

STOCKPORT COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE REPORT – SUMMARY SHEET

Subject: Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders & Moving Traffic Regulation Orders on the Bloor Homes Development, Heald Green (Foxcote Estate)

Report to: (a) Cheadle Area Committee
2024

Date: Tuesday, 29 October

Report of: (b) Director of Place Management

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(s) as set out in **Appendix A** & Moving Traffic Regulation Order(s) as set out in **Appendix B**.

Recommendation(s):

The Director of Place Management requests that the Cheadle Area Committee consider and comment upon the following proposals and recommend that the Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport Services approves the Legal Advertising of the following Traffic Regulation Order(s) (TRO) set out in **Appendix A** and Moving Traffic Regulation Order(s) (MTRO) set out in **Appendix B**, and that subject to no objections being made within 21 days from the advertisement date, the order can be made.

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

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

Item 13 [Agenda for Cheadle Area Committee on Tuesday, 23rd January, 2024, 6.00 pm - Stockport Council](#)

Contact person for accessing
background papers and discussing the report

Officer: Nicola Ryan
nicola.ryan@stockport.gov.uk

‘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.

Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders & Moving Traffic Regulation Orders on the Bloor Homes Development, Heald Green (Foxcote Estate)

Report of the Director of Place Management

1. INTRODUCTION AND PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 To report the findings of a consultation exercise and to seek approval of a Traffic Regulation Order(s) (TRO) and Moving Traffic Regulation Order(s) (MTRO) as set out in the TRO Schedule in **Appendix A** and MTRO Schedule in **Appendix B**.

2. BACKGROUND

- 2.1. One of Stockport Council's aspirations is to make all residential areas within the Borough 20mph. Therefore, all new housing developments will be subject to these reduced speed limits.
- 2.2. Whilst Turnpike Crescent and the surrounding roads have not yet come into the Council's adopted highway, it has been agreed with the developer and local ward councillors to consult with residents on their views on taking such a scheme forward.
- 2.3. As part of the approved planning application DC/078180, proposals are to introduce a Moving Traffic Regulation Order (MTRO) - 20mph Zone and a 7.5t Weight Limit (Except for Access) together with a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) - No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines) on the Bloor Homes Development known as the Foxcote Estate in Heald Green.
- 2.4. Reserved matters permission for 'Phase 2' of the development (124 dwellings and open space) was granted on 11th January 2024. The developer is currently going through the condition discharge process before works can commence on site. Whilst there is no specific timeline for discharging all relevant conditions or when work may commence, it is likely to be early next year; application DC/84620 refers.
- 2.5. On 23rd January 2024, following a consultation with the then residents of the Foxcote Estate, a report was submitted to the Cheadle Area Committee outlining proposals to introduce both a 20mph Zone and No Waiting at Any Time restrictions on the estate. The report also detailed the outcome of the consultation that had taken place with residents. At that time, 100% support was received in relation to the proposed 20mph Zone, however, residents were not supportive of the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' Traffic Regulation Order(s). Following the comments made by residents, Members requested a re-evaluation of the proposals, specifically the extent of the proposed No Waiting at Any Time restrictions on Turnpike Crescent.
- 2.6. In considering the request to reduce the extent of the proposed double yellow lines, Network Management Officers and local ward councillors have held discussions with Engineers from both the Highway Design Team and the Planning Department.

