

Report for Resolution

Report to	Norwich Highways Agency Committee 26 March 2008	Item
Report of	Head of Transportation and Landscape	11
Subject	Waiting Restriction requests for implementation in 2008/9	

Purpose

To consider representations received in relation to proposed new or amended waiting and loading restrictions received in respect to the waiting restrictions advertised early in 2009 and to recommend appropriate action in each case.

Recommendations

The Committee is recommended to:

- (1) ask the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Strategic Director of Regeneration & Development to implement the following restrictions as advertised:-

<u>Location</u>	<u>Plan Number</u>
Bishop Bridge Road	PL/TR/3329/711/10
Catton Grove Road (Angel Road/Elm Grove Lane)	
	PL/TR/3329/711/1
City Road	PL/TR/3329/711/8
Copenhagen Way	PL/TR/3329/711/13
Cremorne Lane	PL/TR/3329/711/4
Girton Road	PL/TR/3329/711/22
Ivy Road	PL/TR/3329/711/18
Kett's Hill	PL/TR/3329/711/6
Knowland Grove	PL/TR/3329/711/11
Koblenz Avenue	PL/TR/3329/711/12
Mill Lane	PL/TR/3329/711/19
Rampant Horse Street	PL/TR/3329/711/14
St Giles Street	PL/TR/3329/711/15
Shipstone Road	PL/TR/3329/711/3
South Park Avenue	PL/TR/3329/711/16
Sunningdale	PL/TR/3329/711/2
Sweetbriar Industrial Estate	PL/TR/3329/711/7
Trafalgar Street	PL/TR/3329/711/20
Union Street (Melbourne Cottages)	PL/TR/3329/711/9
Valley Side Road	PL/TR/3329/711/21
William Kett Close	PL/TR/3329/690

- (2) ask the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Strategic Director of Regeneration & Development to implement the following restriction as amended

Peel Mews	PL/TR/3355/785
-----------	----------------

- (3) ask the Head of Legal and Democratic Services and the Strategic Director of Regeneration & Development to implement the following restriction pending legal advice from the City Council Solicitor on the public ownership status of land affected by proposals:-

Dereham Road (Service Road)

PL/TR/3329/711/17

Financial Consequences

Norfolk County Council has allocated £35,000 through the Local Transport Plan budget towards the implementation of waiting restriction requests of this sort during 2009/10

Strategic Objective/Service Priorities

The report helps to achieve the corporate objective to build a successful economic future for Norwich and secure sustainable growth and the service plan priority to deliver the Local Transport Plan.

Contact Officers

Joanne Deverick, Transportation Manager
Kieran Yates, Transport Planner

01603 21 3430

01603 21 3491

Background Documents

Correspondence by letter and email

Background

1. In September 2008 authorisation was given to advertise changes to waiting restrictions for 22 locations across the Norwich City Council area. These restrictions were advertised from late Jan to mid late February 2009. Representations have been received for 16 of the 22 locations.
2. The proposed waiting restrictions for Charles Jewson Court are now being considered as part of the Mile Cross Road refuge scheme. See separate report on agenda.
3. No written objections were received from the following locations and therefore it is proposed to implement these restrictions as advertised:
 - Bishop Bridge Road
 - Girton Road
 - Koblenz Avenue (Riverside)
 - Mill Lane
 - Rampant Horse Street
 - St Giles Street
 - Shipstone Road
 - Trafalgar Street
 - Union Street (Melbourne Cottages)
 - Valley Side Road
4. Written objections were received from the following locations;
 - Catton Grove Road (Angel Road/Elm Grove Lane)
 - City Road
 - Copenhagen Way
 - Cremorne Lane
 - Crown Road/Rose Lane
 - Dereham Road (Service Road)
 - Ivy Road
 - Knowland Grove
 - Mill Lane
 - Peel Mews
 - South Park Avenue
 - Sunningdale
 - Sweetbriar Industrial Estate
 - William Kett Close
5. The representations are considered in Appendix A, it is proposed to implement these restrictions as advertised with the exception of Peel Mews which is proposed to have a lesser restriction than that advertised.

Local Member Views

Where local members have responded to the proposals their comments have been included in Appendix A..

