



Northumberland

County Council

RECORD OF DECISION TAKEN BY THE DIRECTOR OF ENVIRONMENT AND TRANSPORT

Paul Jones – Director of Environment and Transport

ADDENDUM

PROPOSED SHORT STAY TIME LIMIT, RIVERSIDE & PADGEPOOL PLACE CAR PARKS, WOOLER

Cabinet Member: Councillor John Riddle

Original Decision

To introduce short stay time limits (maximum stay 2 hours, no return within 3 hours), at Riverside and Padgepool Place car parks in Wooler.

Recommendations

It is now recommended that the proposed short stay time limits should be **maximum stay 3 hours, no return within 4 hours**.

Link to Corporate Plan

Living - "We want you to feel safe, healthy and cared for"
Enjoying - "We want you to love where you live"

Key Issues

- There has been an increase in visitor numbers in Wooler following the opening of the Ad Gefrin distillery and museum visitor attraction.
- This increase means that long stay parking reduces the availability of short stay parking to support the town centre.

Delegated decisions

Purpose of Addendum

1. Following the demolition of the former Wooler First School the County Council has made part of the site available for long stay parking and this has resulted in the opportunity to increase short stay parking to support the town centre.
2. The Council therefore consulted on a proposal to introduce short stay parking in the two existing long stay car parks at Padgepool Place and Riverside. The proposal was for a time limit of 3 hours.
3. At the time, the local ward Member and Wooler Parish Council supported the proposed short stay time limits but suggest that they should be 2 hours rather than 3, to bring them into line with the existing short stay parking in the town and to increase turnover. This was subsequently agreed.
4. Since then, however, feedback from the local Ward Member following observations of parking behaviour and the impact of the new Ad Gefrin visitor attraction is that the original proposal of a 3 hour maximum stay is considered more appropriate. This view has subsequently been endorsed by Wooler Parish Council.
5. It is therefore recommended that a 'maximum stay 3 hours (no return within 4 hours)' should be implemented in Padgepool Place and Riverside car parks.

Implications Arising out of the Report

Policy	The proposal is in accordance with relevant guidance.
Finance and value for money	The proposal will be funded via Regeneration funding allocated to Wooler.
Legal	Motorists will be required to comply with the Traffic Regulation Order.
Procurement	None
Human Resources	None
Property	None
Equalities (Impact Assessment attached) <input type="checkbox"/> N/A	None
Risk	None

Delegated decisions

Assessment	
Crime & Disorder	None
Customer Consideration	Statutory consultees have been consulted.
Carbon reduction	None
Wards	Wooler

Background papers:

File ref: CA220004

Record of Decision by the Director of Environment & Transport: Proposed Short Stay Time Limits, Riverside & Padgepool Place car parks, Wooler, 22nd June 2023

Report sign off.

Authors must ensure that relevant officers and members have agreed the content of the report:

	initials
Finance Officer	n/a
Monitoring Officer/Legal	n/a
Human Resources	n/a
Procurement	n/a
I.T.	n/a
Director	
Portfolio Holder(s)	

Author and Contact Details

Report Author ***Richard McKenzie – Senior Programmes Officer***

DECISION TAKEN

Title of Officer(s) and Portfolio Holder (where appropriate):

Paul Jones - Service Director - Local Services

Subject:

PROPOSED 'MAXIMUM STAY 3 HOURS, NO RETURN WITHIN 4 HOURS' RIVERSIDE and PADGEPOOL PLACE CAR PARKS, WOOLER.

Consultation

3 in favour

3 against

4 neutral

Decision Taken:

The proposed 3-hour time limit should be implemented.

