

# Portfolio Holder Decision – Warwick Variation 6 TRO

<b>Portfolio Holder</b>	<b>Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning</b>
<b>Date of decision</b>	<b>12 February 2021</b>
	<b>Signed</b> 

## Decision taken

Note. Following consideration by the Portfolio Holder changes have been made subsequent to the publication of the report on 4 February 2021. These changes relate to the Wedgenock Green Area of Warwick. (See recommendation 4 below and section 26 of the report).

Resolved:

That the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning approves that the proposed “The Warwickshire County Council (District of Warwick) (Permitted Parking Area and Special Parking Area) (Waiting Restrictions, On-Street Parking Places and Residents’ Parking) (Consolidation) (Variation 6) Order 2021” be implemented in part and as modified as follows:-

(i) The order title will be “The Warwickshire County Council (District of Warwick) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Waiting Restrictions, On-Street Parking Places and Residents’ Parking) (Consolidation) (Variation No. 6) Order 2021”;

(ii) The order to be varied is known as “The Warwickshire County Council (District of Warwick) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Waiting Restrictions, On-Street Parking Places and Residents’ Parking) (Consolidation) Order 2017”;

(iii) the proposals relating to the following locations shall be withdrawn from the order:-

- a) Chapel Street
- b) Clinton Lane
- c) Emscote Road
- d) Rugby Road.”

(iv) the proposals relating to the Wedgnock Green area are to be implemented in part. The double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) are to be implemented with a decision on the limited waiting restrictions to be deferred until after further consultation has been undertaken when the parking situation returns to a regime similar to that before COVID-19 restrictions.

## Reasons for decisions

Copies of plans detailing proposals for waiting restrictions can be found as Appendix B.

No objections were received to the following proposals:

1. Binswood Street
2. Birmingham Road

3. Broxell Close
4. Culworth Close
5. New Brook Street
6. Newbold Terrace
7. Percy Terrace
8. Tower Street
9. Upper Grove Street
10. Wise Street

Objections and comments were received to the following proposals:

1. Binswood Avenue
2. Castle Close
3. Chapel Street
4. Charter Approach
5. Clinton Lane
6. Cross Road
7. Emscote Road
8. Farley Street
9. Fernhill Drive
10. Gas Street
11. Greville Road
12. Heathcote Road
13. Kingsway
14. Montgomery Road
15. Myton Gardens
16. Newbold Terrace East
17. Old Milverton Road
18. Othello Avenue
19. Radford Road
20. Reeve Drive
21. Rugby Road
22. Spring Pool
23. St Micheals Road
24. Stratford Road
25. Trinity Street
26. Wedgnock Green
27. Wharf Street
28. William Street

The following tables detail the objections and comments received together with the officers' responses.

## 1. Binswood Avenue – Residents Parking bays

1.1. It is proposed to extend the existing limited waiting bays with L1 exemption on the south side of Binswood Avenue on to the north side outside 1-25 Binswood Avenue. This will preserve or improve the amenities of the local area through which the road runs.

1.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	2
Total comments	5

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	No problem with additional parking bays being marked on the north side of Binswood Avenue. It will probably help avoid confusion which would-be parkers suffer from at the moment as the parking regulations are different on each side of the road.	1
B	it would be better to leave the yellow lines at the end of the cul de sac so that people who have driven to the end of the road, expecting a way through, are able to turn round safely and easily. There is already very little space for them to do so.	1
C	Thank you for notice of changes to parking in Binswood Avenue. We live at 16 Newbold Court and will obviously be affected by these changes and look forward to your confirmation that we will be issued with a residents parking permit	1
D	Visitors to the properties along this street often struggle to find parking slots because of visitors/commuters to Leamington Town Centre.	1
E	extended bays would narrow the street, which would make it more dangerous for daily school use	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	Supports proposals
B	It is thought that the space left for turning would be used for parking. Binswood Avenue is signed as No Through Road so road users should not expect a way through. Vacant parking spaces may be used to turn vehicles around.
C	No objection. Parking permits are available on request in the normal way via the Council's website.
D	All visitors would be subject to a 2-hour limit, so there will turnover of parking places for re-use by other road users. As part of the residents parking schemes within Warwickshire, residents are also permitted to register visitors' vehicles on their permit system which would allow them to park within the required zone.
E	The proposed parking bays replicate the existing pattern of parking, which leaves adequate space between vehicles on the north and south sides of the road to manoeuvre. Due to areas of planting in the carriageway, some proposed bays are to be marked longer than regular bays, but these will be used as normal by one vehicle at a time.

### Recommendations

It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

### Members Comments

No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 2. Castle Close – No Waiting at any Time

2.1. It is proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on the south and west sides of Castle Close Road, outside 2-23, thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic.