- 2.7. Whilst reviewing these proposals, it has been noted that the proposed introduction of a 7.5t Weight Limit (Except for Access) MTRO was omitted from the original plans and consultation. Therefore, this element has now been included.
- 2.8. Turnpike Crescent has been evaluated to comply with current legislation and design standards. Whilst Turnpike Crescent is a residential area with property frontages fronting the road, it is also the 'spine road' of the estate. In addition to this, Turnpike Crescent is not a 'straight' road; within the highway design/layout there are sharp bends which reduce forward visibility. This has had to be considered when reviewing the extent of the proposed double yellow lines.
- 2.9. There is a new signalised junction that has been recently installed with signals installed on Turnpike Crescent. To ensure the signals function effectively, detector loops have been installed underneath the carriageway surface on the south side of Turnpike Crescent and extend to the east of Appletree Close. This means that should any vehicle be parked on this section of highway they would affect the functioning of the traffic signals. For this reason, it would not be deemed safe to reduce the double yellow lines on this part of Turnpike Crescent.
- 2.10. To enable parking on the north side of Turnpike Crescent, (between the junctions of Wilmslow Road and Hurlbote Lane) would likely hinder traffic movement, cause an obstruction and potential safety hazard. Should vehicles be parked here, they would force motorists into the designated right hand filter lane of the signalised junction and once the development is running at full capacity, vehicles parked here would highly impact on Wilmslow Road, as traffic wanting to turn into Turnpike Crescent would be prevented from doing so.
- 2.11. Officers have carried out on-site observations where at which time they have observed motorists turning into Turnpike Crescent from Wilmslow Road being forced into the right-hand filter lane due to parked vehicles and into the pathway of on-coming traffic.
- 2.12. A swept path has been carried out, the outcome of which has evidenced that should vehicles be parked outside properties this only leaves room for one way traffic, Drawing No. D_5102_006 (P06) refers. As the drawing demonstrates, motorists would therefore have to navigate between the parked vehicles to pass one another along the spine road (Turnpike Crescent). Additionally, parked vehicles would hinder services such as, but not limited to, refuse services, road sweepers and the emergency services.
- 2.13. It is noted that all properties have access to off road parking by way of both a driveway and garage. Some properties can accommodate up to 2-3 vehicles with others being able to accommodate up to 3-4 vehicles.
- 2.14. Consideration was given to downgrading some of the proposed double yellow lines to a single yellow line however, this would still hinder vehicle movement, including larger vehicles such as, but not limited to, refuse vehicles, delivery vehicles and emergency vehicles. Whilst it is not recommended to remove the proposed double yellow lines completely, the extent has been reduced where it is deemed safe to do so.

3. PROPOSALS

- 3.1. It is proposed to introduce a Moving Traffic Regulation Order(s) (MTRO) 20mph Zone and 7.5t Weight Limit (Except for Access) and a Traffic Regulation Order(s) 'No Waiting at Any Time'. These proposals are shown on **Drawing No. D_5102_005 (P07)**.

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. Consideration was given to downgrading some of the proposed double yellow lines to a single yellow line however, this would still hinder vehicle movement including larger vehicles such as, but not limited to refuse vehicles, deliveries, emergency vehicles. Whilst it is not recommended to remove the proposed double yellow lines completely, the extent has been reduced where it is deemed safe to do so.

6. CONSULTATION

- 6.1. The Local Ward Councillors have been consulted; meetings have taken place with Engineers and Officers from the Network Management Dept., Highway Design Dept., Planning Dept., and the Local Ward Councillors, during which, we have tried to take on board the concerns raised by residents. Whilst the proposed double yellow lines have been reduced where it is deemed safe to do so, the revised proposals have not been suggested or approved by the local ward councillors. The revised proposals are a product of re-evaluation in technical terms and therefore, there is no option to further reduce the double yellow lines. The council has to be led by the technical and legal constraints. So, whilst we have sought to respond to residents' concerns, we believe that the option presented is the only one that complies with the technical and legal requirements, we very strongly advise that local ward councillors approve it.
- 6.2. Greater Manchester Police have been consulted and no adverse comments were received.
- 6.3. Affected residents have been consulted with; on 23rd May a total of 149 no. consultation letters and accompanying plan, Drawing No. 5102_005 (P05), were hand posted to residents.

From a total of 149 no. letters, a total of 22 no. (15%) responses have been received.

