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CONTRIBUTION TO OUR AIMS

The Scheme, if confirmed, will contribute to the Council’s aim of improving the Health and Wellbeing of all road users, residents and visitors to the area by creating and maintaining a safer environment. It will also help to improve the quality of life for residents through introducing parking measures enabling residents and visitors to park in the vicinity of their properties.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

It is proposed to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order for a Residents Parking Scheme (RPS) within the identified area shown on drawing TR-18-22-V2 in Appendix A. The scheme will incorporate additional waiting restrictions to prohibit the waiting of vehicles where parking is not appropriate and a two hour Limited Waiting provision to allow short stay parking for visitors.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

1. Subject to a formal consultation and no objections being received, approval is granted to the making of a Traffic Regulation Order to implement a Residents Parking Scheme to the extent shown on drawing TR-18-22-V2 in Appendix A.

2. The assessment of parking permit applications be delegated to the Director of Economy & Growth.

3. In the event that there are unresolved material objections to the Order, these are referred back to the Portfolio Holder for a decision as to whether the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed.
REASONS FOR DECISION

a) To improve the available on street parking for local residents Monday – Saturday between the hours of 8am-6pm, whilst also maintaining a provision for short term visitors to the area.

b) To improve visibility for road users and reduce potential vehicle conflict ensuring that clear unobstructed access throughout the identified RPS is maintained, particularly for emergency service and refuse vehicles.

1. BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

1.1 A request to reintroduce a Residents Parking Scheme for ‘Resident Permit Parking Only 8am-6pm Monday to Saturday or 2 Hour Limited Waiting No Return within 1 Hour’ was submitted by residents of Abbey Park Road (between Abbey Road & Abbey Drive West), Abbey Drive West, Manor Avenue, Abbey Drive East, Wellowgate (south of Abbey Road) and St Olafs Grove within Park Ward in September 2017.

1.2 The streets listed above are approximately a 10 minute walk from Grimsby Town Centre and as a result commuters frequently utilise the above streets, which are currently unrestricted, for parking.

1.3 A high percentage of properties in the area do not have access to off-street parking and are finding it difficult to park their vehicles within close proximity to their properties due to daily commuter parking.

1.4 Previously a RPS within this area restricted parking to ‘ Permit Holders or 1 hour No Return within 1 hour Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm’. However, this scheme ceased in 2012.

1.5 Following a review of the existing on street restrictions, traffic flows and current parking arrangements, local residents and businesses in the identified area were surveyed in March 2018. A total of 309 properties were surveyed including those streets requesting the reintroduction of a scheme.

1.6 The purpose of the survey was to determine the current parking arrangements of residents and gauge initial support for the introduction of parking measures. A response rate of 39% was received of the total survey area, with a higher individual level of response coming from the initial applicant streets.

1.6 Feedback received from the survey has been used to develop a RPS, including revisions to waiting restrictions, for the area. (See Appendix C & D for survey summary details)

1.7 The proposed scheme has been developed following feedback received from residents surveys and consultation and is a slight variation on that initially residents detailed in 1.1 above. (see Appendix B)
2. **RISKS AND OPPORTUNITIES**

Should this proposal not be implemented, the risks are:

- That parking in the affected streets will remain unregulated, resulting in continued issues with parking availability for local residents.
- The potential for the obstruction of emergency service and refuse vehicles to continue.

Should this proposal be adopted, the opportunities are:

- To better control parking in this area by removing long term parking by non-residents.
- To significantly improve the likelihood of parking availability for residents within the RPS Monday to Saturday between the hours of 8am-6pm.
- Ensure the regular turnover of short term visitors to the area through the incorporation of two hour limited waiting.
- To improve visibility at junction corners throughout the scheme area, through the introduction of more robust ‘No Waiting at Any Time’ restrictions. This will reflect rule 243 of the Highway Code which states ‘Do not stop or park within 10 metres of a junction’.
- To improve the street scene by reducing the amount of existing signage through the conversion of existing ‘No Waiting restrictions’ to ‘No Waiting at Any Time’ (double yellow lines), which do not require accompanying signage.
- To provide easier and safer access for emergency service and refuse vehicles to properties and residencies within the scheme area through the introduction of additional ‘No Waiting at Any Time’ restrictions on certain streets where the carriageway width is limited.

3. **OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

3.1 **Do nothing** - There has been a direct request from local residents and Ward Councillors for the introduction of measures to control non-resident parking. Should a scheme not be implemented parking in the affected streets will remain unregulated, resulting in continued issues with parking availability for local residents.

3.2 **Implement ‘Limited Waiting’ restriction with no permit provision for residents** – it is recognised that no-one has an express right to park on the highway.

However, a significant proportion of residential dwellings in the proposed scheme area do not have access to off-street parking.

