

STOCKPORT COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE REPORT – SUMMARY SHEET

Subject: (RSAS) Ludworth Primary School - Objection Report

Report to: (a) Marple Area Committee

Date: Monday, 28 October 2024

Report of: (b) Joint report of the Director of Place Management and Assistant Director - Legal & Democratic Governance

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

Forward Plan General Exception Special Urgency (Tick box)

Summary:

To consider objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation orders presented for the Ludworth Primary School scheme.

Recommendation(s):

The Marple Area Committee is asked to recommend that the Cabinet Member for Parks, Highways and Transport Services approves the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Orders as originally advertised.

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

Communities & Transport Scrutiny Committee

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

There are none.

Contact person for accessing background papers and discussing the report

Officer: Zoe Allan
Tel: 0161 474 3138

'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.

(RSAS) Ludworth Primary School Objection Report

Joint report of the Director of Place Management and Assistant Director - Legal & Democratic Governance

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 This report is to advise committee members of the 7 objections received to a proposed introduction of restrictions on Lower Fold in the Marple South and High Lane 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.
- 2.2. As part of the approved planning application for the extension of Ludworth Primary School, which also included a new park and stride facility for parents located in Brabyns Park Car Park a review of existing parking was undertaken, including several site visits with a view to improving road safety and access in the area, whilst taking into consideration parking for residents.
- 2.3. Initial parking proposals were developed taking into account site observations and the likely effect of the School extension and this scheme was then subject to a consultation with residents and ward councillors.
- 2.4. An amended parking scheme taking into consideration the consultation as well as road safety and access in the area was developed and subsequently the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) required to introduce the waiting/loading restrictions was agreed by the Marple Area Committee on 24th January 2024 and then legally advertised between 24th July 2024 and 13th August 2024.

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:

The objector states: I would like to raise an objection to the proposed parking changes surrounding Lower Fold in Marple Bridge. I have lived at XX Lower Fold for over 23 years at no XX. There is already limited parking for the local residents and the proposal will make things worse. Off road parking is limited and not an option for myself. There seems to have been no consideration for

the local residents. I would like to suggest that some thought is given, and a residents parking permit should be considered.

Response

In answer to the points made by the objector: Traffic restrictions are already in place on Lower Fold due to it being a classified road therefore a main route through. At this location there will be no extension to these but an addition of No Loading restriction to help with enforcement for the 2 hours per day (weekdays only), to aim to keep these sections clear at drop off/pick up times. There is a small extension of junction protection markings at Waters Edge to compliment the Highway Code rule 243 which states 'Do not park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space'.

The current restriction and the proposed restriction will not affect any of the frontages. It is considered that the benefits to safety outweigh the minor impact of on-street car parking availability.

(ii) Objection 2 reason:

The objector states: As a resident of Lower Fold, Marple Bridge, I am writing concerning the proposed traffic regulations ZLA/3220 in my area. I object to them for the following reasons: The plans involve the reduction in the number of available parking spaces for local residents which are already insufficient. The objections raised some time ago about the increase in capacity at Ludworth School were ignored and now we have a marked increase in the congestion most notably at school drop off and pick up times. Parents currently ignore the existing road markings so adding more isn't going to make a difference to them, only to those of us who live here. It would be far more beneficial to arrange a drive through drop off point within the school grounds so as to take the problem off the roads. If there were alternative parking arrangements made for locals, I would not object but to further limit parking in an area which is already struggling to accommodate residents will not be beneficial to anyone.

Response

The Traffic Team Officers undertook many site visits as part of the development of this safety scheme and took all comments into consideration as part of the consultation and proposals put forward to help prevent congestion at drop off and pick up times, as the area would be restricted and therefore parents/carers would be required to park elsewhere away from the school and help to encourage other modes of getting to school, i.e. walking, cycling. The extension to the school was a separate consultation by our planning department and I understand 20 parking spaces were created in Brabyns Park for parents/carers to the school to try and prevent the congestion around the area.