2.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	2
Total comments	12

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Support	8
B	Object: Should be Single Yellow Lines, operational for 4 hours on both sides, weekdays, no footway parking, except residents and carers, deliveries etc.	1
C	Support & ask for 2 hour waiting limit where DYLS not proposed	2
L	Object: this will increase parking pressures for a visiting carer or relative or even a tradesman. Could the council provide an exemption for carers to park on double yellows.	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	Supports proposals
B	Single Yellow Line restrictions would apply to all vehicles including visitors and residents. Deliveries and all loading/unloading would not be restricted by the proposals.
C	A 2 hour waiting limit would apply to residents and carers
D	We don't provide exemption for carers to park on double yellow lines, Carers will have alternative parking available in the surrounding streets. This also applies to relatives and tradesman who wish to gain access into Castle Close. Deliveries and all loading/unloading would not be restricted by the proposals.

### Recommendations

It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

### Members Comments

No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

### 3. Chapel Street – Limited Waiting with Resident Permit Exemption

3.1. It is proposed to extend the section of limited waiting bays with L6 exemption on the north side of Chapel Street. This will preserve or improve the amenities of the local area through which the road runs.

3.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	3
Total comments	0

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Parking outside Regency Mews will adversely affect the aesthetics of the street, lowering the appeal of the properties.	2
B	Additional parking is not required as there is sufficient parking for the nearby properties.	3
C	Parking in this location will reduce the safety of the road by obscuring risks.	2
D	An increase in parking would lead to an increase in noise and disturbance for the nearby residents.	2
E	The proposals were consulted upon 4 years ago and nothing has changed since	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A/B	The purpose of these proposals was to provide parking within the L6 zone and as such they would benefit the wider area rather than solely the residents of Regency Mews.
C	Whilst it is acknowledged that parked cars could reduce the visibility of potential hazards at this location, observing proper road safety guidance these risks can be mitigated.
D	The total length of the proposed parking bay would only permit a small number of cars to park along Chapel Street therefore the increase in noise generated would likely be negligible.
E	These proposals were requested by a resident with concerns for pressure within the L6 parking zone as a whole.

#### Recommendations

Due to the lack of support received it is recommended that these proposals are withdrawn

#### Members Comments

No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

#### 4. Charter Approach – No Waiting at any Time

4.1. A request was received to extend the existing Double Yellow Lines from the West Street junction to the end of the bollards outside no. 3 and introduce Double Yellow Lines at the junction outside no. 38 & no.25-27, thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic.

4.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	0
Total comments	1

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	The problem has now been moved further into Charter Approach with cars parking either side of the road just beyond the bollards starting outside of number 4 & 5. I strongly suggest that additional bollards are installed outside 4 & 5 Charter Approach to prevent cars parking there straddling the pavement and road. This will then help ensure that cars only park on one side of the road at this choke point allowing better access for vehicles that need to reach the end of Charter Approach.	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	The bollards and proposed Double Yellow Lines are to protect the junction of the three arms of Charter Approach. Further physical or legal restrictions would reduce the amount of parking available to residents and visitors.

Recommendations
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 5. Clinton Lane – No Waiting at any Time

5.1. It is proposed to introduce new, and to extend existing, no waiting at any time restrictions on the east and west sides of Clinton Lane, between the junctions with Castle Green and Beehive Hill, thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic.

5.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	42
Total comments	61

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Lack of adequate parking places for residents outside their properties or reasonably close as a result of the proposals.	42

Ref	Officer Comments
A	The majority of 61 responses were objections (42), only 7 responses supporting the proposals in some way and 15 other comments, including suggesting alternative proposals such as HGV bans and resident parking bays.

Recommendations
Due to the amount of correspondence objecting to this scheme it is recommended that these proposals are withdrawn.

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 6. Cross Road – Double Yellow Lines

6.1. It is proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on the junctions along the length of Cross Road acting as junction protection at and between the junctions with Guy's Cliffe Road and Oswald Road, thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic.

6.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	3
Total comments	6

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	to ask that the Council try first with single yellow lines for the Percy Terrace/ Cross Road junction. The current situation is dangerous and commuter parking on Cross Road means that often the bin lorries can't get through. However, there is no alternative parking, and I hope that starting with single lines on this particular junction - Percy Terrace is the widest of the roads - will enable us to get used to the restrictions which I agree are necessary, particularly in the working week. Double yellow at all junctions [would lead] to radical reduction of residents' parking particularly at weekends	1
B	[Support] request is the double yellow line is extended along Cross Road [on the south side between Guy's Cliffe Road & Gunnery Terrace] as cars park next to the entrance between 8 Cross Road and Pyper's Cottage making it very difficult to come out of the entrance to the back of the properties and car parking. The cars park illegally and make it dangerous to exit as visibility and the turning circle is significantly reduced	1
C	Support	1
D	Support but also add proposed DYs to the most important part of the "chicane", the corner on the north east side of the junction between Gunnery Terrace and Cross Road to the front of number 13. This is where parking causes most problems both to residents and to delivery vehicles (especial the poor refuse collectors)	1
E	the double yellow lines stretch further into the streets (in places) than I would deem necessary and would limit parking spaces that I wouldn't deem dangerous e.g. to the door of number 9 Cross Road where you would not have any visual benefit turning onto Guys Cliffe Avenue and vice versa. We would support the application if parking could be guaranteed for the residents of the area (e.g. via area pay / display or Residents permits) and the yellow lines are limited to an area where they would have true benefit to road users.	
F	Object: Currently road markings north of the Oswald Road junction restricts parking for 4 meters which is perfectly adequate and should be mirrored in a southerly direction	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	Single Yellow Lines would only prohibit parking at junctions for signed hours. The obstruction of junctions and hazards to road users would remain outside signed hours.
B/C	Support proposals
D	Support proposals. The effects of the restrictions will be monitored, and it will be



