

NORTHUMBERLAND

Northumberland County Council

RECORD OF DECISION TAKEN BY CORPORATE DIRECTOR OF LOCAL SERVICES

Corporate Director of Local Services - Barry Rowland

PROPOSED 'NO WAITING AT ANY TIME' RESTRICTIONS – ALBERT ROAD, COLLYWELL BAY ROAD & QUEENS ROAD – SEATON SLUICE

Purpose of report:

To consider introducing 'No Waiting at Any Time' Restrictions on Albert road, Collywell Bay Road and Queens Road in Seaton Sluice

Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Corporate Director of Local Services agrees the proposals set out in the report relating to;

1) The provision of 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions On Albert Road, Collywell Bay Road and Queens Road in Seaton Sluice

Key issues

- 1) Collywell Bay Road is situated on the coast of Seaton Sluice and is therefore a popular location for visitors to park
- 2) There is a lack of suitable parking surrounding the local convenience store on Albert Road
- 3) Vehicles are parked at the junction of Queens Road to use the local post office and pharmacy

Report Author Paul McKenna – Senior Transport Projects Engineer
(01670) 624129
Paul.McKenna@Northumberland.gov.uk

PROPOSED 'NO WAITING AT ANY TIME' RESTRICTIONS – ALBERT ROAD, COLLYWELL BAY ROAD & QUEENS ROAD – SEATON SLUICE

BACKGROUND

Introduction

- 1) Albert Road, Collywell Bay Road and Queen Street are predominantly residential in nature aside from a few notable businesses which include a coffee shop, a local convenience store, a post office and a pharmacy. Coincidentally, these businesses are all located on the corner of two adjoining streets and this has an impact on the standard of parking taking place.
- 2) Outside the local convenience store on Albert Road, Signal Controlled Crossings, bollards and guardrail have been provided to improve safety particularly for pedestrians. Aside from 'Advisory H bars' marked in front of driveways on Beresford Road there are no other formal restrictions to note.
- 3) After conducting a number of site visits which involved concerned residents and the Local Council Member who was in post at the time, proposals to introduce 'No Waiting at Any time' restrictions were formulated. With displacement of vehicles in mind, the intention is to protect junctions where visibility is of concern and to introduce passing places where suitable.

Consultation

- 4) 157 consultation letters were sent out to those affected and to associated statutory bodies. With 22 responding in favour and 16 against, a number of conflicting comments as to the extent of the problem were expressed. Most notably the businesses in particular strongly argued the detrimental effect the restrictions would have on their trade. Petitions were submitted with 88 signatures voting against the proposal and as a consequence a further public meeting took place on site. Residents expressed their unease at the potential knock on effect the restrictions would have, serving only to move the problem in front of their premises. Additional H bar markings were requested and can be accommodated, yet some residents felt these measures had limited or sporadic effect.
- 5) The length of the proposed 'No Waiting' restrictions on Collywell Bay Road was disputed. The level of parking on both sides reduces traffic to a single lane and visibility is impaired as the road bends. Some felt the restrictions should extend the entirety of the road down one side to allow two-way traffic. In doing so higher speeds and an increase on parking pressure in front of residential properties is anticipated. Coupling that with Residential Parking would then limit space for

visitors who would need some alternative form of parking such as a car park. Whilst acquiring land to construct a car park is possible, it is beyond the finances available at this time.

- 6) With the potential impact on businesses and knock on effect for residents in mind, it is accepted that the length of the restrictions particularly on Albert Road and Queens Road can be reduced without impinging on the initial safety concerns. These areas are shown on Appendix 3.
- 7) The Council has the power to hold a public inquiry before making a traffic regulation order. Such an inquiry might enable disputed evidence to be tested under cross-examination and the need for an order to be critically examined by an independent inspector. In this particular case, officers believe that the extensive consultation process and involvement with interested parties, means that such an inquiry is unlikely to bring any fresh information to light and it is therefore recommended that an inquiry is not held.