The proposed parking restriction to those already in the area are again to help alleviate inconvenience to residents and give a safe passage to school for pedestrians, improve visibility and keep the areas clear for exiting junctions. Most of the new restrictions proposed are for 1 hour at the beginning and end of the school day. There have been some restrictions removed which compensate for the installation of another, i.e. Double White Lines.

It would not be feasible to have a drop off and pick up turning point within the school grounds, due to insufficient space as this would generate a lot of extra vehicle manoeuvres in and out of the grounds and the need for safe passage for children to the school.

(iii) Objection 3 reason:

The objector sent in two objections which states: As a resident of Lower fold, Marple Bridge, I am writing concerning the proposed traffic regulations ZLA/3220 in my area. I object to them for the following reasons: The plans involve the reduction in the number of available parking spaces for local residents which are already insufficient. The objections raised some time ago to the increase in capacity of Ludworth School were ignored and we now have a marked increase in congestion most notably at school drop off and pick up times. Parents currently ignore existing road markings so adding more is not going to make a difference to them, only those of us who live here and pay council tax. It would be far more beneficial to arrange a drive through drop off and pick up point within the school grounds so as to take the problem off the roads. If there were alternative parking arrangements made for locals I would not object but to further limit parking in an area which is already struggling to accommodate residents will not be beneficial to anyone.

Second objection: With regards to the proposed traffic regulations in my area, I would like to put forward an official objection to them due to the apparent lack of provision of alternative parking arrangements for local residents. I would be interested to know what has prompted these proposals as I am struggling to see how they would benefit anyone.

If I recall correctly, there were a number of concerns raised by local residents to the proposals to increase the capacity of Ludworth Primary School some time ago. The concerns were in relation to the obvious increase in traffic congestion it would cause to the area. These were ignored and the school was extended regardless, and the concerns raised beforehand have since been proven to be valid. We are now left with increased congestion in the area particularly at school drop off and pick up times.

Now, in addition to this, another layer of inconvenience and problems are proposed for local residents who, it would appear, have not been considered at all.

By implementing these traffic regulations, it is clear that the already difficult issue of lack of parking will become even further exacerbated. Removing the right to park on certain stretches of road, particularly on Lower Fold, will reduce the number of available parking spaces to residents who are already struggling to park their vehicles, therefore causing inconvenience (and potentially tensions) whilst people juggle for the few remaining spaces.

Requests in the past to convert front gardens on Lower Fold to parking spaces were rejected on the basis that the spaces would not be large enough, despite them being larger than many of those on Compstall Road so we are not able to create our own parking spaces, yet the council would like to remove some of the few which are available to us.

I would have no objection to these proposals if alternative parking spaces were made available to residents or some form of permit system were implemented. I would be grateful if you could confirm how local residents have been considered when putting together this proposal and what plans are in place to provide replacement parking for them.

Response

In answer to the points made by the objector; the extension to the school was a separate consultation by our planning department and I understand 20 parking spaces were created in Brabyns Park for parents/carers to the school.

There was a public consultation carried out in December 2022 for the safety scheme that was advertised on site recently, with letters posted and advertised on site, this was also available through our online consultation, which all comments were considered, and proposals put forward following this. A total of 69 letters were delivered and 17 on-street notices were placed on lighting columns in proximity to the proposed works. The letter and on-street notices provided a link to the 'have your say' webpage (www.stockport.gov.uk/haveyoursay) where information was posted about the proposed scheme along with a copy of the proposal drawings to enable residents to provide feedback online. Additional hard copies of the survey could have been requested by contacting tro.consult@stockport.gov.uk or calling the contact centre.

Following the consultation and consideration of comments proposals some changes were made and then put forward to the Area Committee for approval to take forward. The Area Committee approved the proposals, and these were then subsequently legally advertised recently on site for the Traffic Regulation Orders. The Traffic Regulation Order restrictions are proposed in order to improve the flow of traffic on Lower Fold and prevent vehicles blocking the road and visibility exiting junctions onto Lower Fold. It is considered that the benefits to safety outweigh the minor impact of on-street car parking availability. Albeit, the proposed extension of the double yellow lines on Lower Fold at the junction with Pear Tree that is proposed to be extended to allow safe passage, this is negated by the existing restriction of the double white line system being reduced to accommodate the same amount of parking for residents as the extension of the DYL, and even more so if you consider that you should also not park whereby it is a broken line, therefore that starts at number 46.

