

<b>March 2019</b>	<b>ITEM: dem services to add number</b>
<b>Delegated Decision Report</b>	
<b>Stanford Le Hope Parking Permit Area – Zone C</b>	
<b>Wards and communities affected:</b> Stanford Le Hope West	<b>Key Decision:</b> No
<b>Report of:</b> Delegated decision to determine appropriate action following receiving objection to the Public Consultation for the Statutory Consultation on revised and expanded parking controls.	
<b>Accountable Assistant Director:</b> Andy Millard – Assistant Director of Planning, Transportation and Public Protection	
<b>Accountable Director:</b> Steve Cox – Corporate Director of Place	
<b>This report is Public</b>	

## **Executive Summary**

A review of the existing Controlled Parking Zone for Stanford Le Hope has been undertaken following complaints from residents. Measures to increase the size of the enforcement area, segregation of the overall area to provide separate zones and the conversion of the restrictions to a more user friendly Parking Permit Area were proposed as part of this project.

### **1. Recommendation(s)**

- 1.1 It is recommended that the objections are partially upheld and that the scheme is advanced with changes, following a review of the objections. Details of each objection are contained in the report under section 5.**
- 1.2 It is further recommended that the objectors be notified accordingly.**

### **2. Introduction and Background**

- 2.1 Funding was allocated within the 2017/18 Integrated Transport Block funding to investigate the expansion of the Controlled parking Zone, following resident representations concerning Commuter Parking issues in and around the Stanford Le Hope Ward. A review of the existing restriction identified that the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) was difficult to enforce, not clearly denoted on site and liable to commuter parking issues from within the zone; with residents**

on the fringes of the zone parking closer to the train station in an authorised manner. This caused issues around the train station for residents living in these areas.

- 2.2 A review of the extents of the Order identified that a administrative change to the Order to a Parking Permit Area (PPA) was a more practical system in terms of enforcement, maintenance and can be clearly denoted on the highway. Additionally, with the expansion of the area covered, a zoned system can alleviate the issues raised by residents and provide smaller zones for improved management.
- 2.3 A review identified a potential for 5 zones covering the entire ward extents. Zone C covers the highway asset from east of the railway line, north of Corringham Road/ London Road, east of Billet Lane and south of the Dunstable Roundabout.

### **3. Issues, Options and Analysis of Options**

- 3.1 The current CPZ extents require the Authority to mark out bays and in some locations, where the minimum requirements for marked bays cannot be met, restriction are required. The administrative change to a PPA enables a more effective use of the highway asset by enabling drivers to park on the highway unless there is a restriction of it will cause obstruction. As no marked bays are required, this is proven to provide a more flexible solution to parking.
- 3.2 The change to a zoned approach reduced the internal commuter parking problem as each zone will have a specific permit for just that zone.
- 3.3 Within the Town Centre area, there is still the need to provide marked bays for limited waiting; which is included within the PPA.
- 3.4 A Statutory Consultation was undertaken whereby 6 objections from 7 residents were received. These are identified below, with the appraisal and recommendation:

Objection 1 – Objection to remove single yellow line over dropped kerb crossings.

Appraisal and recommendation: Single yellow lines are not included in the PPA extents and no restrictions are proposed over vehicle crossovers. However, Parking Services can enforce vehicles parked over dropped kerb crossings and vehicle access under the Traffic Management Act 2004. This will be monitored and should an issue arise, measures to install Double Yellow Line restriction will be investigated under the ad-hoc request route. The objection is therefore not upheld

- 3.5 Objection 2 – Request for additional parking bays for permit holders on Victoria Road for residents only.

Appraisal and recommendation: The removal of the marked bays requirement and the removal of single yellow lines should enable a more efficient parking layout for residents. Double yellow lines are only proposed where accessibility, visibility and/or safety is affected. However, this will be monitored as part of the installation of the scheme. The objection is therefore not upheld

- 3.6 Objection 3 – Objection to the scheme on Hardie Road as there is not a commuter problem.

