

COUNTY COUNCIL LOCAL COMMITTEE FOR ALLERDALE	Paper No 7
Meeting date: 5 March 2009	
From: Cumbria Highways	

WORKINGTON TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER REVIEW

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 *This Report informs Members of progress on a review of possible changes to the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for Workington.*
- 1.2 *It describes the responses received to consultation with the public on resultant proposals in 4 of the 6 Electoral Divisions covered by the TRO. (Harrington Clifton & Stainburn, Moorclose, Moss Bay and Seaton)*
- 1.3 *Based on these responses, it recommends whether each of these proposals should be adopted or modified for inclusion in a new TRO, to be advertised, or whether they should be abandoned.*

2.0 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 2.1 *The proposals address the management of the existing highway infrastructure in line with the County Council's Local Transport Plan.*
- 2.2 *The proposals also contribute to Wealthier, Safer and Greener Council Plan themes.*
- 2.3 *There are no equality implications contained in this report.*

3 RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 *That Members note progress on the review of the Traffic Regulation Order for Workington*
- 3.2 *That Members authorise the advertising of a replacement Traffic Regulation Order for Workington to include the proposals as set out below:-*

- i. As proposed in the original consultation – Appendices A4, A5, B1, B3, B7, C1, C2, C3, C4, C5, D1, D3, D4, D5, D6, and (subject to Workington Town Council’s response) D7.*
- ii. As modified in response to consultation – Appendices A1, A2, A3, A6, B5, B6 and D2.*

3.3 ***That Members agree to abandon the consultation proposals set out in Appendices B2 and B4.***

4 BACKGROUND

- 4.1 Cumbria Highways carries out periodic reviews of all Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs). A comprehensive review of the Workington TRO began in January 2008. The review involves assessments of requests for changes from a variety of sources, including the Public, Elected Members, The Police, Allerdale Borough Council, and Town and Parish Councils, as well as issues identified by officers.
- 4.2 The Workington TRO covers six Electoral Divisions – Harrington Clifton & Stainburn, Moorclose, Moss Bay, Seaton, St. John’s and St. Michael’s.
- 4.3 The consultation exercise in Harrington, Moorclose, Moss Bay and Seaton is now complete and the Report deals with proposals for each of these Wards. Review work has started in St. John’s and St. Michael’s Wards, and progress on these will be reported at a later date. The recommendation is to advertise a TRO, now, for changes identified in the 4 Wards, with a further TRO for the two remaining Wards to follow as soon as practical.
- 4.4 In the 4 wards, 73 requests have been assessed. Cumbria Highways has consulted the public on 38 of these, (shown on the 25 maps in Appendices to this Report), while 4 have resulted in the instruction of white “H” keep clear markings, not requiring a TRO. The remainder were not considered to justify changes to the TRO, and those who requested these changes have been informed. The Review also includes the addition of bus stop clearways within the area (not requiring a TRO) and identification of any areas where Maintenance is required to existing signs and road markings. There are approximately 80 requests in the St John’s and St Michael’s Wards, of which almost half have been assessed to date.

Detail – Harrington, Clifton and Stainburn

- 4.5 There were 22 different requests for changes (including additions) to the TRO, at 16 different locations, in the Harrington Ward. In seven cases assessment showed that consultation on proposals was not justified. One request has resulted in a ‘KEEP CLEAR’ white line carriageway marking, not requiring a Traffic Regulation Order, being instructed.
- 4.6 The other 14 requests resulted in consultation with the public on proposals at 7 locations. The reasons for the proposal, a map showing the proposal, a map showing recommended changes (where appropriate) (Drawing

No.....Am1), and a summary of the consultation responses in each case, are included in Appendices A1 – 6.

4.7 The 7 locations are:-

- A1 A597, Church Road, Harrington;
- A2 C2062, Church Road, Harrington;
- A2 Eadie Street, Harrington;
- A3 Hunter's Bank / Clifton Lodge, Great Clifton;
- A4 the lane leading to Derwent Vale Junior School, Great Clifton
- A5 Stainburn Road / Curwendale, Stainburn, and
- A6 Derwent Meadows, Stainburn

4.8 With the exception of Church Road (C2062) and Eadie Street, Harrington, all the proposals are concerned solely with the possible introduction of waiting restrictions ('no waiting at any time') and the proposals, either as initially proposed (Appendix A.4 and A.5) or as modified following suggestions made in response to consultation (Appendix A.1, A.3 and A.6) are recommended to Members.

