



Title: **Shiphay Controlled Parking Zone - Review**

Public Agenda Item: **Yes**

Reason for Report to be Exempt:

Wards **Cockington with Chelston**  
Affected: **Shiphay with the Willows**

To: **Transport Working Party** On: **16th February 2012**

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

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

Contact Officer: **John Clewer**  
☎ Telephone: **7665**  
✉ E.mail: **john.clewer@torbay.gov.uk**

---

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

- 1.1 It is a requirement of the Council's Parking Policy that any amendment to parking restrictions carried out within the bay area undergoes a review within a timeframe of six months to one year of implementation. The purpose of this report is for members to consider the comments / objections received to the changes to the Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) made as a result of the review of the Shiphay Controlled Parking Zone.

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

- 2.1 It is recommended that members approve the proposals outlined under option 1 in this Issues Paper for implementation as part of the review into the Shiphay Controlled Parking Zone during the current financial year.

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

- 3.1 In April 2005 the Transportation Strategy Working Party identified seven possible areas for the introduction of controlled parking zones, of which the Shiphay zone was the final area to be reviewed. Subsequently issues papers were presented to the Transportation Working Party on 2nd February 2009 (outlining the results of the Stage 2 consultation for the Shiphay Controlled Parking Zone) and 6<sup>th</sup> November 2009 (outlining any objections received following the advertising of the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders).

- 3.2 Members recommended that the report be put before the cabinet and therefore a report was prepared and presented on the 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009. Following which the Mayor, as decision taker, made the decision to implement the Shiphay Controlled Parking Zone with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2010, with the zone being enforced from the 20<sup>th</sup> October 2010.
- 3.3 It is a requirement of the Council's Parking Policy that any amendment to parking restrictions carried out within the bay area undergoes a review within a timeframe of six months to one year of implementation. The purpose of this report is for members to consider the comments / objections received following the changes made to the Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) as a result of the review of the Shiphay Controlled Parking Zone. .
- 3.4 Consultation with the residents of the area, Council Ward Members, has being undertaken and positive feedback received.
- 3.5 **Appendix 1** shows the boundaries of the proposed traffic action zone and **Appendix 2 (plans 1 – 9)** details the proposed amendments.

**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

- A1.1 In April 2005 the Transportation Strategy Working Party identified seven possible areas for the introduction of controlled parking zones, of which the Shiphay zone was the final area to be reviewed. Subsequently issues papers were presented to the Transportation Working Party on 2nd February 2009 (outlining the results of the Stage 2 consultation for the Shiphay Controlled Parking Zone) and 6<sup>th</sup> November 2009 (outlining any objections received following the advertising of the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders).
- A1.2 Members recommended that the report be put before the cabinet and therefore a report was prepared and presented on the 8<sup>th</sup> December 2009. Following which the Mayor, as decision taker, made the decision to implement the Shiphay Controlled Parking Zone with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> September 2010, with the zone being enforced from the 20<sup>th</sup> October 2010.
- A1.3 A plan showing the boundaries of the CPZ are attached as **appendix 1**.
- A1.4 It is a requirement of the Council's Parking Policy that any amendment to parking restrictions carried out within the bay area undergoes a review within a timeframe of six months to one year of implementation. The purpose of this report is for members to consider the comments / objections received following the changes made to the Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) as a result of the review of the Shiphay Controlled Parking Zone.
- A1.5 Consultation with the residents of the area and Council Ward Members, was undertaken during October, with an advert and article in the local media and notices placed on site, as well as the opportunity to register comments via the council web site. Positive feedback has been received.
- A1.6 Comments received as a result of the consultation are summarised as follows:

#### Objections

- South Devon Health Care NHS Foundation Trust asks that due to the status of the Broomhill Way park and ride, the Shiphay CPZ scheme should actually be removed / suspended until another solution is in place.
- One letter was received asking for the situation to “revert back to how it was before the scheme started as it has now proved more restrictive than before it was introduced.”

#### In Support

- Seven letters were received of which four offered direct support thanking the authority for ‘giving a residential street back to its residents’.
- Three others also asked for the addition of an extra hours enforcement during the afternoon period.
- Other correspondence has also been received querying the lack of hours the zone is in operation and requesting either 10am – 2pm or 2 hours maximum parking, no return in 3 hours.

#### Banbury Park

- Three letters were received requesting better enforcement around the junction of Banbury Park and Cadewell Lane.
- One resident complaining about issues when trying to access / egress their driveway.

#### Cadewell Lane

- One letter was received from the landlord of flats 84 – 90 Cadewell Lane requesting permits be issued as, which whilst not within the zone, his properties are accessed via Banbury Park.
- One comment was received concerning the parking bays opposite Cadewell Park Road, which were implemented instead of the previous double yellow lines. These bays force vehicles turning right from Cadewell Park Road into the middle of the road.