Currently, as per The Highway Code for the existing double white lining states 'No stopping on a road marked with double white lines, even when a broken white line is on your side of the road, except to pick up or set down passengers, or to load or unload goods'. Therefore, it currently prevents parking within the system from the boundary of the dropped crossing for number 44 onwards but with the new proposal it will be reduced to start from the dropped crossing at number 40, therefore creating at least 2 more parking spaces. The issue with removing the double white restriction further would be it will then be at the bend of the road thus restricting visibility.

There is parking provision at the Hogarth Road junction car park that may be used by residents, as parents would only accommodate anything spare here between the morning and afternoon. Staff may also use this, but only if free at the time of parking.

The current set up in certain sections of Lower Fold do not look to meet the criteria for permit parking, and the council may not approve to provide residents with permits that currently have their own parking within their property. The only residents permits that we offer are for 'residents parking

schemes' for which more information can be found here:

<https://www.stockport.gov.uk/parking-permits/new-scheme>.

If the criteria could be met, then a petition would need to be submitted by the majority of residents including signatures, after which a desk top study is conducted to advise councillors for a decision if they wanted to fund a scheme.

Any dropped crossing application on Lower Fold would be required to go through the planning department first, as this would be refused by the dropped crossing team as they would not be able to take forward until planning permission had been granted, due to being on a classified Road.

(iv) Objection 4 reason:

The objector states: please accept this e mail as an official objection to the proposed changes to parking restrictions as outlined in document ZLA/3220. I believe implementing the widespread ' no parking/ no waiting ' areas in the neighbourhood will not serve any worthwhile purpose and may actually make the situation worse. it is clear the pressure points for traffic congestion revolves around drop off and collection times for pupils at the local schools. I have lived on lower fold for over 25 years and see this on a daily basis. the recent expansion of Ludworth school has contributed greatly to the problem. however, no amount of lines and signs forbidding parking will reduce the amount of traffic. it will only lead to people arriving earlier to secure a spot or having to drive round the area in a frantic effort to find a parking space. or just ignore the restrictions totally, safe in the knowledge that they are unlikely to receive any penalty in the forthcoming winter months of bad weather, dark mornings and late afternoons the likely chaos is an accident waiting to happen meanwhile those of us who are residents and live in the smaller, older properties (without drives) on Lower Fold lose valuable parking spaces forever not just on school days, but every day. Where are we supposed to park? has no one thought a system such as ' waiting for 30 minutes unless permit holder ' would help? I would ask you to consider all possible alternatives to the blanket restrictions being proposed.

Response

In answer to the points made by the objector: The restrictions will not help those who want to come earlier as they will need to remove the car still before going into the school at those specified timings. Enforcement of the restriction will be requested as soon as the scheme is on the ground and will be re-visited as per the programme of enforcement, or requests made. Enforcement is all year round no matter the weather. There will be no loss of parking on Lower Fold near the traffic signals at the junction with Town Street up past the public house and stops before the terraced properties, as this is currently double white lines therefore you should not stop at this location. Double White lines are enforced by the police, and they have agreed for the removal and that the council installs the double yellow lines (No Waiting 'At Any Time) with No Loading (Mon – Fri, 7.00am – 9.30am and 3.30pm – 6.30pm), to be enforceable by the council enforcement teams. This is proposed with the aim to keep the area clear around the traffic signals approach and support a safer

passage through the town at peak times, encouraging more walking/cycling to school.

(v) Objection 5 reason:

The objector states: I live at XX Lower Fold Marple Bridge, parking is difficult most of the time and I am concerned about the lack of parking spaces as it is. The proposed legislation will make it virtually impossible to park near my home. I have lived here for over 25 years & don't feel that as a local resident we should be penalised due to the Ludworth School expansion. What plans are in place to protect the interest of local residents?

