

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF TECHNICAL SERVICES**

**REVIEW OF PILOT PAVEMENT/VERGE PARKING RESTRICTIONS**

**1.0 EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

- 1.1 At the meeting of this committee on 14 March 2007 Members approved the introduction of pavement/verge parking restrictions as a pilot scheme in the 20 roads listed in Appendix 1.
- 1.2 The roads listed were among those identified by Members, the public and Council highway inspection staff as roads where pavement parking was a problem and in all cases was unnecessary because the width of the road is sufficiently wide to allow vehicles to park fully on the road without causing an obstruction to passing traffic. The selected routes in all cases have facilities for off-street parking, i.e. private drives, and are also locations where the pavement construction is predominantly paving flags which are liable to cracking and displacement because of vehicle overloading leaving the council exposed to potential public liability insurance (tripping) claims.
- 1.3 A number of the locations also have grass verges within the limits of the pavement and the verges are also used for unnecessary parking and overloading causing damage which makes them unsightly and impassable at this time of the year.

**2.0 BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 It was intended to implement the restrictions in all of the above locations in September 2008 following consultation with the public, the emergency services and in some locations schools.
- 2.2 However because of changes in traffic sign legislation which became effective in September 2008 the spacing of the traffic signs required to implement the scheme was increased from a distance 60 metres to 30 metres.
- 2.3 The implications of this change has resulted in twice the number of traffic signs being required than was originally envisaged and a doubling of the scheme costs.
- 2.4 As a consequence it was necessary to divide the scheme into three separate works programmes for both the described financial reasons and also for resource purposes because of the considerable administrative and legal resource required to process each individual traffic order.

**3.0 REPORT**

- 3.1 The first phase of the pilot restrictions were introduced in the following 6 locations;
- |                          |   |
|--------------------------|---|
| Teehey Lane, Bebington   | (Higher Bebington Road to Heath Road, Bebington)    |
| Kings Lane, Bebington    | (Kings Road to Old Chester Road, Bebington)         |
| Kings Road, Bebington    | (Borough Road, Birkenhead to Kings Lane, Bebington) |
| Woodchurch Road, Prenton | (Osmaston Road to Palmwood Close, Prenton)          |
| Holm Lane, Oxton         | (Talbot Road to Oulton Close, Oxton)                |
| Bayswater Road, Wallasey | (Newport Avenue to Greenleas Road, Wallasey)        |
- 3.2 For these initial 6 roads the consultation exercise with residents, emergency services and Merseytravel involved letters being sent out advising of the nature of the restrictions and the reasons for implementing them on a pilot basis.

- 3.3 In response to the Council's consultation with residents a number of letters and telephone enquiries were received both objecting to and supporting the restrictions, but the majority of residents consulted supported the parking restriction proposals.
- 3.4 There has also been positive feedback from elected Members from their meetings with residents of the pilot locations.
- 3.5 The emergency services and Merseytravel responded stating that by effectively restricting the through passage of traffic by forcing vehicles to be parked fully on the road may cause operational problems in terms of delay for their respective services.
- 3.6 However since the introduction of the pilot restrictions there has been no further correspondence from any of the bodies initially consulted indicating any operational problems.
- 3.7 Following the advertising of the proposed orders both on site and in the local press on 19<sup>th</sup> November 2008 the signs were erected the week after. The restrictions became effective on 1 December 2008.
- 3.8 Since the restrictions became operative compliance in all 6 roads has been generally good with warning letters being sent out initially to advise the owners of those vehicles still being parked on the pavement/verge that any future incidents would be enforced by the council's decriminalised parking enforcement contractor.
- 3.9 Some persistent offenders have been issued with penalty control notices for non-compliance but the majority of these notices were issued within the first few weeks of the introduction of the restrictions and latterly it has not been necessary to issue any further notices.
- 3.10 Locations where P.C.N's have been issued

<b>STREET NAME</b>	<b>No. OF P.C.N's ISSUED</b>
Bayswater Road (Wallasey)	7
Holm Lane (Oxton)	0
Kings Lane (Higher Bebington)	6
Kings Road (Higher Bebington)	5
Teehey Lane (Bebington)	7
Woodchurch Road (Prenton)	Not possible to differentiate pavement parking offences from those occurring on the road.

