

# REGENERATION AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PORTFOLIO

## DECISION RECORD

21 JANUARY 2001

The meeting commenced at 3.30 p.m. in the Civic Centre, Hartlepool

### Present:

Councillor Pamela Hargreaves (Portfolio Holder for Regeneration and Economic Development)

Officers: Damien Wilson, Assistant Director (Regeneration and Planning)  
Peter Frost, Traffic Team Leader  
Steve Hilton, Public Relations Officer  
David Cosgrove, Democratic Services Team

### **35. Caravans on the Highway Policy** (*Assistant Director (Transportation and Engineering)*)

#### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

#### **Purpose of report**

To seek approval for a policy defining how the Council will deal with complaints of caravans and trailers parked on the highway.

#### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The Traffic Team Leader reported that periodically, the Council received complaints with regard to caravans and/or trailers parked or abandoned on the highway. These vehicles can cause an obstruction, road safety problems, and in certain cases can then go on to cause damage to kerbs, footways or grass verges. They can also create unacceptable environmental conditions, and prevent maintenance of the highway or grass cutting from taking place.

The policy submitted as an appendix to the report had been developed in order to provide a working practice, so that enforcement could be managed and maintained in accordance with consistent guidance and criteria. There were no direct financial implications from the process, until the stage of removal was reached. If the owners were known then prosecution proceedings would be undertaken to reclaim all associated costs. If the

owners were not known, the sale of the caravan (if in suitable condition) could be used to reclaim costs, should the owner not come forward within a reasonable period of time.

The Portfolio Holder queried if there were any problems anticipated in applying the proposed policy. The Traffic Team Leader indicated that it was a formalisation of the existing powers used by the council. Problems were generally resolved by a pragmatic approach.

### **Decision**

That the policy set out in the submitted document, allowing management of the problems caused by caravans/trailers parked on the highway in a consistent manner be approved.

## **36. Greatham Local Safety Scheme** *(Assistant Director (Transportation and Engineering))*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To seek approval to implement a 20 mph speed limit, vehicle activated signs, speed cushions and road markings in Greatham Village.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The Traffic Team Leader reported that at the Portfolio Holder's meeting on the 24th November 2009, approval had been given to implement a road safety scheme in Greatham. The works were to be carried out in two phases, phase 1 of the scheme being implemented in 2010. Due to some negative comments made in the original consultation, changes had been made to phase 2 of the scheme and further consultation undertaken. It was estimated that the second phase would cost £15,000 and would be funded through the Local Transport Plan (£10,000) and from the South Neighbourhood Consultative Forum (£5,000).

The Portfolio Holder queried the level of support within the village for the proposals. The Traffic Team Leader indicated that from the consultation responses received, there was good support for the scheme; the least supported element of the proposals was the speed cushions, where 58% of respondents supported their introduction. The Portfolio Holder understood that there had been support in other areas of the town from the public for the '20's plenty campaign'. She considered that the whole of the scheme could be approved to 'ring-fence' the finance allocated. Initially, the elements of the proposal that focussed on signage should be implemented first to be followed by a speed survey after six months. If the survey showed that the speed cushions were still needed to provide the necessary

speed reduction, then they could be implemented then. If the signage achieved its aim, and the speed cushions were not required, then the least favourable element of the scheme would not need to be applied.

### **Decision**

That the road safety scheme for Greatham Village, as reported, be approved on the basis that the elements relating to 20mph signage being implemented initially to be followed by a speed survey and a further report after 6 months to assess the need for the implementation of the speed cushions.

## **37. Jesmond Mews – Parking Petition Update** *(Assistant Director (Transportation and Engineering))*

### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

### **Purpose of report**

To inform the Portfolio Holder of a consultation carried out to ascertain the views of residents on introducing parking restrictions and a residents parking zone on Jesmond Mews.

### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The Traffic Team Leader reported that a 13 name petition had been reported to the Regeneration and Economic Development Portfolio on the 3 December 2010, requesting the implementation of double yellow lines on the east side of Jesmond Mews near to its junction with Hart Lane, and the introduction of residents parking on Jesmond Mews. The Portfolio Holder requested that a formal consultation be undertaken with residents in the immediate area before any decision was undertaken.

At the time the report was initially prepared the consultation still had a week to run. The responses were updated at the meeting and now indicated that eight properties were in favour of the introduction of yellow lines, and two against. Only three properties were in favour of the introduction of a Residents Parking Zone.

Based on the updated responses to the consultation, the Portfolio Holder considered that the yellow lines should be approved as there was such strong support from residents. It was acknowledged that this would affect the preferred parking place of one resident, but there were alternatives available to them.

### **Decision**

1. That the request for yellow lines to be implemented in Jesmond

Mews, as originally proposed by residents, be approved.

2. That the request for a residents parking zone in Jesmond Mews be rejected on the basis of the consultation responses.

### **38. Local Safety Schemes** (*Assistant Director (Transportation and Engineering)*)

#### **Type of decision**

Non-key.

#### **Purpose of report**

To report proposals for alternative safety schemes from the updated list of sites, following the Portfolio meeting of 3 December 2010.

#### **Issue(s) for consideration by Portfolio Holder**

The Traffic Team Leader reported that at the last Portfolio meeting, proposals were considered for a safety scheme for the location at the top of the list and it was requested that further proposals be submitted for the next three schemes on the list. These were:-

- A179 (A19 – Hart Village roundabout).
- A178 Tees Road (Brenda Road – Elizabeth Way).
- Winterbottom Avenue.

No additional proposals are suggested for Winterbottom Avenue, as there were two schemes which formed part of the Tees Valley Bus Network Improvements Project which address the concerns at this location. Further detailed proposals for the A179 (A19 – Hart Village roundabout), A178 Tees Road (Brenda Road – Elizabeth Way) and A689 (Burn Road – Brenda Road) were set out in appendices to the report.

The scheme(s) would be funded from the Local Transport Plan (LTP). The A179 scheme, where there had been 13 accidents, was estimated to cost £65,000. The A178 scheme, where there had been 9 accidents, was estimated to cost £60,000. This was in comparison with the A689 scheme reported previously (14 accidents) with estimated cost of £120,000. It was intended that the bulk of the original proposals for the A689 would be picked up through on-going maintenance.

The Portfolio welcomed the revised proposals as it meant more safety work was being undertaken with the finance available. The Officer commented, in response to Portfolio Holder questions, that in the future the criteria would be amended in line with previous comments and there would be the ability to investigate the number and type of accidents at locations when they were being considered for LTP funding.

**Decision**

That approval be given to the implementation of the local safety schemes at both the A179 and the A178 as reported.

The meeting concluded at 3.50 p.m.

**P J DEVLIN**

**CHIEF SOLICITOR**

**PUBLICATION DATE: 26 JANUARY 2011**