

Decision of:	Cabinet Member for Environmental Services and Highways
Decision Number:	PH82/2021
Relevant Officer:	John Blackledge, Director for Community and Environmental Services
Relevant Cabinet member:	Councillor Neal Brookes, Cabinet Member for Enforcement, Public Safety, Highways and Transport
Date of Decision:	9 December 2021

RESIDENTS PERMIT PARKING SCHEME BRYAN ROAD AREA

1.0 Purpose of the report:

- 1.1 To consider the representation and alternative options of the proposed Residents Permit Parking scheme Bryan Road area (amendments and changes).

2.0 Recommendation(s):

- 2.1 In light of the low level and nature of feedback to consider the proposal for Residents Permit Parking scheme Bryan Road area, the recommendation of the officers at 6.15 and consider whether to proceed with the scheme.

3.0 Reasons for recommendations(s):

- 3.1 It is appropriate that the representation is fully considered and a decision made whether or not to proceed with the proposed restrictions or choose a different option.

- 3.2 Is the recommendation contrary to a plan or strategy adopted or approved by The Council? No

- 3.3 Is the recommendation in accordance with the councils approved budget? Yes

4.0 Other alternative options to be considered:

- 4.1 To continue with the current arrangement by not proceeding with the proposal

5.0 Councils priority:

- 5.1 The relevant council priority is: "Communities: creating stronger communities and increasing resilience"

6.0 Background Information:

- 6.1 The Council's Traffic management team received a complaint from a number of residents on Bryan Road that the parking on Bryan Road was becoming a problem. The residents asked Traffic Management to look at the parking on Bryan Road, Myrtle Avenue, Maple Avenue, Poplar Avenue, and Elm Avenue. The resident asked for more bays to be created to allow the residents more chance of obtaining a parking space.
- 6.2 Members of the Traffic Management team went to site to look at the parking and space on the above roads. It was noted that on each road in the middle section there were resident parking bays on both sides of the road, whilst at either end there were bays on one side of the road and on the opposite side were double yellow lines.
- 6.3 After measuring the width of the carriageway on these streets it was found that the carriageway width did not differ much across the whole length of the road. It was decided that it was possible to add extra bays on either end of the road to create more space.
- 6.4 Before officers could implement this change and create extra bays on Myrtle Avenue, Maple Avenue, Poplar Avenue and Elm Avenue, Traffic Management received a further request as a result of a complaint from a resident on Olive Grove. Their complaint related to parking and that people were parking on their street leaving cars for extended periods, going into town or to work in the surrounding area. This meant that the residents struggled to park.
- 6.5 The first option was to add a new scheme to Olive Grove and Hazel Grove, Hazel Grove was considered at this time as it is directly adjacent to Olive Grove, has a similar layout and unrestricted parking. A consultation was carried out on these two streets. Out of the forty-one properties contained on these two streets we received twenty-one replies. Of these twenty-one replies ninety-five percent were in favour of a permit parking scheme.
- 6.6 Whilst the consultation was ongoing on Olive Grove and Hazel Grove Traffic Management received a further request to add Forest Gate to the permit parking scheme. Due to a permit parking scheme(s) already in place in the surrounding area it was a logical step to extend the current Bryan Road scheme to incorporate Forest Gate, Olive Grove, and Hazel Grove.
- 6.7 It also meant that Traffic Management could address the parking on Myrtle, Maple, Poplar and Elm at the same time as dealing with the parking issue on Olive and Hazel Grove and Forest Gate.
- 6.8 Traffic Management conducted an informal consultation with the residents of Bryan Road, Whitley Avenue, Elm Avenue, Poplar Avenue, Maple Avenue, Myrtle Avenue,

Forest Gate, Olive Grove, Hazel Grove and Mere Road in August 2019. This consultation lasted for 3 weeks. This wide consultation took in the area and all the streets contained and affected by the proposal.