	determined if further restrictions are justified.
<b>E</b>	The restrictions have been designed to prevent obstruction of the carriageway by parked vehicles as well as to improve sight lines between road users. A residents parking scheme is not included in this proposal and in any case would not guarantee parking spaces for all residents.
<b>F</b>	The restrictions have been designed to prevent obstruction of the carriageway for refuse vehicles by parked vehicles. A clear distance of 10.0m is commonly recommended at junctions, but this proposal requires only 8.0m at the south of the Oswald Road junction.
<b>Recommendations</b>	
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised	
<b>Members Comments</b>	
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.	

## 7. Emscote Road, Warwick – Proposed Limited Waiting / Residents’ Parking Restrictions

7.1. It is proposed to introduce limited waiting bays with W3 permit exemptions on the north side Emscote Road, between Ilex Court and Broad Street, this will preserve and improve the amenities of the local area through which the road runs.

7.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	3
Additional comments	5
Support in principle received	1

Ref	Comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	It was pointed out that only one of the laybys on the south side of the road is shown on the plan, there are 3 in total, 2 are missing from the plan.	2
B	There is confusion as to whether all laybys on both sides of the road are included as part of the restriction advertised.	2
C	If only north side is considered for the restrictions, then the south side is expected to be overwhelmed.	3
D	With the proposed restrictions, East of Ilex Court's already existing issues will be exacerbated, so they would like the same restrictions applied on Ilex Court.	2
E	Details on which house numbers will get resident's parking permits or how the scheme will be operated are missing.	2
F	Support Received for proposal.	1

Ref	Officer Comments in Response to Comments
A	The laybys on the south side are unrestricted and will not be affected by the proposals
B	The proposals were for restrictions in the laybys on the north side of the road only
C	Whilst it is acknowledged that restrictions here will put additional pressure on the unrestricted sections, properties on the south side have large off-street parking places and it was felt that we didn't need to make any alterations on this side.
D	Ilex Court is not eligible for a residents parking scheme as the majority of the residences have off street parking available.
E	If these proposals are introduced, then the properties that are eligible will be contacted and the process will be explained
F	No comment necessary

Officers' Recommendation
Due to the lack of public support it is recommended that these proposals are withdrawn.

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 8. Farley Street and Plymouth Place– No Waiting at any Time

8.1. It is proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on the north and south sides of the junction of Plymouth Place and Farley Street. Thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic and ensuring free flow of traffic.

8.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	3
Additional comments	6
Support in principle received	0

Ref	Comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	This would add to the existing parking issues in the areas of Radford Road/ Farley Street/ Plymouth Place, because of multiple occupancy houses.	1
B	Changes should only be implemented along with a parking permit system/scheme for the entire road or be replaced entirely by a resident parking scheme.	3
C	Russell Terrace/Farley Street Jct. was discussed at the sit-down meeting with the councillors as that was the jct. with accident occurrences.	1
D	Residents will no longer be able to park outside their own property.	2
E	Parking permit system introduced at Russell Terrace has introduced further issues for Plymouth Place & Farley Street.	1
F	Over past years the area has become a popular parking choice for minibuses, taxis and commercial vehicles, the proposed restriction would only exacerbate existing issues.	2

Officer Comments in Response to Comments	
A/D/F	It is acknowledged that these restrictions could put additional pressure on the parking situation around Plymouth Place, however these proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of other road users As a consequence the overall capacity of the road will be reduced to prevent dangerous parking near the junction
B/E	To introduce a residents parking scheme solely along Plymouth Place would move the parking issues to the surrounding streets, thereby exacerbating the situation in the area as a whole, any residents parking scheme that is proposed would require double yellow lines to be installed along one side of the road in order to maintain a suitable road width whilst still providing spaces for residents.
C	Additional restrictions can be consulted upon in a subsequent variation or as part of a larger scheme.

