

North Tyneside Council Report to Cabinet Date: 9 July 2012

Item 7(a)(i)
Title: Traffic Regulation
Order (Proposed parking
restrictions on Marden
Road, Whitley Bay)

Portfolio(s): Transport and the
Environment

Cabinet Member(s): Cllr E Hodson

Report from Directorate: Chief Executive's Office

Report Author: Ken Wilson, Head of Regeneration, (Tel: 0191 643 6091)
Development and Regulatory Services

Wards affected: Whitley Bay

PART 1

1.1 Purpose:

The purpose of this report is to inform Cabinet of objections received to the proposal to introduce parking restrictions on Marden Road, Whitley Bay, and request that Cabinet confirm the relevant Traffic Regulation Order.

1.2 Recommendation(s):

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- i. consider the objections received;
- ii. set aside the objections in the interests of improved parking management for drivers visiting Whitley Bay; and
- iii. confirm the Traffic Regulation Order, with the revised operational hours of 2 hours with no return within 4 hours between 8.00am and 6.00pm Mondays to Saturdays.

1.3 Forward Plan:

This report appears on the Forward Plan for the period 1 July to 31 October 2012.

1.4 Council Plan and Policy Framework

This report is not directly related to any of the priorities in the Council Strategic Plan 2012 – 2015

1.5 Information:

1.5.1 Background

Construction work commenced on a new lay-by on the western side of Marden Road in February 2012. The proposal was implemented following consultation with the local Councillors and the Whitley Bay Chamber of Trade and was intended to provide additional parking for visitors to Whitley Bay. These works were funded from the Local Transport Plan (LTP) Capital budget 2011/12.

Following discussion with both the local Councillors and the Chamber of Trade, it was agreed that that a restriction on length of stay of 2 hours should be introduced to encourage a high turnover of parking. For consistency, the limited waiting restriction on the opposite side of the road was also to be amended from 1 hour maximum stay to 2 hours.

In February a statutory Notice of Intention was issued to remove the double yellow lines adjacent to the new lay-by and introduce a limit on length of stay of 2 hours on both sides of the road.

Thirty initial objections were received from members of a local cycling group and two from residents in response to the statutory Notice of Intention. The objections from the cycling group and their families all related to the lay-by and the impact that this had on potential cycling in the area. Following clarification of a number of issues raised in the objections, a number of the objectors have withdrawn or chosen not to proceed with their objection. Two objections were received from local residents although one was subsequently withdrawn following a minor amendment to the proposed restriction i.e. no return within 4 hours instead of no return within 2 hours. There are nine outstanding objections from the Cycling Group and their families and one from a local resident, which again related to the lay-bay more than the proposed restriction. A summary of the outstanding objections is provided in section 1.5.3 and the full text of the outstanding objections is reproduced in Appendix 1.

Due to the safety concerns expressed by a number of the objectors, the Council commissioned a consultant to undertake a Road Safety Assessment of the scheme in conjunction with the Police. The Assessment did not highlight any major safety issues that would not be addressed by the resurfacing scheme. A copy of the full Road Safety Assessment is available to read in the Members Lounge.

1.5.2 Statutory Consultation

Parking proposals are subject to statutory legal process under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and associated regulations. Schemes must be advertised on site and in the local press. This enables members of the public to object to the proposal. Any objectors are first sent a detailed response and invited to reconsider their objection. Any objections not withdrawn are referred to Cabinet for its consideration.

1.5.3 Summary of Objections

Newcastle Cycle Campaign Cycling Group

30 objections were initially received from members of the above group and their families. The initial objections from the Cycling group all related to the lay-by and the

impact that this had on cycling to and from Whitley Bay Town Centre. The Council wrote back to these objectors explaining that the construction of a lay-by on Marden Road did not require the Highway Authority to implement a traffic regulation order. The grounds under which they had objected did not therefore appear to be relevant to the Notice of Intention that has been advertised.

It then transpired that the Group had developed some cycling proposals independent of the Local Authority - one of which was the conversion of the previous grass verge (now the lay-by) into a segregated cycle lane.

With regard to the issues that they have raised, although these were not relevant to the Notice of Intention, the Council did respond to the issue raised.

In regard to potential traffic congestion, the construction of the lay-by only resulted in a nominal reduction in carriageway width (300mm), which was unlikely to impact on traffic movements. Again there was only a slight reduction in the footway width and the scheme included a number of features to improve pedestrian movements across Marden Road.

