

Portfolio Holder Decision

The Warwickshire County Council (Borough of Rugby) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Waiting Restrictions, On-Street Parking Places and Residents' Parking) (Consolidation) (Variation No. 5) Order 2023

Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning
Date of decision	12 May 2023
	Signed 

1. Decision taken

That the Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning approves that the below named proposed Traffic Regulation Order be implemented as advertised with the exception to the proposals relating to Tee Tong Road as shown in plan No.PTRO21-004-002:

The Warwickshire County Council (Borough of Rugby) (Civil Enforcement Area) (Waiting Restrictions, On-Street Parking Places and Residents' Parking) (Consolidation) (Variation No. 5) Order 2023.

2. Reasons for decisions

1. Cambridge Street, Rugby – Limited Waiting Mon-Sat 8am-6pm 2 hours No Return within 4 hours Except for R2 Permit Holders

- 1.1. Following on from requests to assist the residents of Cambridge Street, Rugby with issues caused by long-term parking Warwickshire County Council proposed to extend the existing R2 residents parking zone onto the section of Cambridge Street between Clifton Road and Sun Street.
- 1.2. The following tables detail the objections and/or comments received along with the officer recommendations.
- 1.3. A petition has been received with 54 signatures from 36 separate properties in support of the proposals.

Emails/letters	
Total objections	3
Total comments	3

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Object to the proposals	3
B	The proposals will move the vehicles to potentially less suitable locations	1
C	Residents only parking will increase confrontations	1
D	Support the proposals	8
E	The proposals will negatively affect the businesses in the area	1
F	The scheme does not guarantee a space	1
G	Permits are overly restrictive	1
H	The scheme would be restrictive to the religious institutions in the area	1
I	The cost of a permit would put extra pressure on people's finances	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	No comment necessary
B/C	It is acknowledged that the proposals will move the parked vehicles to other locations and could increase confrontations between drivers, however these proposals will promote the turnover of parking along Cambridge Street with the residents given priority for available spaces
D	No comment necessary
E/H	The timings of the parking scheme have been proposed to allow for visitors to the local business and various other destinations along Cambridge Street to park for free for a certain length of time
F	Whilst a resident's parking scheme does not guarantee a space, it will give priority to residents who have purchased a permit.
G	The permit scheme is designed to cater for the vast majority of households with car ownership whilst also providing a visitors permit that can be used on a visitors' vehicle allowing them to park within the zones with exemption from the time limits
I	The cost of one permit is currently £25 a year with

Recommendations

It is recommended to implement these proposals 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. Tee Tong Road, Teeswater Close and Woodleigh Road – No Waiting at any Time

- 2.1. Concerns had been raised by residents within the Tee Tong Road housing estate in Long Lawford about the amount of parking along Tee Tong Road and the nearby junctions. This led to double yellow lines being proposed along sections of Tee Tong Road and at the junctions of Tee Tong Road and Teeswater and Woodleigh Road

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

Emails/letters	
Total objections	3
Total comments	

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Will push the parked vehicles further along Tee Tong Road into less suitable areas	2
B	Request additional parking spaces are provided on the grass verges at the entrance to the Tee Tong Road estate.	3
C	The introduction of yellow lines would limit where residents are able to park	2
D	Object to the proposals	1
E	The parking along Tee Tong Road does not cause an issue	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	It is acknowledged that the restrictions will displace the parked vehicles into other places along the Tee Tong Road estate, however the scope of the proposals was to prevent vehicles from parking in an obstructive manner at the entrance to the estate and allow the residents of the estate to park close to their homes and use their judgement on where would be obstructive.
B	This is beyond the scope of the Civil Parking Enforcement remit and would be cost prohibitive for the limited benefit that it provides.
C	It is acknowledged that these restrictions would have an impact on the residents of the Tee Tong Road estate, however the restrictions were proposed to prohibit vehicles from parking where they could be causing an obstruction to traffic.
D	No comment necessary
E	Whilst there may be a perception amongst some road users that there is not an issue,

Recommendations

Due to the lack of support for the proposed restrictions together with the contentious nature of these proposals it is recommended to withdraw these proposals from the variation order

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. Pytchley Road and Cromwell Road– No Waiting at any Time

3.1. Warwickshire County Council had been approached by the local councillor to introduce assist the local residents with vehicles parking in an obstructive manner at the junction of Pytchley Road and Crowell Road. This led to double yellow lines being proposed at on the south-eastern side of Crowell Road round onto Pytchley Road.

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

Emails/letters

Total objections	2
Total comments	

Ref	Objections and comments received	Total number of responses containing the comment
A	Object to the proposals	1
B	Will remove on street spaces for guests and visitors to residents of the road	1
C	Will push the parked cars further down the road	1
D	Request the lines are shorter	1
E	Request lines on both sides of the road and on the road to the leisure centre	1
F	Parked cars provide a deterrent for vehicles speeding along the road	1

Ref	Officer Comments
A	No comment necessary
B	The lines are being proposed in the locations that it is considered unsafe or inappropriate for a vehicle to be parked, regardless of the length of time that it would be there for.
C	It is acknowledged that vehicles will be displaced to other locations in the area, however the anticipated number of vehicles will be low and their impact on safety would be lower than if they were to remain at the junction.
D	These lines have been proposed following conversations with the local member and residents in the area to allow for greater visibility at the junction of Cromwell Road and Pytchley Road.
E	Additional double yellow lines would be restrictive to the residents and would push additional vehicles into less suitable areas increasing the likelihood of vehicles causing an obstruction.
F	It is acknowledged that the removal of parked vehicles will likely increase the speeds of vehicles using the road however by removing the vehicles it will also provide greater visibility for pedestrians and other road users thereby mitigating the risks.

Recommendations

It is recommended to implement these proposals 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. Background information

3.1 Proposals for waiting restrictions at various locations were advertised and consulted upon in accordance with statutory procedure on the 23rd February 2023, with consultation open until the 17th March 2023.

- 3.2 The statutory criteria for decisions on making Traffic Regulation Orders are included as Appendix A.
- 3.3 Drawings showing published proposals for waiting restrictions are found in Appendix B.
- 3.4 A copy of the published Statement of Reasons for each scheme are found in Appendix C.
- 3.5 Copies of objections and comments received are available as background information in Appendix D.

4. Financial implications

- 4.1 All work will be carried out within the existing 2023/24 CPE budget allocations.

5. Environmental implications

- 5.1 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.

Report Author	Ben Davenport bendavenport@warwickshire.gov.uk,
Assistant Director	scotttompkins@Warwickshire.gov.uk
Strategic Director	Strategic Director for Communities
Portfolio Holder	Portfolio Holder for Transport and Planning

Urgent matter?	No
Confidential or exempt?	No
Is the decision contrary to the budget and policy framework?	No

List of background papers

Appendix A
Appendix B
Appendix C
Appendix D

Members and officers consulted and informed

Portfolio Holder – Councillor Wallace Redford

Corporate Board – Mark Ryder

Legal – Caroline Gutteridge

Finance – Andrew Felton

Equality – n/a

Democratic Services – Isabelle Moorhouse

Councillors – Clarke, Chilvers, Fradgley and D’Arcy

Local Member(s): Feeney, Timms, Roodhouse