

OFFICER DECISION RECORD

For staff restructures, please also complete an RA1 form to update the HR Portal. This is attached at Annex 2.

Decision Ref. No:

RE18 0096

Box 1

DIRECTORATE: Regeneration & Environment

Contact Name: Andrew Low

DATE: 24th May 2018

Tel. No. 01302735136

Subject Matter:

Consideration of objections to the proposed parking restrictions upon the following residential streets/roads:

- Beverley Road
- Canterbury Road
- Chelmsford Drive
- Gloucester Road
- Monmouth Road
- Parkway South
- Selby Road
- Thorne Service Road
- Winchester Avenue

Box 2

DECISION TAKEN:

To implement the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the introduction of parking restrictions upon the following residential streets/roads:

- Beverley Road
- Canterbury Road
- Chelmsford Drive
- Gloucester Road
- Monmouth Road
- Parkway South
- Selby Road
- Thorne Service Road
- Winchester Avenue

As shown in Appendix A – Project Proposal Plan, following due consideration to the objections received which can be reviewed in Appendix B – Objection Correspondences.

Box 3

REASON FOR THE DECISION:

The proposed parking restrictions are deemed necessary as parked vehicles upon the aforementioned roads impede the free flow of traffic and obstruct access. Parking restrictions are also deemed necessary to remove the dangers to pedestrians or any other traffic using the roads or adjacent footways, and to prevent the likelihood of any such dangers arising.

During the legal consultation process, six objections were received (refer to Appendix B – Objection Correspondences) on the basis of the following summarised opinions:

1. Request for permit parking scheme instead of timed parking restrictions
2. Parking proposals will restrict visitors/residents parking on-street
3. Proposals are discriminatory to residents that do not work office hours
4. To the way the consultation has been conducted

In response to the above comments:

1. In order to implement and undertake parking enforcement upon a permit parking scheme, parking bays must be installed upon the carriageway denoting the permit parking area. Unfortunately, due to the existing carriageway layout of the above aforementioned streets/roads the width of the carriageways are insufficient to install the required permit parking bays while maintaining bi-directional travel. In order to provide a permit parking scheme, further parking restrictions in the form of double yellow lines will be required on the opposite side of the parking bays to prevent parked vehicles obstructing the carriageway and the footway. This would prevent residents and or visitors from parking on a 24 hour basis and further reduce parking capacity for residents.
2. Unfortunately, due to the nature of parking restrictions, it is acknowledged that residents and visitors may be inconvenienced by the proposed parking restrictions. However, the proposed parking restrictions consist of a timed parking restriction prohibiting on-street parking between 10am to 3pm Monday to Friday. It is foreseen that this approach will prevent the on-going issues occurring from 'all day' parking by staff and visitors of the DRI hospital and surrounding businesses, without applying a double yellow line 24 hour parking restriction, which would significantly impact on residents.
3. The proposed installation of timed parking restrictions is a consistent approach both throughout the proposed scheme extents and throughout various schemes across Doncaster and are not targeted against people/residents who do not work office hours. As highlighted in above point 2, the proposed timed parking restrictions are designed to limit the impact of parking restrictions upon residents by not applying double yellow lines.
4. An extensive consultation process has been undertaken with residents and stakeholders with regards to the proposed parking restrictions. Prior to the consultation process an in depth study was carried out, which identified the on-going issues and extents of the excessive on-street parking. A report was published outlining a number of potential options (refer to Appendix C – Design Option Report) to resolve the on-going parking issues and was discussed with the elected ward members for this area as well as senior management. The outcome of this meeting was to progress with the proposal of introducing timed parking restrictions. Following approval to proceed an informal consultation took place on 27th November 2017 and ended 8th January 2018. In which

letters outlining the parking proposals (refer to Appendix D - Consultation Letter) were delivered to all residents within the extents of the scheme, as well being advertised upon Doncaster Council website. The results of the informal consultation (refer to Appendix E – Consultation Results) concluded that 95% supported the proposed timed parking restrictions with 5% against. Following the informal consultation a formal consultation took place in which the legal traffic orders were advertised on site on 12th April 2018 and ended 10th May 2018 and within the local press.

Box 4

OPTIONS CONSIDERED & REASONS FOR RECOMMENDED OPTION:

Option 1 – Take no action

The objection could be upheld and the Traffic Regulation Order not implemented. However, it is highly likely that excessive on-street parking will continue upon the residential streets. Thus, restricting both vehicular and pedestrian movements.

