

STOCKPORT COUNCIL
EXECUTIVE REPORT – SUMMARY SHEET

Subject: Objection Report - Greenway Road & Surrounding Roads Traffic Regulation Order

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 on Greenway Road and surrounding roads in Heald Green.

Recommendation(s):

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

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

Communities & Transport Scrutiny Committee

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

Agenda Item 10: [Cheadle Area Committee 29 October 2024](#)

Contact person for accessing background papers and discussing the report

Officer: Diane Knight
diane.knight@stockport.gov.uk

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

Objection Report - Greenway Road & Surrounding Roads Traffic Regulation Order

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 an objection/s received to a proposed introduction 'No Waiting at Any Time' Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) restrictions on Greenway Road and surrounding roads in Heald Green.
- 1.2 To ensure that objections to the permanent Traffic Regulation Order are appropriately and efficiently considered.

2. INFORMATION AND ADVICE

- 2.1. In considering the objection the Area Committee should be mindful that unless otherwise authorised, the only right the general public has over the highway is a right of passage along it. The Authority has both a duty of care to ensure the safety of the travelling public and a duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to secure and facilitate the expeditious movement of traffic.

3. OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS

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

(i) Objection 1 reason:

The objector states:

They can only park in front of their property on the road as they do not have a front drive access. Although having a driveway at the back of the property they state it is not safe to park there due to it being obscured with no CCTV and the property has been targeted on numerous occasions.

Having spoken to other households on Bolshaw Road, there is a real concern that the restrictions will cause disruption for those directly in front of the houses, it will cause a spillover effect on the surrounding houses where people will park very close or in front of their drives.

It is unfair we are being punished 24/7 when bottlenecks and disruption is only happening on limited times during the week. As I have not seen a result of the survey I'm not convinced otherwise.

Objector also states that they are disappointed that despite raising suggestions during the consultation phase, no feedback was communicated and instead, jumped straight into the final proposal.

Response

Rule 243 of The Highway Code states: do not stop or park within 10 metres of a junction. These proposals support this same rule and will improve visibility for all highway users (motorists and pedestrians).

It is acknowledged that the introduction of double yellow lines may force motorists to seek alternative parking, however, the purpose of these proposals is to improve safety for all road users especially when negotiating the junctions.

As part of this scheme, Access Protection Markings were offered at a considerable reduced rate to all residents who have a vehicular dropped crossing. Whilst this marking has no legal standing, it will help highlight to motorists there is a vehicular dropped crossing access point and go some way to help ensuring motorists do not obstruct resident's driveway access.

The consultation letter delivered to residents did inform residents that due to the large number of responses expected, it would not be possible to provide individual responses. All comments made by residents following the consultation were carefully considered following which, a report drafted and submitted to the Cheadle Area Committee on 29th October 2024. This same report provided details of the consultation outcome including responses from residents together with the Councils response. The report is in the public domain and can be viewed via the website:

<https://democracy.stockport.gov.uk/ieListMeetings.aspx?Committeeld=149>

(ii) Objection 2 reason:

The objector states:

Greta Avenue needs to have double yellow lines all the way down one side because the pavement cannot be used due to motorists parking on both sides, all day every day. This parking behaviour poses accessibility problems for pedestrians, particularly those who are disabled and use assisted bikes/buggies.

Response

Initially, double yellow lines were proposed all the way down one side of Greta Avenue. However, following the consultation, several residents stated the problems are not 24/7 and that the proposals would, negatively impact them massively as they would restrict parking for the residents themselves and their visitors. Therefore, Council Officers carried out additional on-site observations where at which time, they noted vehicles were not always parked on both sides of Greta Avenue. Taking this into account and following discussion with the local ward councillors and to appease residents, it was agreed to reduce the proposed double yellow lines to 12 metres at both the junctions on Greta Avenue. Due to the highway layout, the Highway Code rule of 10 metres has been extended here to aid vehicle movement.

The Council acknowledges there is an increased demand for parking in the area due to the local amenities and will therefore, carry out a further review

once the proposed restrictions have been introduced. If at that same time further restrictions are deemed necessary, affected residents will be consulted with.

(iii) Objection 3 reason:

The objector states:

They object to double yellow lines around the junction of Bolshaw Road / Greta Avenue stating this will not help with the traffic flow on Bolshaw Road.

During the initial consultation, the objector states that they suggested double yellow lines along one side of Bolshaw Road (the farm side) where there are no properties and therefore, would not impact on residents. They stated that by adding double yellow lines on the junctions of Bolshaw Road (and adjacent roads) will only affect the residents and not improve the traffic flow.

Objector states that they have observed most of the traffic congestion occurs on Bolshaw Road near the junction of Wilmslow Road due to motorists parking their vehicles on both sides of the road. That not many park further down towards Nixons Farm therefore, if parking was restricted along one side of Bolshaw Road (from Wilmslow Road, alongside the farm to Bolshaw Farm Lane) this would help keep traffic flowing despite vehicles parked on the other side of the road. Objector states they have spoken to their neighbours who are supportive of their proposal and that their neighbours also object to double yellow lines on the junctions.

Objector requests consideration be given to introducing double yellow lines alongside the farm on Bolshaw Road instead of the junctions.

Response

Rule 243 of The Highway Code states: do not stop or park within 10 metres of a junction. These proposals support this same rule and will improve visibility for all highway users (motorists and pedestrians).

The request for double yellow lines to be introduced on Bolshaw Road along the farm side, close to the junction of Wilmslow Road has been noted and discussed with the local ward councillors following the consultation stage. However, due to time constraints, and to avoid further delays with the implementation of this scheme it has been agreed to progress the scheme as legally advertised. Once the new restrictions have had time to 'bed-in', officers will carry out a further review of the area and if further restrictions are deemed necessary, affected residents will be consulted with.

4. PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE ORDER

4.1. No amendments to those originally advertised as proposed.

5. FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

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

6. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1. 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.

7. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1. 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.

7.2. The Committee should make a decision in respect of the objection/s received so that the scheme can be progressed and the Traffic Regulation Order 'No Waiting at Any Times' restrictions introduced or abandoned.

8. ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

8.1. The alternative to the proposals laid out in this report is to continue with the current lack of restriction on the highway by not introducing the proposed traffic regulation orders.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1. It is recommended that:

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

9.3. the Area Committee accept the Traffic Regulation Order be made as originally advertised.

9.4. That the objectors are informed of the decision.

Background Papers

Agenda item 10: [Cheadle Area Committee 29 October 2024](#)

Anyone wishing further information please contact Mavua Maluasi by email on:
mavua.maluasi@stockport.gov.uk