APPENDIX INDEX

Appendix 1 – Consultation Plan

Appendix 2 – Consultation Summary

Appendix 3 - Proposal

BACKGROUND PAPERS

File Ref: M/C/3/107/2

IMPLICATIONS ARISING OUT OF THE REPORT

Policy:	None
Finance and value for money	To be financed by the Members local Improvements Scheme Fund
Human Resources:	None
Property	None
Equalities	None
Risk Assessment	Residential and Business Use
Sustainability	None.
Crime & Disorder	None
Customer Considerations:	Motorists and residents will be required to comply with the restrictions imposed.
Consultation	Emergency Services, Road User Organisations, County Councillor for the area.
Wards	Hartley Ward

DECISION TAKEN

Title of Executive Member

Deidre Campbell – Policy Board Member,
Streetcare and Environment

Subject:

*PROPOSED 'NO WAITING AT ANY TIME'
RESTRICTIONS – ALBERT ROAD,
COLLYWELL BAY ROAD & QUEENS ROAD
– SEATON SLUICE*

Consultation

43 Responses
22 For
16 Against
5 Neither

Decision Taken:

*TO APPROVE THE PROPOSALS SET OUT
IN APPENDIX 3*

Signature of Corporate Director



Date

18/10/13.

Appendix 2 – Consultation Summary

FOR	AGAINST	NEITHER	APPENDIX 2 - CONSULTATION SUMMARY - COLLYWELLBAY ROAD - SEATON SLUICE
1			I agree with the county council about the parking problems in Queens Road and Albert Road but I think you should look again at the problems in Taylor Gardens. I no you have put seven car ports in Taylor Gardens and one in Albert Road before Christmas but I don't think it has helped one little bit I think one of your councillors should pay a visit one night and see the amount of cars that are parked there has been a few times when my family have come to visit and there is no way they can get onto my carport as there are so many cars parked at both sides of the road. There is one car which has been parked and never moved for over 7 months if it wasn't there you might be room for another 2 or 3 cars. I hope someone can come out and have a look sometime.
1			Further to our tel/con of 1/3/13. In general I support your proposals. No waiting at any time restrictions with the following modifications as listed on your plan. These modifications are as our original request and what was on our local petition that was raised on, the Collywell Bay area, that was from no. 12 to 33 Collywell Bay Road.
1			I am very pleased with all documents the only comment is that the double yellow lines on the Premier Store side of Albert Road towards the east is a little too long there must be enough area for cars visiting the Premier Store to park now that the opposite side is forbidden for parking.
		1	As a tenant of Albert Road I am concerned at the parking for customers to café and shop. Are we to have all this extra parking outside our homes. We already have parking problems the council give me a car stand which I am grateful for but will I get access to it. It has been known for Mrs Roma herself parking here when visiting the community centre as others do. I write on behalf of 3, 5, 7 & 9 Albert Road.
1			
	1		I am totally opposed to this proposal. Firstly we have an excellent corner shop on the corner of Albert Road and Beresford Road. This proposal would have a catastrophic effect on the trade of this shop as there would be nowhere near the shop for anyone to park and very many villagers use this shop. Secondly not being able to park on Beresford Road near Queens Road would cause problems for people using the chemist and post office (especially the elderly). Thirdly as for the parking of vehicles on Collywell Bay Road. These vehicles are mainly residents parking outside their own houses. Finally I don't think there is a problem with parking in Seaton Sluice, but there certainly will be if these proposals are carried out.
1			If this goes ahead I hope something will be done to stop people parking on the paths as this is happening more and more.
1			While broadly in favour of the proposals, the 'no vehicles except for access to premises' at the entrance to West Terrace needs to be enforced. Drivers currently ignore this sign to park in West Terrace and the open grassed area - dates and car registrations are available. Drivers are becoming increasingly abusive when the sign is drawn to their attention. Given that the new restrictions are likely to exacerbate the problem it may be prudent to erect a step over fence similar to that at the north end of West Terrace. In addition, if a contact could be provided to the residents of West Terrace this would enable us to report problems of people parking in the street.
1			
1	1		We agree with some of the plans but in my opinion it hasn't gone far enough. When the council came out to assess all the parking around Albert Road, Taylor Gardens and Collywell Bay Court & Road, there was only two councillors attended it was councillors Dungworths. I don't see how councillor Romer could be dealing with this situation as she was not attending at the time she didn't turn up till everyone was ready to leave to hear what all the residents had to say about the situation. We think that it should have carried on to leave no gaps. It is even very hard to get parked at your own door even with a disabled bay outside.
1			I agree with this proposal parking in this area is a problem and can be very dangerous for pedestrians and other vehicles.
1			Seaton Sluice community ass. White lines at junction of Collywell Bay Road & Collywell Ct? Well done!!
1			Proposals look fine to me, but road signs of 20mph are imperative if this is going to work. It was agreed on site visit by councillors and residents. We are expecting this to happen.