Response

In answer to the points made by the objector: There will be no loss of parking on Lower Fold where the objector lives and no changes to that section apart from addition of No Loading to the existing restrictions for 2 hours per day and a new restriction to be installed near the traffic signals from Town Street, albeit this is currently a double white line system therefore you should not park here. The new restriction of (No Waiting 'At Any Time') with No Loading (Mon – Fri, 7.00am – 9.30am and 3.30pm – 6.30pm) on the opposite side of the road, will then be enforceable by the council enforcement teams. This is proposed with the aim to keep the area clear up to the traffic signal to support a safer passage through the area at peak times.

(vi) Objection 6 reason:

The objector states: Having read the notice for plans ZLA/3220 I am writing to share the huge concerns I have as a local resident. I live at XX Lower Fold, Marple Bridge, SK6 5DU in a terraced cottage that has no driveway or designated parking space. I am a car owner. Myself and a few other neighbours who are in a similar position to mine (numbers XX Lower Fold) have to park on Waters Edge, or in the small car parks at the bottom of Hogarth Road. We have done this since purchasing our properties. I bought this property 2 years ago knowing that there are parking spaces literally a few metres away. So far this has worked out well. However, we are concerned that, with the proposed plans due to Ludworth Primary expansion, there will be fewer spaces available to us to park.

With the new proposed plans, it looks like there has been no consideration for residents without a driveway to park who live directly in the affected area. It will be a relentless daily battle to find a space if there are fewer of them. What are we supposed to do? Why have we not been considered? I fully agree that houses with driveways should use them to park their vehicles, but this surely is an unacceptable solution for those of us with no option? Parking options for local residents, like myself, are already very limited (and much more so during drop off and pick up times for Ludworth Primary school pupils) but we can't just be ignored and not taken into consideration? I hope you understand this.

As I mentioned previously, I not only represent XX Lower Fold but also neighbours living between XX Lower Fold, some of whom will also be objecting for similar reasons.

Can you please consider the difficulty this will bring and the huge problem it will cause us, if we don't have some kind of priority parking permit? Could Waters Edge and the small car parks at the bottom of Hogarth Road be for residents only? Albeit 1 vehicle per household for those of us affected negatively by these plans?

I wait to hear from you with your considerations towards this objection and hope you will make suitable arrangements for those of us in a similar position.

In anticipation of a positive outcome

Response

In answer to the points made by the objector: There will be no loss of parking on Lower Fold where the objector lives and there is currently no restriction at this section and none within the proposals. There are no changes opposite to that section apart from addition of No Loading to the existing restrictions for 2 hours per day. Restrictions on Waters Edge are not being changed or any addition to what is currently there apart from on Lower Fold for a 5m section to coincide with the Highway Code rule 243 which states 'Do not park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space'. Therefore, this will help to keep the junction clear and aid visibility.

The only residents permits that we offer are for 'residents parking schemes' for which more information can be found here:

<https://www.stockport.gov.uk/parking-permits/new-scheme>.

If the criteria could be met, then a petition would need to be submitted by the majority of residents including signatures, after which a desk top study is conducted to advise councillors for a decision if they wanted to fund a scheme.

(vii) Objection 7 reason:

The objector states: As a local resident without a drive who has lived on Lower Fold for over 25 years I would like to object to the above proposals for the following reasons

1. The removal of approximately 10 parking spaces from Lower Fold (6) and Hogarth Road (4) will make an already bad situation even worse as residents (and others) will be competing for the remaining (10) spaces on Waters Edge
2. Residents already have to compete with local businesses, visitors, commuters, and neighbours for the existing spaces.
3. The expansion of Ludworth School has increased the capacity from 323 pupils to 420 (for which I have no objection) other than the fact that there has been no regard to the negative impact on the traffic, parking, noise, and pollution this would cause. Expanding the school and removing parking spaces does not make any sense whatsoever.

