

# **North Tyneside Council Report to Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport Date: 13 October 2020**

**Title:** Traffic Regulation Order – Benton Area Permit Parking Scheme

<b>Portfolio(s):</b>	<b>Environment and Transport</b>	<b>Cabinet Member(s):</b>	<b>Councillor C Johnson</b>
<b>Report from Service Area:</b> Environment, Housing and Leisure			
<b>Responsible Officer:</b>	<b>Phil Scott, Head of Environment, Housing and Leisure</b>	<b>(Tel: 0191 643 7295)</b>	
<b>Wards affected:</b>	<b>Benton</b>		

## **PART 1**

### **1.1 Executive Summary:**

This report seeks the approval of the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to introduce permit parking restrictions into Carlton Road, Tynedale Terrace, Eastfield Terrace, Maddox Road, Station Approach, West Avenue, Thornhill Road, The Grove, East Avenue, Queens Gardens, The Oval, Grange Avenue and Parkland in Benton and to set aside ten objections received to the proposal.

### **1.2 Recommendation(s):**

It is recommended that the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport:

- (1) considers the objections;
- (2) sets aside the objections in the interests of reducing long stay non-residential parking in the streets listed above thereby improving residential amenity; and
- (3) determines that the Traffic Regulation Order should be made unchanged.

### **1.3 Forward Plan:**

Considering objections relating to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders is a standing item on the Forward Plan.

## 1.4 Council Plan and Policy Framework

The proposals in this report relate to the following priority in Our North Tyneside, the Council Plan 2020 to 2024:

- Our places will:
  - have an effective transport and physical infrastructure

## 1.5 Information:

### 1.5.1 Background

The proposal to implement a permit parking scheme in the streets to the north of the A191 Whitley Road either side of B1317 Station Road in Benton was developed as a result of long-standing concerns amongst residents regarding the amount of non-residential parking occurring in this area primarily associated with the nearby Tyneview Park office site and Benton Metro Station.

Parking surveys were consequently conducted in the area in accordance with the assessment process set out in the North Tyneside Parking Strategy. Whilst the results failed to meet the specified criteria in some of the streets surveyed, following discussions with ward councillors and the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, it was agreed that all residents should be informed of the result of the assessments carried out in their street and asked for their views on the possible introduction of permit parking restrictions there. This gave residents of those streets which had not met the assessment criteria (in terms of overall levels of on-street parking and proportion of on-street parking associated with non-residents) the opportunity to ask for inclusion in the scheme taking into account the potential for parking to be displaced following the introduction of restrictions in neighbouring streets.

The North Tyneside Parking Strategy requires at least 51% of residents consulted in a particular street to support the introduction of permit parking restrictions for them to be introduced. The streets listed in Section 1.1 achieved this level of support (and have consequently been included in the proposed scheme) whereas Eastfield Road, Southfield Road, Cheviot View and Carolyn Close did not, and have been excluded on this basis. It should be noted that when residents were informed of the consultation results, officers received some additional responses from East Avenue residents in favour of restrictions which meant that (having previously received insufficient support) it was then able to meet the 51% support criterion. As a result, East Avenue was included in the proposed scheme immediately prior to it being formally advertised. Residents of East Avenue were notified of this change by letter.

The scheme proposed for all the streets listed in Section 1.1 with the exception of Station Approach (shown at Appendix 3a) involves the introduction of permit restrictions operating between the hours of 10-11am and 2-3pm, Monday to Friday. These timings are intended to prevent all day commuter parking whilst minimising any inconvenience to residents and allowing some provision for visitors. The scheme proposed for Station Approach (shown at Appendix 3b) involves permit parking restrictions operating between 9am and 5pm, Monday to Friday. The extended operating hours proposed for Station Approach are due to the street's close proximity to Benton Metro station and the differing parking patterns associated with this location.

The proposal is supported by ward councillors who feel that the introduction of permit parking restrictions in this area is necessary to reduce the amount of all-day non-residential parking occurring and to afford residents some priority to park outside their homes.

In accordance with the statutory process, a Notice of Intention for the proposal was displayed on site, in the local newspaper and on the Authority's website outlining the proposed restrictions.

Ten objections were received in response to the statutory Notice of Intention. A summary of these objections is provided below.

#### 1.5.2 Statutory Consultation

Proposed parking restrictions or the revocation or amendment of existing parking restrictions are subject to statutory legal process. Schemes must be advertised on site and in the local press. This enables members of the public or businesses to object to the proposal. Any objectors are first sent a detailed response and invited to reconsider their objection. Any objections not withdrawn are referred to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in accordance with the Scheme of Delegation for Cabinet Members.

#### 1.5.3 Summary of Objections

**Mr C**, a resident of Carolyn Close, submitted an objection to the proposal based on his view that the proposed scheme would be detrimental to the residents of Carolyn Close as that street had not been included. In his opinion, the exclusion of Carolyn Close and the potential for parking to be displaced there was likely to have road safety implications as well as reducing residential parking provision.

An officer wrote to the objector to clarify that permit restrictions were not being proposed for Carolyn Close as the necessary criterion in terms of residential support had not been met. It was highlighted that if restrictions were to be implemented in neighbouring streets, officers would monitor the situation and propose an extension to the scheme if necessary.

The objector was invited to reconsider his objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 31 August 2020. No further correspondence was received.

**Mr A**, a resident of Parkland, submitted an objection to the scheme based on his view that the restrictions proposed for Parkland would not benefit residents owing to the limited on-street parking capacity and as a result, permits would represent an unnecessary additional cost. He also felt the consultation process had been undemocratic, stating that two properties in the street had not received a consultation letter.

An officer wrote to the objector to clarify that consultation letters had been hand delivered to all properties in Parkland. It was confirmed that 8 out of 11 properties responded to the consultation in favour of the proposal which met the criterion set out in the North Tyneside Parking Strategy. It was also explained that the implementation of permit

parking restrictions would be likely to improve the current situation by prioritising the available parking spaces for residents and their visitors.

The objector was invited to reconsider his objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 31 August 2020. No further correspondence was received.

**Mr C**, a resident of East Avenue, submitted an objection to the scheme based on his view that the consultation process had not been democratic as officers had amended the proposal to include East Avenue after previously notifying residents that it had not received sufficient support to be part of the scheme.

An officer wrote to the objector to clarify that after letters had been sent to residents informing them of the outcome of the consultation exercise, additional responses were received from some residents of East Avenue who had not responded previously. These responses raised concerns that parking may be displaced into East Avenue if it were to be omitted from the scheme. The officer explained that these additional responses in support of the scheme allowed the street to meet the necessary criterion and had been taken into account to ensure that the proposal reflected the current wishes of the majority of residents.

The objector was invited to reconsider his objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 31 August 2020. No further correspondence has been received.

