

CARLISLE HIGHWAYS & TRANSPORT WORKING GROUP
--

Meeting date: 12 April 2022

From: Executive Director – Economy & Infrastructure

WEST WALLS AND BLACKFRIARS STREET - TRAFFIC RESTRICTIONS

1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 1.1 *This report advises Members of the Carlisle and Transport Working Group (“the Working Group”) of the representations received in response to the statutory consultation and advertisement of the Orders referred to at paragraph 3.1 of this report proposing to introduce restrictions on West Walls and Blackfriars Street, Carlisle.*
- 1.2 *Copies of the 2 Notices which summarises the proposed restrictions are attached as Appendix 1.*
- 1.3 *Plans showing the proposed restrictions are attached as Appendix 2.*
- 1.4 *A summary of the representations which were received together with officer recommendations, is attached as Appendix 3.*
- 1.5 *Copies of the Council’s Statement of Reasons for proposing to make the West Walls Order and the Weight Limit Order, are attached as Appendix 4.*
- 1.6 *Copies of the amended West Walls One-Way plan and Blackfriars Street plan are attached as Appendix 5.*

2.0 STRATEGIC PLANNING AND EQUALITY IMPLICATIONS

- 2.1 *In considering any implications, members must consider if the proposals impact on the Council Plan, including supporting delivery of Community Strategy and Council Plan priorities, specifically*
 - *To safeguard children, and ensure that Cumbria is a great place to be a child and grow up*
 - *To enable communities to live safely and shape services locally*
 - *To provide safe and well-maintained roads and an effective transport network*
- 2.2 *An equality impact assessment has been undertaken for this scheme.*

3.0 RECOMMENDATION

3.1 *The Working Group is being asked to consider the representations which have been received to the statutory consultation and advertisement of: -*

(i) *The County of Cumbria (Various Roads, Carlisle Urban and Rural Area) (Consolidation and Minor Amendment of Traffic Regulations) (Order 2001) Variation Order (No. 63) 20>< (“the West Walls Order”);*

and recommend that Local Committee Agree to introduce the West Walls Order, as advertised, except with the following amendments: -

- *The One-Way Traffic proposal on West Walls be shortened to apply from Victoria Viaduct to Heads Lane only, as shown on the plan in Appendix 5;*
- *To omit the One-Way traffic restriction on Annetwell Street.*
- *The no loading and unloading restrictions on Blackfriars be shortened on the North Eastern side to run from Ferguson’s Lane to Highland Laddie Lane only, as shown on the plan in Appendix 5.*

(ii) *Agree that The County of Cumbria (West Walls, Carlisle) (Prohibition of Heavy Commercial Vehicles Over 7.5 Tonnes Maximum Gross Vehicle Weight) Order 20>< (“the Weight Limit Order”), be introduced as advertised but with exemptions included for vehicles being used,*

(a) for police, fire and ambulance purposes; or

(b) for the purpose of an undertaker in an emergency, such as the loss of supply of gas, electricity or water to premises in the area, which necessitates the bringing of vehicles into the section of road to which this Weight Limit Order applies; or

(c) in the service of a local authority in performance of statutory powers or duties; or

(d) for mechanical road cleansing and sweeping; or

(e) Anything done with the permission of or at the direction of a police constable in uniform.

4.0 BACKGROUND

4.1 Following the demolition of the former Central Plaza Hotel concerns were raised regarding the impact on the length of West Walls abutting the site and the highways stability and safety of the public.

4.2 An emergency Temporary Traffic Regulation Order (TTRO) was introduced which imposed one way traffic and a 7.5 tonne weight limit. The disabled parking bays were also suspended to allow traffic to travel further from the edge of the carriageway to reduce the impact.

- 4.3 The TTRO has been extended, with the approval of the Secretary of State to run until August 2022. There are discussions regarding the former Central Plaza site and the condition of the highway ongoing with the City Council, but these will not be resolved before the TTRO extension date expires. Therefore, a permanent TRO is required to be put in place to protect the stability of the highway and safety of the public.
- 4.4 The statutory consultation received 73 responses which are listed in Appendix 3. Most of the response were objecting to the proposed One-Way on West Walls. There was one response objecting to the proposed Blackfriars Street restrictions.
- 4.5 The objections to the One-Way on West Walls were regarding the length of the diversion for residents, access to garages and properties on West Walls which would be difficult in a certain direction due to the narrowness of West Walls. There were also concerns that a One-Way could increase vehicle speeds.
- 4.6 It is proposed that these objections could be resolved by limiting the extent of the One-Way to the southern end of West Walls only, to extend from Victoria Viaduct to Heads Lane. The remaining length of West Walls would revert back to two-way traffic flow. The signage of the TTRO has been insufficient and this has resulted in a number of vehicles already using West Walls in this manner and it seems to be operating well.
- 4.7 It is also recommended to omit and not proceed with the proposal to make Annetwell Street One-Way as this will not be necessary with two-way traffic on the northern end of West Walls and this will also allow access to Tullie House's service yard without large vehicles using Abbey Street.
- 4.8 There were also approximately 20 responses requesting that cyclists should be allowed to travel two-way along West Walls as making this One-Way only would make cycling journeys longer. It is considered that West Walls is more pleasant and less congested than cycling along alternative routes such as Lowther Street.
- 4.9 Officers consider that there is insufficient width to provide a dedicated contra flow cycle lane as parts of the southern end of West Walls are only 3m wide. A Road Safety Advice Note has been prepared on the proposal to allow two-way cycling which suggests it is not safe to provide two way cycling with the current road width and visibility. The barriers along the edge of the carriageway block the forward visibility of vehicles turning left into West Walls and they could collide with a cyclist approaching the junction. As this permanent One-Way is being brought in while the safety concerns are investigated and addressed it is hoped two way cycling may be provided when circumstances change.
- 4.10 The objection to the Blackfriars Street proposal was from a local business who load and unload on the double yellow lines, stating that it will increase the risk to employees if they load and unload from the loading bay on the opposite side of the carriageway instead. They request that the no loading and unloading restrictions only run from Ferguson's Lane to as far as Highland Laddie Lane on the North-East side of the street. It is possible if