4. The proposals will be a waste of money due to the fact that some parents dropping off & picking up children will just ignore the new restrictions as this has been proven by existing ineffective traffic measures.
5. The new proposals will therefore just add to the already chaotic system where parents will stop anywhere that's most convenient for them, creating risk of accidents etc. especially in the darker months.
6. Although 48% of local residents objected to the school expansion plans for the reasons above, they went ahead anyway, precipitating the need for these ineffectual measures now.
7. The existing parking provision is already inadequate for the number of people living, working in & visiting the area.
8. Local residents on Lower Fold have been refused planning permission to build drives either due to the area being a conservation area or for the reason that the spaces would be too small to accommodate a car.
9. I've based my objections on 25 years + experience of living on Lower Fold and the results of Stockport Council decisions impact on the local community, making a bad situation even worse.
10. All my objections were highlighted by myself and other residents during the consultation period for the school expansion REF: Ludworth School Expansion- Consultation Summary results from meeting 20.8.2019 Enc.2 Feedback Document item xx
11. Beleaguered residents are again at the mercy of School policy without a thought for the local community.
12. Please can someone develop a solution that works for ALL parties involved?

Response

In answer to the points made by the objector: the extension to the school was a separate consultation by our planning department with 20 parking spaces created in Brabyns Park for parents/carers to the school.

The Traffic Regulation Order restrictions are proposed in order to improve the flow of traffic on Lower Fold and prevent vehicles blocking the road and visibility for vehicles or pedestrian exiting or crossing junctions onto Lower Fold from Pear Tree Close and Waters Edge. It is considered that the benefits to safety outweigh the minor impact of on-street car parking availability. Albeit, the proposed extension of the double yellow lines on Lower Fold at the junction with Pear Tree Close is proposed to be extended to allow safe passage, this is negated by the existing restriction of the double white line system being reduced to accommodate the same amount of parking for residents as the extension of the DYL, and even more so if you consider The Highway Code for the existing double white lining which states 'No stopping on a road marked with double white lines, even when a broken white line is on your side of the road, except to pick up or set down passengers, or to load or unload goods'. Currently this prevents parking within the system from the boundary of the dropped crossing for number 44 onwards but with the new proposal it will be reduced to start from the dropped crossing at number 40, therefore creating at least 2 more parking spaces. It would not be feasible to remove the double white restriction further up as this would take it to the bend

of the road thus restricting visibility where cars would be passing parked vehicles towards the centre of the road.

There is some parking provision at the Hogarth Road junction car park that may be used by residents, as parents would only accommodate anything spare here between the mornings and afternoon. Staff may also use this, but only if free at the time of parking. Hogarth Road will lose 4 spaces but a couple of these should already be kept clear at the crossing point at the top of the footpath, it is just being formalised as a crossing point at this location to help keep the area clear. This area currently has cars pulled up directly beside this crossing point, which makes it difficult for drivers and pedestrians to have the required intervisibility to enable a safe crossing point.

Enforcement officers will be instructed as soon as any restriction are put in place to reinforce them and issue PCNs where required. We trust this will help to prevent the unwanted obstructive and any disregard for parking restrictions in the area.

The current set up in certain sections of Lower Fold do not look to meet the criteria for permit parking, and the council may not approve to provide residents with permits that currently have their own parking within their property. The only residents permits that we offer are for 'residents parking schemes' for which more information can be found here:

<https://www.stockport.gov.uk/parking-permits/new-scheme>. If the criteria could be met, then a petition would need to be submitted by the majority of residents including signatures, after which a desk top study is conducted advise councillors for a decision if they wanted to fund a scheme.

4. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 4.1. 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.

5. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 5.1. 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.
- 5.2. The Committee should make a decision in respect of the objection/s received so that the scheme can be progressed, and the proposed restrictions introduced or abandoned.

6. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 6.1. The alternatives to the proposals laid out within this report would significantly impact the delivery of the scheme and there is minimal loss of parking for members of the public.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

- 7.1. the Area Committee note all Traffic Regulation Orders where objections have been considered by officers;

7.2. the Cabinet Member for Parks, Highways and Transport Services approves the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Orders as originally advertised.