**Ms L**, a resident of Eastfield Road, submitted an objection to the proposal based on her view that the proposed scheme would be detrimental to the residents of Eastfield Road (specifically those living on the section between Tynedale Terrace and Carlton Road) as that street had not been included. She was therefore concerned that parking could be displaced into Eastfield Road further reducing parking provision for residents.

An officer wrote to the objector to clarify that permit restrictions were not being proposed for Eastfield Road as the necessary criterion in terms of residential support had not been met. The officer also explained that in the first instance the Authority would not look to consider individual sections of a street for permit parking restrictions as this could cause confusion for motorists. However, it was highlighted that if the proposed scheme were to be implemented, officers would monitor the situation and propose an extension to the scheme (including all or part of Eastfield Road) if appropriate.

The objector was invited to reconsider her objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 31 August 2020. The resident responded to reiterate that her concerns related to the section of Eastfield Road between Tynedale Terrace and Carlton Road rather than the street as a whole. The officer responded to confirm that this had been noted. No further correspondence was received.

**Mr A**, a resident of The Grove, submitted an objection to the scheme based on his view that the proposed restrictions would not benefit residents. He reported that there was currently no issue with non-residential parking in the street and as a result felt that restrictions were being introduced to address a problem that may not occur.

An officer wrote to the objector to clarify that although some streets had been experiencing more acute problems than others, officers felt that all streets in the area should be included in the consultation exercise to give them the opportunity to ask for restrictions based on the potential for parking to be displaced into any areas left

unrestricted. It was confirmed that 68% of residents of The Grove responded to the consultation in favour of the proposed restrictions which had satisfied the necessary criterion. It was explained that officers would monitor the impact of the scheme should it be introduced and consider changes if necessary.

The objector was invited to reconsider his objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 31 August 2020. No further correspondence was received.

**Mr R**, a resident of The Grove, submitted an objection to the scheme based on his view that the proposed restrictions were not necessary. He reported that there was currently no issue with non-residential parking in the street so the scheme was not required.

An officer wrote to the objector to clarify that although some streets had been experiencing more acute problems than others, officers felt that all streets in the area should be included in the consultation exercise to give them the opportunity to ask for restrictions based on the potential for parking to be displaced into any areas left unrestricted. It was confirmed that 68% of residents of The Grove responded to the consultation in favour of the proposed restrictions which had satisfied the necessary criterion. It was explained that officers would monitor the impact of the scheme should it be introduced and consider changes if necessary.

The objector was invited to reconsider his objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 31 August 2020. No further correspondence was received.

**Mr and Mrs C**, residents of East Avenue, submitted an objection to the scheme based on their view that the proposed restrictions were not required in East Avenue and that the issue of indiscriminate non-residential parking should be dealt with by the police and through engagement with management at Tyneview Park. They also believed that the consultation process had not been democratic as officers had amended the proposal to include East Avenue after previously notifying residents that it had not received sufficient support to be part of the scheme.

An officer wrote to the objector to clarify that after letters had been sent to residents informing them of the outcome of the consultation exercise, additional responses were received from some residents of East Avenue who had not responded previously. These responses raised concerns that parking may be displaced into East Avenue if it were to be omitted from the scheme. The officer explained that these additional responses in support of the scheme allowed the street to meet the necessary criterion and had been taken into account to ensure that the proposal reflected the current wishes of the majority of residents. It was also confirmed that officers had engaged with Tyneview Park and the police around the issue of indiscriminate non-residential parking in the area but problems in the area persisted.

The objectors were invited to reconsider their objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 31 August 2020. No further correspondence was received.

**Mr W**, a resident of Eastfield Road, submitted an objection to the proposal based on his view that the proposed scheme would be detrimental to the residents of Eastfield Road (specifically those on the section between Tynedale Terrace and Carlton Road) as that street had not been included in the proposed scheme. He was therefore concerned that

parking could be displaced into Eastfield Road further reducing parking provision for residents.

An officer wrote to the objector to clarify that permit restrictions were not being proposed for Eastfield Road as the necessary criterion in terms of residential support had not been met. The officer also explained that in the first instance the Authority would not look to consider individual sections of a street for permit parking restrictions as this could cause confusion for motorists. However, it was highlighted that if the proposed scheme were to be implemented, officers would monitor the situation and propose an extension to the scheme (including all or part of Eastfield Road) if appropriate.

The objector was invited to reconsider his objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 31 August 2020. No further correspondence was received.

**Ms B**, a resident of Parkland, submitted an objection to the scheme based on her view that the restrictions proposed for Parkland would not benefit residents owing to the limited on-street parking capacity. She also felt the consultation process had been undemocratic, stating that some properties in the street had not received a consultation letter.

An officer wrote to the objector to clarify that consultation letters had been hand delivered to all properties in Parkland. It was confirmed that 8 out of 11 properties responded to the consultation in favour of the proposal which met the criterion set out in North Tyneside Councils Parking Strategy. It was also explained that the implementation of permit parking restrictions would be likely to improve the current situation by prioritising the available parking spaces for residents and their visitors.

The objector was invited to reconsider her objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 31 August 2020. No further correspondence was received.

**Mr D**, a resident of Front Street, submitted an objection to the proposal based on his view that the proposed scheme would be detrimental to his street as it had not been included. He raised concerns that this may cause parking to be displaced into Front Street and highlighted that this area already experiences parking pressure as a result of the nearby businesses. The objector also asked for consideration to be given to the removal of some waiting restrictions adjacent to his property to increase parking provision.

An officer wrote to the objector to clarify that whilst Front Street had not been included in the current scheme, consideration would be given to its inclusion at a later date depending on the impact of the introduction of restrictions in neighbouring streets. It was confirmed that the request for the removal of the waiting restrictions in the vicinity of the objector's property would be investigated in due course.

The objector was invited to reconsider his objection in light of this information by responding to officers in writing by 31 August 2020. No further correspondence was received.

## **1.6 Decision options:**

The following decision options are available for consideration by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport:

#### Option 1

Approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2.

#### Option 2

Not approve the recommendations set out in section 1.2.

Option 1 is the recommended option.

### **1.7 Reasons for recommended option:**

Option 1 is recommended as the proposal will help to reduce long stay non-residential parking in the area thereby improving residential amenity.

### **1.8 Appendices:**

Appendix 1 Details of each objection and associated correspondence

Appendix 2 Traffic Regulation Order advertised on site

Appendix 3 Copy of Proposed Plans

### **1.9 Contact officers:**

Andrew Flynn, Integrated Transport Manager, 0191 643 6083

Nick Saunders, Senior Traffic Engineer, Capita, 0191 643 6598

Cathy Davison, Principal Accountant Investment (Capital) and Revenue, 0191 643 5727

### **1.10 Background information:**

North Tyneside Parking Strategy

<https://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/737/parking-strategy>

## **PART 2 – COMPLIANCE WITH PRINCIPLES OF DECISION MAKING**

### **2.1 Finance and other resources**

Funding is available from the 2020/21 (Parking Management) Local Transport Plan capital budget.