#### Collaton Road / Exe Hill

- Four letters and numerous telephone calls have been received concerning the congestion caused in this area since amendments were made to the existing parking restrictions, especially during the morning commuter period and school times.

#### Crosspark Avenue

- One letter requested the introduction of parking restrictions to create passing places due to the useable width of the carriageway being reduced by parked vehicles.

#### Grosvenor Close

- Five letters have been received concerning the effects on residents of overspill parking from vehicles which have been displaced from inside the CPZ.

#### Grosvenor Avenue

- One letter requested that the double yellow lines be extended further in to the junction of Grosvenor Avenue / Higher Cadewell Lane, resulting in poor visibility.

#### Higher Cadewell Lane

- Four letters have been received concerning the effects on residents of overspill parking from vehicles which have been displaced from inside the CPZ.
- Three letters request that Higher Cadewell Lane be included within the boundaries of an extended CPZ.
- One letter requests that bays be relaxed within the zone to make capacity for vehicles currently using Higher Cadewell Lane.
- One letter requests the introduction of parking restrictions to create passing places due to the useable width of the carriageway being reduced by parked vehicles.

#### Lloyd Avenue

- One letter, backing up previous comments made, concerning parking around the junction of Lloyd Avenue and Summerfield Road and asking that some bays are removed on the 'uphill' side of Lloyd Avenue to reduce the risk of 'uphill' and 'downhill' traffic coming into conflict.

#### Queensway

- Six letters and numerous telephone calls have been received from the residents of Queensway and adjacent cul-de-sacs regarding overspill parking from vehicles which had previously parked within the CPZ. This problem has only occurred recently and is believed to be due to NHS staff, who previously had permits to park at the Focus DIY store, being displaced since it was redeveloped as ASDA.

The residents request that parking restrictions be implemented as vehicles parking close to the junction of Queensway and Shiphay Lane, force vehicles turning into Queensway to come into conflict with downhill traffic. This parking is causing congestion, vehicles are stationary on Shiphay Lane, as they are unable to freely turn into Queensway.

#### Rougemont Avenue

- One letter was received from a resident requesting the reinstatement of on-street parking bays to act as a traffic calming feature at the junction of Rougemont and Grosvenor Avenues.

#### Shiphay Lane

- Correspondence was received from one resident requesting a change to the parking restrictions on the West side of Shiphay Lane.
- Correspondence was also received from the Shiphay Dental enquiring into the possibility of the provision of a small section of 3 hour parking in the vicinity of the surgery.
- A further letter commented on the problems caused by cars parking in the vicinity of the bus stop near house no.62.

#### Stanbury Road

- One letter has been received concerning the effects on residents of overspill parking from vehicles which have been displaced from inside the CPZ.

#### Wallace Avenue

- One letter has been received concerning the effects on residents of overspill parking from vehicles which have been displaced from inside the CPZ.

#### Other comments:

- Allowed vehicle size - One letter was received from a resident asking for the size of vehicle allowed within the zone to be increased to 'plate certificate' size.
- Bank Holiday / Christmas Operation – correspondence was received regarding the operational days of the zone and whether it should be enforced over holiday periods?
- Number of permits per household – correspondence was received stating that two permits per household was restrictive where households have grown up children with cars.
- Original Consultation – One comment was received stating that the original “vote on the scheme was flawed as only one vote was allowed per dwelling thus disenfranchising multiple car owners in a property.”
- Parking of traders – correspondence was received regarding the parking of emergency short term callers
- Scheme Registration – Correspondence was received regarding the amount of information requested prior to the issue of a vehicle permit. Some residents feel this to be “completely intrusive and unnecessary, also a threat to use the information for other purposes is a disgrace and unwarranted.”

- Value for money – One letter was received stating that the £30 permit was poor value for money when the scheme is only in operation for one hour a day.
- Visitor Annual Parking Permit - one letter was received requesting the ability to purchase an annual permit for a regular visitor whose vehicles are not registered at the property.
- Visitor Permits – correspondence was received concerning the time limited nature of these permits.

In response the following actions are proposed:

#### Banbury Park (Appendix 2 Plan No.1)

- Parking Services to be informed and asked to check this area on a regular basis.
- There is a small gap in the existing Traffic Regulation Order, which will be advertised as currently signed i.e. 'Permit Holder Bay Mon – Fri 10am-11am'

#### Cadewell Lane

- No action.

#### Cadewell Lane / Cadewell Park Road junction (Appendix 2 Plan No.2)

- Remove 11m of 'Limited waiting 2 hours no return in 3 hours Resident Permit Holders Exempt Mon – Fri 8am – 6pm' and implement double yellow lines, to improve the movement of vehicles turning right out of Cadewell Park Road.