7.3. That the objectors are informed of the decision.

Background Papers

[Marple Area Committee - Wednesday, 24th January, 2024 6.00pm](#)

Anyone wishing further information please contact Zoe Allan on telephone number Tel: 161 474 3138 or by email on zoe.allan@stockport.gov.uk

Appendix A

REVOCATION OF EXISTING STATIC TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

There are some discrepancies between on-site measurements and the measurements within the Consolidation Orders. Where this is the case, the measurement within the Consolidation Order is to be used for all revocations.

Revocation of existing static Traffic Regulation Orders as referred to in Consolidation Order 2010 and the (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting) and (Revocation) Order 2014 (Grid Z23, Z24, AA23 & AA24), for the following locations:

Lower Fold, (Both sides), Waters Edge, (Both sides), Pear Tree Close, (Both sides), Hogarth Road, (Both sides), Bonington Rise, (Both sides), Lowry Drive, (Both sides), Constable Road, (Both sides), Cottam Crescent, (Both sides),

PROPOSED SCHEDULE

No Waiting 'At Any Time'

Lower Fold, (North-West side): From a point 11 metres south-west of its intersection with the south-western kerb line of Waters Edge, in a north-easterly direction to a point 10 metres north-east of its intersection with the north-eastern kerb line of Waters Edge.

Waters Edge, (South-West side): From its intersection with the north-western kerb line of Lower Fold, in a north-westerly direction for a distance of 38.5 metres.

Waters Edge, (North-East side): From its intersection with the north-western kerb line of Lower Fold, in a north-westerly direction for a distance of 8.5 metres.

Waters Edge, (South-East side): From a point 73 metres south-west of its intersection with the north-western kerb line of Lower Fold, in a south-westerly, then a north-westerly direction for a distance of 43.5 metres.

Waters Edge, (North-West side): From a point 53 metres west of its intersection with the north-western kerb line of Lower Fold, in a south-westerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.

Lower Fold, (North-West side): From a point 65 metres north-east of its intersection with the north-easterly kerb line of Waters Edge, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 37.5 metres.

Pear Tree Close, (Turning head): From a point 111 metres north-west of its intersection with the north-western kerb line of Lower Fold, in a south-easterly, north-easterly, then north-westerly direction for a distance of 22 metres.

Hogarth Road, (North-East side): From its intersection with the south-eastern kerb line of Lower Fold, in a south-easterly, then north-easterly direction for a distance of 70 metres to its intersection of the north-western kerb line of Bonington Rise.

Hogarth Road, (South-West side): From its intersection with the south-eastern kerb line of Lower Fold, in a south-easterly, north-easterly, then southerly direction for a distance of 119 metres.

Bonington Rise, (North-West side): From its intersection with the north-westerly kerb line of Hogarth Road, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 39 metres.

Bonington Rise, (South-East side): From its intersection with the north-easterly kerb line of Hogarth Road, in a north-easterly direction to a point 10 metres east of its intersection with the easterly kerb line of Sandby Drive.

Bonington Rise, (South side): From a point 10 metres west of its intersection with the western kerb line of Homer Drive, in an easterly direction to a point 10 metres east of its intersection with the eastern kerb line of Homer Drive.

Bonington Rise, (South side): From a point 10 metres West of its intersection with the Western kerb line of Raeburn Drive in an Easterly direction to a point 10 metres East of its intersection with the Eastern kerb line of Raeburn Drive.

Sandby Drive, (West side): From its intersection with the southerly kerb line of Bonington Rise, in a southerly direction for a distance of 2.5 metres.

Sandby Drive, (East side): From its intersection with the southerly kerb line of Bonington Rise, in a southerly direction for a distance of 3 metres.

Homer Drive, (West side): From its intersection with the southerly kerb line of Bonington Rise, in a southerly direction for a distance of 5.5 metres.

Homer Drive, (East side): From its intersection with the southerly kerb line of Bonington Rise, in a southerly direction for a distance of 5 metres.

Raeburn Drive, (Both sides): From its intersection with the southerly kerb line of Bonington Rise, in a southerly direction for a distance of 6.5 metres.