4.9 Traffic management issues on both Church Road (C2062) and Eadie Street, Harrington, have been the subject of much concern and discussion for some years. There is conflict between the interests of resident parking and through traffic, all exacerbated by the recent amalgamation of local schools to a single location at the top of Eadie Street. Rationalisation is needed. The original proposals for Eadie Street sought to remove the opportunity for dropping off schoolchildren by removal of daytime parking. Residents felt this was unacceptable, and alternative arrangements are proposed. "Residents Only" parking can only be used in exceptional cases, and can not be used simply to exclude other road users where this would be convenient for residents. In this case a "Residents Only" parking zone is proposed to exclude other drivers, for purely traffic management reasons, without penalising the residents. The proposals, as modified, particularly at Eadie Street, are shown/described on Drawing No.WTROR-HTN-P002 (Am1) (Appendix A2) and are recommended to Members.

Detail – Moorclose

4.10 There were 11 different requests for changes (including additions) to the TRO, at 11 different locations, in the Moorclose Ward. In three cases assessment showed that consultation on proposals was not justified. One request has resulted in a 'KEEP CLEAR' white line carriageway marking, not requiring a Traffic Regulation Order, being instructed.

4.11 The other 7 requests resulted in consultation with the public on proposals at 7 locations. The reasons for the proposal, a map showing the proposal, a map showing recommended changes (where appropriate) (Drawing No.....Am1), and a summary of the consultation responses in each case, are included in Appendices B1 – 7.

4.12 The 7 locations are:-

- B1 Alexander Close;
- B2 Elterwater Avenue;
- B3 Everest Mount;
- B4 Grasmere Avenue (One-way traffic);
- B5 Grasmere Avenue (Waiting restrictions);
- B6 Newlands Lane South/Westfield Drive/Glenn Road;
- B7 Ullswater Avenue.

4.13 The proposal at Grasmere Avenue is a possible extension of one-way traffic. All the remainder are concerned solely with the possible introduction of waiting restrictions ('no waiting at any time') except at Newlands Lane South/Westfield Drive/Glenn Road, which includes, in addition, the possible introduction of loading restrictions ('no loading at any time'). The proposals, either as initially proposed (Appendix B.1) or as modified following suggestions made in response to consultation (Appendix B.5 and B.6) are recommended to Members.

4.14 Having received 13 responses in connection with the Elterwater Road waiting restriction proposal, 10 of which were against the proposal, (Appendix B.2), it has been decided to recommend abandoning this proposal and to take no further action.

Everest Mount, Moorclose

4.15 Everest Mount (Appendix B.3) has longstanding problems of parking for residents, due largely to its 1950's layout. The road is narrow, (very narrow at each end) and has a central grassed area between the road and front gardens in the central section, which is being damaged by residents' vehicles. Approximately half of the houses are managed by Westfield Housing Association, with the remainder in private ownership. Members have previously allocated funds to assist with design (only) of a comprehensive solution.

4.16 Westfield Housing Association has taken the lead in promoting combined access/hardstanding, but has not been able to obtain universal support. Westfield HA has submitted a planning application to Allerdale Borough Council for a partial solution. There are technical problems with this proposal, which has been discussed at recent joint meetings.

4.17 The current traffic management proposal will be necessary if a comprehensive off-carriageway solution cannot be found. The proposal is opposed by residents, who have submitted a joint response, effectively a petition, confirming this. It is hoped that a solution will be found (providing access/off-carriageway parking) which would remove the need for double yellow lines. Pending such a solution it is necessary to continue to progress this traffic management solution.

Grasmere Avenue, Moorclose (One-way traffic)

- 4.18 At present, a normal two-way traffic flow operates on the first 65 metres of Grasmere Avenue from its junction with Westfield Drive. Thereafter, and all the way to the junction with Honister Drive, the direction of flow along Grasmere Avenue is one-way, northbound. Many years ago the entire length was one-way, northbound, but it was changed to two-way for the first 65m for ease of egress for elderly/disabled people, especially in an emergency, who live at the Moorclose Croft sheltered housing complex. This complex is doubling in size.
- 4.19 Four of the six respondents to the public consultation (Appendix B.4) strongly objected to the proposal to convert the initial length to one-way, for the original reason, and because of the expansion of the housing complex. It is recommended to abandon this proposal and to take no further action.