Limited Waiting alone would prevent all day parking within the affected streets, however this would have a negative impact on the residents, as they too would need to comply with any imposed time limit.
3.3 **Implement ‘Residents Parking Only’** – due to the number of streets who have requested residents parking and the size of the area concerned, a residents parking only restriction would not be suitable.

There are a number of local businesses within the area and in close proximity, these being Abbey Road and Wellowgate, Wellowgate Chapel and Auto Repair shop situated on Abbey Drive East. A residents parking only restriction would have a negative impact on these businesses.

4. **REPUTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS CONSIDERATIONS**

4.1 The introduction of a resident parking scheme to alleviate parking issues for local residents can be controversial as such a scheme reserves road space just for the residents of the streets concerned. It is therefore preferable to consider a scheme format that balances the needs of all road users.

In order to action the request from local residents but also be sympathetic and supportive of the needs of local businesses in the area, it is considered appropriate for the zone to be a combination of residents permit parking and limited waiting.

Due to the significant level of support demonstrated by the initial application form submission towards the introduction of a parking scheme, it is expected that there will be little potential for negative reputational implications resulting from the decision.

4.2 There will be a reduction in the capacity of on-street parking throughout the zone, however this is likely to be off-set by the removal of non-resident parking through the implementation of parking restrictions. By introducing a parking scheme which works on a zonal basis, residents may park anywhere within the zone that parking is permitted. Any proposed prohibition of waiting restrictions will be signed and marked accordingly, and would apply equally to permit holders.

4.3 Previous communication has been undertaken with local residents and businesses in the area which included parking surveys and informal consultation on a preliminary scheme design. Residents were subsequently advised of changes to the scheme design resulting from resident feedback.

4.4 As part of the statutory procedure for introducing a Traffic Regulation Order there is a requirement to formally advertise the proposals. This formal consultation period instigates a further opportunity for individuals to object to elements of the scheme, should they wish to do so.

5. **FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS**
5.1 The recommendation does not require any capital expenditure. Any standard lining, signage and public notices required are covered through the Council’s Regeneration Partnership arrangement.

6. CONSULTATION WITH SCRUTINY

6.1 There has been no consultation with Scrutiny in relation to this matter.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1 There are no financial implications resulting from this report, as costs incurred are covered via the Engie contract.

8. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

8.1 Under Section 1 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 traffic authorities are empowered to make Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) for (inter alia) the reasons set out at the beginning of this report. Section 2 specifies what TROs may require and the recommended order is within those powers.

8.2 The procedure for making TROs is set out in Schedule 9 Part III of the 1984 Act and the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and provides for advertisement and consideration of any objections before making a final decision on the proposed TRO.

8.3 Regulation 8 makes provision for objections and regulation 14 allows the Council to modify a TRO before it is made.

8.4 If it is decided to make the TRO notwithstanding any objections made it can only be challenged by Judicial Review in the Administrative Court.

9. HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

9.1 There are no direct implications contained within this report

10. WARD IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The proposal relates to issues solely within the Park Ward.

11. BACKGROUND PAPERS

Traffic Management Act 2004

Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

Residents Parking Policy and Guidance document
Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) Regulations 1996

The Highway Code
https://www.gov.uk/browse/driving/highway-code

12. CONTACT OFFICER(S)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Damien Jaines White</th>
<th>Debbie Swatman</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acting Assistant Director Regeneration</td>
<td>Traffic Team Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economy &amp; Growth</td>
<td>ENGIE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01472 324674</td>
<td>01472 324514</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

COUNCILLOR STEWART SWINBURN
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Appendix B - Summary of Feedback Received

As detailed in 1.5 of the main report a survey response area was identified containing 309 properties (see Appendix C). The survey responses completed by residents were analysed and the results added to site survey data to inform a preliminary scheme design produced in November 2018. Initial responses indicated that residents on some streets did not wish to be included within a residents parking schemes and, as a result the proposed scheme area was reduced to 226 local residents and businesses (see Appendix D).

The scheme design included:

- Residents Parking and 2 hour limited waiting
- An alternative restriction (No Waiting - Monday to Saturday 10:00-11:00 and 2:30-3:30 pm) in Abbotsway to prevent displacement of commuter parking
- An alternative restriction on Abbey Park Road (Limited Waiting - Monday to Saturday 8am-6pm for 2 hours, No Return within 2 hours).

This design was distributed to the 226 local residents and businesses within the revised scheme area seeking their feedback.

A total of 31 (13%) responses were received with 6 in support of the initial scheme design and 22 not in support of one or more elements within it, 3 objected to the scheme in its entirety.