these restrictions are reduced that blue badge parking will commence on the double yellows in the area with no loading restrictions. It is, however, proposed to shorten these restrictions to allow more loading and provide slightly more options for blue badge holders in the area.

- 4.11 There were a few requests for exemptions on the 7.5 t weight limit to allow for essential maintenance to be undertaken. It is proposed that exemptions are included for vehicles being used;
- (a) for police, fire and ambulance purposes; or
 - (b) for the purpose of an undertaker in an emergency, such as the loss of supply of gas, electricity or water to premises in the area, which necessitates the bringing of vehicles into the section of road to which this Weight Limit Order applies; or
 - (c) in the service of a local authority in performance of statutory powers or duties; or
 - (d) for mechanical road cleansing and sweeping; or
 - (e) Anything done with the permission of or at the direction of a police constable in uniform.
- 4.12 There were also comments regarding the loss of the disabled spaces at the north end of West Walls as these were used by church congregation members. Unfortunately, these cannot be operational at the current road width so need to be revoked as part of the West Walls Order at this time. The three disabled bays further along West Walls have remained and there are spaces at the southern end of English Street. There are no other streets nearer to provide additional disabled parking spaces. An equality impact assessment has been carried out to consider the issues the removal of these bays cause and the proposal to reduce the length of the no loading and unloading will offer blue badge holders slightly more options.

5.0 OPTIONS

5.1 The Working Group could suggest to Local Committee to:

- (i) Agree the Recommendations at paragraphs 3.1 (i) and (ii);
- (ii) Not Agree the Recommendations at paragraphs 3.1 (i) and (ii); or
- (iii) Agree the Recommendations at paragraphs 3.1 (i) and (ii) IN PART only.

6.0 RESOURCE AND VALUE FOR MONEY IMPLICATIONS

6.1 The estimated costs for implementation of the restrictions in this order are £1,500. The costs of implementation will be met from the Signs, Lines and TROs element of the 2022/23 Capital Devolved Budget.

7.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The County Council, as Traffic Authority, must take into consideration the matters contained in section 122(2) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (“the 1984 Act”) detailed below, in considering whether it is expedient to agree to the implementation of the Orders detailed in this Report. for the reason specified in the Statements of Reason attached as Appendix 4, namely: - (a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the roads or any other roads or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or
- (b) for preventing damage to the roads or to any building on or near the roads, or
 - (d) for preventing the use of the roads by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the roads or adjoining properties.
- 7.2 Under Section 122(2), the matters which must be taken into account in exercising that duty are: -
- (a) The desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
 - (b) the effect on amenities of an area;
 - (c) the national air quality strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995;
 - (d) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and
 - (e) any other matters appearing to the authority to be relevant.
- 7.3 Local Committees may, pursuant to Part 2D, paragraph 5.1.2 g) of the Constitution, approve the making of traffic regulation orders in accordance with powers under Parts I, II and IV of the Road Traffic Regulation act 1984, **except** for the making of Traffic Regulation Orders which involve the introduction for on-street residents permits, which are delegated to the Executive Director – Economy and Infrastructure subject to a decision of the appropriate member body to introduce such charges.

8.0 CONCLUSION

- 8.1 This report informs the Working Group of the responses to the statutory consultation on the West Walls Order and the Weight Limit Order.
- 8.2 In summary, the Recommendations are to shorten the proposed extent of the West Walls One-Way and no loading and unloading on Blackfriars Street, omit the Annetwell Street One-Way and implement the 7.5t weight limit with exemptions as set out in paragraph 4.1 and revoke the disabled bays as advertised.

Angela Jones
Executive Director – Economy and Infrastructure

28 March 2022

APPENDICES

- Appendix 1 – Legal Notices
Appendix 2 - Location Plans
Appendix 3 - Consultation responses
Appendix 4 - Statements of Reason
Appendix 5 - Plans to show the reduced One-Way for West Walls and no loading on Blackfriars Street

Electoral Division: Castle

Executive Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Key Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If a Key Decision, is the proposal published in the current Forward Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Is the decision exempt from call-in on grounds of urgency?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If exempt from call-in, has the agreement of the Chair of the relevant Overview and Scrutiny Committee been sought or obtained?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has this matter been considered by Overview and Scrutiny? If so, give details below.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has an environmental or sustainability impact assessment been undertaken?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has an equality impact assessment been undertaken?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

PREVIOUS RELEVANT COUNCIL OR EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

No previous relevant decisions.

CONSIDERATION BY OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY

Not considered by Overview and Scrutiny.

BACKGROUND PAPERS

No background papers.

REPORT AUTHOR

Contact: Abigail Dodds
Abigail.dodds@cumbria.gov.uk