Signature of Director



Date

24th April 2024

Delegated decisions

Appendix A

Padgepool Place Consultation Responses

F O R		A G A I N S T		N E U T R A L		Other Relevant Comments
				1		<p>I would inform you that as an Emergency Service we may be required to use the above road(s) 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.</p> <p>I would thank you for your consultation on this matter and offer our support for the on-going road safety programme.</p>
				1		<p>Councillor Mather has made us aware that the car park which is currently free, is being changed to 3 hour maximum stay. This will have an effect on the clinical staff working in Cheviot Primary Care Centre who need their vehicles parked at the centre for quick access when going out to calls and emergency visits. We have a very small private car park which has 4 parking places for the clinical staff. We currently have a minimum of 4 doctors on duty a day (5 on a Thursday), 4 district nurses, one podiatrist, one physiotherapist and the paramedics who are on duty 24/7. The doctors need access to their vehicles for going out on urgent visits. Having to run with full medical bay and the emergency bay to the new all day car park is out of the question. The district nurses similarly have heavy bags to carry to their patients as well as equipment and supplies for those patients. The other clinical members of the team mentioned here also have heavy bags and equipment to carry in and out. When the health centre was built in 2005, we were given special dispensation by the Council for the doctors and nurses to display " doctor/nurse on Call" notices in their cars when parked in the ambulance bay which is adjacent to the 3 disabled bays so that they would not get parking tickets. This works really well and, to get around the problem of making the car park a maximum of 3 hours, I am requesting that this special dispensation continues but to include the rest of the car park as long as they are displaying their "on call" stickers. Alternatively, and this proposal was discussed by our Patient Participation Group, is to move the disabled bays into the main car park and use the 3 current bays as surgery clinical staff only. This would give us 7 bays which, although not enough, would help considerably. This would obviously cause the council extra expense so having our special dispensation continued would bear no cost to the Council. Councillor Mather, when asked about this proposal, said we were classed as a business so are essentially not a special case. Yes we are essentially a business, NHS England paying business rates for the building, but we are providing an essential health care service for the population of Wooler and the huge surrounding area so I am requesting that the Council give consideration to our request.</p>
				1		<p>I write on behalf of the residents of Padgepool Place Wooler. I ask that you issue residents parking permits to the 10 domestic residences of Padgepool Place Wooler which will be adversely affected by the plans to introduce limited time parking in the car park. Currently, the residents of Padgepool Place park in the area out with the car park. If your proposed plan is implemented, the people who would normally park in the car park for extended periods will be looking to park in the spaces normally occupied by residents rather than walk the extra distance to the long stay car park in the School lane. The knock-on effect of this means that residents would then have to use the long stay park which is not at all practical for reasons of health, mobility and carrying shopping etc. The residents are mostly elderly and would find this impossible. There is also the question of tradesman's van needing to park when carrying out work to any of the properties. An effective compromise would be that residents are issued with permits to use the short stay car park and be exempt from charges.</p>
				1		<p>Following the meeting of the Parish Council on Monday, the council expressed their wish that this carpark be kept in line with the High St parking restrictions of 2 hours.If this is not possible, then a maximum stay of 3 hours should apply.</p>
1	1				2	

Delegated decisions

Appendix B

Riverside Car Park Consultation Responses

F O R	A G A I N S T	N E U T R A L	Other Relevant Comments
1			1. After many discussions with residents and local business I'd like to reduce the times to 2 hours, this will allow enough time to eat or shop but turn over the number of cars needed. 2.I think a Disabled bay at the other end of the car park will support access to the park and new shopping facility. 3.What speed with the car charger point be as if these are slow as the ones in Padgepool they will be a waste of spaces. Max 1or 2 and in the centre so prime spaces get the most use.
1			My concern is will it be policed or digitally monitored as nobody seems to take any notice of the double yellow lines in that area now and I do notice most days Ad gefrins own car park isn't full yet people still park over the road. It would be better if it was advertised maybe by road signs that there was parking on their site. Ad gefrin says it was only going to improve life for Wooler residents well it hasn't so far. Will this new car park stop overnight motorhomes.
1			I would like to enquire whether the proposal above will include charging for using the car park? As a local resident, supporting an elderly relative who has mobility issue and is registered blind, I regularly need to use a car to take that person shopping, or short trips out to support physical and mental health and to various health appointments around Wooler. There are many retired folks living in the town who need similar, easy, free car access to local services. If the car park is free to use there is not a problem and I welcome the addition of a new Budgens convenience store at that site as a competitor to the local Co-op, but if charges are introduced then it becomes an extra expense to local people who are already really struggling with cost of living increases in such a rural area. Will local residents be issued with free parking permits if parkin charges are introduced at the Riverside location or anywhere else in the town? Would Budgen have a separate car park and if so, would this be free to their customers?
1			Further to your plans to use the Riverside area as a new car parking facility, perhaps you could also then consider using more parking on the high street for disabled parking?
1			I feel that three hours parking is not good enough The Peth has recently lost parking due to yellow lines due to planning from the distillery I want to see more unlimited parking we're are people meant to park? I am against 3 hour limited parking the distillery has ample parking. Peth Head now does not have enough parking for residents or guests, this parking is now our nearest 24 hour guaranteed parking for our properties although it's still a few minutes' walk away.
1			I am writing from Carrs Billington In Wooler where the implementation of the proposed 3 hour time limit will have an impact on staff at our site. We are open 8am -5pm and for staff parking here this will obviously exceed the 3 hours limit. If this were to proceed we would need to have 4 permits exempting staff cars from the 3 hours limit.
2	2	2	