- In relation to the proposed introduction of the No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow line) restrictions:
 - 9 no. responses (41%) received support the proposals.
 - 12 no. responses (54.5%) received do not support the proposals.

- 1 no. response (4.5%) received partially support the proposals.
- In relation to the proposed introduction of the 7.5t Weight Limit (Except for Access) restriction:
 - 20 no. responses (91%) received support the proposals.
 - 2 no. responses (9%) received do not support the proposals.
- Previously consulted on; proposals to introduce a 20mph Zone throughout the Bloor Homes Development, Heald Green known as the Foxcote Estate, received 100% support from the residents.
- Comments received from residents following the most recent consultation are detailed below together with comments from Traffic Services:

Comments Received from Residents	Traffic Services Comment
Will no parking lines (white lines) be introduced on adopted roads?	There are no plans to introduce Access Protection Markings within the remit of this scheme.
Are there measures being incorporated to prevent Turnpike Crescent becoming a rat-run for HGVs etc., or to prevent speeding from the A34?	There are proposals, which have been wholly supported by residents, to introduce a 20mph Zone throughout the whole estate. There are also proposals to introduce a 7.5t weight limit (except for access).
We don't want double yellow lines, these will prevent family/visitors such as friends, gardeners, carers and service deliveries, from parking on Turnpike Crescent.	Turnpike Crescent is the spine road of the estate which will eventually link to the A34 (details of which are in the public domain). Turnpike Crescent has sharp bends reducing forward visibility within its design. A swept path has been carried out, the outcome of which has evidenced that should vehicles be parked outside properties on Turnpike Crescent, this would only leave room for one way traffic. Vehicles would, therefore, have to navigate between the parked vehicles to pass one another along the spine road (Turnpike Crescent). It is noted that all properties have off-road parking by way of a driveway and garage. Some properties can accommodate up to 2-3 vehicles with others being able to accommodate up to 3-4 vehicles. If room is not available on a resident's driveway for their visitor(s), the visitor(s) will need to utilise the unrestricted nearby parking. Deliveries will not be affected by the introduction of double yellow lines as loading/unloading is permitted on them.
Bloor Homes sold houses saying that there would NOT be a through road. Properties were bought believing the development will be closed off and Turnpike Crescent would just be the road which loops round. The A34 MRN Project which had consultation in 2020 and which was subsequently approved, was done so before Bloor Home Development had any occupancy. This means the actual residents of the Foxcote Development who are directly affected by the spine road and the proposed TRO of double yellow lines were not consulted and have not been involved in what was wanted or needed, meaning that the initial consultation was not the true reflection of any consultation.	The approved planning application ref DC/78180 clearly states that the path connection to the A34 is a possibility for future development and that SMBC retained this right if they so wished to have a connection there. The A34 link, which is part of the A34MRN project came along, it had a community engagement exercise (consultation) in late 2020 prior to the Bloor Homes development having any occupancy. Turnpike Crescent is the 'spine road' of the estate and will eventually connect to the A34 Wilmslow Road. This is all in the public domain and should have been picked up by solicitors when they were carrying out their searches.
Please consider placing bollards at the pedestrian crossing point of the cycle/footpath of Arrowsmith Drive. This is because we have seen vehicles driving	It is proposed to install bollards at this location.