### **2.2 Legal**

Proposals that involve the revocation or amendment of existing parking orders and the introduction of any new parking restrictions are subject to statutory legal process set out in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Regulations that flow from that Act, namely, the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996. All schemes are formally advertised and include a 21-day period for objections.

Before making a Traffic Regulation Order the Authority must consider all objections made and not withdrawn, and can decide whether it is expedient to make the Order unchanged, to make the Order with modifications or not to make the Order.

In accordance with the Authority's scheme of Delegation to Cabinet Members, if any objections made in relation to a proposed Order cannot be resolved, then the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport is required to consider the objections made and not withdrawn and to determine whether it is expedient for the Traffic Regulation Order to be made.

The Legal Notice of Intent was published in the local press and may be cited as the North Tyneside Council (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading) (Consolidation) Order 2019 and (On Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2019 Variation Order 2020.

## **2.3 Consultation/community engagement**

### **2.3.1 Internal consultation**

Ward members' views on the proposal were sought as described in section 1.5.1.

### **2.3.2 Community engagement**

Local residents' views on the proposal were sought as described in section 1.5.1. This involved letters being sent to all residents in the area informing them of the results of parking assessments carried out in their street and asking for their views on the possible introduction of permit parking restrictions. Officers also engaged with representatives of the DWP (which operates out of Tyneview Park) to discuss the proposed scheme and other measures to mitigate the impact of commuter parking. The proposal was advertised in line with statutory process as described in section 1.5.2.

## **2.4 Human rights**

The proposals within this report do not have direct implications in respect of the Human Rights Act 1998.

## **2.5 Equalities and diversity**

There are no adverse equalities or diversity issues arising from this report.

## **2.6 Risk management**

There are no risk management implications directly arising from this report.

## **2.7 Crime and disorder**

There are no crime and disorder implications directly arising from this report.



## 2.8 Environment and sustainability

There are no environment and sustainability implications directly arising from this report.

### PART 3 - SIGN OFF

- Chief Executive ☐
- Head of Service ☐
- Mayor/Cabinet Member ☐
- Chief Finance Officer ☐
- Monitoring Officer ☐
- Head of Corporate Strategy and Customer Service ☐

**Details of Objection – Mr C (Dated 11<sup>th</sup> July 2020)**

Dear Parking team,  
I wish to object to the roll out of the proposed parking scheme in Benton.

Specifically, that Carolyn Close is not included at present.

The area around Carolyn Close is already a “popular” spot for non-residents to park. It is the closest, free, non-permit parking to Four Lane Ends Metro and is already used by a number of non-residents for free parking on weekdays who can then be observed walking up to the Metro station. It is usually a quiet piece of road as there are no houses on the Williams park side and many see it as a “safe” place to park.

The fact the vote was 50% seems unfair in that it is so close. The 8 houses in Carolyn Close appear to have been added into a much wider catchment of people who are less likely to be impacted by people parking on the road. I know for a fact that 2 residents were unable to vote for different reasons.

I also find it unacceptable that notifications are in place only near Carlton Avenue and Tynedale terrace. There is nothing near Carolyn Close, thus reducing the chance of people objecting like myself.

Even one or two cars parking near the Carolyn Close/Eastfield road junction makes it dangerous to leave as your view is obstructed to see vehicles coming from Front Street in particular. You must often immediately start driving on the wrong side of the road to get to the Front street junction. The risk of accident will increase massively if the view is obscured and the area will become especially dangerous during periods when people are dropping off or picking up children for St Barts and ST Stephens schools.

Additionally, as you have said previously, the DWP parking and the commuters parking close to Benton Metro are now simply going to shift to Eastfield road. As I stated above, the area near Carolyn Close will be especially popular due to its proximity to Front Street.

I also believe this will have an unexpected effect on traffic near Goathland avenue. If people don't use Eastfield road for dropping off children this will have an impact as they will need to find an alternative location to park and have no option but to try and park close to the school. This will lead to more congestion.

I live on the end and it will become a regular occurrence that I return home from work to find someone parked on Carolyn Close outside my house leaving me with nowhere to park. The increased risk of damage to my property and risk to my young children is not acceptable.

I would request that there be further consideration about the area immediately around Carolyn Close and Carolyn Close itself being included in the permit scheme.

**Officer Response (Dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020)**

I am emailing following your formal objection to the proposal to implement permit parking restrictions in a number of streets in Benton and would like to address the points you raise.

In terms of the process followed to determine which streets have been included in the proposed scheme, I can confirm that each street was considered in its own right and either included or excluded depending on the level of support from its residents. The criterion which requires at least 51% of residents to support the proposal for it to be progressed is set out in North Tyneside Council's Parking Strategy (which is available to view at the following link to the council's website: <https://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/737/parking-strategy>)

It is acknowledged that the consultation result was close in Carolyn Close but the requirement for majority support reduces the likelihood of schemes (which involve permit charges) being imposed on residents who do not want them and in our view, is the fairest way of proceeding.

As you have highlighted, no notices were erected near Carolyn Close as they are only placed at locations directly relevant to the proposed scheme. Alternatively, following the consultation, a letter was delivered to all properties in the area including Eastfield Road and Carolyn Close to explain our intention to progress specific streets within the scheme.

Nevertheless, your comments regarding the potential for parking to be displaced into streets left unrestricted are noted and I can confirm that if the scheme is implemented, its impact will be monitored (as with any new permit parking scheme) and if necessary, consideration given to the inclusion of additional streets in the future depending on residents' views and parking patterns.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above, I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 31st August. If I do not hear from you by then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision with regard to this scheme in due course.

### **Details of Objection – Mr A (Dated 9<sup>th</sup> July 2020)**

Hello,

I wish to object to the permit parking proposal for the Parkland cul-de-sac.

I have recently spoken with 2 of my neighbours, and out of the 3 of us, only 1 house received a request to vote on this matter. I find this incredibly undemocratic. How can North Tyneside Council justify implementing a charge that will impact everyone when they only asked 1/3rd of the residents impacted. This must have done deliberately to squash any negative views on this proposals.

I have been a resident of Parkland since 2018, yet you deliberately did not contact my self or some of my other neighbours, about these proposals.

North Tyneside Council taxes, are some of the highest in the UK, ranking 165th out of 205 councils, any extra charges such as parking permits will only impact the poorest/single income households, in the area hardest.

<https://propertydata.co.uk/council-tax>

Speaking with my neighbours it has come to light that there used to be parking permits in the area, however these were voted out because there was no need for them, and it was only costing people more money.

This proposal will also have a negative impact on house prices, as new owners will have to register for permits and no one wants to pay any extra to a local authority.

Please answer the following:

1. Why was I and my neighbour deliberately missed from the vote?
2. Will this impact parking on drives?
3. How much will a permit cost?
4. How many permits will be allocated per house hold?
5. How many household out of the actual households impacted, were asked for their vote?
6. Why are these permits being considered when they were previously voted out?
7. Why have the proposals been brought about when the cul-de-sac has a total of 11 households for only 6 carparking spaces? These permits will only make parking more chaotic.
8. Will the cost of this permit be deducted from our council tax? If not, why?