	1	<p>I am in receipt of a letter put through my door that is notifying me of plans to stop parking on Queens Road, Albert Road and Collywell Bay Road, Seaton Sluice. Apparently the council and councillor Romer have been working on a solution to various parking problems in these areas. Their answer is to put in place parking restrictions. These proposed restrictions will only compound and not alleviate the problems. I see from this correspondence that Taylor Gardens has been given no consideration in these plans. All that will happen is to push the vehicles into a road that is already suffering from a lack of parking places. This is due to councils stunning plan to provide their properties with driveways (to people without cars) which has reduced the number of road side parking spaces. Drivers should be well aware of their responsibilities to the Highway Code and not park on junctions; corners etc. However the reason that they do is to use the local facilities as there is no provision for safe parking areas for the public to use the corner shop, post office etc. Would it not therefore be prudent to make the roads wider; remove wasted cobbled / grassed areas to actually provide parking for the patrons of these businesses? If you do proceed with your plans I have no doubt that the local shops will close. I should imagine that the only people who are complaining about the traffic are those who use Albert Road as a cut through to enable them to avoid the speed camera at the top of the main road. Cars parked on Collywell Bay Road, reducing it to a single lane still makes it wider than Taylor Gardens. It is actually beneficial as this deters 'boy racers' from tearing up and down as care has to be taken when driving along it. There is no need whatsoever for the creation of 'passing places' just sensible driving.</p>
1		<p>I fully agree that parking in this area mentioned needs to be addressed - but would mention that the restrictions at Albert Road any overspill of transport etc would come to Boundary Way - which is the side of my home.</p>
	1	<p>I would inform you that as an emergency service we may be required to use the above road for access and egress in the event of being activated to attend an emergency call, or to convey patients to hospital for out-patient appointments. I would thank you for your consultation on this matter and offer our support for the on-going road safety programme.</p>
1		<p>We agree with the proposal 'no waiting at any time' restrictions. This will not only create passing places to allow the safe passage of traffic, but, will also allow you to pull out so you can see clearly onto a main road.</p>
1		<p>If parking is going to be restricted in Albert Road people will start parking across road in Boundary Way. Therefore restrictions should be set there as well.</p>
	1	<p>I understand the reasoning behind the proposals because I have seen for myself the problems arising from dangerous parking outside the chemist / post office. I live at no. 15 Beresford Road and have experienced difficulty because of parking outside of these premises I've mentioned, making it difficult to drive out of Queens Road onto Beresford Road. However, if these proposals are passed and put into force, I will not be able to park outside of my house. At the moment I park outside of my Queens Road window. I will be unable to use the main road either, so what am I to do? The 'even-side' of Beresford Road have been provided with parking spaces, would it not be possible for the 'odd-side' to have this facility?</p>
	1	<p>If a resident only scheme could be introduced I would be ok with that. I have a hard time parking outside my house due to post office and pharmacy staff and visitors.</p>
1		<p>Proposals should solve some of the problems, another big problem is speeding, and it was suggested road markings or signs of 20mph were put in place. Local councillors agreed on this, as did local residents. No such markings are on the road map! It is essential that this is put in place to have an overall effect, or it is half-cooked! Thank you.</p>
1		<p>The problem on Collywell Bay Road is that people who live near the pubs can not get parked because of people going to the pubs and club. Not using the car parks provided and parking outside the houses. Your proposal will make it worse why not instead of making passing places just put signs up making the housing side permit holders and the park side for visitors. The road is wide enough for this. Doing it your way will only add to the problems and it will be cheaper to put a few signs up rather than put in passing places.</p>
1	1	<p>There are two concerns about this proposal. 1, where will delivery vehicles for the premier shop, Albert Road park to pick up and drop off supplies? 2, parking on Beresford Road. I have an 'H' bar outside my drive, and still people park their cars. This will get worse and I wont be able to use my drive or park outside my house. We have two cars, which means my husband has to park outside our house. I think the other proposals are necessary.</p>
	1	<p>Wants DYL's outside window to prevent parking. Wanted specific bay for visitors but informed she cannot have that.</p>
1		<p>Yes I have very strong views on this proposal, being someone that lives in Queens Road and being a driver. I would say every time I leave my street I am restricted to how much I can see from the main road to either turn right or left because of parked cars on the road to the right. During opening hours of the chemist and post office it is worse where cars actually park on the corner of the street and one of the worst offenders is the delivery driver going to the post office, his vehicle always being a large van. I myself have experienced a near miss accident, but these people seem to have no consideration for the danger they create because of their lack of consideration so yes I support this decision / proposal. The thing is will they be prosecuted if they offend if this goes ahead?</p>

