

STOCKPORT COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE REPORT – SUMMARY SHEET

Subject: Objection Report - Bloor Development (Foxcote Estate) - Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders/Moving Traffic Regulation Order(s).

Report to: (a) Cheadle Area Committee
2025

Date: Tuesday, 11 March

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 report the objections made in relation to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order No Waiting at Any Time and Moving Traffic Regulation Order(s) '20mph Zone' and 7.5t Weight Limit (Except for Access) and to seek approval for the introduction of the Traffic Regulation Order/Moving Traffic Regulation Order(s) as originally advertised.

Recommendation(s):

That the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) / Moving Traffic Regulation Order(s) be made as originally advertised.

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](#)

Item 8 [Agenda for Cheadle Area Committee on Tuesday, 29th October, 2024, 6.30 pm - Stockport Council](#)

Contact person for accessing
background papers and discussing the report

Officer: Zoe Allan / Nicola Ryan

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

Objection Report - Bloor Development (Foxcote Estate) - Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders

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 objections received to a proposed introduction of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) No Waiting at Any Time on Turnpike Crescent, a Moving Traffic Regulation Order(s) 20mph Zone and a 7.5t Weight Limit (Except for Access), on the Bloor Development (Foxcote Estate) in the Heald Green Ward.
- 1.2 To ensure that objections to the permanent Traffic Regulation Orders 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 Local Highway Authority has both a duty of care to ensure the safety of the travelling public and a duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to secure and facilitate the expeditious movement of traffic.

3. OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS

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

(i) **Objection to the introduction of a 7.5t Weight Limit (Except for Access)**

9 objections have been received from 8 separate households. Reasons detailed below:

Strongly disagree with the 7.5t limit and think this should be reduced to 3.5t to prevent HGV vehicles passing through and posing a risk to children and residents. There are many children playing on the estate and therefore, the weight limit should be 3.5t, the same as what it is on the nearby Queensway and Outwood Road.

Response:

The 3.5t weight limit (except for access) on the nearby Queensway and Outwood Road are historical and something we would be less likely to promote now as even the smaller delivery vehicles gross weight limit are likely to weigh more than 3.5t. Even medium sized electric Transit type vehicles will be over 3.5t. With the electrifying of vehicles, existing weight limit restrictions will likely be reviewed in the future and possibly changed to 7.5t.

(ii) Objection to the introduction of No Waiting at Any Time (Double Yellow Lines)

7 objections have been received from 6 households. Reasons details below:

Many of the residents, particularly of Turnpike Crescent neither knew nor agreed with the idea of these double yellow lines. The majority of residents being affected by these restrictions were not told about the link road and it failed to come up in searches.

The residents haven't asked for these restrictions, and it is being pushed by the developer and funded according to local council meetings. However, both deny where the funding is coming from which is non-transparent.

In no report or search was this TRO highlighted before the properties/plots were sold. The inability to park in front of one's own home will likely impact the desirability and future saleability of our property.

These restrictions are disproportionate as all other adjacent roads pose bigger traffic flow problems and do not have double yellow lines or 20mph narrower width. It just does not make sense to say *just because it is a new road, its funded to be double yellow lines on both sides.*

As there will be a 20mph speed limit in place, there is no real necessity to have double yellow lines throughout Turnpike Crescent.

The road hasn't even opened yet for it to be trialled or audited to see how it will function. Therefore, on what traffic advice have you got to evidence claims of it being a through road and cars would be parked to obstruct traffic in a 20mph? How many cars are parked overnight or in working hours?

Heald Green has a high rate of car related crime i.e. car theft and many residents have therefore installed CCTV cameras for safety and off-road parking will put our cars at vulnerability from CCTV cover as well as increased insurance premiums – we cannot see why we should be penalised for this.

Although there is driveway space, most of the houses are likely to have 2 cars or more and therefore, these restrictions will impact on future access to the property. 90% of the houses have a 'tandem' style driveway which makes it inconvenient at times to navigate.

There are only residential properties along the road, there are no outside influences such as shops or schools therefore, no outside traffic is likely to park on Turnpike Crescent.

Residents may have visitors who are disabled – these restrictions will impact on their parking and put them at a greater risk of injury for example caused by falls.

There is no designated parking for visitors (family/friends/cleaners/window cleaners and other service providers) and thus these restrictions will just shift the parking and congestion onto other adjacent roads.

I am not sure why the consideration of leaving the double yellow lines on the one side and leaving some gaps for residents parking (away from kerbsides etc.) wouldn't be considered on the north of Turnpike Crescent as it now has been on the south side following our objections.

Response:

The proposed double yellow lines have been documented throughout the planning process and the determination of applications for development on this site.