### **Officer Response (Dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020)**

I am emailing following your formal objection to the proposal to implement permit parking restrictions in a number of streets in Benton and would like to address the points you raise. I can confirm that during the most recent consultation exercise we received responses from 8 of the 11 properties in Parkland and that 6 of these expressed support for the scheme. The letters were all hand delivered on the same day so I am unable to explain why some residents (including those reported by you) may not have received them. In any case, as explained in the consultation letters if we do not receive a response from a resident, it is assumed that they do not support the proposal. Therefore even if the 3 residents who did not respond to the consultation (for whatever reason) had contacted us to say they did not support the scheme, because 6 of the 11 households have responded in favour, the proposal would still have been progressed as this constitutes a majority.

Please find responses to your questions below:

1. Please see paragraph above.
2. The permit restriction only applies to parking on the public highway, so private driveways will not be affected.
3. £25 per permit annually.
4. Residents can apply for a maximum of 3 resident permits and 1 visitor permit.
5. A consultation letter was hand delivered to all properties on Parkland, in addition to a letter to explain the outcome of the consultation.
6. Officers undertook parking surveys as a result of concerns from a number of residents which highlighted that parking issues (involving non-residential parking) had returned to the area.
7. As parking in Parkland is already limited, the proposed permit parking scheme will be beneficial in terms of reducing the level of non-residential parking thereby prioritising residents.
8. The charges for permits are required to cover the cost of operating permit parking schemes in areas with particular parking issues. They are required to allow the schemes to be sustainable. This charge is not connected with council tax.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above, I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 31st August. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for

consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision with regard to this scheme in due course.

Please note that further information about parking permits is available to view at the following link to North Tyneside Council's website. <https://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/161/parking-permits>

### **Details of Objection – Mr C (Dated 2<sup>nd</sup> July 2020)**

Dear North Tyneside Council Traffic & Road Safety Team,

Your latest letter states that you are making an amendment to the proposed permit parking scheme for the Benton area, following "feedback from residents" to your last letter dated 22 June. I object to this action.

Are you able to correctly verify that these are East Avenue residents who had not previously confirmed their position regarding the proposal, when residents' views were originally solicited in February? Does their newly stated objection reflect a change in position from their previous consultation response(s)?

East Avenue has a community WhatsApp group and the permit parking matter has been discussed at length by street residents in the course of the last week. One resident expressed their forceful view that the outcome of the scheme decision ran contrary to their preference to see permit parking introduced. That resident also indicated they would contact the council to challenge the decision and see if it could be changed.

The consultation process should be a democratic one, whereby all residents are given an equal number of opportunities to provide their views and preference regarding the proposed scheme. This has been undertaken and the outcome was confirmed in your previous letter.

This latest action by the council has been done selectively. I venture that this move wholly undermines the previous consultation process. Consequently, I do not recognise the legitimacy of this amendment by the council.

If individual residents now wish to seek an amendment to the previous decision, concerning the future status of East Avenue, then a further formal opportunity should be given to all of the street's residents to restate their preference.

I would be grateful if you can clarify the council's position in this matter.

### **Officer Response (Dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020)**

I am emailing following your formal objection to the proposal to implement permit parking zones in a number of streets in Benton including East Avenue and would like to address the points you raise.

With regard to the decision to amend the proposal to include East Avenue prior to the statutory consultation, as my colleague has previously advised, additional responses in support of the inclusion were received from residents from whom we had no record of a previous response. They raised concerns about non-residential parking being displaced into East

Avenue if it was omitted from the scheme. These additional responses meant that the level of support from the street was able to meet the 51% criterion specified in North Tyneside Council's Parking Strategy. As a result, notwithstanding the fact that not all responses were submitted at the same time, officers are of the opinion that the inclusion of East Avenue in the proposed scheme accurately reflects the current views of the majority of its residents and is therefore valid.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above, I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 31st August. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision with regard to this scheme in due course.

### **Details of Objection – Ms L (Dated 21<sup>st</sup> July 2020)**

As part of the consultation, I asked for part of Eastfield Road (numbers 1 - 12) to be included with Tynedale Terr, Eastfield Terr and Carlton Rd. The reason being that we have been experiencing the same level of parking issues as Carlton Road. This has not happened so this part of the street will become as bad as Tynedale Terr. I would ask for reconsideration

### **Officer Response (Dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020)**

I am emailing following your formal objection to the proposal to implement permit parking zones in a number of streets in Benton.

With regard to your comments about Eastfield Road being omitted from the proposed scheme, as I believe my colleague has previously advised, our assessment process normally considers streets as a whole to avoid confusion and displacement of parking within streets. We do appreciate your concerns about Eastfield Road being left out of the proposed permit parking scheme and can confirm that we will monitor the parking situation in any streets left unrestricted in the event that the proposed scheme is introduced. Consideration will then be given to including additional streets (and where appropriate, sections of streets) if significant parking issues are being experienced and a consensus amongst the relevant residents can be achieved.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above, I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 31st August. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision with regard to this scheme in due course.

### **Ms L Response (Dated 18<sup>th</sup> August 2020)**

Can I clarify that it is part of Eastfield Road that I am referring to, not the whole street.

### **Officer Response (Dated 7<sup>th</sup> September 2020)**

Apologies for the delay in responding to your below query.

Yes, officers understand that you are discussing only part of Eastfield Road. As explained below, in the first instance, we would normally only look to consider the full extent of a street to avoid confusion when implementing permit parking restrictions. We will however review the situation if any restrictions implemented on surrounding streets cause displacement and consider the section of Eastfield Road that you have referred to.

I will assume that you still wish to object to the proposed scheme and therefore your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision with regard to this scheme in due course. Please let me know if you have reconsidered and would like to remove your objection.

### **Details of Objection – Mr A (Dated 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2020)**

Dear Sir/Madam

I wish to object to the proposal for parking permits in my street, The Grove, as I do not consider it necessary for the reasons outlined below:

1. The Grove is a tree lined street and parking between the trees is difficult. Most residents have got used to this, but it puts commuters off parking in this street.
2. During the working week, I have not noticed any commuter cars parked in The Grove. No commuter has ever parked outside our house.
3. Even on the busiest day of the year, when the Blue Flames host their firework display and Thornhill Road is full, parking has never been an issue in The Grove. I have seen cars come down the street and try to park between the trees but give up. There have always been spaces.
4. The proposal pre-empt's a problem that may or may not exist in the future given that working patterns will likely change post Covid-19 as more office based staff work from home. I think the proposals should only be considered when the problem starts to occur in The Grove, if it does.
5. There is no trial period for the scheme, it appears permanent.
6. I foresee issues with neighbourhood relations as there are certain residents in the street who would take advantage of the scheme and use the council to try to disrupt people's lives by reporting minor or perceived transgressions.

