

# North Tyneside Council Report to Cabinet 7 April 2014

**ITEM 6(c)**  
Traffic Regulation Order –  
Southfields, Dudley

**Portfolio(s):** Economic Development

**Cabinet Member(s):** Cllr F Lott

**Report from Service Area:** Environment and Leisure

**Report Author:** Phil Scott, Head of Environment and Leisure (Tel: 0191 643 7295)

**Wards affected:** Weetslade

## PART 1

### **1.1 Purpose:**

The purpose of this report is to seek Cabinet's approval to extend the existing waiting restriction on both sides of Southfields at its junction with Weetslade Road in Dudley, and set aside one objection received to the proposal.

### **1.2 Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that Cabinet:

- (1) considers the objection;
- (2) sets aside the objection in the interests of discouraging inconsiderate and unsafe parking at the junction thereby improving vehicular access and road safety; and
- (3) confirms the Traffic Regulation Order, as drafted.

### **1.3 Forward Plan:**

Objections relating to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders are a standard item on the Forward Plan.

### **1.4 Council Plan and Policy Framework**

The proposals in this report are relevant to the following priority set out in Our North Tyneside, the Council Plan 2014 to 2018:

- 1 C We will improve accessibility in the borough and support accessibility by walking and cycling

## **1.5 Information:**

### **1.5.1 Background**

Following representation from residents of Southfields and local ward members a proposal to extend the existing 'no waiting at any time' restriction on both sides of Southfields at its junction with Weetslade Road by 10 metres was developed. The proposed restrictions are intended to address problems created by vehicles parking on the south side of Southfields to the east of the existing restrictions at the junction, effectively reducing the carriageway to one lane at this location. This has led to a number of reported "near misses" between vehicles entering the cul-de-sac and others exiting it onto Weetslade Road. Extending the existing double yellow lines eastwards will help to discourage this obstructive parking and improve road safety at the junction.

Affected residents were informed of the proposal by letter and in accordance with the statutory process, a Notice of Intention for the proposal was displayed on site, in the local newspaper and on the Authority's website outlining the proposed restrictions.

One objection was received in response to the statutory Notice of Intention. A summary of the objection is provided below.

### **1.5.2 Statutory Consultation**

Parking proposals are subject to statutory legal process. Schemes must be advertised on site and in the local press. This enables members of the public or businesses 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 Objection**

A local resident submitted an objection to the proposal on the following grounds:

- (1) The proposed restrictions are unnecessary as there are never any parking problems in the street and being a cul-de-sac, there is no through traffic.
- (2) Introducing additional restrictions would reduce the available on street parking for visitors.

An officer from the Authority met with the objector on site to discuss his concerns. The officer reiterated the rationale behind the proposals but the objector maintained his opinion that the proposed restrictions are unnecessary and confirmed that he did not wish to withdraw his objection.

Officers maintain the view that the proposed restrictions would alleviate parking problems in the locality.

## **1.6 Decision options:**

The following options are available for consideration by Cabinet:

### 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 will help to discourage inconsiderate and obstructive parking at the junction of Southfields and Weetslade Road thereby improving vehicular access, visibility and road safety.

## **1.8 Appendices:**

- Appendix 1 Details of objection and associated correspondence
- Appendix 2 Legal Notice of Intention as published in local press
- Appendix 3 Plan of scheme will be displayed in each group room and will be available for inspection at Cabinet

## **1.9 Contact officers:**

Andrew Flynn, Client Manager - Integrated Transport, 0191 643 6083  
Kevin Ridpath, Highway Network Manager, Capita, 0773 028 5609  
Garry Hoyle, Parking Manager, Capita, 0191 643 6599  
Alison Campbell, Financial Business Manager, 0191 643 7038

## **1.10 Background information:**

North Tyneside Parking Strategy 2012 - 2016

[http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse.shtml?p\\_subjectCategory=360](http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk/browse.shtml?p_subjectCategory=360)

## **PART 2 – COMPLIANCE WITH PRINCIPLES OF DECISION MAKING**

### **2.1 Finance and other resources**

Funding is available from the 2014/15 Parking Control (Parking Management) 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 set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Regulations that flow from that Act, namely, the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. All schemes are formally advertised and include a 21-day period for objections. In accordance with the Authority's policy, if any objections cannot be resolved, then Cabinet is asked to consider the objections.

The Legal Notice of Intent was published in local press and may be cited as the North Tyneside (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading) (Consolidation) Order 2012 Variation Order No. 9 2013.