Timetable

6. It is proposed to implement these restrictions early in the 2009/10 financial year.

**Waiting restrictions requests – results of Jan/Feb 2009 public consultation
Norwich Highways Committee 26th March 2009**

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
<p>Catton Grove Road, Angel Road, Elm Grove Lane junction</p> <p>Introduction of new double yellow lines (no waiting at any time/loading permitted) at this junction. This would prohibit verge parking on the east side of Catton Grove Road.</p>	<p>Resident 1 Objection: Concern over loss of on street and verge parking. Junction safety problems are due to traffic speed not danger from parked vehicles and width of Elm Grove Lane junction. Risk that traffic speeds will increase. Call for junction redesign.</p> <p>Resident 2 Objection: loss of on street parking and location of bus stop near junction.</p>	<p>The need to improve visibility at this junction outweighs the loss of parking., following a number of injury accidents and a fatality. I.</p> <p>Injury accident data will continue to be monitored and remedial action taken as appropriate if required.</p> <p>Concerns with traffic speed will be raised with the Police Safer Neighbourhood Team.</p> <p>The bus stop is an existing facility, and is not in a critical position to affect visibility at this junction.</p> <p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>
<p>City Road (opposite No 43b)</p> <p>Reduction in length of permit bay on western side of City Road (outside builders depot) by 5 metres.</p>	<p>Resident 1 Comment: no objection but concern over efficacy of proposal to solve the problem.</p>	<p>There is no other practicable solution is possible at the current time to deal with access for large vehicles to the builders depot.</p> <p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>
<p>Copenhagen Way</p>	<p>Resident 1</p>	<p>On street parking is not a right for residents, who should be parking within their curtilages and</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
<p>Double yellow lines (no waiting at any time/loading permitted) for all four corners of Copenhagen Way loop road</p>	<p>Objection: Concern over loss of on street parking and lack of alternative parking options for residents with no driveways, garage court does not provide adequate space for parking.</p> <p>Resident 2 Objection: Concern over loss of on street parking</p> <p>Resident 3 Objection: parking restrictions will affect property and possibly force vehicles to park on driveway. Requests council pays for lockable bollards or widens road.</p> <p>Resident 4 Objection: parking restrictions will mean there is no space for visitors to park as property does not have driveway.</p> <p>Norfolk Fire & Rescue Service No objection</p> <p>4 Different Residents Support for proposals</p> <p>Cllr Brian Morrey Support for proposals: "Proposal is sensible</p>	<p>garages to maximise remaining on street parking provision. Any vehicles parked on street that cause an obstruction may be dealt with by the Police at their discretion. It is recommended residents co-operate with each other with regard to on street parking. It is not the responsibility of the City Council to provide for the cost of lockable bollards on non adopted land.</p> <p>Due to the geometry of Copenhagen Way on street parking in proximity of the corners of the loop roads causes an obstruction to refuse vehicles and emergency services. The length of waiting restrictions has been designed to be minimum required for an 11metre vehicle.</p> <p>Parking enforcement is conducted on a periodic and on demand basis and is effective in providing a deterrent effect. Current non enforcement of waiting restrictions is due to a lining issues that is being addressed</p> <p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
	<p>if enforced"</p> <p>Resident 9 Support for proposals; concern about impact for properties adjacent to the parking restrictions (27 & 29 Copenhagen Way) that may suffer from obstruction of driveways and garages as a result.</p> <p>Resident 10 Support for proposals: concern about non enforcement of existing yellow lines and pressure on parking from buy to let properties in multiple occupation; requests permit parking.</p>	
<p>Cremorne Lane</p> <p>Double yellow lines (no waiting at any time/loading permitted) at entrance to office car park</p>	<p>Resident 1 Objection: loss of on street parking</p>	<p>The proposed waiting restrictions are of a minimum length to ensure visibility from a large business car park. Vehicles often park in the mouth of this access which can cause obstruction and difficulties with access in and out of the car park.</p> <p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>
<p>Crown Road & Rose Lane and Rose Avenue</p> <p>Loading ban (at any time) for Crown Road (excluding the limited waiting and parking</p>	<p>Business 1 Comment: remarks made on parking pressures on Crown Road and need for better enforcement of existing restrictions</p> <p>Business 2</p>	<p>Existing double yellow lines can only be used to enforce against waiting vehicles. This does not apply to vehicles whose purpose is for loading or unloading, this definition also applies to private hire vehicles who often wait with engines running and drivers present who are waiting for fares to be</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
