

STOCKPORT COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE REPORT – SUMMARY SHEET

Subject: OBJECTION REPORT - THE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL OF STOCKPORT (HILLCREST ROAD & BRIDGE LANE, BRAMHALL) (PROHIBITION AND RESTRICTION OF WAITING) (REVOCATION) ORDER 2020

Report to: (a) Bramhall & Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee

Date: Thursday, 23 July 2020

Report of: (b) Joint report of the Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration and the Head of Legal, Democratic Governance and Estate & Asset Management

Key Decision: (c) ***NO / ~~YES~~*** (Please circle)

Forward Plan ☐ General Exception ☐ Special Urgency ☐ (Tick box)

Summary:

To report the objections made in relation to the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders at Hillcrest Road at its junction with Bridge Lane, Bramhall and to seek approval for the introduction of the Traffic Regulation Orders as originally advertised.

Recommendation(s):

That the Traffic Regulation Order be made as advertised.

Relevant Scrutiny Committee (if decision called in): **(d)**

Communities & Housing Scrutiny Committee

Background Papers (if report for publication): **(e)**

Hillcrest Road Report – 18th July 2019 (initial report)

Hillcrest Road Report – 30th January 2020 (2nd report following further investigations)

Drawing No. NM8-5098-01

Drawing No. NM8-5098-02

Drawing No. NM8-5098-03

Contact person for accessing
background papers and discussing the report

Officer: Nicola Ryan
0161 474 4409

‘Urgent Business’: (f) **~~YES~~ / NO** (please circle)

OBJECTION REPORT - THE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL OF STOCKPORT
(HILLCREST ROAD & BRIDGE LANE, BRAMHALL) (PROHIBITION AND
RESTRICTION OF WAITING) (REVOCATION) ORDER 2020

Joint report of the Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration and
the Head of Legal, Democratic Governance and Estate & Asset Management

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report is to advise committee members of objection received to a proposed introduction of 'No Waiting at Any Time' restriction and 'No Waiting Monday-Friday 7am-9.30am & 4pm-6.30pm restriction on Hillcrest Road at its junction with Bridge Lane, in the Bramhall North Ward.
- 1.2 To ensure that objections to the permanent Traffic Regulation Order are appropriately and efficiently considered.

2. INFORMATION AND ADVICE

- 2.1. In considering the objection the Area Committee should be mindful that unless otherwise authorised, the only right the general public has over the highway is a right of passage along it. The Authority has both a duty of care to ensure the safety of the travelling public and a duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to secure and facilitate the expeditious movement of traffic.

3. OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS

- 3.1. The specific objections and points contained within each letter have been analysed and detailed below together with the response.

(i) Objection 1 reason:

Objector has made reference to a number of properties on Bridge Lane and has stated that they do not benefit from a drive space, garage to use for parking or have parking options at the front of the properties. Rely on spaces available on Hillcrest Road to park. Forcing occupants to park further afield when they have children/infants presents considerable inconvenience and more importantly, safety concerns. The Objector also makes reference to a new house on Hillcrest Road whereby plans to build a platform (for parking) overlooking a number of gardens on Bridge Lane were opposed. Objector raises concerns that the proposed plans to implement the Traffic Regulation Order would compromise the street parking options and result in this particular owner 'reviving those plans', which would lead to significant dispute with the residents

Response:

A property on Bridge Lane does have off road parking facilities at the front of the property with the associated dropped kerb to enable access to the driveway. Up to 3 vehicles have been observed parked on the driveway of this property. Another property on Bridge Lane had off road parking facilities which we believe were changed by the previous owner. This is evidenced by

the dropped kerbs located at the side of the property (on Hillcrest Road). The current resident does have the option of reinstating off road parking should they wish to do so. In order to allow safe movement of traffic using the junction and safer passage along Hillcrest Road it is necessary to introduce these Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). The introduction of the TROs will cause minimal walking distance. With regards to the planning aspect associated with the new property, these are not relevant.