In accordance with the Local Government Act 2000 and the regulations made under that Act in relation to responsibility for functions, Cabinet is responsible for determining this matter.

### **2.3 Consultation/community engagement**

Consultation was carried out in line with statutory process as described in section 1.5.2.

## 2.4 Human rights

The proposals within this report do not have direct implications in respect of the Human Rights Act 1998.

## 2.5 Equalities and diversity

There are no adverse equalities or diversity issues arising from this report. There are potential positive equalities implications in that physical accessibility, particularly for people with disabilities, may be improved.

## 2.6 Risk management

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

## 2.7 Crime and disorder

There are no crime and disorder implications directly arising from this report.

## 2.8 Environment and sustainability

There are no environment and sustainability implications directly arising from this report.

## PART 3 - SIGN OFF

- Chief Executive  X
- Deputy Chief Executive  X
- Head of Service  X
- Mayor/Cabinet Member(s)  X
- Chief Finance Officer  X
- Monitoring Officer  X
- Strategic Manager Policy, Partnerships, Performance and Communication  X

**Details of Objection – Mr W, Local Resident (dated 9 December 2013)**

Dear Mr V,

I have just seen your notice on a lamp post, proposing introducing parking restrictions in my street, and I wish to oppose this most strongly.

Firstly, I see no justifiable reason to introduce them.

There is never any issue of the road being restricted due to parking problems, as it is quite wide, and all the residents are able to park their cars off the street – either on their driveways or in the lay-bys. Furthermore, as Southfields is just a residential cul-de-sac, there is no through traffic.

However, when any of us have visitors, if it is in the evening or at the weekend, there is usually nowhere for them to park other than on the street. That is because most residents have two or three vehicles, and therefore need to use the lay-bys as well as their driveways.

If you introduced parking restrictions, where would you expect our visitors to park their cars?

As a resident of this street for many years, I see no possible benefit in having them, and lots of reasons to object.

If there is a planned meeting to discuss this proposal, could you please inform me when and where it is, as I wish to attend to voice my opposition in person.

Yours sincerely.

Mr W

**Council response**

An officer from the Authority met with the objector on 7 January 2014 to discuss his concerns. The officer reiterated that the proposals had been developed in response to representation from a number of residents and were intended to discourage obstructive parking at the junction thereby improving visibility and road safety. However, the objector maintained his opinion that the proposed restrictions are unnecessary and confirmed that he did not wish to withdraw his objection.

**NORTH TYNESIDE COUNCIL**

**North Tyneside (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading) (Consolidation)  
Order 2012 Variation Order No.9 2013**

North Tyneside Council gives notice that it proposes to make a Variation Order under Sections 1, 2 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and all other enabling powers. The effect of the Order, if made, will be to vary the North Tyneside (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading) (Consolidation) Order 2012, so that

1. no vehicles except those used by the police may park on the west side of Percy Park Road, Tynemouth from a point 30 metres south of its junction with Percy Park to a point 36 metres south of its junction with Percy Park;
2. a no waiting at any time restriction is introduced on the following lengths of road:-
  - a) both sides of Southfields, Dudley, from its junction with Weetslade Road for a distance of 10 metres in a north easterly direction;
  - b) both sides of Back Percy Gardens, between its junctions with Hotspur Street and rear Hotspur Street;
  - c) Algernon Industrial Estate access road:-
    - i) west side, from its junction with New York Road for a distance of 40 metres in a southerly direction;
    - ii) west side, from a point 76 metres south of its junction with New York Road to a point 96 metres south of its junction with New York Road;
    - iii) east side, from its junction with New York Road for a distance of 292 metres in a south easterly direction; and
    - iv) from the southern boundary of Unit 8 for a distance of 15 metres in a south easterly direction.
3. a no loading or unloading restriction is introduced on the east side of Algernon Industrial Estate access road, from its junction with New York Road for a distance of 292 metres in a south easterly direction.
4. a loading bay for goods vehicles only is introduced on the west side of Algernon Industrial Estate access road, from a point 40 metres south of its junction with New York Road to a point 76 metres of its junction with New York Road.

Full details of 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 18 December 2013. Any objections received will be placed in the working file and can be viewed by the public if requested.

27 November 2013

V Geary, Head of Law & Governance  
c/o Democratic Services, Quadrant, Silverlink North, Cobalt Business Park, NE27 0BY