With regard to the scheme if it goes ahead, I would like the following to be considered:

1. The proposals do not allow for visitors parking for the full day during the week, such as social visits or workmen. Visitor permits should be allowed as per the previous scheme
2. The proposals require that each individual vehicle has a permit, rather than a permit that can be used on several vehicles. The proposals should allow the resident to identify which vehicles the permit can apply to up to a maximum, say three. This would allow the resident flexibility on which vehicle to park on the road. (I have a parking space at my work and use different vehicles when necessary - the registration numbers of the vehicles I use are shown on the permit).

3. I understand completely the need to restrict parking on Thornhill as the parking at the junction of the Grove restricts views of traffic on Thornhill Road making egress dangerous - particularly since the rat run is now open again. I imagine this is the same for the residents who live on Thornhill Road itself.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

### **Officer Response (Dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020)**

I am emailing following your formal objection to the proposal to implement permit parking zones in a number of streets in Benton and would like to address the points you raise.

The proposal to introduce permit parking restrictions was brought forward as a result of concerns raised by a number of residents regarding the amount of non-residential parking occurring in the area associated primarily but not exclusively with Tyneview Park.

Parking surveys were conducted which indicated significant levels of non-residential parking taking place and residents were subsequently consulted to determine their views regarding the re-introduction of permit parking restrictions.

Whilst it is acknowledged that certain streets have been experiencing more acute problems than others, it was felt that all streets in the area should be included in the consultation process to allow them the option of being included in the scheme based on the likelihood of parking being displaced into those streets left unrestricted.

In the case of the Grove, as 68% of households have indicated their support for restrictions, it has been included in the proposed scheme. We are satisfied that the inclusion of the Grove accurately reflects the majority view and have respected this accordingly.

Your comments regarding the restrictions being unnecessary are noted however, and I can confirm that regardless of whether the scheme is implemented or not, we will continue to monitor parking patterns in the area and consider changes as appropriate.

With reference to your query about permits, if a scheme is implemented each property will be eligible to apply for up to 3 resident permits (specific to individual vehicles) in addition to a visitor permit which can be used for any vehicle. Please also note that supplementary parking vouchers (to cater for additional visitors and tradesmen etc) can be purchased from North Tyneside Council. Further information about permits is available at the following link to the Council's website: <https://my.northtyneside.gov.uk/category/161/parking-permits>

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above, I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 31st August. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision with regard to this scheme in due course.



### **Details of Objection – Mr R (Dated 22<sup>nd</sup> July 2020)**

I wish to object to the proposal to apply a parking scheme to the Grove. We don't have a problem with people parking in the street who don't live in the area.

### **Officer Response (Dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020)**

I am emailing following your formal objection to the proposal to implement permit parking zones in a number of streets in Benton.

The proposal to introduce permit parking restrictions was brought forward as a result of concerns raised by a number of residents regarding the amount of non-residential parking occurring in the area associated primarily but not exclusively with Tyneview Park.

Parking surveys were conducted which indicated significant levels of non-residential parking taking place and residents were subsequently consulted to determine their views regarding the re-introduction of permit parking restrictions.

Whilst it is acknowledged that certain streets have been experiencing more acute problems than others, it was felt that all streets in the area should be included in the consultation process to allow them the option of being included in the scheme based on the likelihood of parking being displaced into those streets left unrestricted.

In the case of the Grove, as 68% of households have indicated their support for restrictions, it has been included in the proposed scheme. We are satisfied that the inclusion of the Grove accurately reflects the majority view and have respected this accordingly.

Your comments regarding the restrictions being unnecessary are noted however, and I can confirm that regardless of whether the scheme is implemented or not, we will continue to monitor parking patterns in the area and consider changes as appropriate.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above, I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 31<sup>st</sup> August. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision with regard to this scheme in due course.

### **Details of Objection – Mr and Mrs C (Dated 11<sup>th</sup> July 2020)**

Dear Sirs

We are writing with regard to the proposals put forward by North Tyneside Council regarding residents only parking in East Avenue, Benton North Tyneside (a copy of the said proposal attached).

We wish to voice our strong objections to both the proposals and to the charges that North Tyneside wish to levy for the right to park outside our own home.

My family and I have lived in this house in this street since 1954 and have never experienced a parking problem. Indeed the street consists of houses on one side with at least one private

parking space on their driveway, and further on-street parking for one or more vehicles outside. The other side of the street consists of double fronted terraced houses with on-street parking to the front for at least two vehicles per house, further parking to the rear of each property in the back lane, and in most cases a rear yard where residents can also park their vehicles. This alone to me demonstrates that parking is not an issue in this street. The issue has only been raised because some employees of the nearby Department for Work and Pensions park their vehicles at the entrance to the estate and the council decided the correct message to send out to residents was that if you don't accept parking permits in your street – these people will park outside your home instead.

The council ran a public consultation, sending a letter to each household setting out the proposals and giving them the opportunity to vote for or against the proposals on a street-by-street basis. Every household had their chance to have their say. The council then chose to extend this consultation giving residents further time to respond. The consultation then closed with the results given at a later date. The results for East Avenue concluded that parking permits were not wanted; therefore, our street was to be excluded from any proposals.

The council then wrote back to us to inform us that the street now was being included in the permit scheme, despite the consultation time having passed, as another resident had written to them. I do not see how the council can run a consultation and then simply change the result after it has closed at their will. They site their reasons as being they received a response from a resident who had not previously replied. If that resident or residents had felt so strongly about permit parking, they had two previous opportunities to be heard, but they let this pass. The initial result clearly shows that the majority of residents do not want parking permits in this street. Other residents have clearly stated this and voiced their opinion to the woman concerned but she was adamant that she wanted permits even offering to buy some for me. This whole change in heart seems to be driven by the council's use of wording and language telling residents that once the other streets are given restrictions, everyone will park here instead.

I feel the council are ignoring the wishes of many residents. They are not fully exploring the options open to them, and I have no confidence that even a fair consultation has taken place.

The only reason for proposing permit parking in the first place was a consequence of staff from the DWP parking in nearby streets. If this problem is addressed directly, there will be no need for permit parking. Indeed permit parking has already been in place here a number of years ago and it was revoked as it was pointless, served no purpose and simply caused a nuisance to anyone who had visitors such as friends, family, child minders, gas engineers, builders, carpet fitters etc. who could no longer legally park. Conversely by introducing parking restrictions, the council would not be solving any problem, it would only be pushing any problem further afield.

The council at no time prior to the consultation bothered to communicate with the DWP to ask staff to respect local residents and refrain from parking in front of their properties. My wife works there and the DWP take their responsibilities as a local employer and a government-representing department very seriously. They are likely to be supportive of the local resident's issues but the council have only now contacted them at my request. This alone may resolve the situation. If not, there are certainly examples of the staff parking in nearby Tynedale Terrace which could have been dealt with by the police rather than a parking scheme as they block the entire footpath by parking on it near the junction with station road. Incidentally, this is not outside anyone's driveway.