It was explained that there was no approved scheme to introduce a separated cycle lane on the verge on the western side of Marden Road and that this route was not part of any dedicated cycle route within the borough.

In relation to Tyne and Wear Integrated Transport Authority's bid to the Local Sustainable Transport Fund (LSTF), which seeks to improve sustainable access to employment sites, the Council clarified that the bid did not identify any specific streets in any town centre for new cycling infrastructure, and that a large part of the bid related to revenue funding, rather than capital funding for infrastructure. It was further explained that the Whitley Bay Chamber of Trade had been consulted during the development of the lay-by and had been very supportive of the scheme, which they felt offered significant benefits to the vitality and viability of Whitley Bay Town Centre.

Following consideration of the above information, a number of the objectors withdrew their objection or chose to provide relevant ground for objection to Notice of Intention advertised. The nine outstanding objections from the Cycling Group and their family members have revised their grounds of objection to one of safety, particularly with regard to its impact on cyclists and pedestrians, and potential congestions caused by the reduced width of the carriageway.

Mr H (Local Resident)

Mr H initially objected about the aesthetic impact of removal of a grass verge to accommodate a lay-by; the removal of a 'buffer strip' between traffic and pedestrians; that parked vehicles would restrict visibility exiting Grosvenor Drive; the potential congestion caused by vehicles negotiating in and out of the parking spaces on both sides of the road.

The Council clarified that the construction of the lay-by was not relevant to the Notice of Intention that has been advertised. In regard to his safety concerns regarding the difficulties exiting Grosvenor Drive, whilst the impact of the parking bay on visibility splay was checked during the design stage, the Council had subsequently commissioned an independent safety audit of the scheme which would be included in the report to be considered by Cabinet.

1.6 Decision options:

Cabinet may:

Option 1 - Approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2.

Option 2 - Not approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2.

Option 1 is the recommended option.

1.7 Reasons for recommended option:

Option 1 is recommended as the proposals are intended to make efficient use of the parking space provided by encouraging a higher turnover which is consistent with the Council's Parking Strategy for town centres.

1.8 Appendices:

Appendix 1 Letters of objection and associated correspondence

Appendix 2 Legal notice of intention as published in local press

Appendix 3 Plan of scheme.

1.9 Contact officers:

Derek Smith, Senior Manager, (0191) 643 6106

Kevin Ridpath, Network and Transportation Manager (0191) 643 6089

Garry Hoyle Parking Manager (0191) 643 6599

Alison Campbell, Financial Business Manager, (0191) 643 7038

1.10 Background information:

None.

PART 2 – COMPLIANCE WITH PRINCIPLES OF DECISION MAKING

2.1 Finance and other resources

The original lay-by construction was funded from the 2011/12 Parking Control element of the Local Transport Plan Capital Budget. The amended signage proposed and the costs of the independent safety assessment will be funded from the 2012/13 Parking Control element of the Local Transport Plan Capital budget.

2.2 Legal

Parking proposals that involve revocations or amendments to existing parking orders and any new parking restrictions are subject to statutory legal process. All schemes are formally advertised and include a 21-day period for objections. In accordance with Council policy, if any objections cannot be resolved, then Cabinet is asked to consider the objections.

The required legal Notice of Intent was published in the local press and the proposed order may be cited as the North Tyneside (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading) (Consolidation) Order 2012 Variation Order No.3 2012 & The North Tyneside (On-street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2011 Variation No.5 2012. A copy is attached as Appendix 2.

2.3 Consultation/community engagement

Consultation was carried out with the Ward Members and the Whitley Bay Chamber of Trade during the development of the scheme. The process is also subject to statutory consultation as described at paragraph 2.2.

2.4 Human rights

The proposals within this report do not have direct implications in respect of human rights obligations.

2.5 Equalities and diversity

There are no adverse equalities or diversity issues arising from this report. The scheme may have potential positive equal opportunity implications in that physical accessibility, particularly for people with disabilities, may be improved as a result of the scheme.

2.6 Risk management

There are no adverse risk management implications arising from this report.

2.7 Crime and disorder

There are no direct crime and disorder issues arising from this report.

2.8 Environment and sustainability

There are no direct environment and sustainability issues arising from this report.

