



**Meeting:** Transport Working Party

**Date:** 14<sup>th</sup> March 2013

**Wards Affected:** Clifton with Maidenway, Cockington with Chelston and St Marys with Summercombe

**Report Title:** Parking Restrictions Various

**Executive Lead Contact Details:** Sue Cheriton, Executive Head – Residents & Visitor Services

**Supporting Officer Contact Details:** John Clewer Senior Engineer - Highways Development & Traffic

---

1. **Purpose**

1.1 This report is in response to correspondence/objections received following the advertising of a number of amendments to existing Traffic Regulation Orders,

2. **Proposed Decision**

2.1 It is recommended that members approve the proposals outlined under option 6.1 in this Issues Paper, to amend a number of existing Traffic Regulation Orders.

3. **Action Needed**

3.1 It is recommended that members approve the proposals outlined under option 6.1 in this Issues Paper for the implementation of amendments to a number of Traffic Regulation Orders and the advertising of the amended Traffic Regulation Order and implementation should no objections be forthcoming. Any objections will be referred to a forthcoming meeting of the Transport Working Party.

4. **Summary**

4.1 In 2008 members agreed to impose a moratorium on the processing of traffic regulation orders for waiting restrictions, a moratorium which is still in place.

4.2 This 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, members agreed to temporarily lift the moratorium. In June 2012 a budget of £15,000 was identified and a number of proposals were identified following feedback from members, residents and stakeholders.

- 4.3 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.
- 4.4 At the meeting of the Transport Working Party on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, members agreed to advertise a number of these proposals and implement should no objections be forthcoming. This report is to consider the objections which have been received from residents / stakeholders.

---

## Supporting Information

### 5. Position

- 5.1 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. 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.

- 5.2 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. 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.
- 5.3 At the meeting of the Transport Working Party on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2012, members agreed to advertise a number of these proposals and implement should no objections be forthcoming.
- 5.4 This report is to consider the objections which have been received from residents / stakeholders with regard to the following roads. The original proposals were as shown in **Appendix 1** and the correspondence / objections received are attached in **Appendix 2**.

#### Brixham

- Cudhill Road – Extra lines were requested both to the side and opposite the entrance to The Paddock.
- New Road/Holwell Road – A request was made to cut back the lines in the vicinity of the surgery, however with two junctions accessing on to Holwell Road at this location, this was rejected due to the likelihood of congestion.

#### Paignton

- Baymount Road – Objection received regarding the placement of double yellow lines on the Eastern side of the road, this was rejected as parking is predominantly on the opposite side of the road and no other objections were received.
- Maidenway Road / David Road – Objections due to loss of parking, however this is at a junction of three roads and considered to be a road safety issue.
- Primley Park – Multiple objections to the proposal of restrictions on the inside of the bend and therefore the proposal has been withdrawn.

#### Torquay

- Burridge Road/Boundary Road - Objections due to loss of parking, however this is at a crossroads junction and considered to be a road safety issue.
- Sherwell Rise South - Multiple objections to the proposal of restrictions. As original proposal was to remove the restrictions, these objections have been upheld and a reduced level of double yellows are recommended to be re-advertised at the junction with Bramble Close, Burridge Road and Nutbush Lane.

5.5 Following consideration of the objections (attached in **Appendix 2**) received, the following actions are proposed:

#### Brixham

- Cudhill Road - Implement as advertised.
- New Road / Holwell Road - Implement as advertised.

#### Paignton

- Baymount Road - Implement as advertised.
- Maidenway Road / David Road - Implement as advertised.
- Primley Park - Do not implement restrictions.

#### Torquay

- Burridge Road/Boundary Road - Implement as advertised.
- Sherwell Rise South - Due to objections do not implement advertised restrictions. Instead re-advertise and implement should no objections be forthcoming, the removal of the existing restrictions and place no waiting at any time restrictions at the junctions of Sherwell Rise south and Bramble Close, Burridge Road and Nut Bush lane as shown on plan. Any objections to be referred to a future meeting of the Transport Working Party.

## 6 Possibilities and Options

The Working Party are requested to consider whether they wish to support amendments to traffic regulation orders in the area as detailed above in 5.5

6.1 Advertise and implement, should no objections be forthcoming, the proposed

changes to the Traffic Regulation Orders, as per 5.5 above. Any objections will be referred to a future meeting of the Transport Working Party.

6.2 Advertise and implement, should no objections be forthcoming, a selection of the proposed changes to the Traffic Regulation Orders. Any objections will be referred to a future meeting of the Transport Working Party.

6.3 Members may wish to recommend that no changes are considered at the present time.

## **7 Preferred Solution/Option**

Members are recommended that the option in 6.1 above would be the most appropriate option.

## **8 Consultation**

Consultation with members and residents has been undertaken, the proposed alterations to the Traffic Regulation Orders have been advertised, both in the local media (Herald Express) and on site between 22<sup>nd</sup> November – 13<sup>th</sup> December 2012 and a number of objections (attached as per **Appendix 2**) received.

## **9 Risks**

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.

### **Appendices:**

**Appendix 1** – Copies of the plans showing the original proposals to alter the existing Traffic Regulation Orders.

**Appendix 2** – Copies of the correspondence / objections received.

**Appendix 3** – Copies of the plans showing the revised proposals to alter the existing Traffic Regulation Orders.

### **Additional Information:**

None

### **Documents available in Members' Rooms:**

None

### **Background Papers:**

None