Ullswater Avenue, Moorclose

- 4.20 There has been a longstanding issue over parking of residents' vehicles on the footways of Ullswater Avenue, restricting the available footway width. The public were consulted over the installation of double yellow lines on one side of the road. (Appendix B7). Of 20 responses, 19 from residents and one from the Town Council, 19 were strongly against. However the other response raised legal issues, the implications of which Members must consider.
- 4.21 Ullswater Avenue is a narrow sub-urban residential road of 42 houses, forming an L shaped cul-de-sac, with the short end of the L closed off from Newlands Lane. Following an initial approach from a resident, the Police, in 2003, asked residents to park in their drives, or risk being prosecuted for obstruction of the footway. The Police then changed their view, indicating, in 2005, after advice from the Crown Prosecution Service, that they considered "it would not be in the public interest to prosecute any person for an obstruction [of the footway] on Ullswater Avenue".
- 4.22 The resident who initiated the complaint then turned to the County Council for a solution. Prevention of waiting on one side of Ullswater Avenue would allow waiting on the other side, and avoid the need for parking on the footway. Although waiting restrictions are not usually applied on residential roads, unless there is a problem with parking by non-residents (eg close to shops), or parked vehicles obstruct through vehicular traffic, Cumbria Highways agreed to include consultation on such a proposal in the TRO review. The Local Government Ombudsman, in 2007, accepted that any such "scheme would have to be assessed for practicality and subject to public consultation", and commented that "this was a fair and reasonable response from the Council", and "a fair way to settle [the] complaint".
- 4.23 Consultation responses confirm that many residents have more than one vehicle. The majority of residents consider that the current practice avoids inconvenience of manoeuvring in and out of drives to get second vehicles out, while cars parked fully on the road would make this manoeuvring difficult. Many state that the footways are not obstructed for wheelchair and

pram users, though this must inevitably happen at times. In similar circumstances the recommendation would normally be to abandon the proposals.

- 4.24 However the resident who initiated the proposal has sought comments on the County Council's powers and duties under the various Acts of Parliament. Legal advice is set out at Section 7. Cumbria Highways can only recommend continuation to formal advertising of the proposal. (Appendix B7)

Detail – Moss Bay and Salterbeck

- 4.25 There were 23 different requests for changes (including additions) to the TRO, at 20 different locations, in the Moss Bay Ward. In 15 cases (at 12 locations) assessment showed that consultation on proposals was not justified.
- 4.26 The other 8 requests resulted in consultation with the public on proposals at 7 locations. The reasons for the proposal, a map showing the proposal, a map showing recommended changes (where appropriate) (Drawing No.....Am1), and a summary of the consultation responses in each case, are included in Appendices C1 – 5.
- 4.27 The 7 locations are:-
- C1 Cross Street;
 - C1 Salisbury Street;
 - C1 Northcote Street;
 - C2 Derwent Road;
 - C3 Holden Road/Pearl Road/Moorclose Road;
 - C4 Mountain View, Salterbeck Road;
 - C5 Wether Riggs Road.
- 4.28 Cross Street and Salisbury Street. The proposal at both these streets is to reduce the length of the double yellow line carriageway markings ('no waiting at any time'), as shown on the drawing (Appendix C.1), in order to increase, albeit slightly, parking capacity, and to remove completely the loading restrictions, which are now considered to be unnecessary. There has been no response to the public consultation. Consequently, the proposal is recommended to Members.
- 4.29 Northcote Street. (also Appendix C.1) The proposal here is similar to that above at 4.28 but there are no loading restrictions. Again, there has been no response to the public consultation and the proposal, therefore, is recommended to Members.
- 4.30 Derwent Road. The proposal is to introduce waiting restrictions ('no waiting at any time'), as shown on the drawing (Appendix C.2), in order to improve road safety at the junction with Solway Road (A597) by ensuring unobstructed visibility and access to/egress from the minor road. There has been no response to the public consultation. However, Cumbria Highways

would like to modify the proposal by including waiting restrictions at the west side of Solway Road, as shown on Drawing No.WTROR-SBK-P005 (Am1) (Appendix C.2), so that drivers of any displaced vehicles are not encouraged to park on the main road. The proposal, as modified, is recommended to Members.