Officers' Recommendation
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 9. Fernhill Drive+ No Waiting at any Time

9.1. It is proposed to introduce new, and to extend existing, no waiting at any time restrictions on the north east, south east, and south west sides of Fernhill Drive, thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic

9.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	2
Additional comments	8
Support in principle received	2

Ref	Comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	There are no double yellows proposed across dropped crossings, people park on them; vulnerable persons not able to cross safely.	7
B	Changes should only be implemented along with a parking permit system/scheme for the entire road.	3
C	The current proposal would add to the existing difficulties driving up/down the Drive	2
D	Changes should only be implemented if done along the entire length of the road as residents have ample off-street parking.	1
E	It is implied that parking issues around the area are because of the nearby school and leisure centre.	2
F	Suggestions for double yellows to cover both sides of both sharp bends.	3
G	Sharp bend at the top of Fernhill Drive has parked cars obstructing visibility of the jct with Upper Holly Walk.	3
H	Areas that are not restricted by double yellows will see an increase in cars parking outside residents' properties	3
I	Support Received for proposal	2

Officer Comments in Response to Comments	
A	These restrictions were proposed to prevent dangerous parking along Fernhill Drive whilst balancing the needs of road users and the nearby businesses. Including further restrictions at this location would require re-consultation with relevant interested parties. These restrictions can be consulted upon at a later date.
B	A residents parking scheme would not be appropriate for Fernhill Drive as a majority of the properties have access to off street parking spaces.
C/F/G	The double yellow lines were proposed in locations where parking would cause an obstruction to traffic. Whilst these proposals would still permit vehicles to park along Fernhill Drive, they would only permit it where it is safe to do so.
D/H	These proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of other road users. As a consequence, these proposals will still permit vehicles to park in suitable locations whilst preventing dangerous parking elsewhere.
E	The restrictions are being introduced due to a combination of local issues which include the school and Leisure Centre.
I	No comment necessary

Officers' Recommendation
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

**10. Gas Street, Priory Street – Limited Waiting with Resident Permit Exemption+ No Waiting at any Time**

10.1. It is proposed to introduce residents parking schemes on Gas Street and Priory Street. Sections of no waiting at any time restrictions along the length of Gas Street and Priory Street will avoid danger to persons or traffic and ensuring free flow of traffic.

10.2 The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	0
Additional comments	1
Support in principle received	2

Ref	Comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Parking restrictions are welcome by residents.	2
B	Option 4 was put forward by one of the residents	1

Ref	Officer Comments in Response to Comments
A	No comment necessary.
B	An informal consultation was undertaken by the local County Councillor for an extension to the residents parking zone. A number of options were presented to the residents and these proposals received popular support.

Officers' Recommendation
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 11. Greville Road, Warwick – Proposed No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions

11.1. It is proposed to extend the no waiting at any time restrictions on the east and west sides of Greville Road, north of its junction with Dickins Road, thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic.

11.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	0
Additional comments	1
Support in principle received	1

Ref	Comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Proposed Double yellows should be extended further on the East side of the road and existing lines between no. 92-98 should be removed.	1
B	Support Received for disabled bay to be removed.	1

Ref	Officer Comments in Response to Comments
A	These proposals were for the removal of the disabled badge holders only bay along Greville Road and replacing them with double yellow lines. Further extensions to the double yellow lines can be considered as part of a subsequent variation.
B	No comment necessary.

Officers' Recommendation
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 12. Heathcote Road, Whitnash – Proposed No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions

12.1. It is proposed to extend existing no waiting at any time restrictions on Heathcote Road connecting restrictions on the north side, and extending south side restrictions up to and a short distance into Avon Street, thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic and ensuring the free flow of traffic.

12.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	3
Additional comments	5
Support in principle received	1

Ref	Objections received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	It is Avon Road residents who are concerned about the many Heathcote Road residents who do not have driveways and will be forced to use Avon Road to park.	4
B	Avon Road is already experiencing issues with Heathcote Road residents parking near the jct. the restriction would made things more difficult.	3
C	Heathcote Road resident is objecting as he doesn't have a driveway and is disabled and reliant on carers and other medical staff.	1
D	Double yellows should not run very close to the shops area as this would drive more traffic and further parking issues on Avon Road.	1
E	Residents are requesting that the double yellows should be accompanied by resident parking permits for both Avon Road and Heathcote Road.	3
F	Support Received for part of proposal + note D	1

Ref	Officer Comments in Response to Objections
A/B/D	It is acknowledged that these restrictions could put additional pressure on the parking situation around Avon Road, however these proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of other road users As a consequence the overall capacity of the road will be reduced to prevent dangerous parking near the junction.
C	We don't provide exemption for carers to park on double yellow lines, Carers will have alternative parking available in the surrounding streets. A vehicle that is displaying a valid Disabled Persons Blue Badge is able to park on double yellow lines for up to 3 hours.
E	A residents parking scheme here is not appropriate as a majority of the properties have access to off street parking places
F	No comment necessary.