PART 3 - SIGN OFF

- Chief Executive X
- Mayor/Cabinet Member(s) X
- Chief Finance Officer X
- Monitoring Officer X
- Strategic Manager for Policy and Partnerships X

Appendix 1 Letters of objection and associated correspondence

- **Details of objection - Ms K (Chair – Newcastle Cycling Group)**

Objection to Traffic Management Orders: THE NORTH TYNESIDE (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING AND LOADING) (CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2012 VARIATION ORDER NO. 3 2012 & THE NORTH TYNESIDE (ON STREET PARKING PLACES)(CONSOLIDATION ORDER) ORDER 2011 VARIATION ORDER NO. 5 2012

I wish to object on the following grounds:

1/ Network Management – Under North Tyneside’s Network management Plan Marden Bridge is designated as a “Red” grade congested route, a bridge at the junction of two A Roads. North Tyneside Council has a legal obligation under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to prioritise movement of traffic, be it pedestrian, bicycle, bus or private motor traffic. Inserting an additional row of parked cars into this location takes space from all modes, pedestrian, cycle, bus and private motor traffic. This scheme directly contravenes the Traffic Management Act Part 2 2004 under which the Council has a duty as a local traffic authority to manage the road network with a view to securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network.

2/ Loss of amenity for local people - Local school children and local residents have traditionally been able to use the pavement and grass verge to cross Marden Bridge by bicycle, the verge offering sufficient width for this to happen without conflict with pedestrians. The requirement for separated bicycle access into Whitley Bay will increase with the addition of parked cars on the bridge as the main carriageway will become even more dangerous and inhospitable. There is no alternative route.

3/ Conflict with Tyne & Wear Local Sustainable Transport Fund bid - Tyne & Wear are currently bidding into the LSTF with an “access to town centres” element covering North Shields & Whitley Bay. Successful implementation of this program will require conversion of both of the grass verges along Marden Bridge into greenway bicycle tracks serving Whitley Bay town centre. These traffic orders directly conflict with the LSTF bid and have the potential to cause significant embarrassment to North Tyneside Council & Tyne & Wear as a whole. Local people have been involved with the bid devoting a significant amount of time over the last twelve months.

4/ Failure to Consult - To our knowledge none of the usual statutory and non-statutory consultees have received any notification of the changes to parking regulations or associated street works. Contractors are already on site.

We look forward to hearing from you.

Yours Sincerely
Ms K (Chair – Newcastle Cycling Campaign)

Response from Council

I have been forwarded a copy of your objection to the Notice of Intention relating to the proposed new Waiting Restrictions on Marden Road, Whitley Bay.

Can I clarify that the construction of a lay-by on Marden Road does not require the Highway Authority to implement a traffic regulation order. The grounds under which you have objected would therefore not appear to be relevant to the Notice of Intention that has been advertised.

The Notice of Intention that has been advertised simply relates to the restriction on waiting that the Council are proposing to regulate use of the lay-bay.

The proposal to restrict the length of time that drivers can wait in the lay-by is designed to maximise use of the facility by encouraging a high turnover of the space. To enable me to determine if your objection is relevant to the traffic regulation order, I need you to clarify why you feel that the restriction on length of stay in the parking bay is unreasonable.

Regards

Garry Hoyle
Parking Manager

Response from Ms K (Chair – Newcastle Cycling Group)

Dear Garry,

Thanks for your letter dated 13 March 2012 re: Objection to Traffic Regulation Order -Marden Road, Whitley Bay

For clarification, the Newcastle Cycling Campaign is objecting to the published order stating: "i) Revoke the existing waiting at anytime restriction [...] on the west side between its junction with Grosvenor Drive and a point 147 metres south of that junction;"

We believe that any new parking at all is unacceptable.

This, we think, has been made very clear in our objection.

Best regards
Ms K (Chair– Newcastle Cycling Campaign))

- **Details of objection - Mr B (Delegated spokesman for the Newcastle Cycling Campaign for the North Tyneside area)**

Text of objection the same as Ms K's

Initial response from Council the same as that sent to Ms K's

Response from Mr B

Dear Gary,

My objection states clearly that it is an object to the orders listed on the Council's website and the notices pinned up on Marden Road.

To be clear I am objecting to the part of this order that removes the prohibition on parking on the west side of Marden Road on Marden Bridge, currently double yellow lines. Your order allows parking where it had not previously been possible and will I assume legitimise removal of the double yellow line.

The objection relates to parking being allowed on both sides of the road. There is insufficient width in the carriageway to allow for this without taking space from other road users.

I am saying that allowing parking for even one second on the West side of the bridge is unacceptable, let alone two hours.

I've stated very clearly the reasons why allowing this parking is unacceptable, namely:

1/ It breaches the Council's network management duty, by taking space previously used by through traffic, pedestrian, bicycle and motor, and reallocating this for parking.