Appraisal and recommendation: The removal of the scheme is likely to push commuters into this cul-de-sac road and cause an issue. Further representations from residents in support of a scheme have also been made since the closure of the scheme and Local Ward Member requests for parking controls has also been made. The objection is therefore not upheld

- 3.7 Objection 4 – Concerns with increased likelihood of double parking on roads

Appraisal and recommendation: Double parking cannot be resolved by the PPA proposals but is a common issue on unrestricted roads throughout the borough. If vehicles cause obstruction, this is enforced by the Police. The objection is therefore not upheld

- 3.8 Objection 5 – Would like to see increased restrictions at the bend of Fetherston Road

Appraisal and recommendation: A review of the restrictions in this area will be made. As the extension cannot be covered by this consultation, a further consultation will be required. Therefore the objection is partially upheld and a single amendment order will need to be progressed under the ad-hoc request route.

- 3.9 Objection 6 – Objection to the inclusion of Scratton Road into the scheme

Appraisal and recommendation: Scratton Road will see an increase in commuter parking on street as a result of the surrounding roads being included. Therefore the objection is not upheld

#### **4. Reasons for Recommendation**

- 4.1 Following various complaints from residents, the scheme proposed offers a more practical and simpler system for drivers to use. It also reduces the Council's maintenance burden for the area; by way of reduce signage and lines on the highway.

#### **5. Consultation (including Overview and Scrutiny, if applicable)**

5.1 The scheme falls within the ward of Stanford-le-Hope West and members from this ward have been consulted on this DDR. Ward Members were consulted on 15<sup>th</sup> March 2019 to 18<sup>th</sup> March 2019. Cllr S Hebb agrees with the recommendations and reiterates that objectors need to be notified. No further comments were received.

## **6. Impact on corporate policies, priorities, performance and community impact**

6.1 The scheme will enable a more efficient parking control zone that will improve the enforcement ability of the Parking Services Team. It also sees a reduction in sign clutter on the network and reduces the maintenance liability in the area. The initial cost of the scheme is fully funded through the Integrated Transport Block Funding and as such has no implications on Parking Services Budgets.

## **7. Implications**

### **7.1 Financial**

The cost of the scheme is estimated at being in the region of £25,000.00 and is allocated within the integrated Transport block funding allocation for the DfT.

Implications verified by: **Mark Terry, 01375 652150**  
**Senior Financial Accountant**

### **7.2 Legal**

The Legal implications of the proposal will see an administrative change to the Traffic Regulation Order, in relation to roads already subject to the Order, and an expansion of the Order as changed into currently unrestricted roads. The impact is considered to be minimal and not likely to affect the rights of homeowners to park within the restricted area, due to the number of permits likely to be issued to each household.

The proposals make a positive contribution towards Highways Safety, Visibility and Accessibility. As such they are likely to have a disproportionate positive impact on groups sharing certain characteristics including the disabled, elderly and young persons as compared to persons not sharing those characteristics. If these proposals are not approved then there would be a negative impact on those groups.

Implications verified by: **Tim Hallam, 01375 652709**  
**Deputy Head of Law (Regeneration) and**  
**Deputy Monitoring Officer**

### **7.3 Diversity and Equality**

With regards to equality implications the proposal to introduce restrictions will improve road safety, visibility and accessibility for all, regardless of protected characteristics. These positive road safety impacts are, in particular, likely to not disproportionately affect the elderly and people who are disabled, due to the control measures to deter non-resident parking. The equality impacts on not upholding the restrictions have been considered but are not considered to impact positively or negatively.

Implications verified by: **Roxanne Scanlon, 01375 652312**  
**Community Engagement and Project  
Monitoring Officer**

7.4 **Other implications** (where significant) – i.e. Staff, Health, Sustainability, Crime and Disorder)

None

**Report Author:**

**Name:** Matthew Ford, Chief Engineer

**Telephone:** 01375 652214

**E-mail:** Mford@thurrock.gov.uk