Officers' Recommendation
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

### 13. Monarch Gardens / Kingsway, Leamington Spa – Proposed No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions

13.1. It is proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on the east and west sides of Monarch Gardens extending into Kingsway, thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic.

13.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	0
Additional comments	1
Support in principle received	1

Ref	Objections received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Resident is requesting that the double yellows extend along Kingsway up to jct. with Queensway. Traffic queueing at the jct., parked vans and HGVs make it difficult for emergency services to access Monarch Gardens.	1
B	Support Received for proposal.	1

Ref	Officer Comments in Response to Objections
A	These restrictions were proposed to balance the needs of the residents, nearby businesses and other road users. Extending the restrictions up to the junction would likely move the parking into less suitable areas.
B	No comment necessary.

Officers' Recommendation
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.



#### 14. Montgomery Road / Tachbrook Road, Leamington Spa – Proposed No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions

14.1. It is proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on the on the north and south sides on the junction of Montgomery Road extending into Tachbrook Road, avoiding danger to persons or traffic.

14.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	3
Additional comments	3
Support in principle received	0

Ref	Objections received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Concerns that with the double yellows many residents from the area would have no other option for parking	2
B	Resident is objecting by implying that the 18m restriction is too small and should be extended due to people parking too close to the jct., it is pointed out that cyclists are at risk of being hit.	1
C	Objections to installing the double lines and complaints that the residents are harassing people who park legally on the street.	2

Ref	Officer Comments in Response to Objections
A/B/C	These proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of other road users As a consequence the overall capacity of the road will be reduced by approximately 2 car spaces to prevent dangerous parking near the junction and give safe access/egress to motorists using Montgomery Road, there are no further plans to introduce further restrictions at this time.

Officers' Recommendation
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 15. Myton Gardens – No Waiting Mon-Fri 8am-6pm

15.1. A request was received to introduce a No Waiting restriction along Myton Gardens to prevent vehicles belonging to students of the nearby school from parking along Myton Gardens, presenting difficulties for the residents.

15.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	0
Total comments	9

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Agree with the proposals	9
B	Consider resident exemptions to single yellow line	1
C	Consider extending the restrictions to include Saturday and Sunday	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	No comment necessary.
B	It is against the Warwickshire County Council parking policy to permit vehicles to wait in areas of No Waiting unless there are specific reasons to do so.
C	An extension of the restrictions to include Saturday and Sunday could be considered, however this would likely create a detrimental impact on the residents as this would also prevent visitors from parking nearby.

Recommendations
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised.

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 16. Newbold Terrace East – No Waiting at any Time

16.1 It is proposed to introduce sections of no waiting at any time restrictions on the south side of Newbold Terrace East in order to create passing points for traffic, thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic.

16.2 The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	1
Total comments	8

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Will make parking even more difficult for residents	1
B	There are not enough spaces along the road	1
C	Consider using double yellow lines to protect the crossing points	4
D	Request to extend the double yellows further from the traffic lights	2
E	Proposed 20 metre passing place should be extended to 40 metre passing place	1
F	Request that more resident parking bays are installed along Newbold Terrace East	2
G	Support the proposals	2
H	Request that the double yellow lines are extended a further 20 metres towards the leisure centre	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A/B	It is acknowledged that these restrictions could put additional pressure on the parking situation around Newbold Terrace East, however these proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of other road users As a consequence the overall capacity of the road will be reduced to prevent dangerous parking near the junction.
C/F	Including further restrictions at this location would require re-consultation with relevant interested parties. These restrictions can be consulted upon at a later date.
D/E/H	These proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of other road users. As a consequence, these proposals will still permit vehicles to park in suitable locations whilst preventing dangerous parking elsewhere
G	No comment necessary

### Recommendations

It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

### Members Comments

No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 17. Old Milverton Road – No Waiting at any Time

17.1. It is proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions along the east side of Old Milverton Road outside of Vauxhall Drive, replacing the existing restrictions, thereby avoiding danger to persons and traffic.

17.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	1
Total comments	0

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Residents comment "Queuing traffic is more likely to happen given the new position the Council is suggesting that the car transporters are likely to be due to the restrictions"	1
B	Request extending the yellow lines from Goodfellow Street.	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	These parking restrictions were proposed to allow the car dealership to load/unload their transporter (a short-term action by its nature) on Milverton Road rather than on the Rugby Road which is a major route into and out of Leamington.
B	The existing restrictions at the junction of Old Milverton Road and Goodfellow Street are sufficient to allow safe egress and access from Goodfellow Street.

### Recommendations

It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

### Members Comments

No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 18. Othello Avenue – No Waiting at any Time

18.1. It is proposed to introduce sections of no waiting at any time restrictions for junctions and central island features for the length of Othello Avenue. Thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic and ensuring free flow of traffic.