2/ It results in a loss of amenity for local people i.e. those who could previously have made use of the grassed verges to make their way to and from Whitley Bay can no longer do so.

3/ Allowing parking directly conflicts with the LSTF bid because it blocks access to the town centre rather than aiding it.

Whatever way you cut it putting in parking bays cuts 2.5 metres out of the width of space available to everyone else, if not more when you allow for doors opening etc. This is a bridge, through traffic has to take priority.

Hope this helps clarify things,

Best regards,

Mr B

Further response from Mr B

Garry,

I've been contacted by someone else who objected who says that you are claiming that objections are not specific enough.

To be clear the published orders include the following: "i) Revoke the existing waiting at anytime restrictionon the west side between its junction with Grosvenor Drive and a point 147 metres south of that junction;" That is what people are objecting to. Any new parking at all is unacceptable.

Kind regards,

Mr B

- **Details of objection - Mr S**

Text of objection the same as Ms K's

Initial response from Council the same as that sent to Ms K's

Response from Mr S

Hi Garry

My objection is to any extension of parking on this stretch of road which is so very important for access to the town centre from the south and south west by cyclists and pedestrians.

Any increase in the number of parked cars will restrict access, narrow the space available for cyclists, create an extra hazard for people crossing the road and be inconsistent with council stated policies to make our roads more cycle friendly.

Kind Regards,

Mr S

- **Details of objection - Ms T**

Text of objection the same as Ms K's

Initial response from Council the same as that sent to Ms K's

Response from Ms T

Dear Mr Hoyle

My understanding is that there will now be cars parked on each side of the road and that this would mean less room for cyclists and pedestrians. I don't know which order that comes under

Best wishes

Ms T

- **Details of objection - Mr M**

Text of objection the same as Ms K's

Initial response from Council the same as that sent to Ms K's

Response from Mr M

Dear Gary,

The published orders include the following:"i) Revoke the existing waiting at anytime restrictionon the west side between its junction with Grosvenor Drive and a point 147 metres south of that junction;" That is what I am objecting to. Any new parking at all is unacceptable, as it effectively closes access to Whitley Bay town centre for families, and means that the parking of private property in public space is being prioritised over the safe movement of people. This is very clear in the objection, which also states that I have particular concerns over the impact this development will have on my family, as my daughter attends Marden Bridge Middle School.

Best regards,

Mr M

- **Details of objection - Mr P**

Text of objection the same as Ms K's

Initial response from Council the same as that sent to Ms K's

Response from Mr P

Mr Hoyle

To clarify - my objection is to any extension of parking on this stretch of road which is so strategically important for access to the town centre from the south and south west by cyclists and pedestrians.

Clearly, any increase in the number of parked cars will restrict access, narrow the space available for cyclists, create an extra hazard for people crossing the road and be inconsistent with council stated policies to make our roads more cycle friendly.

In addition, I am surprised that such a radical change on a junction of two A roads does not require a traffic regulation order.

Yours Sincerely

Mr P

- **Details of objection from Mr C**

Text of objection the same as Ms K's

Initial response from Council the same as that sent to Ms K's

Response from Mr C

Mr Hoyle

Where was the consultation on this scheme with residents or users before it was implemented?

To clarify my objection is to anyone being able to park on this side of the bridge at all, regardless of the length of time. It's dangerous for both pedestrians & cyclists on a route many school children take. If there is any logic here which is in keeping with the councils supposedly green travel policies and local sustainable transport fund bid it escapes me.

Regards

Mr C

- **Details of objection - Ms E (Cyclists Touring Club)**

Objection to Traffic Management Orders: THE NORTH TYNESIDE (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING AND LOADING) (CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2012 VARIATION ORDER NO. 3 2012 & THE NORTH TYNESIDE (ON STREET PARKING PLACES)(CONSOLIDATION ORDER) ORDER 2011 VARIATION ORDER NO. 5 2012

I wish to object on the following grounds: Because of their location the parking places will not be easy to enter or exit. Whilst doing so this will cause problems for other road users.

Ms E

- **Details of objection from Sam & Izzy B (age 8 and 11)**

Objection to Traffic Management Orders: THE NORTH TYNESIDE (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING AND LOADING) (CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2012 VARIATION ORDER NO. 3 2012 & THE NORTH TYNESIDE (ON STREET PARKING PLACES)(CONSOLIDATION ORDER) ORDER 2011 VARIATION ORDER NO. 5 2012

Please do not put extra parked cars onto Marden Bridge. Instead could you please give us space for some cycle paths to make it easier for us to ride our bikes to school and to the shops in Whitley Bay.