onto the cycle path which poses a danger to residents and pedestrians using the cycle/footpath.	
Can understand and agree to double yellow lines on the spine road, but not the rest of the development. It doesn't allow for flexibility for residents & visitors. Do not agree with the 7.5t weight limit restriction – this will limit delivery options for residents.	The double yellow lines are only proposed on the spine road (Turnpike Crescent) together with the junctions of Appletree Close, Hurlbote Lane, Dearden Crescent and Grimshaw Avenue, all of which run off Turnpike Crescent. The double yellow lines proposed on Appletree Close, Hurlbote Lane, Dearden Crescent and Grimshaw Avenue are 10 metres in length and complement Rule 243 of The Highway Code which states: DO NOT stop or park within 10 metres of a junction. The weight limit restriction will not prohibit any deliveries to residents whatsoever as it enables 'access'.
The residents of Turnpike Crescent are against the double yellow lines as shown by the results of the last proposed traffic regulation order where the majority said no to the lines, everyone agreed with the 20mph speed limit. Double yellow lines being on both sides is unfair. Even at the council meeting there were a lot of Foxcote residents there to voice out their concerns about the double yellow lines - please listen to our voices. There is narrow parking for 99% of the household. If any visitors come, they would need to park on the road and 2 parking areas per home is not enough. Some houses may need 3-4 people needing to drive for work.	The proposals have been reviewed, as requested by Area Committee on 24th January 2024. Since then, Engineers within the Planning Dept and Highway Design Team have reduced the extent of the proposed double yellow lines where it is deemed safe to do so; this is explained in the consultation letter dated 23rd May 2024 and accompanying plan delivered to residents. All properties have off road parking by way of a driveway and garage with some properties having off road parking availability for 2/3 vehicles and other properties 3/4 vehicles. A large amount of unrestricted highway will remain in place throughout the estate therefore, enabling visitors with the ability to park.
Property value will be lost if double yellow lines are introduced.	The Council as the Local Highway Authority cannot ignore its responsibilities to accommodate fluctuations in the housing market.
We strongly opposed the TRO of double yellow lines on the Turnpike Crescent Road. Though some properties have a driveway accommodating upto 3 cars, they are placed one behind the other and not side by side. The proposed TRO will not allow to get the cars off the drive.	The proposed double yellow lines will not prevent vehicles being moved for the purpose of allowing another vehicle to get off the driveway.
We oppose the TRO of double yellow lines as they will prevent deliveries.	Loading/Unloading is permitted on double yellow lines and therefore, these proposals will not prevent deliveries from being made.
Not all the roads of less than 6.75 metre in SMBC have double yellow lines.	The sizes of vehicles and legislation has changed over the years and therefore, we respond to new developments and areas which have road safety or traffic concerns. The council has a Traffic Management Quarterly Meeting where the emergency services, TfGM, bus service representatives attend and can raise concerns regarding any particular area within Stockport which they wish us to investigate. In addition to this, the Waste Department will request Network Management investigate a location(s) as and when they encounter accessibility problems. Residents can and do also request double yellow lines at locations throughout the borough due to various concerns, such as accessibility issues and safety concerns. As and when such requests are received, these are investigated. The progression of any such request is determined by the outcome of the investigations and discussions with the respective local councillors.
Removing the on-street parking could lead to increased traffic congestion, vehicles will be forced to circle the area in search of parking, contributing to	The proposals have been reviewed, as requested by Area Committee on 24th January 2024. Since then, Engineers within the Planning Dept and Highway Design Team have