Option 2 – Implementation of Traffic Regulation Order

In this instance it is perceived that the installation of parking restrictions upon the aforementioned residential streets will relieve the issue and hazards associated with excessive on-street parking and provide a safer environment for both vehicular and pedestrian traffic. It is considered that the proposed parking restrictions presented, represent the most suitable solution to resolve all day excessive parking.

It is therefore the recommendation of the project engineer that the objection is over-ruled and that the Traffic Regulation Order is implemented as advertised.

Box 5

LEGAL IMPLICATIONS:

Where a local authority proposes to make a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, they are required pursuant to the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 before making the Order, to consider all objections made to the Order and not withdrawn.

Name: Karen Winnard

Signature:

Date: 25/05/2018

Signature of Assistant Director of Legal and Democratic Services (or representative)

Box 6

FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS:

There is no specific financial implication associated with the upholding of the Traffic Regulation Order within this ODR. The actual scheme to introduce waiting restrictions will cost approximately £4,200.00 (Cost of Legal Order £1200, Design Fees £1000, Installation of works £2000) and will be funded from within existing revenue budget (EN038).

There will be no additional enforcement costs as the scheme will be incorporated with the existing parking enforcement beat routes.

Name: Richard Taylor

Signature:

Date: 25/05/2018

Signature of Assistant Director of Finance & Performance (or representative)

Box 7

HUMAN RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS:

There are no HR implications.

Name: David Knapp

Signature:

Date: 25/05/2018

Signature of Assistant Director of Human Resources and Communications (or representative)

Box 8

PROCUREMENT IMPLICATIONS:

There are no direct procurement implications associated with this report

Name: Hayley Donnellan

Signature:

Date: 24/05/2018

Signature of Assistant Director of Finance & Performance (or representative)

Box 9

ICT IMPLICATIONS:

There are no ICT implications in relation to this decision

Name: Elaine Thompson

Signature:

Date: 29/05/2018

Signature of Assistant Director of Customers, Digital & ICT (or representative)

Box 10

ASSET IMPLICATIONS:

There are no asset implications associated with this Officer Decision Record

Name: Gillian Fairbrother

Signature:

Date: 24/05/2018

Signature of Assistant Director of Trading Services and Assets

(or representative)

Box 11

RISK IMPLICATIONS:

Should the objection be upheld, the proposed parking restrictions will not be installed upon the aforementioned residential streets/roads. It is foreseen that the excessive on-street parking will continue and impede the free flow of both vehicular and pedestrian movements.

Box 12

EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS:

The proposal to restrict parked vehicles upon the residential streets takes reasonable consideration of the impact on all users and residents and is of universal benefit, including to those with protected characteristics. As the proposals relates to increase in vehicle and pedestrian safety, it should be of particular positive benefit to the more vulnerable users, including the young, the elderly, people with disabilities.

Name: Andrew Low Signature: _____ Date: 24.05.2018
(Report author)

Box 13

CONSULTATION

Consultations were carried out whilst the proposals were under formulation and when advertised, including statutory consultees, the Police and other emergency services.

In addition, the Portfolio Holder for Highways and Transport along with Councillor Eva Hughes, Councillor Jane Kidd, Councillor Paul Wray and the Head of Parking Services Mark Benton were all consulted.

Box 14

INFORMATION NOT FOR PUBLICATION:

In accordance with the Freedom of Information Act 2000, it is in the public's interest for this decision record to be published in full, redacting only the signatures.

Name: S Greaves Signature: Date: 03/07/18

Signature of FOI Lead Officer for service area where ODR originates

Box 15

Signed: _____ **Date:** 5 July 2018
Assistant Director

Signed: _____ **Date:** _____
**Additional Signature of Chief Financial Officer or nominated representative
for Capital decisions (if required)**

Signed: _____ **Date:** 4 July 2018
**Signature of Mayor or relevant Cabinet Member consulted on the above
decision (if required).**

- This decision can be implemented immediately unless it relates to a Capital Scheme that requires the approval of Cabinet. All Cabinet decisions are subject to call in.
- A record of this decision should be kept by the relevant Director's PA for accountability and published on the Council's website.
- A copy of this decision should be sent to the originating Directorate's FOI Lead Officer to consider 'information not for publication' prior to being published on the Council's website.
- A PDF copy of the signed decision record should be e-mailed to the LA Democratic Services mailbox