- **Details of objection – Mr H (Local Resident)**

I write to you concerning the above, although I feel that I am almost certainly wasting my time. It appears to me that publishing the Traffic Regulation Order some ten days after the commencement of civil engineering works is rather like putting the cart before the horse, making the whole exercise something of a foregone conclusion. I find the destruction of the grass verges in Marden Road a deplorable act of vandalism, completely destroying the aesthetic appearance of this approach road, all for the sake of a few last motorists and satisfying the ego of a particular councillor. This scheme is not a new proposal as it was first broached some twenty years ago. On that occasion, common sense prevailed and the scheme was dropped.

My main objection to the introduction of parking bays on both sides of Marden Road South is that a row of parked vehicles on the west side of the road will seriously restrict the view of motorists trying to exit Grosvenor Drive, particularly if they are intending to turn to the right. This is the only junction on Marden Road South and it is particularly important to the residents of the Grosvenor Estate.

A further matter for concern is the fact that motorists seeking to park on this stretch of road will seriously impede the flowing traffic, particularly if they have to cross the carriageway to gain a parking space; It also concerns me that drivers egressing their vehicles will be stepping out onto the carriageway in many cases.

The grass verges along this stretch of road have created a natural barrier between the pavements and the carriageway and it should be noted that these pavements are well used, particularly by pupils of Marden Bridge School, not to mention shoppers and other people.

The only thing of merit that I can see coming out of the scheme is that the construction of a crossing point at the south end of the road, something that should have been provided many years ago. The money wasted on this scheme could have been put to better use if some of it had been spent on providing a safety barrier at the north end of Marden Road South, in front of the premises now occupied by 'Deep' and St Paul's Churchyard. This is a particularly narrow stretch of pavement which often has vehicles mounting it in order to form two lines of traffic whilst queuing at the traffic lights.

I reiterate my point that the proposal to tear up the grass and substitute them with parking bays should have been properly advertised and the general public been given an opportunity to object or comment long before any civil engineering works were set in motion. It is becoming apparent to me that the current administration in North Tyneside Council likes to do things their own way.

Yours sincerely

Mr H

Initial response from Council

Dear Mr H

I have been forwarded a copy of your objection to the Notice of Intention relating to the proposed new Waiting Restrictions on Marden Road, Whitley Bay.

Can I please clarify that the construction of a lay-by does not require the Highway Authority to implement a traffic regulation order. The proposal was however discussed with your Local Councillors prior to undertaking the final design of the scheme.

The Notice of Intention that has been advertised simply relates to the restriction on waiting that the Council are proposing to regulate use of the lay-by.

Whilst the matters that you have raised are not relevant to the Notice of Intention that has been advertised, I would like to respond to some of your concerns:

1. Our Traffic Officers have checked the junction of Grosvenor Drive and Marden Road and are satisfied that the visibility splay will be suitable.
2. The new arrangement should improve the traffic flow as it will create parking provision on both sides of the road.
3. The Road Safety Officer has viewed the proposal and is satisfied that there are no significant safety concerns associated with the removal of the grass verge. The proposals do include new crossing points that will aid the operation of the School Crossing Patrol in this area.
4. The footway fronting the Deep is too narrow to accommodate any barrier.

The proposal to restrict the length of time that drivers can wait in the lay-by is designed to maximise use of the facility by encouraging a high turnover of the space. To enable me to determine if your objection is relevant to the traffic regulation order, I would be grateful if you to clarify why you feel that the restriction on length of stay in the parking bay is unreasonable.

Yours sincerely

Garry Hoyle
Parking Manager

Response from Mr H

I thank you for your letter in reply to my letter of objection. Your response is more or less what I expected and I had not intended to reply but your final paragraph asks me to clarify why I feel that the restriction on length of stay in the parking bays is unreasonable. I made no reference whatsoever with regard to the latter and I am indifferent as to whether the length of stay should be one hour or two hours. In my experience such parking restrictions are rarely, if ever, policed or enforced.

I was aware that the traffic regulation order only applied to the type of parking restrictions that the Council are proposing to introduce but logic and common sense tell me that the public should be allowed to have their say on the matter before the implementation of expensive civil engineering works. Once the latter is completed, it makes the whole project a fait accompli. You

say that the project was discussed with our ward councillors prior to undertaking the final design of the scheme but the first the residents heard of it was in a newsletter from Councillor McIntyre, who was claiming credit for persuading the Council to go ahead with hardening up both hard shoulders of the road. This was distributed less than a week prior to engineering work commencing. Talking with ward councillors is not the same as consulting the residents. I know one ward councillor has been pushing for the scheme for some twenty years but he is the only person that I know who is for it.