<p>higher emissions and wasted fuel. Additionally, navigating around parked cars can create bottlenecks, particularly during peak hours, this could worsen traffic flow on Turnpike Crescent. Rather than imposing double yellow lines throughout, strategic placement of parking restrictions at critical points, such as junctions and bends could effectively address the issue without overly restricting parking along the entire road. Introducing measures such as single yellow lines that restrict parking during peak traffic hours could also be a viable alternative. Maintaining safety while allowing parking at less critical times. Given that the estate is still in development, it is premature to implement extensive parking restrictions without the input from future residents - a follow up consultation after more homes are occupied would provide a more accurate reflection of the community's need and preferences. This approach would ensure that the measures taken are supported by the majority of residents both current and future.</p>	<p>reduced the extent of the proposed double yellow lines where it is deemed safe to do so; this is explained in the consultation letter dated 23rd May 2024 and accompanying plan which was hand delivered to residents. Turnpike Crescent is the spine road of the estate which will eventually link to the A34. Turnpike Crescent has sharp bends reducing forward visibility within its design. A swept path has been carried out, the outcome of which has evidenced that should vehicles be parked on Turnpike Crescent, this would only leave room for one way traffic. Vehicles would, therefore, have to navigate between the parked vehicles to pass one another along the spine road (Turnpike Crescent) which would hinder larger vehicles, such as but not limited to refuse services, road sweepers and the emergency services. Other residents responding to this consultation have commented that vehicles already parking on Turnpike Crescent are causing obstructions and have raised concern that this will become more of an issue when the estate get busier and are therefore, welcoming these proposals. Additionally, Network Management officers have carried out on-site observations and have witnessed motorists turning into Turnpike Crescent from Wilmslow Road being forced into the right-hand filter lane. The proposed restrictions will show up when solicitors carry out their searches for prospective buyers; prospective buyers will therefore be in a position to make an informed choice as to whether to progress with the house purchase or not.</p>
<p>We completely refute double yellow lines on both sides of Turnpike Crescent. We find no benefit to having double yellow lines on both sides outside our home. Keep the proposals around bends and signal posting what we don't need or want is continuous double yellows on both sides all along the road.</p>	<p>The double yellow lines are not continuous on both sides of all along the road. The proposals have been reviewed, as requested by Area Committee on 24th January 2024. Since then, Engineers within the Planning Dept and Highway Design Team have reduced the extent of the proposed double yellow lines where it is deemed safe to do so; this is explained in the consultation letter dated 23rd May 2024 and accompanying plan which was hand posted to residents. Turnpike Crescent is the spine road of the estate which will eventually link to the A34. Turnpike Crescent has sharp bends reducing forward visibility within its design. Other residents responding to this consultation have commented that vehicles already parking on Turnpike Crescent are causing obstructions and have raised concern that this will become more of an issue when the estate get busier and are therefore, welcoming these proposals. Network Management officers have carried out on-site observations and have witnessed motorists turning into Turnpike Crescent from Wilmslow Road being forced into the right-hand filter lane and into the path of oncoming traffic due to vehicles having been parked on the north side of Turnpike Crescent. There is a new signalised junction that has been recently installed with signals installed on Turnpike Crescent at its junction with Wilmslow Road. To ensure the signals function effectively, detector loops have been installed underneath the carriageway surface on the south side of Turnpike Crescent and extend to the east of Appletree Close. This means that should any vehicle be parked on this section of highway they would affect the functioning of the traffic signals. For this reason, it would</p>

