



Title: **Parking Restrictions Various**

Public Agenda Item: **Yes**

Wards Affected: **All wards in Torbay**

To: **Transport Working Party** On: **25<sup>th</sup> October 2012**

Key Decision: **No** How soon does the decision need to be implemented: **November 2012**

Change to Budget: **No** Change to Policy Framework: **No**

Contact Officer: **John Clewer**  
Telephone: **7765**  
E.mail: **john.clewer@torbay.gov.uk**

---

## 1. What we are trying to achieve and the impact on our customers

1.1 In 2008 as part of the budget reductions for the following year, members agreed to impose a moratorium on the processing of traffic regulation orders for waiting restrictions, a moratorium which is still in place.

This has led to a back-log of requests being held on file and, in an effort to get the processing of Traffic Regulations orders underway, it was proposed by members to temporarily lift the moratorium.

1.1.1 At the meeting of the Transport Working Party, which took place on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2012, a budget of £15,000 was identified and it was proposed to carry out some local consultation, to judge the feelings of the communities affected by the proposals as listed in **Appendix 1**. These proposals had been identified following feedback from members, residents and stakeholders.

**Appendix 2 (tables 1 – 3)** lists the number of comments received, whilst **Appendix 3 (plans 1 – 6)** details the revised schemes following consultation with residents.

This report seeks permission to advertise the schemes identified in **Appendix 2 (tables 1 – 3)** and implement, should no objections be received. Any objections will then be submitted to a forthcoming meeting of the Transport Working Party.

## **2. Recommendation(s) for decision**

- 2.1.1** It is recommended that the amendments to the Traffic Regulation Orders identified in **Appendix 2 (tables 1 – 3)** are advertised and implemented should no objections be received. Any objections will then be submitted to a forthcoming meeting of the Transport Working Party for consideration.

## **3. Key points and reasons for recommendations**

- 3.1** These proposals have been identified following feedback from members, residents and stakeholders. Their implementation will reduce the risk of delays to road users due to the carriageway width and visibility being restricted by inconsiderate parking.

**For more detailed information on this proposal please refer to the supporting information attached.**

**Patrick Carney**  
**Service Manager – Street Scene Services**

## Supporting information

### A1. Introduction and history

- 1.2 In 2008 as part of the budget reductions for the following year, members agreed to impose a moratorium on the processing of traffic regulation orders for waiting restrictions, a moratorium which is still in place. However traffic regulation orders have still been considered if they were part of capital funded schemes.

This has led to a back-log of requests being held on file and, in an effort to get the processing of Traffic Regulations orders underway and the outstanding back-log reduced, it was proposed by members to temporarily lift the moratorium.

- 1.2.1 At the meeting of the Transport Working Party, which took place on 21<sup>st</sup> June 2012, a budget of £15,000 was identified and it was proposed to carry out some local consultation, to judge the feelings of the communities affected by the proposals as listed in **Appendix 1**. These proposals had been identified following feedback from members, residents and stakeholders. Their implementation will improve road safety and reduce the risk of delays to road users, due to the carriageway width and visibility being restricted by inconsiderate parking.

This report details the feedback received, **Appendix 2 (tables 1 – 3)** lists the number of comments received, whilst **Appendix 3 (plans 1 – 6)** details the revised schemes following consultation with residents and seeks permission to advertise the schemes identified in **Appendix 2 (tables 1 – 3)** and implement, should no objections be received. Any objections will then be submitted to a forthcoming meeting of the Transport Working Party.

Revised schemes following feedback from consultation:

#### Brixham

##### Berryhead with Furzeham

- New Road (**Appendix 3 plan 1**) – Extend the double yellow lines in Holwell Road South past the dentist.
- Northfields Lane / Pavilion Close (**Appendix 3 plan 2**) – Extend the double yellow lines in each direction.

##### St Marys with Summercombe

- Doctors Road (**Appendix 3 plan 3**) – This was a Police request as parked cars close to the mouth of the junction force traffic turning into Doctors Road onto the 'wrong' side of the road into the path of oncoming traffic. Therefore it is proposed to advertise the removal of one car parking space.

#### Torquay

##### Cockington with Chelston

- Sherwell Rise South (**Appendix 3 plan 4**) – Replace existing restrictions with double yellow lines and extend further along road.

## Tormohun

- Church Street (**Appendix 3 plan 5**) – Change the proposed end of time restrictions from 6pm to 4pm

## Watcombe

- Seymour Drive (**Appendix 3 plan 7**) – Extend the double yellow lines slightly further into both Padacre Road and Seymour Drive.
- Moor Lane – The original consultation received 19 replies, 16 of which were in disagreement with the proposal. Councillors Darling and Stringer have also carried out a parking survey, which attracted 11 replies, 6 from Brunel Avenue, 3 from Moor Lane and 2 unknown.

The general consensus is that residents recognise that there is a parking problem generated by the presence of the schools, those residents in Moor Lane would support restrictions but those in Brunel Avenue are likely to object due to being affected by the displacement of vehicles.

Therefore, as there is no agreement between residents as to how to progress this situation, Highways feel that we can not currently progress this matter.

### Option 1

Advertise the amendments to the Traffic Regulation Orders as listed in **Appendix 2 (tables 1 – 3)** and implement should no objections be received. Any objections will then be submitted to a forthcoming meeting of the Transport Working Party for consideration.

### Option 2

Do not advertise the amendments to the Traffic Regulation Orders as listed in **Appendix 2 (tables 1 – 3)**.

### Option 3

Advertise a selection of amendments as listed in **Appendix 2 (tables 1 – 3)** and implement, should no objections be received. Any objections will then be submitted to a forthcoming meeting of the Transport Working Party for consideration.

## A2. Risk assessment of preferred option

### A2.1 Outline of significant key risks

Whilst the proposed changes to the existing Traffic Regulation Orders have been identified following feedback from members, residents and stakeholders, it is possible that when the alterations are advertised (both on site and in the local media), these will attract objections from the members of the public. Any such

objections will then have to be referred back to a future meeting of the Transport Working Party for consideration.

## **A2.2 Remaining risks**

A2.2.1 If these changes to the existing Traffic Regulation Orders are not approved due to objections, there will be a greater risk of delays to road users due to the possibility of carriageway width and visibility being restricted by inconsiderate parking.

## **A3. Other Options**

A3.1 That the proposed amendments to the existing Traffic Regulation Orders are not advertised.

## **A4. Summary of resource implications**

A4.1 Implementation of the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders will be carried out by the Street Scene & Place Group. Enforcement of the waiting restrictions will be provided by staff from within the Residents & Visitor Services Business Unit. These works have been funded by the Capital allocation for integrated transport.

## **A5. What impact will there be on equalities, environmental sustainability and crime and disorder?**

A5.1 None

## **A6. Consultation and Customer Focus**

A6.1 Consultation with the residents and Council Ward Members has being undertaken and positive feedback received. The proposed parking restrictions will be advertised, both on site and in the local media. Any comments or objections received will be referred back to a future meeting of the Transport Working Party for consideration.

## **A7. Are there any implications for other Business Units?**

A7.1 Amendments to the existing Traffic Regulation Orders will require legal orders which have to be sealed by the Legal Services team.

## **Appendices**

Appendix 1 A list of the original proposals.

Appendix 2 Tables 1 – 3 list a summary of the feedback received following consultation.

Appendix 3 Details the revised schemes following consultation with residents.

## **Documents available in members' rooms**

Plans of the original proposals, as submitted to members at the meeting of the Transport Working Party 21<sup>st</sup> June 2012.