18.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	1
Total comments	13

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Support the proposals	6
B	Reduce Othello Avenue, between Portia Way and Banquo Approach, to single lane with priority to south-bound traffic.	1
C	Request that double yellow lines are installed opposite T-junctions	1
D	Request 'No Hospital Parking' along Othello Avenue	1
E	Double yellow lines will only move the problem into the surrounding streets	1
F	Request double yellow lines in Costard Avenue	1
G	Request double yellow lines further along Othello Avenue	6
H	Residents permit parking would work better to solve the issue	1
I	Request a 20mph speed limit	1
J	Double yellow lines will not solve the issue	2
K	Object to the proposals	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	No comment necessary
B	This suggestion is outside the scope of works for parking issues and would require a feasibility study to be done with the likely outcome being that the benefit would be negligible compared to the cost of reducing the road width.
C/E/F/G/H/J	It is acknowledged that these restrictions could put additional pressure on the parking situation around Othello Avenue, however these proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of other road users.
D	'No Hospital Parking' is not a legally enforceable restriction and as such cannot be introduced or enforced by Warwickshire County Council.
I	This suggestion is outside the scope of works for parking issues.
K	No comment necessary

### Recommendations

It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

### Members Comments

No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 19. Southam Road, Radford Semele – No Waiting at any Time

19.1. It is proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on the north and south sides of the Southam Road junctions with Church Lane and School Lane. Thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic, and ensuring free flow of traffic

19.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	1
Total comments	0

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Object to the proposals as it would prevent reversing onto the drive by not allowing a vehicle to wait for a gap in traffic	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	These proposals will not prevent a vehicle from waiting for a gap in traffic to access a driveway

Recommendations
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 20. Reeve Drive, Kenilworth – No Waiting at any Time

20.1. It is proposed to extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction on the south side of Reeve Drive and introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on the northern side, in a southward's direction. Thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic and ensuring free flow of traffic.

20.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	0
Total comments	3

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Would reduce the amount of parking available to residents	1
B	Parked cars do not adversely affect the free flow of traffic due to the traffic calming feature further along the road	1
C	Double yellow lines would not be an improvement to safety	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A/B/C	It is acknowledged that these restrictions could put additional pressure on the parking situation around Reeve Drive, however these proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of other road users. By preventing cars from parking in this location it would allow a better view of the road from the junction to the traffic calming feature meaning that there will be fewer confrontations between vehicles from opposite directions.

Recommendations
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 21. Rugby Road, Leamington Spa – No Waiting at any Time

21.1. It is proposed to extend the existing no waiting at any time restriction along the south side of Rugby Road in a westward direction. Thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic and ensuring free flow of traffic.

21.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	10
Total comments	1

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Removing parked cars would increase traffic speeds	1
B	There are already major parking problems for residents in the area	3
C	The proposals will push the problem to less suitable areas	2
D	There are no advantages to these proposals	3
E	Will increase the parking pressure on the local area	3
F	Support the proposals	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	These proposals will not significantly increase vehicle speeds because the total number of parked cars that will be removed is only one.
B/C/E	It is acknowledged that these restrictions could put minimal additional pressure on parking on Rugby Road, however these proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of other road users.
D	These restrictions would have the advantage of giving the residents on the south side of Rugby Road a clearer view of the traffic travelling out of Leamington.
F	No comment necessary

Recommendations
Due to the lack of support, it is recommended that these proposals are withdrawn.

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.



## 22. Spring Pool – Double Yellow Lines/Limited Waiting and Residents Permit Exemptions

22.1. It is proposed to introduce a residents parking scheme on Spring Pool, sections of no waiting at any time restrictions along the length of Spring Pool, and limited waiting bays with W2 permit exemptions along sections of Spring Pool. Thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic, and ensuring the free flow of traffic

22.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	0
Total comments	6

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Fully support	6
B	The proposals significantly reduce the amount of the road available for parking	1
C	The proposals don't cover the private off-street parking	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	No comment necessary
B	It is acknowledged that these restrictions would reduce the availability of on street parking along Spring Pool, however these proposals were created as a balance between creating parking spaces and providing a clear path for vehicles, in particular refuse vehicles.
C	These proposals are for the sections of the public highway only, Warwickshire County Council cannot govern parking on private areas. If vehicles were to park across the off-street parking areas, then they would be causing an obstruction and can be considered to be causing an obstruction which is enforceable by the police.

### Recommendations

It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised but the implementation is delayed until the parking situation returns to a regime similar to that before COVID-19 restrictions.

### Members Comments

No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

### 23. St Michael's Road-Double Yellow Lines

23.1. It is proposed to extend the existing no waiting at any time restrictions on St Michael's Road in a westerly direction up to the disabled bays. Thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic and ensuring free flow of traffic.