The council could also have addressed this many years ago by allowing sufficient parking spaces when the DWP site was developed. Instead, they limited their plans, yet have now

allowed the DWP to develop even more spare land adjacent to their car park with a new housing estate.

The council and residents also have the option to ask the police to stop anyone entering and parking in our entire estate, which of course includes East Avenue. There are clear NO MOTOR VEHICLES signs at the entrances to our estate, a red circle with a motorcycle over a car. These signs give ORDERS and are enforceable by law. I have taken legal advice on this and anyone who enters our estate and parks in East Avenue with no business in the estate is committing an offence. This renders the whole point in issuing permits as a pointless paper exercise to extract money from residents to allow them to park in front of their own house, something we are absolutely not prepared to do. The council should have taken this fully into account, and highlighted this to all residents before trying to persuade them to accept a chargeable permit scheme. If these signs are enforced, the parking stops immediately and the problem disappears.

We wish to make it clear that we strongly object to these proposals including but not exclusively on the grounds above. We cannot agree to pay for unwanted permits to park outside our own home. We feel the consultation has reached a result, which pleases the council and not the residents who clearly voted against this in the council's initial consultation.

### **Officer Response (Dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020)**

I am emailing following your formal objection to the proposal to implement permit parking zones in a number of streets in Benton including East Avenue and to address the points you raise.

With regard to the decision to amend the proposal to include East Avenue prior to the statutory consultation, as my colleague has previously advised, additional responses in support of the inclusion were received from residents from whom we had no record of a previous response. They raised concerns about non-residential parking being displaced into East Avenue if it was omitted from the scheme. These additional responses meant that the level of support from the street was able to meet the 51% criterion specified in North Tyneside Council's Parking Strategy. As a result, notwithstanding the fact that not all responses were submitted at the same time, officers are of the opinion that the inclusion of East Avenue in the proposed scheme accurately reflects the current views of the majority of its residents and is therefore valid.

To address your point about the DWP, I can confirm that officers have engaged with the DWP around sustainable travel and parking prior to you suggesting this course of action but unfortunately problems in the area have persisted. Similarly, officers have discussed the enforcement (both of the access restriction on Grange Avenue and Thornhill Road and against obstructive parking in general) with the police previously and whilst they try to assist where possible, their available resources only allow for limited interventions.

The previous permit parking scheme (to which you refer) was removed following surveys which showed that parking problems had reduced but the more recent surveys indicated that non residential parking had increased again resulting in the latest proposal. In terms of permit parking schemes causing a nuisance to anyone with visitors, please note that visitor permits and supplementary parking vouchers to cater for additional visitors and tradesmen etc can be purchased as necessary.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above, I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 31<sup>st</sup> August. If I do not hear from you before then, I

will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision with regard to this scheme in due course.

#### **Details of Objection – Mr W (Dated 24<sup>th</sup> July 2020)**

Dear Sir/ Madam,

We wish to object to the parking permit proposals for the above area and the fact that Eastfield Road is to be omitted from these restrictions.

The situation at one end of Eastfield Road is quite different from the other end, as borne out by the results of your consultation, so it makes no sense to treat the street as a whole.

Current proposals would just move the problem round the corner at the east end of the street where the issue would just need to be addressed again, which seems a waste of time and money.

Surely it would be better to consider Eastfield Road in sections of a similar size to the corresponding streets under deliberation to try and avoid having to revisit the situation in the near future.

I hope you take onboard our concerns

#### **Officer Response (Dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020)**

I am emailing following your formal objection to the proposal to implement permit parking zones in a number of streets in Benton.

With regard to your comments about Eastfield Road being omitted from the proposed scheme, our assessment process normally considers streets as a whole to avoid confusion and displacement of parking within streets. We do appreciate your concerns about Eastfield Road being left out of the proposed permit parking scheme and can confirm that we will monitor the parking situation in any streets left unrestricted if and when the proposed scheme is implemented. Consideration will then be given to including additional streets (and in the case of Eastfield Road, a section of the street) if significant parking issues are being experienced and a consensus amongst residents can be achieved.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above, I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 31st August. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision with regard to this scheme in due course.

#### **Details of Objection – Ms B (Dated 13<sup>th</sup> July 2020)**

To who it may concern,

I've recently received a letter informing me about the parking restrictions in Parkland, Benton NE128AL.

I'm sure you're fully aware there are 11 houses in this small community and only 6 parking spaces, making it extremely difficult to park as it stands. We are very lucky that everyone in the square is very respectful and looks out for one another when it comes to parking.

After speaking to a number of neighbours, I found out that several of them did not even receive a letter for the right to vote. Those people in question would have voted no permit. I find this very unfair because not all residents of Parkland have been included in the vote. They have not even received one letter let alone the 2 letters I have received so far.

As I have mentioned before we are a small community and we should not be included in all of the other streets you have on the list. It should be a separate vote for us as there are only 11 of us. Instead of making it more difficult to park in our small square due to the lack of spaces anyway, you should be trying to create more parking spaces for us. The majority of people in this square are families, people with children, I am a family of 4, and friends who come to visit, what are we supposed to do when the restrictions are 2 permits to each house? And how is logical to allow 2 permits to one household, when we currently only have 6 places.

Not only are you taking away the right to park our cars outside of our own houses, and the right to have more than 2 cars per house, you are also taking the right away of family and friends coming to visit because there would be absolutely nowhere to park if any visitors came over. I have elderly parents who want to come to my house and a lot of people in this square have people coming and going all of the time, and I'm sure if we had a separate vote for Parkland the majority would vote no to permits. The only person I know who has voted yes for permits does not drive and does not have any family come to visit at all.

The only option people have got in this square is to make the place look an absolute tip by parking on their front garden grass, and that's for the lucky ones who have a front!!

Once again this is highly unfair for all the streets that have put in their votes which are long streets with many houses on and majority having drives. We are a tiny little square with no means of even creating any drives to park cars. It's a joke. And I'm sure looking deeper into this there has got to be some legal action that could be taken by houses having massive mortgages and also having no where to park. Absolute disgrace.

Please can you reconsider a new, fair, separate vote for Parkland.

### **Officer Response (Dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020)**

I am emailing following your formal objection to the proposal to implement permit parking zones in a number of streets in Benton including Parkland and would like to address the points you raise.

I can confirm that Parkland was assessed separately from the surrounding streets with only the views of the 11 households considered in respect of the introduction of restrictions at this location. As I understand my colleague has previously advised, during the most recent consultation exercise we received responses from 8 of the 11 properties in Parkland and 6 of these expressed support for the scheme. The letters were all hand delivered on the same day so we are unable to explain why some residents may not have received them. Notwithstanding this, as explained in the consultation letters if we do not receive a response from a resident, it is assumed that they do not support the proposal. Therefore even if the 3 residents who did not

respond to the consultation had contacted us to say they did not support the scheme, the proposal would still have been progressed as 6 of the 11 households (the majority of residents) responded in favour.