Hogarth Road, (East side): From its intersection with the south-eastern kerb line of Bonington Rise, in a south-easterly, then south-westerly direction for a distance of 48.5 metres.

Hogarth Road, (East side): From a point 14 metres north of its intersection with the north-western kerb line of Cottam Crescent to a point 10 metres south of its intersection with the south-eastern kerb line of Cottam Crescent.

Cottam Crescent, (Both sides): From its intersection with the eastern kerb line of Hogarth Road, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 15 metres.

No Stopping: Mon – Fri, 8:00 - 9:00am and 3:00 -4:00pm, On School Keep Clear Markings

Lower Fold, (North-West side): From a point 65.5 metres north-east of its intersection with the north-easterly kerb line of Waters Edge, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 37.56 metres.

No Waiting 'At Any Time' with No Loading: Mon – Fri 7:00 - 9:30am and 3:30 - 6:30pm

Lower Fold, (North-West side): From a point 5.5 metres north-east of its intersection with the projected north-eastern kerb line of Town Street, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 45.5 metres.

Lower Fold, (South-East side): From a point 11.5 metres north-east of its intersection with the north-eastern kerb line of Town, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 45 metres.

No Waiting 'At Any Time' with No Loading: Mon – Fri 8.15 - 9.15am and 2:45 - 3:45pm.

Lower Fold, (South-East side): From a point 6.5 metres north-east of its intersection with the north-eastern kerb line of Hogarth Road, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 36 metres.

Lower Fold, (North-West side): From its intersection with the north-eastern kerb line of Pear Tree Close, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 20.5 metres.

Hogarth Road, (East side): From a point 12.5 metres south of its intersection with the south-eastern kerb line of Constable Drive, in a northerly direction to a point 14 metres north of its intersection with the north-western kerb line of Constable Drive.

Constable Drive, (North-West side): From its intersection with the eastern kerb line of Hogarth Road, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 14.5 metres.

Constable Drive, (South-East side): From its intersection with the eastern kerb line of Hogarth Road, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 15 metres.

Hogarth Road, (West side): From a point 15 metres north of its intersection with the north-western kerb line of Lowry Drive to a point 13 metres south of its intersection with the south-eastern kerb line of Lowry Drive.

Lowry Drive, (South-East side): From its intersection with the western kerb line of Hogarth Road, in a south-westerly direction for a distance of 15 metres.

Lowry Drive, (East, South and West sides): From a point 45 metres south-west of its intersection with the western kerb line of Hogarth Road, in a southerly, westerly, then northerly direction (to cover cul-de-sac end of Lowry Drive), for a distance of 50 metres.

Lowry Drive, (North-West side): From its intersection with the western kerb line of Hogarth Road, in a south-westerly direction for a distance of 57 metres.

Pear Tree Close, (North-East and East sides): From its intersection with the north-western kerb line of Lower Fold, in a north-westerly, then northerly direction for a distance of 74 metres.

Pear Tree Close, (South-West, North-West and North-East sides): From its intersection with the north-western kerb line of Lower Fold, in a north-westerly, north-easterly, south-easterly, then north-easterly direction (to cover cul-de-sac end of Pear Tree Close) for a distance of 109 metres.

No Waiting & No Loading: Mon– Fri 8.15 - 9.15am and 2:45 - 3:45pm.

Lower Fold, (South-East side): From a point 42 metres north-east of its intersection with the projected north-eastern kerb line of Waters Edge, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 61 metres.

Lower Fold, (North-West side): From a point 41 metres north-east of its intersection with the north-eastern kerb line of Waters Edge, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 24 metres.

Pear Tree Close, (South-East side): From a point 74 metres north-west of its intersection with the north-western kerb line of Lower Fold, in a north-easterly direction for a distance of 26 metres.

Lowry Drive, (South-East side): From a point 15 metres south-west of its intersection with the western kerb line of Hogarth Road, in a south-westerly direction for a distance of 30 metres.

Hogarth Road, (East side): From a point 12.5 metres south of its intersection with the south-eastern kerb line of Constable Drive, in a south-easterly direction for a distance of 20.5 metres.