

STOCKPORT COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE REPORT – SUMMARY SHEET

Subject: OBJECTION REPORT - THE METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL OF STOCKPORT (RAVENOAK ROAD & RAVENOAK PARK ROAD, CHEADLE HULME) (PROHIBITION OF WAITING) ORDER 2020

Report to: (a) Bramhall & Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee
Thursday, 23 July 2020

Date:

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 Order at Ravenoak Park Road at its junction with Ravenoak Road, Cheadle and to seek approval for the introduction of the Traffic Regulation Order 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)**

There are none.

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
(RAVENOAK ROAD & RAVENOAK PARK ROAD, CHEADLE HULME) (PROHIBITION
OF WAITING) 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' restrictions on Ravenoak Park Road/Ravenoak Road, Cheadle Hulme the Cheadle Hulme South 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:

On the 9 February 2018, a Traffic Services Officer wrote to us proposing a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) similar to the order above, seeking our view on the proposal. I replied to the Traffic Services Officer within the requested timescale disagreeing with the proposal.

On the 31 July 2019, another Traffic Services Officer wrote to us in a similar manner proposing the same TRO, and again seeking our view. I replied to the Traffic Services Officer within the requested timescale disagreeing with the proposal. On both occasions I provided further comment.

The proposed TRO is at the junction of Ravenoak Road and Ravenoak Park Road. Motorists should be aware that stopping or parking within 10 metres of a junction is not allowed. This is stipulated in the Highway Code (Rule 243). My observations are that pedestrians are not obstructed by parked cars when crossing the road. This includes part of the junction where the kerb has been lowered; where pedestrians, particularly older or disabled people, or young children are most likely to cross the road. It is clear to me that motorists are generally complying with the requirements of the Highway Code with regards to not parking at this junction.'

'Ravenoak Park Road is a No through road for vehicles. There have not been any recent significant changes or developments on this road causing a change in traffic flows. The junction appears to cope well with current traffic flows. On this basis there appears to be little justification for introducing a prohibition of parking at any time.'

The Schedule and drawing contained in the draft order contradict each other and are ambiguous. The Schedule states the restriction is to apply on Ravenoak Road, Cheadle Hulme west side from a point 11.5 metres south of the projected kerb line of Ravenoak Park Road for a distance of 30 metres in a northerly direction. The accompanying drawing (Drawing number NBM-5013-01), does not show the extent of the proposed 30 metres in a northerly direction. The drawing shows a dimension of 11.5 metres and 10 metres along Ravenoak Road. Extrapolating indicates the extent of the proposed TRO to be approximately 27 metres. There is ambiguity regarding the proposed extent of the proposed TRO north along Ravenoak Road. As residents of the property within the proposed TRO we require a clear and unambiguous drawing showing the precise extent of the proposed TRO. Without this we are unable to determine if the proposed TRO is to extend as far as or beyond the drop kerb outside our residence. If appropriate, the Schedule and order should also be changed.

Response:

Traffic Services carried out an investigation back in 2018 however, this did not proceed beyond the Consultation Process. In June 2019, the Highway Ward Spokesperson requested that we revisit this and therefore, carried out the second Consultation on 31st July 2019.

Traffic Officers have witnessed vehicles parked within 10 meters of this junction, both on Ravenoak Park Road and Ravenoak Road. The proposed 'No Waiting At Any Time' Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will complement The Highway Code Rule 243 to which is referenced in this Objection and will highlight to motorists not to park there. The implementation of the (TRO) should alleviate obstructions and hazards faced by other motorists when entering and exiting the junction together with pedestrian visibility.

In order to allow safe movement of traffic using the junction and safer passage along Ravenoak Park Road it is necessary to introduce this TRO. The introduction of this TRO will also make it safer for other road users, i.e. pedestrians using the junction as it will give them clearer visibility.

The drafting of the TRO has been written and the drawing compiled in a standard way. Traffic Services can confirm that the measurements are correct. Furthermore, Traffic Services can confirm that the proposed TRO will not extend over the driveway of any property. If necessary, Traffic Services can spray paint where the restriction will start and end on Ravenoak Road, in order to alleviate any concerns that the lines will extend beyond any driveway.

(ii) Objection 2 reason:

'I agree there is a parking problem at the entrance to Ravenoak Park Road Cheadle Hulme that needs addressing. The parking problems here are caused by visitors to the Church Inn and the Governors House both of which

have adequate parking facilities of their own on Ravenoak Road but not by residents. Previously I have complained to the licensing authority about patrons of the Church Inn and the Govenors House on Ravenoak Road parking their vehicles at the entrance to Ravenoak Park Road. This takes place at the entrance to the road and also outside my house on both sides of the road. Manoeuvring in and out of my drive is often extremely difficult and dangerous due to parking of the opposite side of the road and if visibility is bad. Also these vehicles severely restrict ones line of vision on exiting the drive. Effectively these visitors park on both sides of the road outside neighbouring properties. Opposite my house there is a 25m length which is also used by pub visitors. I fear the proposed waiting restrictions will have the effect of pub visitors parking further down the road, making an intolerable situation for myself and other residents. In the past I have spoken to my local councillor about the use of residents permits to control the parking on the road. If the proposal goes ahead the scheme should also include resident parking only. This would hopefully solve the problem.'

Response:

Resident Parking Schemes are currently on hold and are not within the scope of this scheme. With regards to the 'fears' that the parking of vehicles may move further down the road and cause further problems, this is something Traffic Services can monitor after 6 months and if required, carry out further investigations at that time.

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 restrictions introduced or abandoned.

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

Drawing NM8-5013-01

Ravenoak Park Road/Ravenoak Road Report – 5th December 2019

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