	not be deemed safe to reduce the double yellow lines on this part of Turnpike Crescent.
We refute the idea that you propose no double yellow lines would restrict access to emergency vehicles. If this is true, how come every road in Stockport doesn't have double yellow lines.	A swept path has been carried out, the outcome of which has evidenced that should vehicles be parked on Turnpike Crescent it would reduce the carriageway width, leaving room for only one way traffic. Motorists would, therefore, have to navigate between parked vehicles to pass one another along the spine road. Parked vehicles would therefore, hinder vehicles such as, but not limited to, refuse services, emergency services, road sweepers, delivery vehicles.
Adjacent and corresponding Queensway and Wilmslow Road do not have double yellow lines. How come?	The sizes of vehicles and legislation has changed over the years and therefore, we respond to new developments and areas which have road safety or traffic concerns. The council has a Traffic Management Quarterly Meeting where the emergency services, TfGM, bus service representatives attend and can raise concerns regarding any particular area within Stockport which they wish us to investigate. In addition to this, the Waste Department will request Network Management investigate a location(s) as and when they encounter accessibility problems. Residents can and do also request double yellow lines at locations throughout the borough due to various concerns, such as accessibility issues and safety concerns. As and when such requests are received, these are investigated. The progression of any such request is determined by the outcome of the investigations and discussions with the respective local councillors. In specific relation to Turnpike Crescent, Turnpike Crescent has been evaluated to comply with current legislation and design standards. Whilst Turnpike Crescent is a residential area with property frontages fronting the road, it is also the 'spine road' of the estate. In addition to this, Turnpike Crescent is not a 'straight' road; within the highway design/layout there are sharp bends which reduce forward visibility. This has had to be considered when reviewing the extent of the proposed double yellow lines.
There is a continuous emphasis on Turnpike Crescent being the spine road and there is already an enforcement of a 20mph speed limit for drivers not to carelessly or recklessly drive around the bends in this residential area, but I don't see any proposals in regard to highway safety for all road users and residents in terms of potential speed bumps or sharp bends signages approaching.	Currently, there is no Moving Traffic Regulation Order in place for the 20mph speed limit. Whilst there has been 100% support from residents consulted with, this scheme has yet to be legally advertised and the process completed in full. The bends act as a natural traffic calming features and therefore, speed bumps are not required. As Turpike Crescent is set to become a 20mph Zone signage for the sharp bends is not required.
Clarify where the funding for the road markings is coming from.	This scheme is being wholly funded by the developer as part of the S278.
Advise how we can challenge this outside emailing our grave concerns and objections to such draconian proposals? Once you have all responses, please keep me informed about Cheadle Area Committee agendas to discuss the amended proposals.	In line with procedure, due to the volume of responses the council receives during any consultation, it is not possible to provide residents with individual responses to their comments/questions. The consultation letter delivered to residents does advise this. Dates of upcoming Area Committee meetings can be found on the SMBC website together with details of the agenda and access to the report(s) – an officer has provided the resident with this information and has advised them how to raise questions

	should they so wish to do so, once they have read the contents of the report.
Last time many residents got given conflicting information as to when we had the right to speak out against these enforcements from 2020 rather than democratic discourse or process of what current residents feel would be safe, appropriate, and proportionate to the road.	The 2020 proposals referenced, relate to the A34 link, which is part of the A34MRN. This had a community engagement exercise (consultation) in late 2020 prior to Bloor Homes development having any occupancy. This is all in the public domain and should have been picked up by solicitors when they were carrying out their searches.
When purchasing our house, we were not aware nor informed of these proposals affecting those whom live on Turnpike Crescent restricting access.	50 letters were delivered during the initial consultation in July 2023, with these same letters being delivered to all properties which had been sold/were occupied at that time. The re-consultation has also included all residents who have taken up occupancy/bought a new home on the estate since the initial consultation, with 149 letters having been hand posted for the most recent consultation. Additionally, these proposals should be picked up by solicitors when carrying out the Con29 searches for prospective buyers.
Please consider whether No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow lines) is the way to prevent obstructions at Turnpike Crescent. Apart from the parking needs for local residents, there are further parking and loading/unloading needs for visitors, gardeners, house cleaners, goods deliveries etc., which the above needs should never be jeopardised. Thus, double yellow lines should never be applied in front of residential houses.	The proposals have been reviewed, as requested by Area Committee on 24th January 2024. Since then, Engineers within the Planning Dept and Highway Design Team have reduced the extent of the proposed double yellow lines where it is deemed safe to do so; this is explained in the consultation letter dated 23rd May 2024 hand delivered to residents. The double yellow lines will not prevent deliveries from taking place as loading/unloading is permitted on double yellow lines. There will be a large amount of unrestricted parking remaining in place throughout the estate therefore, if visitors to residents are unable to park on the driveway of the property they are visiting, they will be able to access unrestricted parking nearby.
Would Bloor Homes, Highways Team and Planning Department consider widening Turnpike Crescent and provide sufficient parking lots and loading/unloading bays before applying the waiting restrictions?	At a coordination meeting with Bloor Homes, Officers raised and both parties investigated the possibility of providing carriageway widening/lay-by formation on the outside of the first bend on Turnpike Crescent. It was concluded this would not be practical for reason of requiring road profiling design changes, significant changes to drainage infrastructure, street lighting design changes, increased maintenance costs and liability, potential impact on a sub-station, potential impact on a pedestrian link and a detrimental reduction in greenspace to be provided adjoining the road. There would also be a considerable cost implication and requirement to amend the planning permission which the developer does not wish to pursue.
We only partially agree to the TRO - NWAAT (double yellow lines). Whilst the explanation in response to previous objections, we still believe the requirement is being incorrectly framed & mis portrayed as it is in fact linked to the Eden Park Roundabout Link Road which Bloor declined to inform purchasers about. If this were not the case, we feel the extent of the double yellow lines could be reduced so as not to impact residents off Turnpike Crescent and cause visitors to park elsewhere.	The approved planning application ref DC/78180 clearly states that the path connection to the A34 is a possibility for future development and that SMBC retained this right if they so wished to have a connection there. The A34 link, which is part of the A34MRN project came along, it had a community engagement exercise (consultation) in late 2020 prior to the Bloor Homes development having any occupancy. Turnpike Crescent is the 'spine road' of the estate and will eventually connect to the A34 Wilmslow Road. This is all in the public domain and should have been picked up by solicitors when they were carrying out their searches. The proposals have been reviewed, as