- 4.31 Holden Road/Pearl Road/Moorclose Road. Waiting restrictions ('no waiting at any time') and mandatory 'SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR' carriageway markings are proposed at this location. (Appendix C.3). Only two responses were received from the public – one supportive and the other neutral. The proposals are recommended to Members.
- 4.32 Mountain View, Salterbeck Road (Appendix C.4). The proposal is to remove the existing double yellow line carriageway markings ('no waiting at any time') from outside Mountain View. There are purpose-built parking bays immediately behind the markings (between the markings and the footway). Hence, all parking in the bays, in theory, is illegal. If parking in the bays is to continue, and there is no reason why it shouldn't, the markings must be removed. There was only one, supportive response to the public consultation. The proposal is recommended to Members.
- 4.33 Wether Riggs Road (Appendix C.5). The proposal is to introduce waiting restrictions ('no waiting at any time'), primarily at the junction with Salterbeck Road, in order to keep the junction clear of parked vehicles, but also further into Wether Riggs Road to ensure unobstructed passage to/from the mini roundabout junction with Walls Road. However, there has been some opposition to the proposal from the residents, mainly because parking availability is already at a premium. Investigation has shown that there is unlikely to be an affordable solution involving provision of alternative on street parking.

Detail – Seaton

- 4.34 There were 17 different requests for changes (including additions) to the TRO, at 16 different locations, in the Seaton Ward, together with one in St Michael's Ward, at nearby St Helen's Business Park, which was assessed at the same time. In 7 cases (at 6 locations) assessment showed that consultation on proposals was not justified. Two requests resulted in a 'KEEP CLEAR' white line carriageway marking, not requiring a Traffic Regulation Order, being instructed.
- 4.35 The other 9 requests resulted in consultation with the public on proposals at 7 locations. The reasons for the proposal, a map showing the proposal, a map showing recommended changes (where appropriate) (Drawing No.....Am1), and a summary of the consultation responses in each case, are included in Appendices D1 – 7.
- 4.36 The 7 locations are:
- D.1 Causeway Road;
 - D.2 Derwent Ridge;
 - D.3 High Seaton (Main Road);

- D.4 Ling Beck Park;
- D.5 Main Road/High Seaton/Fernleigh Drive/Hunter's Drive;
- D.6 Milburn Croft;
- D.7 St. Helen's Business Park.

- 4.37 The proposals at Derwent Ridge, Ling Beck Park, Main Road/High Seaton/Fernleigh Drive/Hunter's Drive and Milburn Croft are concerned solely with the possible introduction of waiting restrictions ('no waiting at any time') and the proposals, either as initially proposed (Appendix D.4, D.5 and D.6) or as modified following suggestions made in response to consultation (Appendix D.2) are recommended to Members.
- 4.38 Causeway Road (Appendix D.1). The proposal is to introduce a one-way traffic flow (south-eastbound – ie. running from Main Road to Church Road). The reason is to retain the current level of on-street parking whilst eliminating the possibility of any head-on conflict, particularly at the bend; also the possibility of conflict at the junction with Main Road. All re-routed traffic would then access Main Road via Church Road, which is very wide and could easily accommodate a slight increase in traffic. Visibility, in both directions, at the Church Road/Main Road junction is far greater than the visibility at the Causeway Road/Main Road junction – an added safety factor. Of the 12 responses to the public consultation, 7 were supportive/very supportive and only three people were against, one of whom felt that she would have to re-align her gateway and wondered if there would be any financial assistance from the County Council towards so doing (which would not be the case). Despite the 3 responses against (see Appendix D.1), the proposal is recommended to Members.
- 4.39 High Seaton (Main Road) (Appendix D.3). The proposal is to make the existing advisory 'SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR' carriageway markings mandatory. There have been 3 responses to the public consultation – all supportive. Consequently, the proposal is recommended to Members.
- 4.40 St. Helen's Business Park, St. Michael's Ward (Appendix D.7). This location was included in the Seaton section due to its proximity with Seaton. The proposal is to introduce waiting restrictions ('no waiting at any time') throughout the highway network on the estate; also to introduce a prohibition of all motor vehicles except for goods delivery vehicles on part of the estate. There is a problem of occupation of the estate roads by travellers. There has been only one response, from the Police, who are fully supportive. A response from Workington Town Council, which has only recently been consulted, is still awaited. The proposal is recommended to Members, subject to there being no objection from Workington Town Council.