As has been witnessed during the investigations carried out, even with just a few cars parked along one side of Hillcrest Road it causes a 'bottle neck' effect when multiple vehicles are entering and exiting the junction at the same time. In order to create safe movement of traffic using the junction and safer passage along Hillcrest Road it is necessary to introduce these TROs. The Limited Waiting restriction will only be in operation during peak times and therefore, parking outside of the operational times will be permitted. In the event of parking during the restrictions operational hours, any additional walking will be minimal. Bramall Hall does have its own Pay & Display Car Park which could be used when visiting the Hall.

(ii) Objection 2 reason:

Regularly visits family/friend and their young baby and parks on Hillcrest Road outside the friend's property with their young baby/family for ease of getting into the house with 'all associated paraphernalia'. Objectors state when they visit it is never busy and there are not a lot of cars parked there and those that are, are only parked on one side of the road. Objectors feel that if they park further up the road it is far more difficult in terms of availability and practicality and feels the residents further up the street would inevitably become frustrated. Objector states parks on Hillcrest Road also, when visiting Bramall Hall.

Similar objections were raised 3 times.

Response:

As has been witnessed during the investigations carried out, even with just a few cars parked along one side of Hillcrest Road it causes a 'bottle neck' effect when multiple vehicles are entering and exiting the junction at the same time. In order to create safe movement of traffic using the junction and safer passage along Hillcrest Road it is necessary to introduce these TROs. The Limited Waiting restriction will only be in operation during peak times and therefore, parking outside of the operational times will be permitted. In the event of parking during the restriction's operational hours any additional walking will be minimal. A motorist is entitled to park on park on Public Adopted Highway provided they are not parked in contravention i.e. obstructing a residents driveway, on double yellow lines. Bramall Hall does have it's own Pay & Display Car Park which could potentially be utilised when visiting the Hall.

(iii) Objection 3 reason:

Regularly parks here when visiting family and does not like to park further up as this means their car is outside someone else's house and for safety and courtesy reasons thinks it is best avoided. The short extension of the double yellow line is fair enough, if there is a proven problem with cars turning into

Hillcrest Road. Objector states has only seen parking issues on the mornings of the Weekend Park Run. Feels current plans are excessive and that whatever the cost is planned for this extension it would be better spent on looking at the drainage on Hillcrest Road.

Response:

As aforementioned, as has been witnessed during the investigations carried out, even with just a few cars parked along one side of Hillcrest Road it causes a 'bottle neck' effect when multiple vehicles are entering and exiting the junction at the same time. In order to create safe movement of traffic using the junction and safer passage along Hillcrest Road it is necessary to introduce these TROs. The Limited Waiting restriction will only be in operation during peak times and therefore, parking outside of the operational times will be permitted. Site visits have not been undertaken when the Weekend Park Run has been taking place and therefore, are unable to comment about any issues that may arise with parking at such times. In the event of parking during the restriction's operational hours, any additional walking will be minimal. A motorist is entitled to park on Public Adopted Highway provided they are not parked in contravention i.e. obstructing a resident's driveway, on double yellow lines.

(iv) Objection 4 reason:

Would like to raise an objection to the proposed extension of double yellow lines on Hillcrest Road in Bramhall.

This objection was received 2 times.

Response:

Objectors do not elaborate as to the reasons for the objection therefore, our original comments still stand. The purpose of the introduction of these TROs is to enable safe movement of traffic at the junction and safer passage along Hillcrest Road. These TROs will also provide better visibility for pedestrians using the junction.

(v) Objection 5 reason:

As a resident living close by I would like to register my objection to the extension of the double yellow lines on Hillcrest. This area is regularly used by my family and would cause several safety issues if parking was restricted.

This objection was received 3 times.

Response:

The introduction of these TROs is to enable safe movement of traffic at the junction and safer passage along Hillcrest Road. Parking will be permitted outside of the Limited Waiting hours of operation. Any additional walking will be minimal.