Please note that if a scheme is implemented, each property will be entitled to apply for up to 3 residents permits plus a visitor permit to park within the zone. It is acknowledged that parking capacity in Parkland is limited but it is anticipated that by reducing the amount of non-residential parking occurring, there will be a greater likelihood of residents being able to park in the vicinity of their homes.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 31<sup>st</sup> August. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision with regard to this scheme in due course.

### **Details of Objection – Mr D (Dated 14<sup>th</sup> July 2020)**

Dear Sir / Madam,

Benton Area – Parking Review

I refer to your correspondence dated 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2020 regarding the above subject.

I am the owner of a residential property situated on the north side of Front Street, which forms a section of the A191.

Whilst I am grateful for your correspondence, which informed us of the outcome of a consultation exercise carried out in February of this year to examine parking problems in the streets north of the A191, I am disappointed that we were not notified or included in the February discussion. This is especially acutely felt given the circulation of your recent letter, which included our address, clearly implies that the proposed revised parking arrangements are likely to impact upon the extremely limited residential parking available on Front Street itself.

At a somewhat heated meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> January 2016 at St Aidan's Church Hall, residents raised several concerns regarding the adequacy of infra structure to support the councils proposed building projects along the A191 corridor. Principal among these was the re configuration of the A191 along Front Street to accommodate three lanes.

I would point that my wife and I were among the least vocal of those present, choosing instead to listen to the rationale and afford your department the opportunity to deliver on the assurance of your representative; namely to arrive at a viable solution to address, among other issues, the necessity for adequate access and parking for residents of Front Street.

Now some three to four years on, the traffic management chaos which arrived with the inception of the scheme has not improved and along with the vigorous competition for parking from various sources, continues to severely interrupt residential access, inconvenience daily life and engender a general atmosphere of anxiety for those of us on Front Street who at this stage feel rather excluded and overlooked.

Currently the outside lane of the westbound carriageway of the A191; designed to absorb increased capacity, in fact provides an overtaking opportunity along Front Street which invites speeds well in excess of the mandatory limit. This has the consequence of making a right hand

turn, when travelling west or east, a routinely hazardous manoeuvre and also renders the temporary parking on the south side of the carriageway, opposite Casa Antonio's, restaurant, redundant; I have never seen a vehicle parked there as it appears to be simply too dangerous an undertaking for any prudent driver to contemplate.

The single, eastbound lane is by comparison extremely slow moving for at least two hours, twice daily, between Four Lane Ends and Station Road.

All of this serves to highlight the issues of inadequately co-ordinated traffic management provisions and contributes to the reduction in road safety, increased carbon footprint and significant disruption for residents, which now characterises this section of the road as it passes through the village of Longbenton.

Whilst acknowledging that the A191 is an important arterial route and accepting that many councils face the challenge of managing significant increase in road traffic, I feel that a useful compromise could be reached by at least relieving the local problem of residential access and parking on Front Street which has arisen and worsened over time. A starting point for this would be the introduction of the same residential priority parking system as is proposed for neighbouring streets.

I am fully aware it is not an inalienable right for residents to have access to street parking directly outside their property however I feel strongly that whilst the requirement for parking on Front Street is clear, there is also a very compelling case for parking on Front Street which prioritises residents. The argument is not least made out in the preceding paragraphs but further reinforced in the more specific paragraphs below.

The A191 remodelling exercise has made the operation of entering or leaving the driveway of my address a hazardous undertaking. I am not alone in this experience; my neighbour for example has abandoned tackling the driveway altogether. In my view this serves to further demonstrate the pressing need for residential prioritisation of the limited parking on Front Street. This would, at the very least, provide a safe haven in which to remain until there is a suitable break in the traffic.

The following observations may also be of some assistance should further justification for the inclusion of Front Street in any permit scheme be necessary.

- **Casa Antonio's:** This is a restaurant with a private car parking facility capable of accommodating in excess of twenty vehicles. Whilst we have no argument with the restaurant per se, customers will often choose to occupy public spaces on the adjacent road side instead of the private facility and this creates competition with local residents who unless eating there, have no legitimate access to the restaurant car park on penalty of civil action being taken.
- **Ship Inn:** The previously private rear courtyard of the premises has been converted to a "beer garden" and "smoking area" for the resort of customers. The publican, who also lives on this premises, perfectly reasonably as a resident and valued neighbour, parks his vehicles on Front Street. He has commented that there is "no" useful parking to accommodate his customers and he could not reasonably advertise "parking" as a feature of the premises. A residential priority to parking would therefore not adversely affect his business.
- **David James Car Sales:** We understand that despite an extensive fore court, it is policy of the business not to allow employees to park on the premises. This is presumably to maximise the available space for customer parking and to display vehicles for sale. Consequently, employee vehicles but more often, promotional vehicles and courtesy cars

from the business frequently occupy the public parking bays on the north side of Front Street. This activity, if not in part already in breach of trading regulations, is at the very least unreasonable and inconsiderate.

- **Other business parking and metro passengers:** The extremely “limited” number of Front Street parking bays are frequently utilised “all day” by persons who are either walking to work nearby (Tyne View park) or using the metro system.
- **Residents of Cheviot View:** With the demand for street parking in Southfield and limited access to the rear of Cheviot View, residents frequently drift to the parking bays outside the Shipp Inn and Polar Cottage West.
- **Temporary Parking:** This area on the south side of Front Street serves no useful purpose for the restaurant, local businesses or residents and for the reasons I have already outlined, along with the prescriptive time period and absence of any crossing facility, is effectively redundant. I have never seen it used.

The current proposals which have singled out certain nearby streets to attract a parking priority for permit holding residents, will undoubtedly shift demand to those streets not captured in the scheme. I understand Cheviot View is among those which did not attract the prerequisite support for the proposal, although given the situation with parking there, I would hazard that this is down to a lack of understanding of what was required to signal approval.

Implementation of the scheme will undoubtedly place parking on Front Street at a premium. Surely this cannot be fair when the residents were not even included in your consultation exercise whilst those in neighbouring streets, with easy access to driveway and garaging facilities will by virtue of this scheme also be afforded the ability to freely park unmolested outside or nearby their own homes? I'm sure you will agree there is a lack of equality should this situation be allowed to prevail.

I would respectfully suggest that the marked parking bays situated on the north side of Front Street, adjacent to the eastbound A191, do not by definition form part of the carriageway and as such should have been included in any consideration of parking issues north of the A191. The area known as PARKLAND for example “has” been included in the exercise.

Given that the current proposals were in response to specific parking and congestion problems in the area, which undoubtedly also acutely affect Front Street, I would invite you to conduct an urgent review in which the limited parking on Front Street is included among existing plans to implement permit parking restrictions in the majority of surrounding streets.