#### Collaton Road / Exe Hill (Appendix 2 Plan No.3)

- Parking restrictions will be implemented to allow the free passage of traffic and to reduce both congestion on Collaton Road and the conflict between vehicles turning into Exe Hill, especially during the morning commuter period and school times.
- Change the restrictions in the existing parking bays fronting property nos 3 – 9 Shiphay Lane from 'Limited Waiting 1 hour return prohibited within 2 hours' to 'Limited Waiting 1 hour return prohibited within 2 hours, Mon-Fri 8am-6pm'.

#### Crosspark Avenue (Appendix 2 Plan No.4)

- Implement the minimum parking restrictions required to allow the free passage of traffic (especially buses), create passing places, reduce congestion and maintain access to properties.

#### Grosvenor Close

- Low level consultation to be undertaken with the residents to gain feedback as to whether they wish to become part of the Controlled Parking Zone. It should be remembered that residents originally voted to be part of the zone, before opting out during the final stages of consultation.

#### Grosvenor Avenue (Appendix 2 Plan No.5)

- The double yellow lines are to be extended further in to the junction with Higher Cadewell Lane, to prevent vehicles parking on the apex of the corner and therefore improve the visibility for drivers exiting Grosvenor Avenue.

#### Higher Cadewell Lane (Appendix 2 Plan No.4)

- Implement the minimum parking restrictions required to allow the free passage of traffic (especially buses), create passing places, reduce congestion and maintain access to properties.

#### Lloyd Avenue (Appendix 2 Plan No.6)

- Remove the Permit holder only bay outside house no's 2 – 4 Lloyd Avenue and replace with double yellow lines, to reduce the risk of 'uphill' and 'downhill' traffic coming into conflict.

#### Queensway (Appendix 2 Plan No.7)

- Parking restrictions will be implemented to allow the free passage of traffic and to reduce both congestion and the conflict between vehicles turning into Queensway and those travelling downhill.

#### Rougemont Avenue (Appendix 2 Plan No.5)

- There is a gap in the existing Traffic Regulation Order (outside house no's 49 – 51), which will be advertised as currently signed i.e. 'Permit Holder Bay Mon – Fri 10am-11am'.
- With regard to the request for the reinstatement of on-street parking bays to act as a traffic calming feature at the junction of Rougemont and Grosvenor Avenues, it is felt that the carriageway in this area is too narrow and that parked cars would reduce the available visibility.

#### Shiphay Lane (Appendix 2 Plan No.8 & 9)

- Change the existing restrictions in the parking bay fronting house no's 39 – 45 Shiphay Lane from 'limited waiting 2 hours no return in 3 hours, resident permit holders exempt Monday – Friday' to 'limited waiting 3 hours no return in 4 hours, resident permit holders exempt Monday – Friday'. As per appendix 3 plan no.11.
- No action to be taken regarding parking in the vicinity of the bus stop near house no.62.
- Change the existing restrictions in the parking bay fronting house no's 112 – 114 and opposite house no's 111 - 115 Shiphay Lane from 'limited waiting 1 hour no return in 2 hours', to 'limited waiting 2 hours no return in 3 hours, Monday to Friday 8am – 6pm.' As per appendix 3 plan no.12.

#### Stanbury Road

- No action.

#### Wallace Avenue (Appendix 2 Plan No.4)

- Implement the minimum parking restrictions required to allow the free passage of traffic, create passing places and maintain access to properties.

#### Other comments:

- These all concern the actual policy behind the Control Parking Zone and as such are outside the remit of this report. These comments will be help on file, until such time the policy is reviewed.

## **A2. Risk assessment of preferred option**

### **A2.1 Outline of significant key risks**

A2.1.1 Whilst consultation has been undertaken with major stakeholders, it is possible that when the alterations to the existing Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) 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 By making the best use of the available road space we will be able to reduce congestion, formalise parking and therefore reduce the number of wasted journeys made by drivers as they search for on-street parking spaces. If these changes to the existing Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) are not approved due to objections, congestion will continue and wasted journeys may increase with the resultant rise in both traffic movements and vehicle emissions.

## **A3. Other Options**

A3.1 The following options have been identified:-

### **Option 1**

Advertise the amendments to the Traffic Regulation Orders as detailed in **Appendix 2 Plan No's 1 - 9** of the Shiphay Controlled Parking Zone Review 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 nothing

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

A4.1 Advertising of the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders will be carried out by staff from within the Residents and Visitor Services Business Unit using existing resources. 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.

## **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.

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

A7.1 None



## **Appendices**

Appendix 1 Shows the boundaries of the existing Controlled Parking Zone.  
Appendix 2 Plans 1 – 9 detail individual scheme proposals.

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

Comments received as a result of consultation.

## **Background Papers:**

The following documents / files were used to compile this report:

None.