<p>bays) and on the main highway on Rose Lane and Rose Avenue (to prevent verge parking). Combined with the existing double yellow lines, these restrictions will prevent waiting or loading at any time.</p>	<p>Comment: believes that existing parking restrictions should be better enforced. Concern that loading restrictions would cause difficulties for residents.</p> <p>Resident 1 Comment: concerns about impact of loading restriction on residents but wants something to be done to tackle private hire vehicles parked at all hours in Crown Road.</p>	<p>booked. This practice is causing nuisance to residents of Crown Road and damage to the grass verges on Rose Avenue.</p> <p>Private hire vehicles may wait on other sections of Rose Lane and Cattlemarket Street outside of peak hours. (No Loading or Unloading Mon-Sat 7.30am-9.30am and 4.30pm-6.30pm Any Such Day Not Being Christmas Day) This enables private hire vehicles to wait in a location that does not cause excessive disruption for city centre residents or verge damage.</p> <p>Residents will also be affected by the loading ban, but they may use the parking bays and single yellow line (No Waiting, loading permitted Mon-Sat 7.30am-6.30pm Any Such Day Not Being Christmas Day) bay outside the former Steam Packet pub</p> <p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>
<p>Dereham Road (Service Road) 638 – 656 Dereham Road</p> <p>Verge parking restriction and double yellow lines (no waiting at any time/loading permitted).</p>	<p>Resident 1 Objection: Challenges view that service road is adopted and need for waiting restrictions. Poor visibility caused by street furniture and brow of hill not parked vehicles.</p> <p>Resident 2</p>	<p>The concern raised by one resident about the loss of parking outside their property is noted but is balanced against the wider benefits of this proposal to adjacent properties. Parking is available for sufficient vehicles and should be shared amongst all residents.</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
	<p>Comment: supportive of proposals in principle but concerned that would not be able to park in front of house since not in visibility splay.</p> <p>Resident 3 Support for proposals</p> <p>Resident 4 Comments on whether the verge is adopted or not and how this relates to the specification of the parking restrictions and subsequent maintenance of it.</p>	<p>Land registry searches have confirmed that the service road and verges in this location are not owned by the adjacent properties, the search indicates that their ownership ends with their front garden boundary. No evidence from deeds from property owners has been received to date to demonstrate the contrary to land registry information.</p> <p>Legal advice from Norwich City Council's Solicitor on an appropriate approach to installation of waiting restrictions on land that has no clear ownership. Is being sought and the outcome will be reported orally to your meeting.</p> <p>Implement proposal as advertised pending legal advice.</p>
<p>Ivy Road</p> <p>Double yellow lines (no waiting at any time/loading permitted) at entrance to Ivy Road at its junction with Bowthorpe Road.</p>	<p>NELM Supportive of proposals; request for additional parking restrictions on remainder of Ivy Road</p> <p>Resident 1 Supportive of proposals; requests further parking restrictions at junction with Roe Drive.</p> <p>Resident 2</p>	<p>Implement proposal as advertised</p> <p>Comment: No yellow lines are proposed near to Number 20 but future requests for waiting restrictions may be considered in relation to the Fire Station.</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
	Objection: No waiting restrictions on Ivy Road required especially near Number 20.	
<p>Knowland Grove</p> <p>Single yellow lines (No waiting Mon – Sat 8am – 6.30pm, loading permitted, no restriction at any other time) proposed at eastern end of Knowland Grove with its junction of Marl Pit Lane.</p>	<p>Resident 1 Objection: parking for local residents in flats is severely limited and this loss of on street parking is unreasonable especially for disabled drivers. Car crime and vandalism is a problem and vehicles need to be parked near to where people live due to malicious damage.</p> <p>4 further residents Objection: loss of car parking provision, lack of alternatives. Enforcement ineffective at present of existing restrictions.</p> <p>Cllrs Read, Panting & Markoff Support for proposal as advertised</p>	<p>Knowland Grove is the only access road that serves the estate. Several complaints have been received about the delays experienced by vehicles trying to turn out of the estate, and the presence of parked vehicles hampers this movement.</p> <p>Both NELM and a local PCSO requested these waiting restrictions. The proposal for these waiting restrictions to be single yellow lines (time restricted) will enable parking to occur evenings and Sundays.</p> <p>The issue of car crime will be referred to the local Safer Neighbourhood team</p> <p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>
<p>Riverside (adjacent to Koblenz Avenue) Full Time Taxi rank (Hackney Carriage stand at any time) for half of the bay, to supplement the existing function of the remainder of the bay as a part time bus stop/taxi rank)</p>	<p>X Leisure (Operators of Riverside businesses) Supportive of proposals</p>	<p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>
<p>Mill Lane</p>	<p>Resident 1 Supportive of proposals</p>	<p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
Short extension of double yellow lines (no waiting at any time, loading permitted)		
