

Report of the Strategic Director Place to the meeting of Bradford East Area Committee to be held on 16 February 2017.

X

Subject:

BRADFORD EAST AREA-WIDE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – OBJECTIONS

Summary statement:

This report considers objections received to the recently advertised Bradford East Area-wide Traffic Regulation Order

Wards:

**10 Eccleshill
18 Little Horton**

Steve Hartley
Strategic Director Place

Portfolio:

Regeneration, Planning and Transport

Report Contact: Andrew Smith
Principal Engineer
Phone: (01274) 434674
E-mail: andrew.smith@bradford.gov.uk

Overview & Scrutiny Area:

Environment and Waste Management



1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 This report considers objections received to the recently advertised Bradford East Area-Wide Traffic Regulation Order.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 At its meeting of 17 March 2016 this Area Committee approved as part of its Safer Roads Schemes Programme the advertisement of an area wide Traffic Regulation Order for 22 sites throughout Bradford East.
- 2.2 The Order has been promoted to resolve a number of requests for small areas of existing waiting restrictions to be amended or new restrictions to be introduced. The requests have been raised by local residents, schools and businesses that have problems with on street parking and gaining access to premises.
- 2.3 The Traffic Regulation Order was advertised between 6 and 27 January 2017. At the same time consultation letters and plans were delivered to residents and businesses affected by the proposals. This has resulted in objections to the proposals on Mallard Close, Eccleshill and Holme Street, Little Horton. One letter of objection was received to each. Plans of the proposals that have received objections are attached as Appendix 1 and 2.
- 2.4 A summary of the valid points of objection and corresponding officer comments is tabulated below:

Objectors concerns	Officer comments
<u>Mallard Close (Ward 10)</u> <u>Dwg No. TDG/THS/103330/CON-15A</u> <u>Number of objectors 1</u> Vehicles which would have parked on Mallard Close will be displaced on to Cavendish Road. The objector thinks that the parking situation on Cavendish Road will now become an issue particularly at school times. Despite this the objector does state that parking on Mallard Close between Cavendish Road and the cul de sac to properties numbered 2 – 6 Mallard Close could be said to be an issue.	<u>Mallard Close</u> Mallard Close is approximately 4 metres wide and gives access to 2 of the parking areas of Cavendish Court a complex of 40 flats and 7 other residential properties. Concerns have been raised regarding parking on Mallard Close causing access difficulties. As a consequence of the width of Mallard Close any parking that takes place often does so half on the footway. This causes obstruction of the footway. The proposals are necessary to maintain unhindered access along Mallard Close for vehicles and pedestrians. Cavendish Road is approximately 7.5 metres wide with currently low numbers of parked vehicles. It can therefore accommodate any displaced parking.
<u>Holme Street (Ward 18)</u> <u>Dwg No. TDG/THS/103330/CON-21B</u> <u>Number of objectors 1</u> The objector would like the proposed double yellow lines to extend the full width	<u>Holme Street</u> Currently the majority of Holme Street is subject to a residents permit parking only restriction, 3 residential properties at the end of the street have no restrictions

of his property frontage. They consider that they have been inconvenienced with obstructive parking for many years and do not feel it should be necessary to compromise on the length of double yellow lines, particularly as their main antagonist has alternatives to parking on street.	outside them; one of which has off street parking. Due to parking issues on the street and difficulties for these residents it was proposed to cover the driveway to the property which has off street parking with double yellow lines and add a permit parking bay outside the other 2 properties as an addition to the existing permit parking zone. Following an initial consultation a request was received to extend the permit parking bay and to slightly reduce the length of the double yellow lines (1m). The length of double yellow lines proposed will still prevent obstruction of the driveway. The resident with the driveway is eligible for a parking permit and can use any of the on street parking bays when displaying a valid permit. It is in the interest of all residents to maximise the amount of permit parking.
--	--

2.5 During the advertising period an email of support was received for the proposals on Holme Street.

2.6 A petition containing 196 signatures in favour of the 20 minute limited waiting, 8am to 6pm adjacent to properties numbered 190 to 200 Barkerend Road has also been received. There have been no objections to the Traffic Regulation Order at this site.

3.0 OTHER CONSIDERATIONS

3.1 Prior to advertising an initial consultation exercise was carried out on all of the proposed sites. Some objections were received at this stage and following consultation with Ward Members proposals at Dudley Hill Road, Bolling Road, Gurbax Court, Doctor Hill and Howgate, Idle were not advertised. This report formally abandons these proposals.

3.2 Local ward members and the emergency services have been consulted on the advertised sites. No objections have been received.

4.0 FINANCIAL AND RESOURCE APPRAISAL

4.1 The cost of the proposals will be met from the Safer Roads Budget.

5.0 RISK MANAGEMENT AND GOVERNANCE ISSUES

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

6.0 LEGAL APPRAISAL

6.1 The options contained in this report are within the Councils powers 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 gasses arising from this report.

7.4 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS

The introduction of some of the waiting restrictions in the Order will be beneficial in terms of road safety.

7.5 HUMAN RIGHTS ACT

None

7.6 TRADE UNION

None

7.7 WARD IMPLICATIONS

Ward Members have been consulted on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order.

7.8 AREA COMMITTEE WARD PLAN IMPLICATIONS

The implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order supports priorities within the Bradford East Area Committee Ward Plan 2015-16.

8.0 NOT FOR PUBLICATION DOCUMENTS

8.1 None

9.0 OPTIONS

9.1 That the objections be overruled and the Traffic Regulation Order be implemented as advertised.

9.2 That the objections be upheld and the proposals be abandoned or amended to address the objectors concerns.

9.3 Members may propose an alternative course of action; in which case they will receive appropriate guidance from officers.

10.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 10.1 That the original proposals for a Traffic Regulation Order at the sites listed in paragraph 3.1 are abandoned.
- 10.2 That the objections be overruled and the Traffic Regulation Order be sealed and implemented as advertised.
- 10.3 That the objectors be informed accordingly.

11.0 APPENDICES

- 11.1 Appendix 1 – Drawing No. TDG/THS/103330/CON-15A.
- 11.2 Appendix 2 – Drawing No. TDG/THS/103330/CON-21B.

12.0 BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS

- 12.1 City of Bradford Metropolitan District Council File Ref: HS/TRSS/103330.



