

16 September 2020

Wards: Avenue

Pearson Park Proposed Additional Parking Restrictions – Objection Report

Report of the Assistant Director Major Projects & Infrastructure

This is a Non-Key Decision

1. Purpose of the Report and Summary

- 1.1 One objection has been received in response to the recently advertised proposals to introduce additional double yellow line, no waiting at any time, parking restrictions on parts of the Pearson Park perimeter road as shown in Appendix A (drawing No. TDT/1468).
- 1.2 This report seeks a decision from the Wyke Area Committee on how, in view of the objection, the scheme should be progressed.

2. Recommendations

- 2.1 Option 2 – implement the parking restrictions as originally advertised.

3. Reasons for Recommendations

- 3.1 This option would incur no additional cost and would fulfil the original objectives of the scheme; however, it would not satisfy the objector.
- 3.2 Implementing the scheme as originally advertised would ensure that the pedestrian crossing places are kept free of parked vehicles whilst still maintaining some parking close to the children's play areas, ice cream parlour and other facilities.

4. Impact on other Executive Committees (including Area Committees)

- 4.1 Implementing the restrictions should have a positive impact by promoting safe pedestrian movement, however, whichever option the Committee chooses there is a possibility that further representations could be received from local residents which may have to be brought to a future Wyke Area Committee.

5. Background

- 5.1 In October 2019 Major Projects and Infrastructure was commissioned by the Pearson Park working group to progress a scheme to introduce short lengths of double yellow lines adjacent to the pedestrian access and crossing places on the park perimeter road.
- 5.2 Subsequently the proposals as per Appendix A (drawing No. TDT/1468) were advertised to which one formal objection was received.

6. Issues for Consideration

- 6.1 The double yellow lines as proposed are exactly as agreed by the Pearson Park Trust and restoration working group.
- 6.2 The proposals seek to provide visibility at the pedestrian crossing places and access points and ensure that they are not obstructed by parked vehicles whilst at the same time maintaining some kerbside parking for users of the adjacent children’s play areas, ice cream parlour and other facilities.
- 6.3 One objection was received to the proposals and a précis of the points made by the objector and officer responses are reproduced in the table below:-

<u>Objector’s points</u>	<u>Officer response</u>
a) Considers that the proposed double yellow lines do not go far enough and should be continuous, on both sides of the road, for the full length of the perimeter road adjacent to the children’s play areas and ice cream parlour.	Longer lengths of double yellow lines can unfortunately lead to an increase in vehicle speeds which is highly undesirable in such a location. Continuous double yellow lines would also remove convenient parking facilities for users of the children’s play areas, ice cream parlour and other facilities.
b) Is concerned that ‘joy riders’ will try and cross the new bridge across the lake by accessing the approach ramp on the west side.	This issue is outside the scope of this report.
c) Believes that the perimeter road should be closed off to vehicles by the placing of barriers to the north and south of the children’s play area thus creating a pedestrianised area.	This issue is outside the scope of this report.

7. Options and Risk Assessment

- 7.1 Option 1 – do nothing. This would have no additional financial implications for the Council however it would not fulfil the original objectives of the scheme and nor would it satisfy the objector.
- 7.2 Option 2 – implement the scheme as originally advertised. This option would incur no additional cost and would fulfil the original objectives of the proposals, however, it would not satisfy the objector.
- 7.3 Option 3 – amend the existing scheme. Major Projects & Infrastructure would be happy to incorporate where possible any suggested amendments that the local members may have to enable the progression of a revised scheme although this could entail additional cost, require re-advertisement and may not address the original objectives of the scheme or satisfy the objector.

8. Risk Assessment

- 8.1 If measures are not taken to prevent parking adjacent to the pedestrian crossing places and access points there is a risk that parked vehicles will present both a physical obstruction to pedestrians and also restrict the visibility of motorists and pedestrians alike.

9. Consultation

- 9.1 The proposed Traffic Regulation Order as per Appendix A was advertised in the press on 15th January, 2020 and on street notices from 13th January to 31st January, 2020.
- 9.2 The City Council received one letter objecting to the proposals.

10. Comments of the Town Clerk (Monitoring Officer)

- 10.1 The Council has power under S. 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make the order as advertised, or with minor modifications. As noted in the report, most of the objection relates to matters outside the Order and confirmation is supported.

11. Comments of the Section 151 Officer

- 11.1 The Section 151 Officer notes the report and has no further comments.

12. Comments of HR City Manager and compliance with the Equality Duty

- 12.1 This is noted by the Assistant Director of HR and OD. There are no staffing or equality issues identified in this report. (SH)

13. Comments of Overview and Scrutiny

- 13.1 This decision has not been subject to pre-decision scrutiny. (Ref: Sc5626) (MK).

Gary Taylor – Assistant Director Major Projects & Infrastructure

Contact Officer: Tim Binnington Telephone No.: 614865

Officer Interests: None

Background Documents: - Original objection letter held on departmental files.

Implications Matrix

This section must be completed and you must ensure that you have fully considered all potential implications

This matrix provides a simple check list for the things you need to have considered within your report

If there are no implications please state

I have informed and sought advice from HR, Legal, Finance, Overview and Scrutiny and the Climate Change Advisor and any other key stakeholders i.e. Portfolio Holder, relevant Ward Members etc prior to submitting this report for official comments	Yes
I have considered whether this report requests a decision that is outside the Budget and Policy Framework approved by Council	Yes
Value for money considerations have been accounted for within the report	Yes
The report is approved by the relevant City Manager	Yes
I have included any procurement/commercial issues/implications within the report	No
I have considered the potential media interest in this report and liaised with the Media Team to ensure that they are briefed to respond to media interest.	No
I have included any equalities and diversity implications within the report and where necessary I have completed an Equalities Impact Assessment and the outcomes are included within the report	No
Any Health and Safety implications are included within the report	No
Any human rights implications are included within the report	No
I have included any community safety implications and paid regard to Section 17 of the Crime and Disorder Act within the report	No
I have liaised with the Climate Change Advisor and any environmental and climate change issues/sustainability implications are	No

included within the report	
I have included information about how this report contributes to the City Plan/ Area priorities within the report	No