23.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	0
Total comments	4

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Support the proposals	4
B	Request traffic calming features	1
C	Request a residents parking scheme	1
D	Request regular enforcement	1
E	Request that the informal bay remains unchanged	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	No comment necessary
B	This type of work is outside the scope of parking restrictions
C	A residents parking scheme would not be appropriate for St Michaels Road as the majority of properties have access to off street parking. Additionally, any residents parking scheme that is proposed would require double yellow lines to be installed along one side of the road in order to maintain a suitable road width whilst still providing spaces for residents.
D	All parking restrictions within Warwickshire are enforced proportionally to their location and the observed compliance with the restrictions.
E	The disabled bay will remain unchanged by these proposals.

Recommendations
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

**24. Stratford Road, Stratford Road Service Road, Shakespeare Avenue, Alders Grove, Foxes Way, Fishers Court-No Waiting at any time**

24.1. It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines on the junctions of Stratford Road, Stratford Road Service Road, Shakespeare Avenue, Alders Grove, Foxes Way and Fishers Court. Thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic and ensuring free flow of traffic.

24.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

<b>Emails/letters</b>	
Total objections	2
Total comments	4

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Objections and comments received</b>	<b>Total number of responses containing the comment</b>
<b>A</b>	Object to the proposals	1
<b>B</b>	Request a speed camera	1
<b>C</b>	Request double yellow lines along the whole of Stratford Road	1
<b>D</b>	Support the proposals	2
<b>E</b>	Request double yellow lines on both sides of Alders Grove	2

<b>Ref</b>	<b>Officer Comments</b>
<b>A</b>	No comment necessary
<b>B</b>	This type of work is outside the scope of parking restrictions
<b>C/E</b>	These proposals were created to balance the parking needs of the local area with the safety implications associated with parked cars. If parking was to be prevented in its entirety in this location then the parked cars, along with the safety implications, could potentially be moved to less suitable areas.
<b>D</b>	No comment necessary

<b>Recommendations</b>
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

<b>Members Comments</b>
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 25. Trinity Street-No Waiting at anytime

25.1. It is proposed to extend the existing no waiting at any time restrictions on the south side, thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic, and ensuring free flow of traffic.

25.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	2
Total comments	4

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Support the proposals	2
B	Objection	2
C	Will increase the parking pressure on the local area	2
D	Request residents parking along Trinity Street	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	No comment necessary
B	No comment necessary
C	It is acknowledged that these proposals could increase the pressure on the available of on street parking however these proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of other road users. As a consequence, the overall capacity of the road will be reduced to prevent dangerous parking.

Recommendations
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

**26. Wedgnock Green, Oken Road, Cape Road, Deerpark Drive, Newburgh Crescent-No Waiting at any Time, and Wedgnock Road -Limited Waiting with Resident Permit Exemptions.**

- 26.1. It is proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions for the extents of the junction of Wedgnock Green and introduce limited waiting bays with W7 exemptions for sections of Wedgnock Green. This will preserve or improve the amenities of the local area through which the road runs and thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic and ensuring free flow of traffic.
- 26.2. An informal consultation was undertaken in 2019 where a majority of residents asked were in favour of a residents parking scheme in the area
- 26.3. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	5
Total comments	23

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Concerned that the proposals will increase vehicle speeds along Newburgh Crescent.	4
B	Request traffic calming features along Newburgh Crescent	3
C	Request permit parking along Newburgh Crescent similar to Deerpark Drive	2
D	Request visitors permits	1
E	The number of controlled bays along Wedgnock Green does not seem sufficient and request more	2
F	Request No Waiting at any Time along Cape Road	1
G	Introduction of parking restrictions will move the problems	1
H	Residents are being penalised for issues caused by other drivers	4
I	The proposals limit the number of available parking spaces	1
J	These proposals will prohibit the loading of vehicles from the house	1
K	These proposals will prohibit elderly people from accessing their cars	1
L	Support the proposals	14
M	Object to the proposals	5
N	Allow permit parking along the footway of Cape Road	1
O	Request that the double yellow lines are single yellow lines along Newburgh Crescent	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A/B	It is acknowledged that vehicle speeds could increase as a result of parked vehicles being removed from the road, however due to the narrow nature of the road, this effect is expected to be low and as such traffic calming features would not be considered appropriate in this location.
C/E/N/O	These proposals were created to maximise the amount of parking available to the residents whilst also balancing the needs of the wider area together with the safety aspects that are associated with parked cars. As such permit parking has only been permitted where it is safe and reasonable to do so.
D	As part of the residents parking schemes within Warwickshire, residents are also permitted to register visitors' vehicles on their permit system which would allow them to park within the required zone
F	The No Waiting at any Time restrictions extend along Cape Road as far as was

	considered necessary for this scheme. To introduce further restrictions along Cape Road would require re-consultation.
<b>G</b>	It is acknowledged that these proposals could move the parking issues to other areas, however the majority of the surrounding area already has parking controls therefore the detrimental effect would be minimal.
<b>H/I</b>	It is acknowledged that these proposals could increase the pressure on the availability of on street parking, particularly for the residents, however these proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents, the needs of other road users and the safety implications associated with parked cars. As a consequence, the overall capacity of the road will be reduced to prevent dangerous parking.
<b>J/K</b>	Double yellow lines will not prohibit the loading and unloading of goods or the setting down and picking up of passengers.
<b>L/M</b>	No comment necessary

#### **Recommendations**

It is recommended that these proposals are to be implemented in part. The double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) are to be implemented with a decision on the limited waiting restrictions to be deferred until after further consultation has been undertaken when the parking situation returns to a regime similar to that before COVID-19 restrictions.

