

Report to: TRO Sub Committee, North Essex Parking Partnership

Date: 18th October 2012

Subject: TRO Objections

Author: Trevor Degville & Shane Taylor

Presented by: Trevor Degville & Shane Taylor

1. Introduction and Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This report concerns objections that have been received following the publication of notices of intention in the Colchester Borough.
- 1.2 Formal Consultation has taken place and details of the objections which have not been withdrawn are shown below.
- 1.3 Members are asked to decide whether to proceed to the making of the traffic regulation orders notwithstanding objections made following the statutory notification of the proposed traffic regulation order.

2. TRO Schemes

- 2.1 **Coventry Close** – No objections have been received.
- 2.2 **Dedham High Street** – No objections have been received
- 2.3 **Villa Road – Objection**

Objector A – Objects to the proposal as they feel that it is unnecessary and therefore a waste of public money at a time of severe financial restriction. The “school run” does cause some congestion and inconvenience but only for a short period of time in a working day. Objector A feels that this should be tolerated for the sake of responsible parents who wish to see their children safely to school. They should be encouraged to behave responsibly and not obstructed by overzealous application of parking restrictions. As for public safety aspect, the present situation has existed for many years without any serious incidents and objector A fails to see the necessity for any further action at this time

- ***NEPP Officer Response***

The restriction is a remedy to the inconvenience suffered by local residents during school collection and drop off times. Although the parking is for a short period of time, the planned restriction would only be in place for a similar period of time and is deemed an acceptable resolution in this case. The restriction will ensure that future safety at the site is promoted and the lack of accident incidents is preserved. It will also enable our enforcement officers to instigate immediate action to contravening motorists. We have received no further objections to this scheme and although there have been no significant safety issues reported, site visits conducted have illustrated the parking practices of parents and the perceived threat to pupil safety. The restriction will

ensure that future safety at the site is promoted and the lack of accident incidents is preserved.

2.4 Eudo Road – **Objection**

Objector B – Has relied on parking at Eudo Road since 1994 as Objector B has no off-street parking. If they were no longer able to park in Eudo Road they would have to consider having a dropped kerb installed and converting their front garden to a parking space, as is the case at numerous nearby properties.

- **NEPP Officer Response**

The parking restrictions are requested by the owner of the road to promote access and to regulate parking on the road by the facility users. The formal parking measures are seen as an alternative to the instigation of private enforcement of the road. There has never been a formal agreement in place with the owners to allow parking in the area.

2.5 Victoria Esplanade – **informal objection**

Objector C – has objected as they suggest that the extension of the parking restrictions will lead to people parking opposite their driveway causing access issues.

- **NEPP Officer Response**

The restriction has been funded by an internal department and the area chosen was done so due to complaints received locally. Objector C was invited to confirm their formal objection and no further correspondence has been received.

It is not considered that the road will be adversely affected by the introduction of further restrictions and access to the resident's property will still be available. It is considered that the obvious benefits of removing parking close to a blind bend, with the introduction of the planned restriction extension will outweigh the minor perceived inconvenience to the local resident.

3.0 Decision

<p>3.1 Members are asked to consider the Objections to the schemes outlined above.</p>

<p>Options available are to consider alternative schemes, to withdraw the scheme on the basis of the Objection or to progress with the schemes having dealt with the Objector's concerns.</p>

<p>3.2 Members are therefore asked to decide whether to progress with the schemes.</p>

3.3 Members are recommended to approve the progression of the schemes despite the formal objections that have been received, for the reasons given above.