<p>Peel Mews</p> <p>Single yellow lines for the entire length of the adopted highway of Peel Mews (no waiting Mon – Sat 8am – 6.30pm, loading permitted, no restriction at other times)</p> <p>NB This recommendation is for a lesser restriction than that advertised which was for a double yellow line (no waiting at any time, entire length of Peel Mews)</p>	<p>Resident 1 Objection: Waiting restrictions proposed will prevent 2 cars being parked in the undercroft area i.e. resident plus visitors vehicle, there is insufficient permit parking spaces in the area to compensate. Single yellow lines would be overly restrictive also. Request that Peel Mews is taken out of CPZ and that private enforcement is utilized.</p> <p>Resident 2 Objection: Loss of second vehicle parked in undercroft is undesirable. Single yellow line preferable</p> <p>Resident 3 Concern that proposals will be of detriment of residents who will not be able to park 2 vehicles in their undercroft areas. Considers that the only problem is related to parking near to entrance of Peel Mews that prevent access to garages. Suggests alternative compromises to do with signage and enforcement.</p> <p>Bush Management</p>	<p>The introduction of a no waiting restriction would mean that any vehicle parked with more than two wheels across them in the undercroft parking areas would be liable to receive a parking ticket when the restriction is in operation.</p> <p>The advertised restriction was for a double yellow line (no waiting at any time, loading permitted), however on balance a single yellow line (no waiting Mon – Sat 8am – 6.30pm, loading permitted) is now recommended for the entire length of Peel Mews, this would convert existing sections of double yellow to single and introduce new lengths of single yellow for the remainder of the Mews, these would be installed for the extent of the adopted highway which our records indicated is for the highway and pavement sections to the back of building line of the Mews.</p> <p>The rationale for introduction of waiting restrictions in Peel Mews is that it is adopted highway located within a controlled parking zone and all kerbside space must have some form of waiting restriction. The original traffic regulation order did install a “no waiting” restriction at any time for the “entire length” of Peel Mews however</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
	<p>Concerns that there is “no problem” from parking in Peel Mews. Suggests that private parking controls are sufficient deterrent. Queries if the yellow lines can be marked on the “kerbside” rather than back of building line. Concern that proposals would affect visitor parking.</p> <p>Petition signed by 8 householders Request that a single yellow line is introduced in front of the undercroft to allow some visitor parking.</p>	<p>was not implemented on the ground and this power has now lapsed. Permit parking was proposed for Peel Mews but was rejected by residents and NHAC. It not desirable to remove Peel Mews from the CPZ as this sets an inappropriate precedent for parking controls on adopted highway. Merely signing parking controls have proven to be ineffective. Private parking controls can only apply to non adopted land such as undercroft parking and is not applicable to adopted land. Legally enforceable parking controls are the only options we recommend.</p> <p>Implement single yellow lines, not double yellow lines as initially advertised. This is a lesser restriction and therefore does not require re-advertisement. This proposal is shown on the plan attached as appendix B.</p>
<p>South Park Avenue (opposite Colman School)</p> <p>Access to Eaton Park from South Park Avenue protected by double yellow lines (no waiting at any time, loading permitted)</p>	<p>Norwich City Council: Parks Supportive of proposals</p> <p>Colman School Supportive of proposals</p>	<p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
<p>Sunningdale (at its junction with Newmarket Road)</p> <p>Double yellow lines (no waiting at any time, loading permitted) on Sunningdale from its junction with Newmarket Road to Wentworth Green</p>	<p>Resident 1 Objection: Resident of Newmarket Court. Lack of sufficient car parking spaces for 2 bedroom apartments necessitates parking on Sunningdale. Request for lines to be shortened or removed on one side</p> <p>Resident 2 Comment: concern about displacement of parked vehicles from Sunngindale to Wentworth Green.</p> <p>Resident 3 Supportive of proposal. Suggests double yellow lines are extended across entrance to 2 Wentworth Green</p>	<p>There is a need to improve safety at this junction. The double yellow lines will improve visibility and enable vehicles to enter and exit Sunningdale unimpeded. It is vitally important that vehicles entering Sunningdale are not forced to slow down unexpectedly or queue back onto Newmarket Road due to on street parking. The development at Wentworth Green also necessitates capacity improvements at this junction which these waiting restrictions will facilitate.</p> <p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>
<p>Sweetbriar Industrial Estate</p> <p>Double yellow lines (no waiting at any time, loading permitted) for the majority of the estate roads, with the exception of some sections of road left for unrestricted on street parking bays.</p> <p>Includes: Hellesdon Hall Road,</p>	<p>Business 1 Objection: concern about loss of on street parking and lack of alternative parking options for staff and visitors.</p> <p>Business 2 Objection: proposal is “ridiculous” due to detrimental impact on business</p> <p>Business 3 Objection: concern over loss of on street</p>	<p>The loss of on street parking needs to be balanced against the need to facilitate the movement of commercial vehicles including large trucks and articulated HGVs in and out of the industrial estate. There are numerous site accesses from the main estate roads and the proposed “no waiting at any time” restrictions were designed around them.</p> <p>Estate roads are not designed for the purpose of parking and it is the responsibility of the business</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