- 3.11 A further benefit of the proposals is that in those roads where the restrictions have been introduced vehicles parked fully on the road have acted as a traffic calming measure causing approaching vehicles to slow down before passing.
- 3.12 In those roads where the grass verges were in poor condition due to vehicle damage prior to the introduction of the restrictions those verges have now improved and recovered in terms of grass coverage. This is due partly to the reduction in vehicle overrunning and also to the repairs instigated by the council in repairing the verges with topsoil and grass seed in the more overridden and damaged locations.

#### **4.0 PETITION**

- 4.1 During the trial period a petition was submitted from the residents of Woodchurch Road requesting the revocation of the traffic order for the section of Woodchurch Road from Holmlands Drive to the railway bridge by junction 3 of the M53 motorway.
- 4.2 Of the 43 properties situated along this section of Woodchurch Road 29 objected to the permanent introduction of the restrictions.

- 4.3 The basis of their objections were specifically in relation to road safety.
- 4.4 Residents consider that if there are more than 2 vehicles in a household it is impractical for them to park 3 or 4 vehicles on a private driveway when there is a 4.5 metre wide pavement available in front of their property which has been used as an “on street” parking facility without problems for many years. By parking their vehicles in adjacent side roads this has caused displacement and added to the parking issues in other roads.
- 4.5 Similarly they claim it is more difficult and hazardous to move vehicles around outside their properties without the use of the pavement because of the speed of the vehicles coming off the motorway slip road which is not visible to those properties nearer the railway bridge.
- 4.6 They also feel that they already have considerable problems driving into and out of their properties on a heavily trafficked principal route with urban clearway parking restrictions prohibiting parking at peak times on the road without their only facility for “on street” parking being removed.
- 4.7 One resident who was not a petitioner and supported the restrictions stated that in his opinion the practice of parking on the pavements obstructed visibility to residents leaving their properties in vehicles causing a potentially hazardous situation when trying to enter the heavy traffic flows on Woodchurch Road.
- 4.8 Due to the proximity of junction 3 in relation to these properties and the volume of traffic coming from the motorway both from a north and south bound direction I have no objection to the traffic order not being continued on this section of Woodchurch Road. I will be considering however as part of a future improvement of the pavement between Holmlands Drive and the railway bridge the introduction of a traffic order to allow residents to park on the pavement in bays marked out by the council following consultation with the residents to ensure that inconsiderate parking close to driveways obstructing visibility is prohibited.

## **5.0 LOCATIONS FOR THE SECOND PHASE OF IMPLEMENTATION**

- 5.1 It is now proposed to introduce pilot restrictions from the approved list in the following roads as part of the second phase of the implementation programme.
- |      |                       |   |
|------|-----------------------|---|
| i)   | Townfield Lane, Oxton | (Bidston Road to Shavington Avenue)           |
| ii)  | Storeton Road, Oxton  | (Woodchurch Road to Ingestre Road)            |
| iii) | Frankby Road, Frankby | (Blackhorse Hill to Newton Park Road)         |
| iv)  | Greasby Road, Greasby | (Upton By Pass to Frankby Road)               |
| v)   | Leasowe Road, Leasowe | (Heyes Drive to Reeds Lane – south side only) |
| vi)  | Pensby Road, Pensby   | (Gills Lane to Whitfield Lane)                |
- 5.2 The Consultation process is to commence during November 2009 and subject to the outcome of the process I intend to advertise the orders in December 2009 with the restrictions becoming effective in January 2010.
- 5.3 As with the first pilot scheme the results of the second pilot scheme will be reported back to Members in December 2010 together with a breakdown of enforcement costs.
- 5.4 The remaining 8 locations from the original pilot scheme list will be resurveyed to determine whether the pavement/verge parking problems are still at a level where restrictions should be considered.
- 5.5 The survey will be undertaken after the second pilot scheme has become effective in January 2010. The consultation exercise will commence in February 2010 and subject to the outcome of that process the restrictions could become effective in April 2010.