(vi) Objection 6 reason:

Objector considers the proposals as unnecessary. States since the implementation of the existing double yellow lines the hindering at the junction has been eliminated. The rebuild of a property on Hillcrest Road is now in the phase where construction vehicles are no longer posing a problem. Other

building projects taking place nearby on a further two houses are now complete. Vehicles only park on the 'West' side of Hillcrest Road and, on the rare occasions that vehicles do park on the 'East' side it is usually transient ie. parcel delivery. With the exception of the Weekend Park Runners, parking is extremely quiet and confined in the main, to a small number of residents on Hillcrest Road and Bridge Lane who lack capacity for off-road parking. Wonders if those organising the Weekend Park Runners could put cones out on the East side of Hillcrest to ensure the irresponsible parking does not happen. Further restriction on parking on Hillcrest will compromise safety and inevitably lead to further parking on the grass verges on Bridge Lane which poses a serious visibility hazard for vehicles emerging from Hillcrest Road. The impact on residents who may be forced to park well away from their houses would be severe, especially those with young children.

Response:

Majority of the houses on both Bridge Lane and Hillcrest Road have off road parking facilities. Site visits have been undertaken to observe the movement of traffic at the junction. Even with a small number of vehicles parked on the 'west side' of Hillcrest Road these proved to be an obstruction, because when multiple cars were attempting to enter and exit the junction at the same time a 'bottle neck' effect was created because the vehicles entering Hillcrest Road from Bridge Lane were unable to pass the vehicles waiting to exit Hillcrest Road onto Bridge Lane due to the parked vehicles on the 'west side' of Hillcrest Road. The TROs proposed will allow more vehicles into Hillcrest Road and for them to pass more efficiently and keep visibility clear for other road users i.e. pedestrians, using the junction at this point.

As previously stated, we are unable to comment on the parking caused by the Weekend Park Runners as site visits were not undertaken at the time these have taken place. However, that said, we are more concerned with the every day manoeuvres around this junction. The suggestion that organisers of the Weekend Park Run could be asked to put cones out on the East side of Hillcrest Road is not relevant to these TROs. Any additional walking will be minimal, and vehicles will be able to park outside of the Limited Waiting TRO operational hours.

(vii) Objection 7 reason:

Objector states that they do not currently have 'practical off-road parking' on their property therefore, needs to park on Hillcrest Road. The proposed timing restrictions would mean if their cars were parked in the area they would have to move them twice a day which would be highly inconvenient. Current plans would create a huge parking issue at their property. Feels parking relatively far away from their property would be unsafe, especially with a young child. As residents, they are careful never to park near the junction and feel that they are being penalised for others (non-residents) who are occasionally doing so. Feels their interests have been ignored. Are aware initial plans were altered/changed at the request and interest of one other resident on Hillcrest Road. Furthermore, states current proposal seems unnecessarily excessive and feels they are being penalised for objecting so ardently to the original plans. If the current proposals were to be approved, it would cause them great anxiety, upset and would be detrimental to their mental health. Objector states, they have already been caused a lot of strain since moving into the property. Objector states that it is mentioned in Section 6.1 of the Report that

'it was not necessary to carry out further consultation following the further investigations. Objector states they would dispute this, given that the revised plans are considerably different to those that originally went through the consultation process. They are concerned that the extension of the double yellow lines will increase the speed of traffic on Hillcrest Road thereby jeopardising the safety of pedestrians and cyclists. As residents and as those who would be most affected by the changes, would hope that the Council will take their interests and concerns very seriously.

Reiterates: Agrees that there is a minor issue with cars turning into Hillcrest Road from Bridge Lane. Maintain the parking restrictions on the west side of Hillcrest Road, do not extend to 37m from the northern kerb line of Bridge Lane, as proposed. If the double yellow lines were extended to 24m, up to their dropped kerb only, and their access protection then reintroduced, this would prevent blockages at the junction and allow them to safely park their cars beyond their dropped kerb, with convenient access to their property.