#### **Members Comments**

No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 27. Wharf Street- No Waiting at any Time

27.1. It is proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on the east and west sides of Wharf Street thereby avoiding danger to persons or traffic, and ensuring free flow of traffic

27.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	5
Total comments	10

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Support the proposals	3
B	Request that the double yellow lines extend further	4
C	Request that the double yellow lines are single yellow lines	1
D	The restrictions will move the parking issues further down Wharf Street	7
E	Object to the proposals	6
F	Request a residents parking scheme	2
G	Removal of cars would increase vehicle speeds	2
H	Allowing parking opposite driveways would cause access issues	2
I	Restrictions will be useless unless they are enforced	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	No comment necessary
B/D	These proposals were created to balance the parking needs of the local area with the safety implications associated with parked cars. If parking was to be prevented in its entirety in this location then the parked cars, along with the safety implications, could potentially be moved to less suitable areas.
C	A single yellow line would not be appropriate at this location because the parking would not be considered appropriate at any time of the day.
E	No comment necessary
F	A residents parking scheme would not be appropriate for this location as a majority of houses in the area have access to off street parking.
G	It is acknowledged that removal of parked cars could potentially increase the vehicle speeds along Wharf Street, it is anticipated that this effect will be low due to the narrowing of the road at the railway bridge.
H	The proposals for Wharf Street prevent parking on both sides of the road for their extents. Whilst it is acknowledged that these proposals could potentially move parking further along the road, outside the extents the responsibility lies with the driver of the vehicle to park in a safe and reasonable manner.
I	All restrictions in Warwickshire are enforced proportionally to their location and the compliance observed.

### Recommendations

It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

### Members Comments

No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.

## 28. William Street – Limited Waiting and Resident Permit Exemption

28.1. It is proposed to introduce limited waiting bays with L4 exemption on the unrestricted sections of William Street. This will preserve and improve the amenities of the local area through which the road runs.

28.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	1
Total comments	6

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Support the proposals	4
B	Request extending the L4 zone and providing more bays	3
C	Object to the proposals	1
D	Parking is already difficult for businesses	1
E	Request business permits	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	No comment necessary
B/D	These proposals were created as a balance between the needs of the residents and the needs of nearby businesses. Whilst they will primarily be for the benefit of the local residents, they will also promote a regular turnover of parking for the nearby residents.
C	No comment necessary
E	Business permits are not considered appropriate as they would be used for long-term parking where short-term parking would be more beneficial.

Recommendations
It is recommended that these proposals are approved as advertised

Members Comments
No comments have yet been received from the local member, if comments are received, they will be forwarded on to the Portfolio Holder for consideration.



## Background information

- Proposals for waiting restrictions at various locations were advertised and consulted upon in accordance with statutory procedure on the 5<sup>th</sup> March 2020, with consultation open until the 30<sup>th</sup> June 2020.
- The statutory criteria for decisions on making Traffic Regulation Orders are included as **Appendix A**.
- Drawings showing published proposals for waiting restrictions are found in **Appendix B**.
- A copy of the published Statement of Reasons for each scheme are found in **Appendix C**.
- Copies of objections and comments received are available as background information in **Appendix D**.

## Financial implications

All work will be carried out within the existing 2021/22 CPE budget allocations.

## Environmental implications

It is anticipated that the presence of waiting restrictions would not have a significant adverse effect on air quality, with no predicted increase in traffic volumes or noise levels as a result of the schemes.

<b>Report Author</b>	Graham Stanley grahamstanley@warwickshire.gov.uk
<b>Assistant Director</b>	Scot Tompkins, Assistant Director for Communities
<b>Lead Director</b>	Mark Ryder, Strategic Director for Communities
<b>Lead Member</b>	Jeff Clarke, Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning

<b>Urgent matter?</b>	Yes
<b>Confidential or exempt?</b>	No
<b>Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?</b>	No

## List of background papers

Letters and email objections along with large scale plans that can be produced if required.

## Members and officers consulted and informed

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Jeff Clarke

Corporate Board – Mark Ryder

Legal – Ian Marriott

Finance – Andrew Felton

Equality –

Democratic Services – Helen Barnsley

Councillors –

Local Member(s):