## **6.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

- 6.1 The change in legislation in September 2008 resulted in the scheme costs for the 6 roads increasing from £11,000 to £22,000.
- 6.2 The enforcement costs incurred for the first pilot scheme were negligible because in all the locations selected the Council's decriminalised parking contractor was enforcing existing parking restrictions so there have been no additional costs for the P.C.N's issued.
- 6.3 It is anticipated that the cost of processing and drafting the Orders in the locations identified in paragraph 5.1 together with the necessary signing costs will be approximately £25,000.
- 6.4 The posts and signs removed from the Woodchurch Road scheme will be reused in one of the locations identified in the second pilot scheme.
- 6.5 The enforcement of the restrictions will be carried out by the Council's decriminalised parking enforcement contractor and there will be increased contractual costs in enforcing the restrictions of those roads listed in paragraphs 5.1
- 6.6 Restricting pavement parking will reduce the Council's expenditure on pavement repairs and will maintain the reduction in public liability insurance claims arising from highway related tripping accidents.
- 6.7 In those locations where the restrictions are to be made permanent and pavement parking will no longer be an issue, I will arrange for the condition of those pavements to be assessed for possible inclusion as pavement reconstruction schemes in a future Structural Maintenance Programme.

## **7.0 STAFFING IMPLICATIONS**

- 7.1 Consultation with residents, the emergency services, Merseytravel and the elected Members together with the processing and drafting of the orders and the preparation of the signing schedules and plans will be carried out by existing staff as part of their normal duties.

## **8.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES IMPLICATIONS**

- 8.1 There are no implications under this heading. Damage caused by pavement parking can have adverse implications for the elderly and people with disabilities.

## **9.0 COMMUNITY SAFETY IMPLICATIONS**

- 9.1 Enforcing and controlling pavement parking will reduce potential hazards and dangers to users of the highway. Vehicles parking in the carriageway can exhibit a traffic calming effect.

## **10.0 LOCAL AGENDA 21 IMPLICATIONS**

- 10.1 Effective control of on-street parking will have positive effects on quality of life issues such as access to property and visual amenity of the environment. It also supports sustainable goals in encouraging use of public transport and may lead to a saving in resource use where fewer repairs to pavements and verges are required.

## **11.0 PLANNING IMPLICATIONS**

- 11.1 There are no implications under this heading.

## **12.0 ANTI-POVERTY IMPLICATIONS**

12.1 There are no implications under this heading.

## **13.0 SOCIAL INCLUSION IMPLICATIONS**

13.1 There are no implications under this heading.

## **14.0 LOCAL MEMBER SUPPORT IMPLICATIONS**

14.1 This report has implications throughout the Borough.

## **15.0 BACKGROUND PAPERS**

15.1 No background papers have been used in the preparation of this report.

## **16.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

16.1 Members are requested to note the contents of this report and also the proposed amendment to the Woodchurch Road site as detailed in Section 4 of the report.

DAVID GREEN, DIRECTOR  
TECHNICAL SERVICES

**APPENDIX 1**

## LOCATIONS APPROVED FOR PAVEMENT/VERGE PARKING RESTRICTIONS

<b>ROAD</b>	<b>FROM</b>	<b>TO</b>
Townfield Lane, Oxton	Bidston Road	Shavington Avenue
Holm Lane, Oxton	Talbot Road	Oulton Close
Woodchurch Road, Prenton	Storeton Road	Palmwood Close
Noctorum Way, Oxton	Townfield Lane	Wethersfield Road
Storeton Road, Oxton	Ingestre Road	Waterpark Road, Prenton
Barnston Road, Thingwall/Heswall	Telegraph Road	Arrowe Park Road
Pensby Road, Thingwall/Heswall	Thingwall Road East	Telegraph Road
Frankby Road, Frankby	Greasby Road	Black Horse Hill
Greasby Road, Greasby/Frankby	Upton By Pass	Frankby Road
Upton Road, Moreton	Moreton Road	Hoylake Road
Leasowe Road, Moreton/Wallasey Village	Wallasey Village	Pasture Road
Warren Drive, New Brighton	Grove Road	Victoria Road
Bayswater Road, Wallasey Village	Harrison Drive	North Wallasey Approach
Kings Road, Bebington	Borough Road	Teehey Lane
Teehey Lane, Bebington	Kings Road	Heath Road
Higher Bebington Road, Bebington	Teehey Lane	Pulford Road
Kings Lane, Bebington	Kings Road	Old Chester Road