	requested by Area Committee on 24th January 2024. Since then, Engineers within the Planning Dept and Highway Design Team have reduced the extent of the proposed double yellow lines where it is deemed safe to do so; this is explained in the consultation letter dated 23rd May 2024 hand posted to residents.
Partial yellow lines are fine where completely necessary, but parking is required for deliveries and guests. Our private road is narrow, if cars and vans park there, other houses will have issue. Totally against through road as this is not required. It will damage the green area.	The proposals have been reviewed, as requested by Area Committee on 24th January 2024. Since then, Engineers within the Planning Dept. and Highway Design Team have reduced the extent of the proposed double yellow lines where safe to do so; this is explained in the consultation letter dated 23rd May 2024 delivered to residents. The double yellow lines will not prevent deliveries from taking place as loading/unloading is permitted on double yellow lines. There will be a large amount of unrestricted parking that remains throughout the estate therefore, if visitors to residents are unable to park on the driveway of the property they are visiting, they will be able to access unrestricted parking a nearby. The approved planning application ref DC/78180 clearly states that the path connection to the A34 is a possibility for future development and that SMBC retained this right if they so wished to have a connection there. The A34 link, which is part of the A34MRN project came along, it had a community engagement exercise (consultation) in late 2020 prior to the Bloor Homes development having any occupancy. This is all in the public domain and should have been picked up by solicitors when they were carrying out their searches.
Totally agree with SMBCs proposals.	N/A
We find these proposals beneficial.	N/A
I think the provision of yellow lines and a 20mph speed limit is an excellent proposal. Not only to prevent speeding vehicles, but to make it safe for residents and children to cross the road as well as providing access for emergency vehicles. In addition, would it be possible to install signs at the beginning of the access road leading to nos. 1-7 and 9-15 indicating that access is only for those premises and for their parking if other residents start to park here it will impede access/egress of driveways.	The area of highway immediately outside nos. 1-7 and 9-15 are private driveways and will not be 'adopted' by the Council. Should other residents begin to park here, this would be a civil matter.
The proposals are very reasonable. Current parking along Turnpike Road is already causing obstructions to normal 2-way traffic. As the estate expands, the traffic issues can only get worse if parking is allowed.	N/A

7. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

7.1. This scheme is to be wholly funded by the developer as part of the S287.

8. TIMESCALES

8.1. 3-4 months, subject to objections. However, as members are aware, the development is still being constructed. Lining and Signing will be completed as and when construction is completed.

