

Report of the Strategic Director, Regeneration to the meeting of Bradford West Area Committee to be held on 20 July 2016

G

Subject:

MANNINGHAM LANE AREA, BRADFORD – OBJECTIONS RECEIVED TO THE PROPOSED MANNINGHAM LANE AREA, BRADFORD TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

Summary statement:

This report considers 14 objections to the recently advertised parking management measures in the area between Manningham Lane and Midland Road.

Ward: 19 Manningham
7 City

Mike Cowlam
Strategic Director Regeneration

Portfolio:

Regeneration, Planning & Transport

Report Contact: Chris Bedford
Principal Engineer
Phone: (01274) 437645
E-mail: chris.bedford@bradford.gov.uk

Overview & Scrutiny Area:

Environment and Waste Management



1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1. This report considers 14 objections to the recently advertised parking management measures in the area between Manningham Lane and Midland Road.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1. The proposed scheme lies within the boundary of Manningham Lane, Queens Road, Midland Road and Trafalgar Street. The area is a mixture of residential and business properties and there is also Bradford City Football Stadium. The scheme proposes to change the waiting restrictions in the area.
- 2.2. The existing Traffic Regulation Order was first introduced in 1997 to alleviate parking problems created on match days and access difficulties to business premises due to on street parking. It is now considered by local residents and businesses that the waiting restrictions are inappropriate for their needs. In this area there have been considerable changes in business use and from business to residential use, which have not been reflected in changes to the waiting restrictions. Residents also feel that their issues are not presently addressed within the current restrictions.
- 2.3. Following a number of meetings with representatives of the local community a scheme was put together that would make parking more flexible for the residents.
- 2.4. The scheme was formally advertised between the 26 February and the 18 March 2016. Full details of the advertised scheme are shown on Drawing No. R/S/BW/102293/TRO-1A attached as Appendix 1. The residents and businesses within the extents of the scheme were consulted on the proposals by letter during the advertising period. 14 objections have been received.
- 2.5. A summary of the valid points of objection and corresponding officer comments are tabulated below: -

Objectors concerns	Officer comments
<p>Objectors One to Ten</p> <p>The objectors are concerned that reducing the waiting time of the limited waiting to 1 hour would not give them enough time to conduct meetings with clients.</p> <p>Removing the convenient parking on Springlodge Place would make one objector feel unsafe or uncomfortable if they had to park away from their place of work.</p>	<p>Officer Comments</p> <p>A meeting was held on the 20 April 2016 with the Sekhon Group of Companies and I.S Sekhon Solicitor, who are purported to represent the objectors who all have offices in the same building. The objectors were mostly concerned about the changes to the parking on Springlodge Place. There are no frontages on this road and the objectors and their customers use it on a daily basis. In view of this it was agreed that introducing the proposed waiting restrictions would have an adverse effect on their day to day business. It is therefore recommended that the existing</p>

Report to the Bradford West Area Committee

	<p>short length of limited waiting adjacent to 140-148 Manningham Lane and the no waiting at any time restriction on the opposite side of Springlodge Place should be removed. The existing limited waiting located near its junction with Cornwall Place should remain.</p>
<p>Objector Eleven</p> <p>Spring Gardens is an un-adopted cobbled road that is treacherous in the winter. The objector is bemused that the Council thinks it has the authority to grant parking on this road. Introducing limited waiting to all will increase damage to the road surface which has to be maintained by the residents. Making only one side of the road permit parking while the objectors side will be limited waiting except permit holders is discriminatory. The proposed limited waiting on Spring Gardens does not comply with the proposals suggested for other residential streets insofar as it will be placed directly outside residential properties.</p>	<p>In view of the objectors comments it is agreed that the proposed limited waiting on the west side of Spring Gardens should be permit holders only.</p> <p>It is however recommended that the proposed limited waiting except for permit holders' bays near to Manningham Lane should remain in the scheme. These areas will provide convenient parking for visitors to Spring Gardens and businesses on Manningham Lane.</p>
<p>Objector twelve</p> <p>The majority of properties on Spring Gardens are residential and have off street parking therefore placing limited waiting adjacent to these properties will cause hardship and access problems for the residents.</p>	<p>In view of the objectors comments it is agreed that the proposed limited waiting on the west side of Spring Gardens should be permit holders only.</p> <p>It is however also recommended that the proposed limited waiting except for permit holders' bays near to Manningham Lane should remain in the scheme. These areas will provide convenient parking for visitors to Spring Gardens and businesses on Manningham Lane.</p>
<p>Objector thirteen</p> <p>Parking spaces on Nesfield Street are already restricted. There is not enough parking for permit holders and the spaces will diminish drastically if the 1 hour limit is</p>	<p>Currently there are 26 parking spaces on Nesfield Street for permit holders only. There are no spaces for visitors who do not have permits. The proposed scheme will increase the number of</p>

