

STOCKPORT COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE REPORT – SUMMARY SHEET

Subject: Hardy Drive, Boston Close, Robins Lane, Glenholme Road & Convamore Road, Bramhall - Proposed Traffic Regulation Order 'No Waiting At Any Time'

Report to: (a) Bramhall & Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee
Thursday, 16 September 2021

Date:

Report of: (b) Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration

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

Forward Plan General Exception Special Urgency (Tick box)

Summary:

To report the findings of a consultation exercise and to seek approval for the introduction of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) 'No Waiting At Any Time' on Hardy Drive, Bramhall and a number of other nearby surrounding roads.

Recommendation(s):

The Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration requests that the Bramhall & Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee approves the legal advertising of the following Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) set out in **Appendix A** and subject to no objections being received within 21 days from the advertisement date, the order can be made.

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
Tel: 0161 474 4409

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

Certification (if applicable)

This report should be considered as 'urgent business' and the decision exempted from 'call-in' for the following reason(s):

The written consent of Councillor _____ and the Chief Executive/Monitoring Officer/Borough Treasurer for the decision to be treated as 'urgent business' was obtained on _____ /will be obtained before the decision is implemented.

Hardy Drive, Boston Close, Robins Lane, Glenholme Road & Convamore Road, Bramhall - Proposed Traffic Regulation Order 'No Waiting At Any Time'

Report of the Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To report the findings of a consultation exercise and to seek approval for the introduction of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) as shown in **Appendix A**.

2. BACKGROUND

The Network Management Section received a request from the Local Highway Ward Spokesperson to investigate traffic issues on several roads nearby to the new Bramhall Manor Care Home. It has been reported that motorists are 'double' parking along Hardy Drive, vehicles are being parked close to, and on the junctions of Hardy Drive/Boston Close, Glenholme Road/Robins Lane, on the bend located on Glenholme Road, as it changes to Convamore Road. It has also been reported that vehicles were also being parked in such a manner that they are obstructing footway access, forcing pedestrians into the carriageway. The parked vehicles are said to be causing an obstruction together with creating unnecessary safety hazards and reducing visibility for other road users.

When the Highway Ward Spokesperson first contacted Traffic Services about this situation, traffic cones were placed on Hardy Drive to prevent obstructive parking however, parking on the junctions of Hardy Drive/Boston Close, Glenholme Road/Robins Lane, and on the bend located on Glenholme Road where it changes to Convamore Road has continued, as has the safety concerns.

The traffic cones were only ever a temporary measure. In order to find a permanent solution to overcome the concerns raised, to improve visibility for both pedestrians & motorists, and to compliment The Highway Code Rule 243, which states: DO NOT park or stop on a bend, it is proposed to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) – 'No Waiting at Any Time' – waiting restriction be introduced.

3. PROPOSALS

- 3.1. The traffic cones currently in place were only ever a temporary measure. Therefore, in order to find permanent solution, and to overcome the concerns raised, and to improve visibility for both pedestrians & motorists, it is proposed to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) – 'No Waiting At Any Time' on Hardy Drive, Boston Close, Robins Lane, Glenholme Road and Convamore Road.
- 3.2. The initial proposals, detailed above are outlined in **Drawing No.NM8-5125-01**.
- 3.3. The proposals compliment The Highway Code, Rule 243 which states: DO NOT stop or park: opposite or within 10 meters (32 feet) of a junction, except within an authorised parking space.

3.4. The Council has a duty of care for the general public and thus, if nothing is done to alleviate any potential difficulties in accessing Hardy Drive or any of the aforementioned junctions, there is the possibility that should an emergency arise, there is a chance that the response time could be considerably longer.

4. LEGAL POSITION/IMPLICATIONS

4.1. The Traffic Management Orders would be made under Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The Council is required by the Local Authorities Traffic Order (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 to give notice of its intention to make a Traffic Order (by publishing a draft traffic order). These regulations also require the Council to consider any representations received as a result of publishing the draft Order.

5. CONSIDERATION OF ALTERNATIVE SOLUTIONS

5.1. No other alternatives were considered

6. CONSULTATION

6.1. The Local Ward Councillors have been consulted and no adverse comments were received.

6.2. The Police have been consulted and no objections to the proposals have been received.

6.3. From a total of 52 No. letters delivered to residents, we received. 22 No. (42%) responses of which 15 No. (68%) agreed with the proposals, and 7 No. (32%) disagreed. Additionally, a response was received from 1 No. resident who had not included within the consultation however, the resident did not specify whether they agreed, or disagreed with the proposals.