Double yellow lines are required here to manage the highway network, and to protect the signalised junction, the development's junctions and bends. Additionally, these proposals are in accordance with Rule 243 of The Highway Code which states:

- Do not stop or park within 10 metres of a junction
- Do not stop or park opposite a junction
- Do not stop or park on a bend
- Do not stop or park on the approach to a signalised junction

Turnpike Crescent is going to be a 'through road' and potentially a bus route and as such, it needs to be kept clear of parked vehicles. This has been evidenced in the Swept Path Drawing, No. D_5102_005 (P06), should vehicles be parked outside properties they would only leave room for one-way traffic along the spine road (Turnpike Crescent) therefore, hindering the movement of traffic.

As to the layout of the driveways, all properties have off road parking facilities by way of a garage and driveway and should therefore, be able to accommodate 3 parked vehicles.

To maximise the off-road parking provision available, we would encourage residents to use both their driveway and garage, if they do not already do so.

The Council as the Local Highway Authority has responsibility to manage the highway and ensure the safe passage of all road users. Potential fluctuations in the housing market are not a consideration in this. There is no legal right to park on a road, verge, or footway, however, this is generally accepted by the Highway Authority and the Police where there are no restrictions, and kerbside parking does not conflict with Highway Code rule 243.

Whilst the Council cannot comment on insurance premiums or crime rates, the Council can still advise that in accordance with GDPR, that, should residents have CCTV, this should only be directed within the areas of their own private boundary.

Whilst it is legal to capture public spaces like footways or streets, if it is unavoidable to protect their property, e.g. filming their driveway with a small portion of the street visible, the resident must ensure the CCTV coverage is minimal.

These proposals are mapped as a 'Con29' on the Councils mapping system and should therefore, appear in conveyancing searches.

This scheme is being wholly funded by the developer as part of the Section 38 Agreement under the Highways Act 1980.

In the outline planning application that was allowed on appeal and established the principle to build on the land, the Council has been clear and upfront from day one that there is potential for the development spine road to have a connection to the A34 and the consequent need for double yellow lines along the link.

The approved reserved matters planning application for phase 1 ref DC/78180 also clearly states that the road connection to the A34 is a possibility and that Stockport Council retained this right if they so wished to have a connection there. Turnpike Crescent will be a 'through road' and eventually link to the A34 (this is all in the public domain and available to solicitors when residents were going through the process of purchasing their property).

To address concerns raised by the residents and following the request made by Members during the Cheadle Area Committee on January 2024, Engineers within the Planning Department and Highway Design Team have reduced the extent of the proposed double yellow lines where it has been deemed safe to do so, as shown on Drawing No. D_5102_005 (P07).

It is acknowledged that these restrictions may mean motorists park on nearby roads that benefit from unrestricted parking, but as there are no outside influences, such as shops/businesses, we would not expect the impact to be problematic.

Unrestricted parking will remain in place nearby therefore, visitors, be this family/friends or service providers, will still be able to park. In accordance with the Blue Badge Scheme, Badge Holders may park on a double yellow line restriction for a maximum of 3 hours. There are no restrictions for loading proposed so deliveries should not be affected.

3.2 In addition to the objections received, the following question has been raised:

Question:

How is the 20mph speed limit to be policed, given that drivers regularly zoom along Wilmslow Road at speeds far in excess of the 30mph limit with impunity.

Response:

Contravention of a speed limit falls within the remit of the Police and should therefore, be reported to them for potential enforcement.

3.3 To confirm, no objections have been received in relation to the proposed 20mph zone.

4. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

5. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

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

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1. To comply with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders, Regulations 1996 the Authority must consider all objections submitted during the consultation period of at least 21 days before 'Making' a Traffic Regulation Order.
- 6.2. The Committee and Cabinet Member for Parks, Highways and Transport Services should make a decision in respect of the objections received so that the scheme can be progressed and the No Waiting at Any Time, the 20mph Zone and the 7.5t Weight Limit (Except for Access) restrictions are either introduced or abandoned.

7. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

- 7.1. The alternative to the proposals laid out in this report is to continue without restriction on the highway and not introducing the proposed traffic regulation orders.

8. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1. It is recommended that:
- 8.2. the Area Committee and Cabinet Member for Highways, Parks & Transport Services note all Traffic Regulation Orders where objections have been considered by officers;
- 8.3. the Area Committee and Cabinet Member for Highways, Parks & Transport Services accept the Traffic Regulation Order be made as originally advertised.
- 8.4. That the objectors are informed of the decision.

Background Papers

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

Item 8 [Agenda for Cheadle Area Committee on Tuesday, 29th October, 2024, 6.30 pm - Stockport Council](#)

Anyone wishing further information please contact Zoe Allan by emailing zoe.allan@stockport.gov.uk or Nicola Ryan by emailing nicola.ryan@stockport.gov.uk.