14 of the objections were regarding the loss of parking in St Olafs Grove

These objections were due to the proposed introduction of double yellow lines along the western kerbline and in the turning head. These restrictions are deemed necessary as St Olafs Grove has a road width of 4.8m making it one of the narrower streets within the scheme area and is therefore unsuitable to accommodate parking on both sides of the carriageway. Vehicles also currently park within the turning head of St Olafs Grove.

7 objections were regarding the 2 hour limited waiting.

The design of the residents parking scheme has taken into consideration the wider impact on the community. It has been identified that due to the size and locality of the proposed scheme, there is a need to introduce a balance of different restrictions to provide parking for permit holders and limited waiting for short stay parking by non-permit holders. This combination will benefit both visitors to local businesses situated on Abbey Road and Wellowgate and any short term visitors to residents.

3 objections were regarding the proposed No Waiting restriction along the eastern kerbline of Abbey Drive West.

During officer site visits, vehicles were observed to be parked outside of marked parking bays. This therefore increases the likelihood of an obstruction to the carriageway particularly for emergency service and refuse vehicles. It is therefore necessary to prevent parking in these areas at all times.
North East Lincolnshire Council’s refuse department were consulted on this proposed change and were fully supportive of the initiative.

The absence of parked vehicles in Abbey Drive West also allows ease of access for property owners to maintain their property boundaries.

**2 residents stated that they do not want a scheme to be introduced.**

**1 resident wanted to oppose the proposal as they are a landlord and not a resident** and therefore not eligible for residents parking permit under the terms of the NELC Residents Parking Policy.

**Summary of scheme changes following consultation**

Where considered appropriate amendments have been made to the proposed scheme design, which include the following:

a) St Olafs Grove – The extent of proposed double yellow lines has been reduced to accommodate additional parking for approximately 2 vehicles, whilst still preserving an area of road space for the turning of vehicles and protection of a residential dropped access.

b) Abbey Drive East – Proposed No Waiting restrictions (Mon-Sat, 8am-6pm) for western kerbline have been converted to No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow lines) in line with comments received regarding access for emergency vehicles at all times.

c) Abbey Drive West – Proposed No Waiting restrictions (Mon-Sat, 8am-6pm) for eastern kerbline have been converted to No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow lines) in line with comments received regarding access for emergency vehicles at all times.


e) Reduced lengths of proposed and existing No Waiting restrictions in 5 streets throughout the zone to accommodate additional shared permit / limited waiting parking space, where it is considered safe to do so.

Affected residents were advised of the changes and provided with a copy of the revised scheme design (see Appendix A) in March 2019. These changes have also been presented to the Ward Councillors, who are in full support of the proposed scheme.
## Appendix D – Summary of Residents Parking Survey

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Total No. of properties</th>
<th>Number of responses received</th>
<th>% response rate</th>
<th>% of respondents with off-street parking</th>
<th>% of respondents with no off-street parking</th>
<th>% of respondents supportive of restrictions</th>
<th>% of total properties supportive of restrictions</th>
<th>% of respondents willing to purchase permits</th>
<th>% of total properties willing to purchase permits</th>
<th>% of respondents who do not have access to off-street parking / sufficient off-street parking willing to purchase permits</th>
<th>% of total properties who do not have access to off-street parking / sufficient off-street parking willing to purchase permits</th>
<th>As a % of total properties</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manor Avenue</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>6.25%</td>
<td>93.75%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>69.23%</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
<td>61.54%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83.33%</td>
<td>57.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Road</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>71.43%</td>
<td>28.57%</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
<td>34.00%</td>
<td>52.00%</td>
<td>26.00%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44.00%</td>
<td>22.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Park Road</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>20.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>36.84%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>31.58%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>15.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ainslie Street</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13.25%</td>
<td>30.00%</td>
<td>70.00%</td>
<td>72.73%</td>
<td>9.64%</td>
<td>54.55%</td>
<td>7.23%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>45.45%</td>
<td>6.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Drive East</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>58.33%</td>
<td>78.57%</td>
<td>45.83%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>78.57%</td>
<td>45.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St Olafs Grove</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>85.71%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>64.29%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>88.89%</td>
<td>57.14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Park Mews</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.90%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wellowgate</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.56%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>90.00%</td>
<td>50.00%</td>
<td>80.00%</td>
<td>44.44%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60.00%</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbotsway</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33.33%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>42.86%</td>
<td>14.29%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abbey Drive West</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
<td>58.82%</td>
<td>41.18%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>68.00%</td>
<td>82.35%</td>
<td>56.00%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>47.06%</td>
<td>32.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Area</strong></td>
<td><strong>309</strong></td>
<td><strong>120</strong></td>
<td><strong>38.83</strong></td>
<td><strong>44.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>49.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>79.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.74</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.89</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.67</strong></td>
<td><strong>25.89%</strong></td>
<td><strong>66.67%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>