Following the consultation exercise, residents in **agreement** with the proposals have made the following comments:

Consultation Comment	Network Management Comment
'Providing' they do not interfere with the parking of their 2 nd vehicle then has no problem with the proposals.	The proposed TRO compliments The Highway Code Rule 243 which states: DO NOT park opposite, or within 10 meters of a junction. These restrictions could displace some parking.
Wants the 'Management' of both Bramhall Manor Care Home and Kenley Lodge to take a greater responsibility regarding where their staff park. Parking provision has been made available within the car park of St. Michaels Church. Double Yellow Lines should only be used as a deterrent to prevent hazardous parking. Would welcome Double Yellow Lines on the junction of Convamore Road and Ack Lane East.	Whilst parking provision has been sourced for staff, nobody can 'force' their staff to utilise this. When Bramhall Manor first opened, it was used as a Nightingale style unit due to Covid. As and when normality returns, it is expected that the parking issues will be greatly reduced. The proposed Double Yellow Lines are to protect junctions and bend(s) in road and to also ensure free movement of traffic. Double Yellow Lines on the junction of Convamore/Ack Lane East are not within the scope of this scheme.
If these restrictions are implemented, SMBC	SMBC's Civil Enforcement Officers patrol the

<p>need to ensure they will be enforced.</p>	<p>whole of the Borough daily, and in doing so will issue a Penalty Charge Notice to all vehicles they observe parked in contravention. Additionally, members of the public may report any vehicle parked in contravention by telephone, email or online.</p>
<p>Feels restrictions on Hardy Drive are excessive. Would like to see the proposals reduced to just one side of Hardy Drive, or that parking be allowed on both sides of the entrance into the Care Home otherwise feels the restrictions should be extended for the full length of Glenholme Road because if parking is unavailable on Hardy Drive people will park on Glenholme Road, and other locations where that are no parking restrictions in place.</p>	<p>Due to the layout and width of Hardy Drive, permitting parking on one side would significantly affect the 'free' movement of traffic, in that two vehicles would not be able to pass each other. This could lead to motorists carrying out dangerous manoeuvres, which could potentially put other road users at risk.</p> <p>Traffic Services like to see new restrictions be in place for at least 6 months before a review is carried out on their impact. Officers will monitor the location, and if evidence requires a further review the restrictions these will be discussed the Highway Ward Spokesperson.</p>
<p>Fears that once Bramhall Manor allows visitors again the parking issue will deteriorate again.</p>	<p>Assuming the proposals are 'passed' and the restrictions implemented, parking will be prohibited 24/7 therefore, as and when visiting re-commences we would not expect to see vehicles parked on the restrictions. However, there are some exceptions; vehicles are permitted to stop in order to pick up/drop off passengers, vehicles may stop for the purpose of loading/unloading and Blue Badge Holders may park on a double yellow line restriction for a maximum of 3 hours providing they display their valid Blue Badge.</p>
<p>Action needs taking against Care Home staff and dog walkers parking on the junction Glenholme Road/Robins Lane. Staff and workmen to Kenley Lodge need to be able to park. Kenley Lodge has limited parking and carers to its residents, and workmen struggle to park. When proposals for Bramhall Manor went in and there were objections. Hopefully, the Double Yellow Lines will ease the parking problems.</p>	<p>These proposals are not aimed to stop any one specific group of people from parking their vehicles and are more about ensuring safety for all road users. Maybe residents of Kenley Lodge could petition Johnnie Johnson Housing for dedicated parking for carers/workmen visiting their building? Managers of Kenley Lodge may wish to consider potentially liaising with the Vicar from St. Michaels Church to ascertain whether the offer to use the Church Car Park can be extended to visitors to Kenley Lodge.</p>
<p>The bin wagon has had issues turning into Kenley Lodge</p>	<p>The Waste Dept. have not contacted Traffic Services to raise any access concerns. However, assuming the proposed TRO is implemented, the restrictions should mean the junctions are clear of parked vehicles and therefore, resolve any issues the Waste Collection Dept. may have encountered.</p>
<p>Is concerned the restrictions will take away their 'visitor parking' and wants to know why a gap has been left between the restrictions near Kenley Lodge.</p>	<p>Whilst nobody has an automatic right to park on adopted highway Traffic Services acknowledge the demand for on-street parking. A gap, sufficient for approximately 2 vehicles has been left on Glenholme Road as Traffic Services deemed vehicles parked here would not impact on the junction, or movement of traffic.</p>
<p>Some residents have raised concerns regarding motorists parking close to, and over their driveways, which on occasions obstructs their access/exit. Residents are concerned that once the parking restrictions are implemented their driveways will be obstructed more than they are at present.</p>	<p>Following the consultation exercise, the Highway Ward Spokesperson has agreed to fund the installation of several Access Protection Markings (APM). Residents will be contacted separately with regards to this. Note. Traffic Services cannot install an APM if the driveway access is affected by the Traffic Regulation</p>

