## Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council

This matter is not a Key Decision within the Council's definition and has not been included in the relevant Forward Plan

Report of the Executive Director, Place

# <u>BLOEMFONTEIN STREET / BARNSLEY ROAD, CUDWORTH – PROPOSED WAITING</u> RESTRICTIONS

#### **Objection Report**

## 1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of this report is to consider the objections which have been received in respect of previously published proposals to implement a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce waiting restrictions on parts of Bloemfontein Street and Barnsley Road, Cudworth.
- 1.2 To seek approval to overrule the objections and implement the restrictions as originally advertised.

## 2. Recommendation

It is recommended that:

- 2.1 The objections received are overruled for the reasons set out in this report and the objectors are informed accordingly.
- 2.2 The Head of Highways and Engineering and The Executive Director of Core Services and Solicitor to the Council be authorised to make and implement the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) as originally published.

#### 3. Introduction/Background

- In December 2018 approval was given to publish traffic restrictions on parts of Bloemfontein Street and Barnsley Road, Cudworth. See officer delegated report attached at Appendix 1 and associated plan attached at Appendix 2.
- 3.2 The proposals were published in January 2019 and 3 objections were received. No objections have been withdrawn.
- 3.3 The objectors oppose the proposed TRO as they argue it will prevent them parking directly outside their property and one of the objectors also alleges that consultation was not carried correctly.

#### 4. Consideration of Objections

As a result of advertising the proposals there are 3 outstanding objections to consider. The main concerns raised are listed below along with the Head of Highways & Engineering's comments in response in **bold**.

(Location of Objector: Barnsley Road) The restrictions will prevent them and their partner from parking their vehicles outside their own property. The objector is disabled, has a blue badge and requires access to a vehicle as close as possible to their home and also cites security reasons due to antisocial behaviour. Asks for a residents' parking permit scheme and a reduction of the proposed lengths of restrictions. Also argues that the consultation process was not carried out as fully as it should have been i.e. letters should have been posted to each individual property affected.

Response: Explained the Council's minimum standard with regard to statutory consultation for TROs, i.e. posting notices on site and in the local press. No individual has any legal right to park on the highway outside their property and it cannot be considered as a facility. The only way any individual can guarantee parking space for their vehicle(s) is to accommodate them within the curtilage of their property. There is no onus on the Council to provide parking space on the highway. The proposed restrictions are for clear road safety reasons to prevent inconsiderate parking on the junction which obstructs visibility for drivers exiting Bloemfontein Street. There is provision under the blue badge scheme for the objector to park on the restrictions for up to 3 hours. There is also provision under the waiting restrictions for other vehicles to stop, load and unload passengers and luggage on condition that they move away as soon as these operations are completed. The Council currently has no funding for residents-only parking schemes. Advised to contact the Police Safer Neighbourhood Team (SNT) concerning anti-social behaviour in the area.

(Location of Objector: Barnsley Road) The restrictions will prevent the
objector and her partner from parking their vehicles outside their home,
which is required as access to space at the rear of their home is limited.
Asks for a residents' parking permit scheme.

Response: The proposals for Bloemfontein Street / Barnsley Road are to protect the junction from parked cars which obstruct visibility for drivers exiting Bloemfontein Street. On-street parking will still be possible on unrestricted carriageway between the waiting restrictions. No individual has any legal right to park on the highway outside their property and it cannot be considered as a facility. The only way any individual can guarantee a parking space for their vehicle(s).is to accommodate them within the curtilage of their property. The Council currently has no funding for residents-only parking schemes.

 (Location of Objector: Barnsley Road) The objection has been received from the owner and lessor of the affected property and their tenant, who occupies the flat upstairs. Staff and customers will not be able to park outside the property. Requests a resident's parking permit scheme or parking meters.

Response: The proposals for Bloemfontein Street / Barnsley Road are to protect the junction from parked cars which obstruct visibility for drivers exiting Bloemfontein Street and impede the free flow of traffic along Barnsley Road. No individual has any legal right to park on the public highway outside their property and it cannot be considered as a facility. The only way an individual can guarantee parking space for their vehicle(s) is to accommodate them within the curtilage of their property. The Council currently has no funding for residents-only

parking schemes. Installation costs and the risk of vandalism are the main barriers to the installation of new parking meters in isolated locations. The highway further along both Bloemfontein Street and Barnsley Road remains unrestricted.

#### 5. Proposal and Justification

It is proposed to implement the TRO as originally advertised as shown on the Plan at Appendix 2, comprising:-

 Introducing 'No Waiting At Any Time' restrictions on the junction of Bloemfontein Street with Barnsley Road. This will ensure the area is kept free from parked vehicles to protect sightlines for drivers exiting Bloemfontein Street and maintain the free flow of traffic along Barnsley Road. Loading and unloading are permitted at any time.

#### 6. Consideration of Alternative Proposals

- 6.1 Option 1 Overrule the objections and proceed with the proposals as shown in Appendix 2. This is the preferred option.
- 6.2 Option 2 Decline to introduce the proposals. This option is not recommended for the following reasons:
  - It will not prevent indiscriminate parking from occurring, which will continue to obstruct sightlines and affect road safety at the junction and may affect the free flow of traffic along Barnsley Road.

## 7. <u>Impact on Local People</u>

7.1 The proposals may affect a number of residents on Barnsley Road, who do not have off-street parking and 1 business whose customers may have to park a short distance away, rather than directly outside the premises. Parking space is available further along both roads where the highway remains unrestricted. Loading and unloading is still permitted at any time.

#### 8. Financial Implications

**8.1** The financial implications remain the same as previously reported (identified in Appendix 1).

#### 9. Legal Implications

- **9.1** The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 provides the appropriate powers for the Council to make the proposed TRO.
- 9.2 In determining the extents of the proposed restrictions, the Council has had due regard to the duty imposed on it to exercise the functions conferred on it by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 so as to secure the expeditious convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway (section 122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) and is satisfied the traffic restrictions proposed will achieve those objectives.

## 10. Consultations

10.1 No additional consultations are required, these having already been carried out at the publication stage.

## 11. Risk Management Issues

Risk	Mitigation/Outcome	Assessment
1. Challenge to the proposals because they infringe the Human Rights Act	It is not considered the proposals have any interference with convention rights. Any potential interference has to be balanced with the duty of the Council to provide a safe highway for people to use. The Executive Director of Core Services and Solicitor to the Council has developed a sequential test to consider the effects of the Human Rights Act which are followed.	Low
2. Legal challenge to the decision to make the TRO.	The procedure to be followed in the making of TRO's is prescribed by legislation which provides an opportunity to object to proposals which must be reported for consideration by Cabinet and there is an opportunity to challenge an order once it is made by way of application to the High Court on the grounds that the order is not within the statutory powers or that the prescribed procedures have not been correctly followed. Given that the procedures are set down and the Council follows the prescribed procedures the risk is minimal.	Low

## 12. Compatibility with European Convention on Human Rights

12. It is not considered the proposals have any potential interference with convention rights.

## 13. <u>List of Appendices</u>

- Appendix 1 Officer Delegated report dated 20<sup>th</sup> December 2018
- Appendix 2 Plan showing proposals for report dated 20<sup>th</sup> December, 2018

## 14. Background Papers

14.1 Highway Design file

Officer Contact: Liz Campbell Telephone No: 772091 Date: 12<sup>th</sup> March 2019