States when traffic surveys were carried out, they witnessed the individuals carrying out the survey parked as close to Bridge Lane as the current double yellow lines allow. States has photographic evidence.

Access protection for their dropped kerb is absolutely required and should be reintroduced to the plans as a priority – this is the only vehicular access to their property.

Response:

There is some conflicting information within this objection with regards to the dropped kerbs/vehicular access. Objector states *'we do not currently have off road parking on our property'* Objector also states *'access protection for our dropped kerb is absolutely required and should be reintroduced to the plans as a priority'* As the dropped crossing is no longer used for vehicles access, access protection is not required.

The reason for the introduction of these TROs is to enable safe movement of traffic at the junction and safer passage along Hillcrest Road. The majority of properties on both Bridge Lane and Hillcrest Road, have off-road parking facilities and therefore, it is anticipated that the objector will not encounter too much inconvenience when parking. Any additional walking will be minimal, and parking will be permitted outside of the Limited Waiting TROs operational hours.

As with any consultation, plans may be 'tweaked' in order to act on responses received. As the initial changes made (Drawing NM8-5098-02) were minimal, there was no requirement to re-consult. Following a site meeting between Traffic Services Officers, a Councillor and the resident, a compromise was attempted however, the resident was not prepared to accept anything less than the double yellow lines ending at the beginning of his dropped kerb (the transition kerb). Back at the office, the Traffic Services Officers looked at other possible solutions. It was at this time it was agreed to shorten the length of the No Waiting At Any Time restriction (double yellow lines) on the west side of Hillcrest Road so that they stop at the residents transition kerb and then introduce a Limited Waiting restriction, to be operational Monday-Friday,

7am-9.30am and 4pm-6.30pm (Drawing NM8-5098-03). These peak times were chosen as this is when the junction is at its busiest. As these further changes were less severe, there was no requirement to carry out any further consultation with residents.

As vehicles will be approaching a junction, they are most likely to be at a considerably reduced speed to enable the driver to negotiate the junction. The reason for these proposed restrictions are to allow more vehicles into Hillcrest Road and pass more efficiently. They will also keep visibility clear for other road users i.e. pedestrians/cyclists using the junction at this point.

Resident only parking schemes are currently on hold and is not relevant to these TROs.

When the traffic surveys were carried out, at no point did the officers vehicle park on the west side of Hillcrest Road as described by the resident. The officer's vehicle was parked on the east side of the road. The officer parked in the same location on each occasion to ensure that 1) they had a clear view of the junction and 2) that the observations were consistent.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1. There are no financial implications arising from the recommendations in this report.

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1. The Council has a statutory duty to ensure that its highways operate safely for the safe passage of all traffic including pedestrians and powers to regulate and restrict traffic to assist in that duty.

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1. To comply with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders, Regulations 1996 the Authority must consider all objections submitted during the consultation period of at least 21 days before 'Making' a Traffic Regulation Order.
- 6.2. The Committee should make a decision in respect of the objection/s received so that the scheme can be progressed and the No Waiting At Any Time and No Waiting Monday-Friday 7am-9.30am and 4pm-6.30pm restrictions introduced.

7. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 7.1. The alternative to the proposals laid out in this report is to continue with the current lack of restriction on the highway by not introducing the proposed traffic regulation orders.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1. It is recommended that:
- 8.2. the Area Committee note all Traffic Regulation Orders where objections have been considered by officers;

8.3. the Area Committee accept the Traffic Regulation Order be made as originally advertised.

8.4. That the objectors are informed of the decision.

Background Papers

Hillcrest Road, Report – 18th July 2019

Hillcrest Road, Report – 20th January 2020

Drawing No. NM8-5098-01

Drawing No. NM8-5098-02

Drawing No. NM8-5098-03

Anyone wishing further information please contact Nicola Ryan on telephone number Tel: 0161 474 4409 or by email on nicola.ryan@stockport.gov.uk