<p>introduced. Staff have problems finding space to park. The introduction of the restrictions will only make this worse. Parents will not be able to park. The proposed restrictions would cause problems for visitors from outside agencies. Other people will take up the spaces making the problem worse as parking is already limited on Nesfield Street.</p>	<p>spaces to 42. Permit holders will continue to be able to park all day however the new proposals will also allow non permit holders to park for 1 hour (no return within 1 hour). This will benefit the local businesses by providing convenient parking for their customers as well as increasing the number of parking spaces available.</p>
<p>Objector fourteen</p> <p>People visit the Shapla Community Hall, Cornwall Terrace, to use their services and to take part in the various activities. The restrictions outside the community hall therefore need to be limited waiting.</p>	<p>Currently outside the Shapla Community Hall there is a disabled parking bay, permit parking and no waiting at any time restrictions. It would help visitors if some limited waiting except for permit holders were to be provided in front of the hall. It is therefore recommended that the scheme be modified to include limited waiting for 1 hour (no return within 1 hour) except permit holders on Cornwall Terrace.</p>

3.0 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

3.1. A request has been made by Midland Road Nursery School for waiting restrictions at the junction of Thorncliffe Road and Midland Road. At the start and end of the school day vehicles park on the junction obstructing access for vehicles and make it dangerous for pedestrians. An additional Traffic Regulation to provide convenient parking for coaches and drivers with disabilities on match days is to be advertised in the near future and this request should therefore be included in this Order.

3.2. Local ward members have been consulted on the advertised proposals.

4.0 FINANCIAL & RESOURCE APPRAISAL

4.1. The cost of the proposals will be met from the Safer Roads Schemes budget for 2014/15.

5.0 RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES

5.1. There are no risks arising out of the implementation of the proposed recommendations.

6.0 LEGAL APPRAISAL

- 6.1. There are no specific issues arising from this report. The course of action proposed is in general accordance with the Councils power as Highway Authority and Traffic Regulation Authority.

7.0 OTHER IMPLICATIONS

7.1. EQUALITY & DIVERSITY

Due regard has been given to Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 when determining the proposals in this report.

7.2. SUSTAINABILITY IMPLICATIONS

There are no sustainability implications arising from this report.

7.3. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS IMPACTS

There is no impact on the Council's own and the wider District's carbon footprint and emissions from other greenhouse gases arising from this report.

7.4. COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

Effective parking management proposals will be beneficial to community safety.

7.5. HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

None

7.6. TRADE UNION

None

7.7. WARD IMPLICATIONS

Manningham and City Ward Members have been consulted on the proposals..

7.8. AREA COMMITTEE ACTION PLAN IMPLICATIONS

Safer Roads schemes support the Safer Communities priorities within the Bradford West Area Committee Action Plan.

8.0 NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS

- 8.1. None

9.0 OPTIONS

- 9.1. That the Traffic Regulation Order as shown on drawing R/S/BW/102293/TRO-1B be sealed and implemented.

- 9.2. This Committee may propose an alternative course of action.

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1. That the objections to the proposals on Springlodge Place be upheld and the existing short length of limited waiting adjacent to 140-148 Manningham Lane be removed and the existing limited waiting located near its junction with Cornwall Place should remain.
- 10.2. That the objections to the proposal to introduce limited waiting except for permit holders adjacent to properties 9 to 29 Spring Gardens be upheld.
- 10.3. That the objection to the proposals for Nesfield Road be overruled.
- 10.4. That the scheme be modified to include limited waiting except for permit holders on part of Cornwall Terrace.
- 10.5. That the Traffic Regulation Order as shown on drawing R/S/BW/102293/TRO-1B be sealed and implemented.
- 10.6. That the objectors be informed accordingly.

11.0 APPENDICES

- 11.1. Appendix 1 – Drawing No. R/S/BW/102293/TRO-1A
- 11.2. Appendix 2 – Drawing No. R/S/BW/102293/TRO-1B

12.0 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 12.1. City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council File Ref: TDG/THCW/102293