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 Director of Place Management requests that the Cheadle Area Committee consider and comment upon the following proposals and recommend that the Cabinet Member for Highways & Transport Services approves the Legal Advertising of the following Traffic Regulation Order(s) (TRO) set out in **Appendix A** and Moving Traffic Regulation Order(s) (MTRO) set out in **Appendix B**, and that subject to no objections being made within 21 days from the advertisement date, the order can be made.

Background Papers

Item 13 [Agenda for Cheadle Area Committee on Tuesday, 23rd January, 2024, 6.00 pm - Stockport Council](#)

Anyone wishing further information please contact Nicola Ryan by email on nicola.ryan@stockport.gov.uk

APPENDIX A

Proposed Traffic Regulation Order Schedule

No Waiting at Any Time

Turnpike Crescent, Heald Green (North Side)

From the intersection of the eastern kerb line of Wilmslow Road for a distance of 495 metres following the kerb line in an easterly, then south easterly, then southerly, then easterly, then north easterly direction.

Turnpike Crescent, Heald Green (South Side)

From the intersection of the eastern kerb line of Wilmslow Road for a distance of 186 metres following the kerb line in an easterly, then south easterly, then southerly direction.

From a point 21 metres northwest of the intersection of western kerb line of Dearden Avenue to a point 10 metres south east of the eastern kerb line of Dearden Avenue.

From a point 58 metres northeast of the intersection of eastern kerb line of Dearden Avenue for a distance of 158.5 metres in a north easterly direction following the kerb line.

Appletree Close, Heald Green (Both Sides)

From the intersection of the southern kerb line of Turnpike Crescent for a distance of 10 metres in a southerly direction.

Hurlbote Close, Heald Green (Both Sides)

From the intersection of the northern kerb line of Turnpike Crescent for a distance of 10 metres in a northerly direction.

Dearden Crescent, Heald Green (Both Sides)

From the intersection of the southwestern kerb line of Turnpike Crescent for a distance of 10 metres in a south westerly direction.

Grimshaw Avenue, Heald Green (Both Sides)

From the intersection of the southeastern kerb line of Turnpike Crescent for a distance of 10 metres in a south easterly direction.

APPENDIX B

Proposed Moving Traffic Regulation Order Schedule

20mph Zone

Ambrose Road (Turning Head - Both Directions)

West side of Hankinson Avenue, for its entire length

Arrowsmith Drive (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Bailey Place (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Hankinson Avenue (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Roscoe Close (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Tanyard Drive (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Beard Street (Turning Head - Both Directions)

For its entire length

Hurlbote Lane (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Turnpike Crescent (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Grimshaw Avenue (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Appletree Close (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Moore Road (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Chantler Close (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Featherstone Crescent (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Dearden Crescent (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Grimshaw Avenue (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Ratcliffe Avenue (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Lower Shut Road (Turning Head – Both Directions)

For its entire length

Walmsley Road (Both Directions)

West side of Ratcliffe Avenue only, for its entire length

Rough Hey Road (Both Directions)

East side of Ratcliffe Avenue only, for its entire length

Bennett Place (Both Directions)

For its entire length

7.5 Tonne Weight Limit (Except for Access)

Ambrose Road (Turning Head - Both Directions)

West side of Hankinson Avenue, for its entire length

Arrowsmith Drive (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Bailey Place (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Hankinson Avenue (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Roscoe Close (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Tanyard Drive (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Beard Street (Turning Head - Both Directions)

For its entire length

Hurlbote Lane (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Turnpike Crescent (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Grimshaw Avenue (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Appletree Close (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Moore Road (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Chantler Close (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Featherstone Crescent (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Dearden Crescent (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Grimshaw Avenue (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Ratcliffe Avenue (Both Directions)

For its entire length

Lower Shut Road (Turning Head – Both Directions)

For its entire length

Walmsley Road (Both Directions)

West side of Ratcliffe Avenue only, for its entire length

Rough Hey Road (Both Directions)

East side of Ratcliffe Avenue only, for its entire length

Bennett Place (Both Directions)

For its entire length