<p>Frensham Way, Burnet Road, Page Road, Barrow Close, Zobel Close, Naylor Road and a short section of Caley Close.</p>	<p>parking used by own company's staff. Suggests that some sections of proposed double yellow lines are removed on Frensham Road.</p> <p>Business 4 Objection: concern over loss of on street parking</p> <p>Business 5 Objection: parking restrictions are not required, just enforce the rules of the highway code</p> <p>Business 6 Objection: double yellow lines on Frensham Road will be located where Woody's snack bar is located, this vehicle has not moved in over 10 years and may not be able to be moved, can parking restrictions be tailed around this vehicle? (a verbal objection has also been raised by the owner of the Snack Bar)</p> <p>Business 7 Comment: concern that since vehicles will be parked on the west side of Frensham Road near to a site entrance this will cause visibility problems.</p>	<p>to manage the parking need for their employees, either through parking provision or travel plans. Some on street parking has been retained where possible.</p> <p>It is necessary to adopt a comprehensive area wide approach to the industrial estate rather than introduce piecemeal waiting restrictions to junctions. It is not feasible to only treat "one side of the road" as the movement of commercial vehicles necessitates more generous provision of waiting restrictions to facilitate access.</p> <p>"Woody's" Snack Bar on Frensham Road is located in a difficult position opposite the entrance to Barrow Close. The 'no waiting' restrictions are required in this location to protect access and movement around the junction. Alternative pitches away from junctions are available nearby if required.</p> <p>On the west side of Frensham Road at least 10metres of double yellow lines are to be installed adjacent to the site access of the objector and this is considered adequate.</p> <p>Additional requests were made to relocate parking bays to be adjacent to a business on Frensham Rd near Tow Win Ltd and extend waiting</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
	<p>Business 8 Concern: proposal is “over zealous” and suggests parking restrictions are place on one side of the road only.</p> <p>Councillor Blakeway Concern: proposal is very “comprehensive” and enquires about parking space for businesses.</p> <p>Business 9 Concern: impact upon need for on street parking, insufficient parking on site.</p> <p>Concern that parking restrictions will negatively affect businesses and that only junctions should be treated.</p> <p>8 Different businesses (Businesses 10-17) Support for proposals</p> <p>Business 18 Support for proposals, concerns about speeding</p> <p>Business 19 Support for proposals, concern about on</p>	<p>restrictions to facilitate site access on Burnet Road (i.e. remove parking between Zobel Close and Naylor Road on Burnet Road. These were not considered to be necessary but we will monitor the situation to consider issues if they arise.</p> <p>Speeding concerns will be raised with the Safer Neighbourhood Team as physical traffic calming is not normally considered appropriate for industrial areas due to the need for free movement of commercial vehicles.</p> <p>Parking on non adopted highway such as access roads cannot normally be dealt with by the City Council. Private parking control companies are available to deal with such issues</p> <p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
	<p>street traders i.e. Woody's Snack Bar</p> <p>Business 20 Support for proposals, concern that vehicles will park on unadopted section of access roads</p> <p>Business 21 Support for proposals; suggest only install double yellow lines on one side of road.</p> <p>Business 22 Support for proposals; requests parking restrictions are swapped from one side of Frensham Road (near Tow Win Ltd) to the other (near to Burnet Road.)</p>	
<p>Valley Side Road</p> <p>Extension of existing double yellow lines near to rear service yard access and introduction of a section of loading ban (at any time) on opposite side of road</p>	<p>Resident 1 Supportive of proposals.</p>	<p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>
<p>William Kett Close</p>	<p>Resident 1 Objection: waiting restrictions are not</p>	<p>Waiting restrictions are required to facilitate access to parking spaces on William Kett Close</p>

Location and summary	Comment	Officer comment
Introduction of double yellow lines (no waiting at any time, loading permitted) for the entire length of the adopted highway (NB waiting restrictions exclude the parking bays on William Kett Close which are not adopted and are not covered by these proposals, their management is the responsibility of the freeholder)	required. Loss of parking will prevent van owners to park, this may affect their ability to work. Vans do not cause an obstruction	<p>and for access to adjacent gas compressor site. Norwich City Council is not responsible for identifying provision for vehicles parked on the highway and the owners of vans will need to make alternative parking arrangements for their vehicles.</p> <p>Implement proposal as advertised</p>