	Order 'No Waiting At Any Time' (double yellow lines) therefore, in these circumstances the resident will not be offered an APM.
Parking concerns were raised at the 'planning stage'. At which time, the Planning Officer stated "there is no evidence whatsoever" on at least 3 separate occasions.	Traffic Services have liaised with the Planning Dept. who have provided the following statement. <i>'Bramall Manor is currently operating as a Nightingale type care home during the Covid-19 pandemic. There are higher numbers of staff with additional NHS staff at site and this current operating model has given rise to some operational difficulties. Once normality resumes, Traffic Services believes the number of staff will reduce thus freeing up parking spaces within their own car park.'</i>
Concerns has been raised that the Double Yellow Lines will push more vehicles to park at the 'top' of Hardy Drive, and that these vehicles may obstruct footway access.	At present there are parking cones in place on most of Hardy Drive and around the junction of Glenholme Road. These cones are currently preventing parking, and cover most of the area where the 'double yellow lines' are being proposed. Site visits have been carried out both before, and after the consultation exercise during which, no 'excessive' parking towards the 'top' of Hardy Drive has been observed. Therefore, Traffic Services, do not anticipate the Double Yellow Lines restriction will push more vehicles to park at the 'top' of Hardy Drive however, officers will monitor the location and if it is felt further restrictions are required, will address this at that time. In the meantime, any obstruction to the footway is a matter for Greater Manchester Police, therefore, should any resident wish to report an obstruction they can do so via GMP's non-emergency telephone number, 101.
Robins Lane is relatively narrow, some residents have requested that the restrictions be extended on east side of Robins Lane to at least the 'Railway Bridge' due to vehicles being parked along this stretch of highway causing an obstruction.	Traffic Services Officers have carried out multiple site visits both prior to the consultation with residents, and after. The Highway Ward Spokesperson has also carried out separate site visits. These site visits have been carried out on different days of the week and at a variation of times during which, no vehicles have been observed parked on this section of Robins Lane. Traffic Services like to see new restrictions be in place for at least 6 months before a review is carried out on their impact. Officers will monitor the location, and if evidence requires a review of the restrictions these will be discussed with the Highway Ward Spokesperson.
Residents have highlighted concerns with regards to the visibility of vehicles turning onto Robins Lane from Ack Lane East.	Following further site visits, Traffic Services Officers have observed private ambulances leave Bramhall Manor Care Home to then park on Robins Lane. This behaviour has been observed on several different occasions. Therefore, having discussed residents' concerns, and the evidence gained from the further site visits with the Highway Ward Spokesperson, Traffic Services have amended the initial plans, and arranged for the restrictions to be extended a short distance. It is anticipated that this amendment will provide more visibility to motorists of the traffic coming from Ack Lane East when leaving their properties/negotiating

	the junction of Glenholme Road/Robins Lane.
Feels Bramhall Manor Care Home should extend their car park so that staff can park 'on-site'.	Traffic Services are further informed that Bramhall Manor Care Home are planning to extend their car park. This extension will provide a further 12 parking spaces for staff/visitors.