	1	I oppose the proposed restrictions to Collywell Bay Road. At present this is a very busy street with customers visiting castaways tea shop, community centre, nursery and general public - walking etc day trippers. I think if the parking is restricted, myself and other residents will have difficulty parking in the street due to visitors taking our spaces. This will cause aggravation and upset. The intended passing places will be an eyesore taking the look off the stone wall surrounding the memorial park.
1		
	1	I have lived in Collywell Bay Road for 20 years, I wasn't aware of a problem with the street. You will be causing problems when you start putting bays on the other side of the road, as the residents will find it difficult to get parked outside our front doors. I'm the owner of a blue badge plus I'm having two hip replacements March - May I need to park my car outside. As for Anita Romer she lives so far up the Street it wont affect her. I strongly disagree with the changes, use the council money on better things. Plus you are spoiling the street putting in parking bays disagree!!!
1		In connection to the above consultation. I believe the Premier food store have started a petition against the proposals Now these signatures are mostly by people that don't actually live around here and really don't care about the dangers and unsocial behaviour that occurs. The owners of the shop are entitled to their opinion like everybody else, but like everybody else, they only have ONE say. This petition is quite frankly, and in my opinion, irrelevant and mis-informative. I respect the owners concerns in this matter, but car owners that have signed this so-called petition (and some that probably have contributed to it) know nothing of the chaos that arises because of it, something must be done. I'm sure the right decision will prevail. Thank you.
1		Deliveries at boots / post office make the junction at Queens Road extremely unsafe for other drivers.
	1	This is stupid. Where do you expect cars to park? Why not provide additional parking first i.e. converting some of the green space in front of the Community Centre / Library. At the moment it is a bland looking dog toiler. Why not cut a section for parking off Collywell Bay Road into the green. Your proposal will not solve any perceived problem and is likely to make things worse as well as preventing persons parking outside their own houses and businesses!
	1	The council discussed this proposal last night at their meeting. They agree with your proposals except for the middle of Albert Road (opposite the convenience store) and suggest that only the 4 corners are marked in Albert Road (2 at Beresford Road and 2 at Taylor Gardens)
	1	Reducing parking on Collywell Bay Road will force people to park on nearby residential streets - such as West Terrace etc.
	1	We are in favour of any measures that would enhance the lives of the people in the community in the areas mentioned, but fail to see how the councils proposals will solve the parking problems. We agree with the passing plans for Collywell Bay Road may be a good way of solving the flow of traffic, but so may making the road one way only. Seaton Sluice is a popular destination for many people who wish to visit the Northumbrian coast all year round so maybe teh solution would be to create more dedicated parking areas rather than restrictive parking places as this will undoubtedly push the problem to other areas. Has any thought been given to the businesses in the proposal area? IN the current economic climate it is difficult enough for these businesses to survive. I'm sure the only general dealer in Seaton Sluice relies not only on the local community but also passing trade and requires parking spaces for this trade to briefly visit the shop. As for us, many of our customers are elderly and can not walk as far as they used to do, maybe a pick and drop zone may benefit our customers rather then restricting the parking. We are also concerned, if this proposal goes ahead, how do you propose to enforce it, more traffic wardens? Dishing out fines? Do you think this will make people want to visit Seaton Sluice or drive them away? How will that affect the businesses, public houses and clubs in teh area? I understand that there were fewer then 30 signatures for the proposal is that the majority of the community? Or are there other issues which, have not come to light yet. We hope this proposal is rejected and a more through out answer is found which will benefit not only the community of Seaton Sluice but also its visitors and businesses.
	1	I reside immediately opposite your parking restrictions proposal. I have canvassed the views of several neighbours all of who share my concerns and beliefs that if your proposals were to be enforced they will have a further adverse effect upon the residents. By reducing car parking on the eastern (shore line) elevation of Collywell Bay Road you will significantly add to the existing parking problem for local residents who currently find it difficult to park when returning home due to the high number of visitors to the area, especially during the spring and summer months. In essence I am strongly against the proposals unless you add some form of protection for residents e.g. free resident parking, residents parking badges or parking meters. Therefore I am seeking your support in that full consideration will be given to alternative means of meeting your desired traffic management outcomes and that local residents will be fully consulted with, and on an on-going basis before any final decision is made even if the decision is to do nothing.