- 6.9 340 letters were delivered and Traffic Management received 100 letters back. The response and opinion was split 50/50 however some of the business and some landlord's vehemently apposed the scheme stating that it would have serious implications on their businesses.
- 6.10 The Councillors for the ward attended a meeting with home owners and businesses about the scheme. After the meeting the ward councillor asked the Council's Traffic Management team to reassess the scheme and see if a different option could be found.
- 6.11 The Traffic Management team considered different options for the proposed scheme. Originally the Traffic Management team planned to implement a zone scheme as this is a simpler and cheaper option to implement, no bays are needed and signage is just placed at the entrance to the zone. However to address concerns and afford access for all the options are limited, a viable option was found that of remark all the bays in the area and convert them to dual usage. This would involve the bays being residents permit parking 24 hours a day 7 days a week and during the hours of 9am – 5pm the general public would be able to park in them for 3 hours. They could then not return to the zone for 1 hour (limited Waiting).
- 6.12 The cost for this type of scheme would have been very high as all the bays in the area and double yellow lines would need checking and amending all corrections / alterations to these existing lines would involve removal (the lines being water jetted off and the cost for that type of machine is over £2000 a day). Each and every line and bay would need remarking and each and every bay would need a new pole and sign.
- 6.13 Traffic Management hoped that this scheme would help the business in the area and would suit the residents. Again 340 letters were hand delivered to each property in the scheme and the businesses on Whitegate Drive. This was done on the 13 February 2020 with a response date of 6th March 2020. Out of the 340 letters delivered the council received 79 responses that equates to a 23% response rate. Out of the 79 responses 40 properties were in favour of the scheme and 39 properties were against the scheme.
- 6.14 After discussions between the Cabinet Member for Enforcement, Public Safety, Highways and Transport., and the Head of Highways and Traffic, it was the view of the Head of Highways and Traffic that due to the level and nature of the feedback response and the validity of the objections, plus the cost to implement the scheme and future maintenance. It is recommended not to proceed with the proposal and the changes to the existing on street provision and also not expand the area of permit control / resident permit parking scheme. The original Bryan Road scheme still stands and will remain in its current format.

6.15 Does this information submitted include any exempt information? No

7.0 List of Appendices:

- 7.1 First consultation letter
- 7.2 Second consultation Letter
- 7.3 Consultation response drawing

8.0 Financial considerations:

8.1 None

9.0 Legal Consideration:

- 9.1 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, sections 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 32, 35, 53 and 124
- 9.2 Traffic Management Act 2004.
- 9.3 The Road Traffic (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Borough of Blackpool) Order 2003 (Statutory Instrument No 2677)

10.0 Risk Management Consideration:

10.1 This would be an amenity order and low risk in safety terms.

11.0 Equality Consideration:

11.1 None.

12.0 Suitability, climate change and environmental considerations:

12.1 None.

13.0 Internal/external consultation undertaken:

13.1 Consultation letters were hand delivered to every property in the affected area.

14.0 Background Papers:

14.1 None.

16.0 Key decision information:

16.1 None

17.0 Call-in information:

17.1 Are there any grounds for urgency, which would cause the decision to be exempt from the call in process?

TO BE COMPLETED BY THE HEAD OF DEMOCRATIC GOVERNANCE

18.0 Scrutiny Committee Chairman (where appropriate):

Date informed:

Date approved:

19.0 Declaration of Interest (if applicable):

19.1 None.

20.0 Executive Decision:

20.1 The Cabinet Member resolved as follows:

To not proceed with the proposal and the changes to the existing on street provision and also not expand the area of permit control / resident permit parking scheme at Bryan Road.

21.0 Date of decision:

21.1 9 December 2021

22.0 Reason(s) for decision:

22.1 The scheme should not proceed due to the level and nature of the feedback response and the validity of the objections, plus the cost to implement the scheme and future maintenance. The Cabinet Member noted that the original Bryan Road scheme still stands and will remain in its current format.

23.0 Date Decision published:

23.1 9 December 2021

24.0 Executive Members in attendance:

24.1

25.0 Call-in:

25.1

26.0 Notes:

26.1