Following the consultation exercise, residents disagreeing with the proposals have made the following comments:

<p>Understands the need for restrictions but fails to understand how by putting them outside 2 commercial businesses that have excessive parking will solve the issue. The proposals do not offer 'safe parking' for the 'offending' vehicles and will just move the problem further into residential areas, the traffic cones are evidence of this.</p> <p>A proposal with a solution for excess parking would be better - set up parking area's on Hardy Drive outside the premises where it would be safe to park and protect residents' properties. Would a designated number of parking spaces marked in a 'safe zone' on Hardy Drive and Robins Lane be viable element to the proposals and provide provision for those vehicles causing the problems?</p> <p>The only outcome I can see is that these proposals will move, and compound the problem already occurring in the resident's streets surrounding these two commercial businesses.</p> <p>On this basis I cannot agree with your proposals.</p>	<p>Bramhall Manor Care Home has initially been used as a Nightingale style unit due to Covid-19. It is expected that the parking issues due to the Bramhall Manor Care Home staff to be greatly reduced once normality resumes. The proposals aim to ensure safety is maintained. Currently there are concerns of junction parking, footway obstruction and parking on bends. In the event of a resident's driveway entrance being blocked they can request parking enforcement. To introduce designated parking on Hardy Drive & Robins Lane would reduce the already relatively narrow road width even more, thus making it impossible for two cars to pass each other. This could ultimately lead to manoeuvres being carried out that could potentially put other road users at risk. The proposals are aimed at ensuring safety, whilst also enabling free movement of traffic.</p>
<p>Kenley Lodge, built in 1971 has insufficient parking. Since Bramhall Manor came along carers, visitors and workmen to Kenley Lodge have found parking more difficult.</p> <p>Plans seem to show more restrictions on Glenholme Road and Convamore Road than Hardy Drive, why? Does not feel the restrictions need to go as far as they do on Hardy Drive.</p> <p>As plans stand, will only push parking to lower end of Robins Lane which is narrow and well used for through traffic. Ack Lane East has its own problems with speeding and parking vehicles, sometimes parked on pavement forcing pedestrians into the road. Currently no one is allowed to park on Hardy Drive, if Double Yellow Lines installed this will continue when not necessary. Would suggest Double Yellow Lines on Robins Lane from Hardy Drive up to the railway bridge. Failure to do this would see parking moved to this area which would cause an already narrow road to become congested and obstructed.</p>	<p>Nobody has an automatic right to park on adopted highway. If the current parking provisions are insufficient at Kenley Lodge then residents should petition Johnnie Johnson Housing, who own the building & existing car park land.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions 'target' the safety concerns raised, they also compliment the Highway Code Rule 243 which states: DO NOT park opposite, or within 10 meters of a junction or on a bend. Traffic Services anticipate the restrictions will ensure visibility, maintain free moving traffic, thus improve safety overall for all road users.</p> <p>Traffic Service Officers have not seen any evidence of vehicles parking on the east side of Robins Lane towards the railway bridge during any of the site visits undertaken.</p> <p>Traffic cones are currently placed on most of the area where the new restrictions are proposed. The cones have been in place for some considerable time. Traffic Services therefore, do not anticipate parking will worsen as and when the double yellow lines are installed.</p> <p>As with all new schemes, the location/restrictions can be reviewed after 6 months and if at that time it is evidenced further restrictions are required this</p>

	will be discussed with the Highway Ward Spokesperson.
Preventing the parking of cars at the end of Glenholme Rd (adjacent to Robins Lane) will push the parking outside our houses leaving us with a difficult job of getting in and out of our drives. It will also push to problems further round Convamore, and around the corner. I think a small section of Double Yellow Lines (on the Kenley side) would suffice to make the turn safer. We frequently get visitors parking from Bramhall Manor Care Home, Kenley Lodge and Carrwood and the section of road adjacent to Robins Lane is usually sufficient to stop them parking outside our houses, which are usually taken up as a rule.	<p>The double yellow lines are required on the junction of Glenholme Road/Robins Lane on both sides. Vehicles currently parking on Glenholme Road adjacent to Robins Lane are obstructing the footway when parking thus forcing pedestrians into the road. The implementation of the double yellow lines as proposed, will improve safety for pedestrians, protect visibility at the junction and maintain movement of traffic. Furthermore, the proposed restrictions compliment Rule 243 of The Highway Code.</p> <p>Following the comments received highlighting residents' concerns that vehicles will park in such a way to obstruct access/exit from their driveways more so than at present, it has been agreed to fund the installation of several Access Protection Markings (APM). Individual residents will be contacted separately with regards to this. Note. Traffic Services cannot install an APM if the driveway access is affected by a Traffic Regulation Order such as 'No Waiting At Any Time' (double yellow lines) therefore, in these circumstances the resident will not be offered an APM.</p>
Need resident parking only in front of our houses	A Resident Parking Scheme is not within the scope of this remit. If residents wish to pursue a request for Resident Only Parking, they may do so. Full details including the required criteria, and how to apply are on the official SMBC website.
<p>Proposals have merit 'in principal'. Narrowness of some of the roads make it impossible to reverse onto or off a drive without access to the full width of the road.</p> <p>Since the opening of Bramhall Manor staff park opposite our driveway for several hours restricting our access.</p> <p>Vehicles are struggling to access Boston Close, when vehicles are parked opposite it's entrance. Large delivery vehicles can only turn by reversing into Boston Close, and have difficulty even when there are no vehicles parked opposite its entrance.</p>	<p>The Highway Code advises against reversing off a driveway. Rule 177 refers.</p> <p>As and when a resident's driveway is obstructed by a parked vehicle, they may request enforcement from the Council's Parking Team. Enforcement can be requested by telephone, email or via completion of an online form. Only the resident of the house affected may request enforcement action. ie. no resident may request enforcement on behalf of another.</p> <p>Following feedback received from the consultation exercise, the proposals have been amended so that the double yellow line restriction will be extended on Hardy Drive to cover the area opposite the junction of Boston Close.</p>