I now note that work appears to have finished on the project but the lay-by constructed on the western side of Marden Road still requires a wearing course to complete it but vehicles are now using the facility. No lay-by has been provided on the eastern side of the road but the original white lining delineating the original bays has been re-marked, although slightly narrower than before, and again, vehicles are making full use of the bays. Subsequently the main carriageway has been reduced in width and a new centre line painted along it, but the original line is still evident. This makes nonsense of your claim that the new arrangement should improve traffic flow. Perhaps you can explain to me why the provision of a lay-by on the eastern side of Marden Road has not gone ahead. Cost I am sure will be used as an excuse and maybe the latest debacle regarding the Council's budget has played its part but I would really like to know if there are any other reasons.

I still maintain that my main objection to the scheme, the egress from Grosvenor Drive, is a very valid point. I have forty years experience using this junction and it has always been a difficult junction to negotiate safely. The fact that there will now be four rows of traffic as well as pedestrians to consider will make it even more hazardous. The Road Safety Officers view that the removal of the grass verges offers no safety concerns with regard to crossing points for pedestrians is all very well but perhaps he should consider the motorists exiting Grosvenor Drive.

Yours sincerely,

Mr H

Response from Council

Dear Mr H

I acknowledge receipt of your correspondence dated 25 March 2012.

I can confirm that your objection to the Notice of Intention will be included in a report that will be submitted to Cabinet for their consideration in the near future. I will notify you of their decision as soon as it is made available.

With regard to your comments about the visibility splay exiting the junction of Grosvenor Drive, I can confirm that this was checked by our Traffic team during the design of the scheme. I can confirm however that the Council are commissioning an independent Safety Audit to be carried out of this scheme. The results of this audit will be included in the report that is presented to Cabinet.

Yours sincerely

Garry Hoyle
Parking Manager

NORTH TYNESIDE COUNCIL

MARDEN ROAD, WHITLEY BAY

**THE NORTH TYNESIDE (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING AND LOADING)
(CONSOLIDATION) ORDER 2012 VARIATION ORDER NO. 3 2012**

**THE NORTH TYNESIDE (ON STREET PARKING PLACES) (CONSOLIDATION ORDER)
ORDER 2011 VARIATION ORDER NO. 5 2012**

North Tyneside Council gives notice that it proposes to make the following Orders under Sections 1, 2, 32, 35, 45, 46, 53 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

The effect of the Orders, if made, will be to:-

- A. Vary the existing North Tyneside (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading) (Consolidation) Order 2012 as follows:
- i) Revoke the existing waiting at anytime restriction on the east side of Marden Road, between its junction with Whitley Road and a point 70 metres south of that junction and on the west side between its junction with Grosvenor Drive and a point 147 metres south of that junction; and
 - ii) Include a new waiting at anytime restriction on the west side of Marden Road from its junction with Grosvenor Drive in a southerly direction for a distance of 16 metres and from a point 96 metres south of that junction to the junction with Hillheads Road.
- B. Vary the existing North Tyneside (On Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2011 as follows:
- i) Re-designate the parking places on the east side of Marden Road between the points 92 and 108 metres south of Whitley Road, so that parking between 8.00am and 6.00pm Mondays to Saturdays is limited to a maximum stay of 2 hours with no return within 2 hours and to remove the exemption for parking permit holders; and
 - ii) Include a new parking places restriction limiting waiting to 2 hours maximum stay with no return within 2 hours between 8.00am and 6.00pm on Mondays to Saturdays on the west side of Marden Road, from a point 16 metres south of Grosvenor Drive for a distance of 12 metres in a southerly direction and from a point 31 metres south of Grosvenor Drive for a distance of 65 metres in a southerly direction.

Full details of the proposals, together with maps showing the proposals, may be examined at the address below between 8.30 am and 4.00 pm on Mondays to Fridays. If you wish to object to the proposals, you should send the grounds for your objection in writing to the undersigned by 16 March 2012. Any objections received will be placed in the working file and can be viewed by the public if requested.

24 February 2012

V Geary

Head of Legal, Governance and Commercial Services

c/o Democratic Services, Quadrant, The Silverlink North, Cobalt Business Park, NE27 0BY

Appendix 3 – Plan of area

