



**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** Andy Godson,  
Senior Engineer

**Tel:** (0114) 2736205

---

**Report to:** Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport  
**Date of Decision:** *As soon as possible*  
**Subject:** Norton Lane/Little Norton Lane: Report on the proposed waiting restrictions to reduce inappropriate parking and objections to the advertised TRO.

Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to? Environment and Transport

Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken? Yes  No

If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given?

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? Yes  No

If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-

**Purpose of Report:**

This report describes the measures to restrict inappropriate parking on Norton Lane/Little Norton Lane, Norton through the introduction of double yellow line (no waiting at any time) parking restrictions.

It sets out officers' responses to objections received and seeks a decision from the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development.

**Recommendations:**

Having considered the representations received and having determined that the reasons to support the proposals outweigh any unresolved objections, it is recommended that;

The Traffic Regulation Order is made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

Introduce the associated double yellow lines as shown in Appendix A

Inform the objectors accordingly.

**Background Papers:**

Appendix A: Original scheme/TRO proposals drawing

Appendix B: Objections – full responses.

Appendix C: Photos

<b>Lead Officer to complete:-</b>	
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.
	Finance: Gaynor Saxton Date: 9 <sup>th</sup> November 2020
	Legal: Richard Cannon / Bob Power Date: 8 <sup>th</sup> September 2020
	Equalities: Annemarie Johnston Date: 25 <sup>th</sup> February 2020
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>	
2	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> Andy Godson
	<b>Job Title:</b> Senior Engineer
<b>Date: 24th January 2020</b>	

## **1. PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 The Council received a number of complaints from residents in the Norton area, regarding vehicles frequently parking on both sides of Norton Lane at the junction with Little Norton Lane, and Norton Lane at its junction with Bochum Parkway. This inconsiderate, potentially illegal parking caused visibility problems particularly for residents accessing their properties by vehicle or on foot. It was suggested by local residents that the majority of the parked vehicles belonged to staff of a nearby car showroom, staff/customers of the nearby Retail Park on the opposite side of Bochum Parkway or customers using the Greaves Park Leisure Centre.
- 1.2 In order to address the problem, double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions were proposed on both sides of Norton Lane from its junction with Little Norton lane. Also, double yellow line ( no waiting at any time ) restrictions on Norton Lane both sides at its junction with Bochum Parkway. It was noted that all the residential premises along this part of Norton Lane and Little Norton Lane have private off street car parking available. Unrestricted on street parking would still exist on Norton Lane and Little Norton lane, except where vehicles are parked in locations which would cause an obstruction or danger to moving traffic as such vehicles would potentially be subject to enforcement action.
- 1.3 The original scheme proposals are shown in Appendix A.

## **2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?**

- 2.1 The primary function of the scheme is to improve visibility for all vehicles using these junctions and to improve visibility for pedestrians, especially those using the nearby controlled crossing on Bochum Parkway. There is no impact on climate change and there is no economic impact. The situation will, however, be improved for HGV/delivery vehicle and emergency vehicle access.

## **3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?**

- 3.1 Legislation requires a 3 week consultation period to be provided, during which affected parties can submit comments on the proposals. The consultation took place between 21<sup>st</sup> November 2019 and the 12<sup>th</sup> December 2019. Officers consulted all affected residential properties (18 letters), 9 street notices were displayed on street, statutory Consultation was undertaken and an advert was placed in the local press.
- 3.2 The following responses were received from the consultation:

- Six responses fully supported the proposals.
- Three responses objecting to the proposals. Two were from residents of Little Norton Lane. One objected to the proposals expressing concerns regarding pushing the parking problem further down the road outside their house. The other expressing disappointment that the scheme does not address the issues of congestion and rat running arising from the recent developments of the Car Dealership, the St Georges Retail Park and the upgraded Greaves Leisure Centre. The third objection was from an employee working at St James Retail Park. The objection was regarding the loss of parking and concerns that she was a lone female who has to work late nights and early morning shifts and has concerns regarding personal safety if forced to walk further distances if having to park further away.
- Two responses from members of the public requesting information after reading the street notices, one of the responders further commented that whilst helpful, the parking would only be moved further down the road, not prevented.. The second responder has not made any further contact.

A full presentation of the responses is given in Appendix B.

- 3.3 Objection: *The removal of parking spaces at the junction of Norton Lane and Little Norton Lane will only succeed in moving the problem outside the objector's house.*

Response: Site visits by officers on a number of locations have seen vehicles already parking on the stretch of Little Norton Lane in the vicinity of the objector's property. Photos have been taken and are attached in Appendix C.

- 3.4 Objection: *This is not a sustainable solution to the problems that we have raised. There are four large sites using our residential streets as a car park all week and at weekends (Greaves Park Leisure Centre, St James Retail Park, JCT car sales and Meadowhead School) we requested a full solution to this problem over 18 month ago and the council has failed to engage with residents since then. I appreciate that this is a step to mitigate some of the potential danger on the junctions, but it does not solve the wider problems.*

Response: At the meetings with residents undertaken in Autumn 2017 it was stated that a large scheme to address all their concerns was unaffordable at that time. However, their concerns regarding parking at road junctions, which affects road safety, would be addressed by means of a small scheme to introduce waiting restrictions in the vicinity of the road junctions.

- 3.5 Objection: *The removal of parking would remove a parking opportunity close to her place of work (which does not have staff parking). The objector works late night and early morning shifts and is concerned for her safety if she has to walk extended distances to her parked vehicle.*

Response: The highway provides a legal right for the public to pass and repass. Parking should only occur where it does not interfere with that right and cause an obstruction to the movement of traffic. The powers available to the Council to restrict parking are exercised pursuant to its legal duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic.

Response: There are alternative parking spaces available along the length of Norton Lane. The waiting restrictions are only proposed in the vicinity of the road junctions.

#### **4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION**

##### **4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications**

- 4.1.1 There are no significant differential, positive or negative, equality impacts from this proposal. The measures will improve safety at junctions through removal of obstructive parking.

##### **4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications**

- 4.2.1 The total cost of implementing the scheme, including commuted sum payment for ongoing maintenance costs, is to be funded from the allocated capital budget for 'Double Yellow Lines 20/21 within the Local Transport Plan. The total cost of implementing these works is anticipated to be around £3,500.

##### **4.3 Legal Implications**

- 4.3.1 The Council has powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ('the 1984 Act') to implement the improvements requested in this report. The Council has the power to make Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) under section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ('the 1984 Act') for reasons that include the avoidance of danger to people or traffic and for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians). In exercising the powers under the 1984 Act, the

Council must have regard to its duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) as well as the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.

- 4.3.2 Before the Council can make a TRO, it must consult with relevant bodies and publish notice of its intention in a local newspaper in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 ('the 1996 Regulations'). The Council has complied with these requirements and any duly made public objections received are presented for consideration in this report.

## **5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 5.1 The only alternative is to not introduce any parking restrictions at this location. This is not considered to be an acceptable option. No other alternatives to parking restrictions have been considered.

## **6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1 The proposed measures will address obstructive parking. This will improve access and visibility for all road users, in particular pedestrians using the nearby controlled crossing on Bochum Parkway.

## **7. RECOMMENDATIONS**

The reasons to support the proposals outweigh any unresolved objections and it is recommended that the Traffic Regulation Order is made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

Introduce the associated double yellow lines as shown in Appendix A.

Inform the objectors accordingly.