Following the consultation, discussions have taken place with the Highway Ward Spokesperson to review the comments received. In considering the comments, the initial proposals have been amended to reflect the inclusion of Access Protection Markings being offered to residents, and the slight extension of the 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions on Hardy Drive, and on Robins Lane. The updated 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions are outlined in **Drawing No. NM8-5125-02 RevB**.

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1. The estimated cost of the scheme is as follows:

Legal	£ 685.00
Road Markings	£1,000.00
TOTAL	£1,685.00

Costs are to be funded by the Bramhall Manor Care Home Developers

8. TIMESCALES

8.1. 3-6 months, subject to objections.

9. EQUALITIES/COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT

9.1. Equal Opportunities

- To provide a suitable and safer environment for pedestrians and other road users. The scheme contributes to the Council's vision statement "Promote equal life outcomes for all by tackling known inequalities across the borough of Stockport".

9.2. Sustainable Environment

- To develop and sustain a healthy, safe and attractive local environment which contributes to Stockport. Stockport Council understands the responsibility it has to lead by example and help the broader community make a positive contribution to the local environment.

10. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

10.1 The Corporate Director for Place Management & Regeneration requests that the Bramhall & Cheadle Hulme South Area Committee approves the legal advertising of the following Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) set out in Appendix A and subject to no objections being received within 21 days from the advertisement date, the order can be made.

Background Papers

There are no background papers to this report.

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

Appendix A.

Proposed (TRO) Schedule

'No Waiting at Any Time'

Boston Close (Both Sides)

From the intersection of the northern kerb line of Hardy Drive, for a distance of 10 meters in a north easterly direction.

Hardy Drive (North East Side)

From the intersection of the north western kerb line of Robins Lane, heading in a north westerly direction to a point 10 meters north west of the intersection of the western kerb line of Boston Close.

Hardy Drive (South West Side)

From the intersection of the north western kerb line of Robins Lane, heading in a north westerly direction for a distance of 86.5 meters.

Robins Lane (North West Side)

From a point, 10 meters north east of the intersection of the north eastern kerb line of Hardy Drive, to a point 39m south west of the intersection of the south western kerb line of Hardy Drive.

Robins Lane (South East Side)

From a point, 18 meters north east of the intersection of the northern kerb line of Glenholme Road, to a point 23.5 meters south west of the intersection of the southern kerb line of Glenholme Road.

Glenholme Road (North Side)

From the intersection for the south east kerb line of Robin's Lane for a distance of 15 metres in a south easterly direction. The from a point, 26 meters south east of the intersection of the south east kerb line of Robins Lane, for a distance of 13 meters in a south easterly direction.

Glenholme Road (South Side)

From the intersection of the south eastern kerb line of Robins Lane, for a distance of 36.5 meters in an easterly then southernly direction.

Glenholme Road (South West Side)

From the intersection of the north western kerb line of Convamore Road, for a distance of 15 meters in a north westerly direction.

Convamore Road (North West Side)

From the intersection of the south western kerb line of Glenholme Road, for a distance of 13 meters in a south westerly direction.