5 OPTIONS

- 5.1 Members may decide to modify or reject any of the recommendations.

6 RESOURCE AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 Funding for works arising from the Workington TRO Review forms part of the provisional Annual Package of Measures (APM) budget for 2009/10.
- 6.2 There will be a small increased financial liability for maintenance of new traffic signs and road markings.

7 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 This report concerns Traffic Regulation Orders and the Committee should be mindful that the Council has a “discretionary” power to make a TRO, thus, so long as the Committee takes into account all relevant issues (which includes the views of consultees), the Committee can decide whether it should or should not make such an order.

In relation to Ullswater Avenue, Moorclose other powers and duties of the Council have been raised by a resident. The Council does have other powers and duties in relation to the obstruction of highways. These include powers under sections 130 and 137 of the Highways Act 1980 to bring legal proceedings. The issue of obstruction has already been considered by the Police as referred to earlier in this report.

8 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 A review of the Traffic Regulation Order for Workington has been carried out for four of the six Electoral Divisions.
- 8.2 The review led to the development of a number of potential traffic management measures, over which the public has been consulted, together with the assessment that some original requests could not be justified.
- 8.3 Based on an assessment of the response to the consultation, recommendations have been made to either progress, modify or abandon the consultation proposals.
- 8.4 Work will continue to complete the review in the two remaining Electoral Divisions in the centre of Workington.

Ed Noble and David Lancaster
Capita Symonds
19 February 2009

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A – HARRINGTON, GREAT CLIFTON AND STAINBURN

- A.1** A597, Church Road, Harrington
- A.2** Church Road/Eadie Street, Harrington
- A.3** Hunter's Bank/Clifton Lodge, Great Clifton
- A.4** Lane leading to Derwent Vale Junior School, Great Clifton
- A.5** Stainburn Road/Curwendale, Stainburn
- A.6** Derwent Meadows, Stainburn

APPENDIX B – MOORCLOSE

- B.1** Alexander Close
- B.2** Elterwater Avenue
- B.3** Everest Mount
- B.4** Grasmere Avenue (One-way)
- B.5** Grasmere Avenue (Waiting restrictions)
- B.6** Newlands Lane South/ Westfield Drive/Glenn Road
- B.7** Ullswater Avenue

APPENDIX C – MOSS BAY AND SALTERBECK

- C.1** Cross Street/Salisbury Street/Northcote Street
- C.2** Derwent Road/Solway Road (A597)
- C.3** Holden Road/Pearl Road/ Moorclose Road
- C.4** Mountain View, Salterbeck Road
- C.5** Wether Riggs Road

APPENDIX D – SEATON

- D.1** Causeway Road
- D.2** Derwent Ridge
- D.3** High Seaton
- D.4** Ling Beck Park
- D.5** Main Road / High Seaton / Fernleigh Drive / Hunter's Drive
- D.6** Milburn Croft
- D.7** St. Helen's Business Park (St Michael's Ward)

IMPLICATIONS

Electoral Division(s): Harrington Clifton & Stainburn, Moorclose, Moss Bay, Seaton, St Michael's and St John's

Executive Decision

Yes*	
------	--

Key Decision

	No*
--	-----

If a Key Decision, is the proposal published in the current Forward Plan?

		N/A*
--	--	------

Is the decision exempt from call-in on grounds of urgency?

	No*
--	-----

If exempt from call-in, has the agreement of the Chair of the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee been sought or obtained?

		N/A*
--	--	------

Has this matter been considered by Overview and Scrutiny?
If so, give details below.

	No*
--	-----

Has an environmental or sustainability impact assessment been undertaken?

	No*	
--	-----	--

Has an equality impact assessment been undertaken?

	No*	*
--	-----	---

N.B. If an executive decision is made, then a decision cannot be implemented until the expiry of the eighth working day after the date of the meeting – unless the decision is urgent and exempt from call-in and the Head of Member Services and Scrutiny has obtained the necessary approvals.

PREVIOUS RELEVANT COUNCIL OR EXECUTIVE DECISIONS ***[including Local Committees]***

No previous relevant decisions

CONSIDERATION BY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Not considered by Overview and Scrutiny.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

No background papers

Contact: Ed Noble
01946 506550
ed.noble@capita.co.uk