	1	<p>This response addresses the issue of parking in, particularly, Collywell Bay Road. This proposal appears to be a massive over-reaction to a minor issue of parking in Seaton Sluice. Fundamentally the proposal should acknowledge that cars parking in Collywell Bay Road have to be divided into those belonging to residents (including their visitors, tradesmen etc) and day-trippers. Since the behaviour of neither of these categories is likely to reduce, the proposed enforcement of blanket restrictions will only affect residents adversely. Parking will, in effect, become available on a first-come-first-served basis. In fact, if there is a 'problem' at all at the moment, it is that on sunny days parking by day trippers can overwhelm parking availability. That being said, Seaton Sluice is a semi-rural location and will not benefit from the unnecessary over-administration of punitive parking restrictions. Furthermore, the proposal is inconsistent. If NCC is concerned about a 'single lane' on Collywell Bay Road, it should also address the same issue on the section of Albert Road leading off Collywell Bay Road, (in front of Collywell Court) which has the same double-parking issues and potentially has more safety issues with turning cars. We have lived on this Road for many years now and are not aware of any 'problem' with inconsiderate driving due to single lane issues. In practice, giving way to oncoming traffic is a rudimentary aspect of driving and is understood by drivers in general.</p>
	1	<p>What evidence is there to support this application? Do you have any data relating to an accident hotspot or police involvement?</p>
	1	<p>I cannot comment on Queens Road as I do not use that road. I decided to wait until after the bank holiday before responding. I do not believe that the proposals for Collywell Bay Road are necessary. I do not think that there are any real problems on Collywell Bay except for perhaps a couple of weekends in the year and even then they only occur for a couple of hours at lunch time and early afternoon. The creation of passing places I think will only make the situation worse by removing parking spaces. Collywell Bay Road is not a narrow road and people/drivers deal well with the slow flow of traffic on busy days. Permanent parking on Collywell Bay Road is mainly resident. Other parking is visitors which is only for 1-2 hours at a time. I believe there is a greater problem, on Albert Road, but again cars park only for minutes. I think if the 10 meters rule is unenforced this is all that will be necessary. People tend to be patient and courteous.</p>
1		<p>I would like to make the comment that enforcement of traffic regulations in the village needs to be stepped up. As an example, motorists frequently park in the bus stop on Beresford Road to visit the fish and chip shop. I recently observed two drivers do this, one behind and one in front of the bus. What ever is put in place will only work if a traffic enforcement officer regularly patrols the village. In the twenty years that I have lived in the village I have never seen one.</p>
	1	<p>I object to the placing of parking restrictions outside of my business. However I appreciate that the council has a responsibility to pedestrians and road users within the area and accept that parking restrictions should be used on the corners of Albert Road.</p>
		<p>As you are aware a meeting was held at my house on 4th April attended by several of my neighbours regarding the plans for yellow lines in and around Albert Road area. As no notes were taken of any ideas or suggestions put forward at the meeting I should like to do so in this letter so that a record is kept of what was discussed. Any yellow lines restrictions cars to park in Albert Road and Queens Road would overload and add to the parking problems already on Beresford Road which is already congested. All customers to the shop on the corner of Albert Road would no doubt park on the main road and please bear in mind there is a zebra crossing at the junction outside the shop. Residents only parking on Beresford Road was a suggestion and those at the meeting were prepared to pay the £15 fee. A Lay-by could be situated higher up past the crossing on the west side of Beresford Road. Another idea was to turn the grassed area on Albert Road adjacent to the side of the shop into a short term car park for customers. This could help any congestion on Beresford Road which as you know is a very busy main road through the village. I should be grateful if you would make a note of these comments for future reference and please let me know that you have done so. Incidentally it seems like the decision had been made without public consultation.</p>
22	16	5

Appendix 3 – Proposal