May I also suggest that it may be of some help to remove the double yellow lines from the north side of Front Street between the boundary of my neighbours property across the driveway and up to the margin of the bus stop to the east. This would create a further two spaces at a point where Front Street is widest. The existing parking is not delineated by “lay by” and there are several examples in the borough where there are “no” restrictions right up the boundary of a bus stop. Similarly, the issue of obstruction across the dropped kerb is catered for in existing legislation (unnecessary obstruction) which would not necessitate civil recourse in the event of a dispute over access.

Whilst this matter is under consideration may I respectfully request that, as been authorised in the past, my neighbour and I may reasonably apply for permits to allow access to parking in the cul de sac adjacent to the A191 known as Parkland? However, I would only suggest this as a short- term measure as this would only serve to shift the problem.

My family has been in residence in Front Street for over 62 years and in that time has witnessed massive change. There has been several variations in parking habits and restriction's but none



has seen the unprecedented demand and subsequent disruption to residential life which has been brought about by recent projects to maintain pace with expansion locally.

Whilst I understand the impulse to serve demands of the various businesses that have grown up in the village, I cannot accept that the council would seek to place the wishes of patrons and business owners, with the resource of huge amounts of private space above the needs of local residents.

I have communicated with your department in the past, although my correspondence on that occasion was somewhat more succinct. In the event I would therefore apologise for my lengthy summation here however I am sure you will appreciate that as a concerned resident faced with yet further seemingly unimpeded displacement and inconvenience, I felt it appropriate to fully articulate the overall position and sense of abandonment.

I hope you will give my request and observations your close attention and look forward to hearing from you in the near future.

May I ask you to provide me with a named contact in any future communications in order that I may identify an appropriately dedicated representative from your department to any other interested party within the council.

### **Officer Response (Dated 17<sup>th</sup> August 2020)**

I am emailing following your formal objection to the proposal to implement permit parking zones in a number of streets in Benton.

Your comments regarding traffic movements and the parking situation in the vicinity of Front Street are noted and will be borne in mind when any future plans for this area are developed. I can confirm that your request for the double yellow lines in front of your property to be removed will be discussed with bus operators to determine whether or not this would be feasible. However, regarding your request to be able to park in Parkland should the scheme be introduced, we are only able to issue permits to properties within the restricted area which would not apply in this case.

With specific reference to the proposed permit parking restrictions, whilst we appreciate your concerns about displaced parking, we do not intend to include Front Street within the scheme at this time. I can confirm however, that we will monitor and review the parking situation in any streets left unrestricted if and when the proposed scheme is implemented. Consideration will then be given to including additional streets if significant parking issues are experienced and a consensus amongst residents can be achieved.

If you would like to withdraw your objection in light of the information provided above, I would be grateful if you could let me know in writing by 31<sup>st</sup> August. If I do not hear from you before then, I will assume that you still object to the proposed scheme and your objection will be included in a report to be presented to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport for consideration in the near future. You will be notified of the Cabinet Member's decision with regard to this scheme in due course.

If you have any further questions about parking restrictions in this area, please do not hesitate to contact me.

**NORTH TYNESIDE COUNCIL**  
**(Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading) (Consolidation) Order 2019 and (On Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2019 Variation Orders 2020**

North Tyneside Council gives notice that it proposes to make Variation Orders under Sections 1, 2, 45, 46 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and all other enabling powers. The effect of the Orders, if made, will be to vary:

- A. the North Tyneside (Prohibition and Restriction of Waiting and Loading) (Consolidation) Order 2019 so that the no waiting at any time restrictions (double yellow lines) be revoked on Thornhill Road, Benton on both sides from a point 5 metres north east of its junction with Station Road to a point 13 metres north east of that junction
- B. the North Tyneside (On Street Parking Places) (Consolidation) Order 2019 so that:
  - a) permit holder parking places, to be operational on Mondays to Fridays between 9.00am and 5.00pm be introduced on the east side of Station Approach, Benton:
    - i) from a point 11 metres north of its junction with Eastfield Road to a point 35 metres north of that junction; and
    - ii) from a point 47 metres north of its junction with Eastfield Road to a point 87 metres north of that junction.
  - b) permit holder parking place zones, to be operational on Mondays to Fridays between 10.00am to 11.00am and 2.00pm and 3.00pm, be introduced on the following lengths of road in Benton:
    - i) Carlton Road from a point 10 metres north of its junction with Front Street to its junction with Eastfield Road;
    - ii) Tynedale Terrace from a point 9 metres north of its junction with Front Street to its junction with Eastfield Road;
    - iii) Eastfield Terrace in its entirety;
    - iv) Maddox Road in its entirety;
    - v) West Avenue in its entirety;
    - vi) The Grove in its entirety;
    - vii) The Oval in its entirety;
    - viii) Grange Avenue from a point 16 metres north of its junction with Whitley Road to its junction with The Oval;
    - ix) Parkland from a point 12 metres north of its junction with Front Street to its northern extremity in its entirety;
    - x) North Avenue in its entirety;
    - xi) Queens Gardens in its entirety;
    - xii) Thornhill Road from a point 5 metres north-east of its junction with Station Road to its junction with Queens Gardens;
    - xiii) East Avenue in its entirety; and
    - xiv) Unnamed lane between East Avenue and Queens Gardens, in its entirety.
  - c) The following addresses be added to the list of properties eligible for the issue of parking permits and vouchers:
    - Whitley Road – No. 6, Garfield, Hillcrest
    - Carlton Road – Nos. 1 to 21 (consecutive)
    - Tynedale Terrace – Nos. 2 to 14 (even) and 1 to 29 (odd)
    - Eastfield Terrace – Nos. Eastfield House and 1 to 6 (consecutive)
    - Maddox Road – Nos. 1 to 10 (consecutive)
    - Parkland – Nos. 1 to 11 (consecutive)
    - Grange Avenue – Nos. 1 to 8 (consecutive)

The Oval – Nos. 1 to 36 (consecutive)  
Thornhill Road – Victoria House, Kyle House, Grove Cottage, The Gables  
Queens Gardens – Nos. 1 to 15 (consecutive)  
The Grove – Nos. 1 to 24 (consecutive)  
West Avenue – Nos. 1 to 10 (consecutive)  
Station Approach – Nos 1-5 (consecutive)  
East Avenue – Nos 1-23 (consecutive), 39–43 (consecutive), The Rookery, The Chestnuts

Details of the proposals may be examined on the Council's website [www.northtyneside.gov.uk](http://www.northtyneside.gov.uk) (Statutory Notices). If you wish to object to the proposals, you should send the grounds for your objection in writing to the undersigned or via email to [democraticsupport@northtyneside.gov.uk](mailto:democraticsupport@northtyneside.gov.uk) by 24 July 2020. Any objections received may be published as part of any reports to councillors on the matter.

3 July 2020

Head of Law & Governance  
Quadrant, Silverlink North, Cobalt Business Park, NE27 0BY



