area whilst still maintaining traffic flows, a situation is especially significant as the road offers access to the former tram track that is now used as a leisure facility.

The option for providing parking in this area is much reduced due to the number of side roads off the main road, controlled crossing points and traffic islands along the route. However, officers have surveyed the road to see where parking can be provided whilst also meeting the needs to provide traffic flow.

The survey looked at highlighting lengths where parking could be provided on one side or the other taking into account where the parking may help to provide a degree of traffic calming. Where parking could be provided on either side the provision was deliberately alternated as it is proven that such a measure will slow traffic speeds.

In addition, the proposal introduces No Waiting at Any Time junction protection to improve sightlines at the junction of the side roads along the strategic route whilst improving access to the residential properties and improving general road safety for all highway users.

The request for the side roads to be subject to signs saying, "Access only" is acknowledged, however this is not possible without a specific order. It should also be noted that the "Access only" signs should not be used as a means of controlling undesirable parking.

As with all new restrictions the changes will be monitored and should further measures be seen as necessary to help control dangerous or obstructive parking then these will be investigated.

Officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented.

WYRE

Fouldrey Avenue, Breckside Close, Breck Road and Riversway, Poulton-le-Fylde Appendix 'I' – Drawing No.21-22(1)/MI-WY2

"These restrictions are being proposed following receipt of significant road safety concerns regarding compromised sightlines at junctions and free flow of traffic on a strategic route along with concerns regarding the safety of school children. "The purpose of this proposed order is to facilitate the free flow of traffic by removing parked vehicles which have been compromising sightlines at specific junctions along the strategic route whilst improving access to the residential properties and improve general road safety for all highway users including school children".

Objections

One objection was received via the local county councillor on behalf of the local school. The school objected to the proposal as the school feels the changes will leave it in conflict with the local residents.

The school considers that the reduced parking outside the school will result in the following:

- Leave parents with little option other than to park either in the side streets or Breck Road which they believe will have a catastrophic effect on the whole of the local road infrastructure.

- Allow higher speeds on Fouldrey Avenue that also carries staff and large HGV traffic which will introduce an untenable potential risk for the children who attend the local Schools.

The objection also includes that they believe the proposal does not take into consideration the Brookfield School, which is a special school for boys where pupils need to be dropped off at school in a safe environment. In addition, the school also owns its own fleet of transport vehicles all of which need to be stored somewhere during the day.

Within the correspondence the local county councillor also stated that he believes the school situation, which is getting worse and more dangerous, is a product of the extensive development in the town over the past 10 years. This is now having a severe impact on the roads in Poulton and the school traffic is just another example of this. A request that the school road safety team get involved to try to improve the issues stated was also suggested.

Officers Comments

The situation around school parking has been ongoing for some time and 2 preliminary consultations have been undertaken. This formal proposal was developed following an on-site meeting with the local county councillor and a local representative where lengths and positions of parking restriction proposals were agreed.

The county council were notified of issues with parking that obstructed the carriageway to the extent that lawful traffic use by a business was obstructed along with issues of parking in inappropriate locations causing issues with residents and parents picking up from the school.

Displacement of parking is inevitable when introducing parking restrictions and would be looked at separately once a scheme was installed and the full effects could be evaluated, it is not the Highway Authorities responsibility to provide parking areas but to ensure that all legitimate traffic can use the Highway.

Fouldrey Avenue has a speed limit on it of 20mph any vehicles travelling in excess of this speed or driving dangerously should be reported to the police for further investigation.

It is not the responsibility of the Highway Authority to provide parking areas for vehicle fleets from schools or business during the working hours. The suggestion to create a new road for access with associated pick up and drop off zones with a car park may indeed help resolve the issues, However, using public funds to create facilities for the school should not be considered and would need to be wholly privately funded.

Correspondence Supporting the Proposals

Three items of correspondence supporting the proposals were received from local residents.

Two of these noted that the double yellow lines, parking restrictions, are to be placed on the 'School' side of the road meaning children may have to cross between parked

cars which they considered could be dangerous and suggested having the restrictions on the ‘Residential’ side of the Avenue and not on the ‘School’ side. In addition, both felt that the yellow lines should be extended around the whole of Breckside Close.

The third confirmed that they welcomed the introduction of parking restriction at the junction of Breck Drive and Riversway, however enquired as to whether there was a possibility of extending the prohibition of waiting at the Royston Avenue and Riversway junction to prevent hazardous parking within 10 metres of a junction.

Officers Comments
Following initial consultations and meetings with local elected representatives, the current proposals were agreed to combat obstruction of the Highway preventing lawful use and in the case of Breckside Close dangerous parking at the junction.

Initially the proposal for parking restrictions at this junction was aimed solely at protecting sight lines and pedestrian crossing points, but after representation it was agreed to extend this to past the point where vegetation prevents pedestrians stepping off the carriageway onto a grass verge.

The parking restrictions proposed are predominantly on the school side to enable parents with children unobstructed views of oncoming vehicles, whilst at the bottom of the Avenue this changes as parking opposite the school would require children to enter the car from the carriageway side as there is no footway.

The request for further restrictions at the junction of Royston Avenue and Riversway has been noted and whilst the consideration of parking restrictions at this junction are not included as part of this proposal officers have agreed to carry out investigations once this proposal, if approved, is implemented to determine the full effect of parking issues at this junction.

Similarly, the request for extending the restriction around the whole of Breck Close to allow residents free access to their properties at all times is noted. However, although, as with all new restrictions the changes will be monitored and should further safety measures be seen as necessary these will be investigated. Vehicles obstructing the driveways is a matter for the Police and the use of parking restrictions to combat this would be an inappropriate use of the legislation.

After considering both the objections submitted and the comments of support, officers recommend the proposed measures are implemented as advertised.

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