ORIGINATING DIVISION: HIGHWAYS AND TRANSPORTATION

CAPITA

REPORT TO: BLACKBURN WITH DARWEN BOROUGH COUNCIL

PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

DATE: 18th February 2016

TITLE: OBJECTION – PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION

SHEAR BROW REVIEW

WARD: SHEAR BROW

COUNCILLORS: Hussain Akhtar

Suleman Khonat

Shiraj Vali

1.0 PURPOSE OF THE REPORT

The purpose of the report is to advise the Committee of the receipt of 1 letter of objection to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders for:-

Randal Street, Blackburn

This proposal is part of a batched order.

2.0 BACKGROUND

Approximately 1000 consultation letters were delivered to properties within the existing Shear Brow Residents Only Parking Scheme and to properties in the surrounding area to which commuter parking could be expected to have migrated.

The split between those properties already within the scheme and those outside the scheme was about 50/50

For those properties already within the scheme the questionnaire asked whether residents considered that the scheme had made the parking and traffic situation Better, No Change, or Worse and whether they wished to remain in the scheme or not.

For those properties outside the scheme, residents were asked to indicate whether there had been No Impact, Some Impact or High Impact on the parking and traffic situation in their street upon the introduction of the scheme and also to indicate whether or not they would be in favour of the scheme being extended to include their street.

The feedback to these questions was as follows:-

Returns from properties within the scheme

There were 94 returns from the approximately 500 questionnaires distributed of which 82 had permits with a total of 133 permits issued to them, i.e. an average of 1.62 permits per property. The remaining 12 properties who returned the questionnaire did not at present have any permits issued to them.

	Permit Holder	Non-Permit Holder	Overall
	S	S	
Situation Better:	50	6	56
No Change:	15	1	16
Situation Worse:	16	2	18
No opinion:	1	3	4
Total:	82	12	94

Remain in Scheme:	60	6	66
Leave Scheme:	20	3	23
No preference stated:	2	3	5

Returns from properties outside the scheme

There were 117 returns from the approximately 500 questionnaires distributed to this group.

	Overall
No Impact:	40
Some Impact:	19
High Impact:	55
No opinion:	3
Total:	117

Extend:	47
Do Not Extend:	70

Overall the results of the consultation indicate that the majority of residents already within the scheme are happy for the scheme to remain whilst the majority of residents outside of the scheme do not wish for it to be extended.

In addition to asking the above specific questions, the questionnaire invited comments from the respondents.

Prior to the consultation exercise the council received a petition from residents of Randal Street pertaining to the scheme. This petition was submitted in 2014 just before the commencement of the consultation exercise and called for the section of Limited Stay parking that was created in 2014 to be amended to Residents Only or to combined use (Short Stay for non-residents, unlimited for Residents). The petition was reported to Planning & Highways Committee in September 2014 where it was resolved that the Petitioners request would be considered as part of the review exercise. The lead petitioner was informed of this resolution.

A review of the Randal Street area subject to the petition noted above was carried out and officers have sympathy with the resident's views that the limited parking bay introduced in 2014 did adversely affect them as it removed 7 spaces from those previously available to residents. At a subsequent meeting with Ward councillors a nearby location covered by a single yellow line was suggested as being suitable for converting into extra parking bays. On closer inspection however Randal Street narrows in this location and the introduction of parking bays would prevent two-way traffic. The limited waiting bays were introduced to cater for customers visiting Golita's plumbing business, and in this respect there is a short length of Oswald Street adjacent to the business which is currently unrestricted. It is recommended therefore that the existing limited waiting bay be converted back to

residents only parking bays and that limited waiting parking bays be provided along this short length of Oswald Street adjacent to the business. It is also recommended that some additional single yellow lines be introduced along the other side of the street in order to keep the access to the business' loading bay clear.

3.0 DETAIL

Approval to advertise this proposed Traffic Regulation Order was given at the Regeneration SPT meeting and this was advertised on 10th December 2015. Following advertising, a letter of objection was received in respect of the Randal Street element of the Batched Order. The letter of objection comes from Golita's Plumbing Supplies on Randal Street and included a petition in support of his objection signed by 101 customers from across the borough. The objections to this proposal are summarised below:-

The objector states that the bay was originally a limited waiting bay that they had fought long and hard to have introduced. This bay was, in his words, 'trialled' as a mixed use bay (residents only and limited waiting) in the original Residents Parking Scheme. The objector states that the officer who dealt with the extension to the scheme agreed that a mixed use bay had been a mistake for this location and had changed the bay back to limited waiting. This proposal now seeks to change it back to a mixed use bay (Residents Only Parking and limited waiting) which would again exclude their customers. The objector feels that the mixed use bay is widely used by residents during the day to the detriment of his customers.

To mitigate for his loss of spaces at the front of his premises it is proposed to introduce a limited waiting bay on the short section of Oswald Street on the gable of the business. The writer also objects to this and states that with these restrictions in place there would be no room for a vehicle to turn around in that area.

A traffic officer recently met with the owner of the business and Ward Councillors and discussed the two bays. He explained to the business owner that formalising the parking in the proposed bay on Oswald Street and introducing a single yellow line on the other side of the road would mean there would be more room to manoeuvre as well as providing short stay parking for Golita's customers. Currently there are no restrictions on this side street and vehicles from across the area park randomly within the street often totally blocking access to Golita's loading bay. Indeed photos included with the objection letter show loading having to take place from Randal Street by fork lift truck which subsequently has to manoeuvre between parked vehicles to access the loading bay in Oswald Street. The owner of Golita would ideally like to see the short section of Oswald Street stopped up as highway to provide a small yard for the sole use of the business but this would need to be the subject of a separate request.

The introduction of a limited waiting bay on the southerly section of Oswald Street will provide short stay parking for Golita's customers and the single yellow line will keep their loading bay clear from obstruction for deliveries whilst the existing bay on Oswald Street when changed to a dual use bay, will provide additional parking for residents whilst still being available for use by Golita's customers.

It is felt therefore that the current proposal is the optimal solution for the business and for residents. It is recommended therefore that the objection is overruled and the order be made as advertised.

4.0 IMPLICATIONS

Customer Amenity

Financial The costs of implementing the scheme will be met from

the traffic budget

Anti-poverty None Crime and Disorder None

5.0 RECOMMENDATION

It is recommended that the Committee recommends that the Executive Member support the officer recommendations that:-

• the objections are overruled.

• The proposed waiting restrictions are made as advertised

• The objectors are informed of the decision.

6.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS: Letter of objection

Selected photos from objector attached

7.0 CONTACT OFFICERS: Gina Lambert

8.0 DATE PREPARED: 4th January 2016



