1 **Purpose of the report**

1.1 This report is to advise Members of objections received to the proposed ‘No Waiting At Any Time’ with peak time loading restrictions on Shawclough Road and some side streets in Healey Ward.

2 **Recommendations**

2.1 It is recommended that the Committee considers whether the proposed Traffic Regulation Order Borough of Rochdale ((Civil Enforcement of Traffic Contraventions) (Various Street) (Rochdale Township) Order 2008) (Amendment) (No.83) Order outlined in Section 7 of this report be implemented.

2.2 This report was considered by the Committee at its meeting on 20th January 2015 at which it was resolved to make the Traffic Regulation Order as originally proposed. However due to a technical oversight not all of the objectors and interested members of the public were given advance notification of the meeting date so that may be afforded the opportunity to attend, hence its resubmission with the sole addition of this paragraph of explanation to the 24th March meeting.

2.3 When the Committee further considered this report on 24th March 2015 it was decided that it be deferred to the next scheduled meeting on 16th June 2015.

3 **Reason for recommendation**

3.1 To comply with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 the Authority must consider all objections submitted during the 28 day consultation period (see section 7) before ‘Making’ a Traffic Regulation Order.

3.2 The committee should make a decision in respect of the objections received so that the scheme to impose ‘No Waiting At Any Time’ restrictions with peak time loading restrictions can be progressed.

3.3 It should be noted that in considering the report, the proposed Order is deemed...
strategic in nature and should be dealt with in accordance with Section F2 of the Scheme of Delegation to Township Committee. Committee has delegated power to confirm the proposals and the Order. However, if the Committee wish not to confirm the proposals and Order, the matter must be referred to Cabinet for a decision.

4 Alternatives Considered
4.1 None

5 Consultation Undertaken
5.1 Consultation required by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 has taken place.  
5.2 The Emergency Services, Transport for Greater Manchester, The Freight Transport Association and The Road Haulage Association were consulted on 2nd May 2014.  
5.3 Notices of intention were posted on site and published in the local newspaper on the 7th May 2014.   
5.4 The objection period ran until the 4th June 2014.

6 Background:

6.1 Statement of Reasons
6.1.1 A request has been received for the Council to introduce parking restrictions on Shawclough Road, Rochdale between Fallowfield Drive and Dell Road.  
6.1.2 It has been reported that vehicles park on both sides of the carriageway creating a hazard for pedestrians crossing, especially school children.  
6.1.3 Also the renovated Healey Hotel Public House and the new residential development opposite Turnpike Close has created an increased demand for on-street parking.  
6.1.4 It has also been reported that the double parking also restricts the two-way traffic flow on Shawclough Road, which is a route known to have a relatively high traffic flow.  
6.1.5 To the north, the alignment at Lower Fold is particularly poor where forward visibility is compromised by the brow of a hill and a high retaining wall.  
6.1.6 The carriageway alignment between Campion Way and Joseph Street also restricts visibility at both Turnpike Close and Fallowfield Drive.  
6.1.7 Therefore, it is proposed to extend the proposal to include parking restrictions on these two areas.  
6.1.8 It is proposed to introduce a 24 hour parking restriction and peak time loading restrictions along one side of Shawclough Road and at each side road junction.  
6.1.9 The Council are also to introduce bus stop clearway markings at each bus stop on the route. This will improve visibility for motorists exiting the junctions and prevent parking at the bus stops, allowing buses unobstructed access to the stops.  
6.1.10 Where the carriageway alignment is poor the restrictions will increase forward visibility and where the carriageway is narrow the restrictions will improve the flow of two-way traffic along the route.

6.2 The Notice of Intention and two associated plans illustrate the proposal in Appendix A of this report.

7 Report
7.1 During the consultation period the Authority received 2 objections (one of which is supported by 9 nearby residents).  
7.2 Unusually for a Traffic Regulation Order proposal 12 letters or emails of support were also received.
7.3 The Council is only required to formally consider the objections received but in this instance it is considered appropriate to describe the scope and strength of feeling expressed in support of this traffic regulation order proposal.
7.4 A synopsis of the objections received and the response of the Director of Economy & Environment, together with the objection emails are attached at Appendix B of this report.
7.5 In considering the objections the committee should be mindful that the only right the general public has on the highway is right of passage along it. The authority has both a duty of care to ensure the safety of the travelling public and duty under the Traffic Management Act 2004 to maintain the expeditious movement of traffic.
7.6 A summary of the expressions of support and points raised are in Appendix C of this report.

8 Legal Implications
8.1 The Council has a statutory duty to ensure that its highways operate safely for the safe passage of all traffic including pedestrians.

9 Financial Implications
9.1 The proposed Traffic Regulation Order is a Rochdale Township Capital Scheme, and is therefore funded from Township Funds.
9.2 If the committee approves the order, then the Order can be ‘made’ and implemented.

10 Personnel Implications
10.1 The scheme has no personnel implications.

11 Corporate Priorities
11.1 The proposed scheme is generated by Rochdale Township Committee.

12 Risk Assessment Implications
12.1 There are no risk assessment implications.

13 Equalities Impacts
13.1 Workforce Equality Impacts Assessment

There are no workforce equality issues arising from this report.

9.2 Equality/Community Impact Assessments

There are no equality/community issues arising from this report.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Background Papers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Document</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that the Rochdale Borough Council, in exercise of its powers under Sections 1, 2 and 4 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, intend to make an Order, the effect of which would be to amend the Borough of Rochdale (Civil Enforcement of Traffic Contraventions) (Various Streets) (Rochdale Township) Order 2008 by inserting the following:-

Schedule 1.1
No Waiting At Any Time

Schedule 5.2
No Loading
Mon – Fri, 8 am – 9.30 am And 4 pm – 6 pm

Shawclough Road, Healey Ward

(niii) south west side from a point 10 metres south east of its junction with Joseph Street to a point 82 metres north west of its junction with Harridge Street

Harridge Street, Healey Ward

(ni) both sides from its junction with Shawclough Road for a distance of 10 metres in a south westerly direction

The Harridge, Healey Ward

(ni) north west side from its junction with Shawclough Road for a distance of 10 metres in a south westerly direction
(nii) south east side from its junction with Shawclough Road for a distance of 8 metres in a south westerly direction

Troughbeck Way, Healey Ward

(ni) both sides from its junction with Shawclough Road for a distance of 15 metres in a south westerly direction

Campion Way, Healey Ward

(ni) both sides from its junction with Shawclough Road for a distance of 10 metres in a south westerly direction

Dell Road, Healey Ward

(ni) north side from its junction with Shawclough Road for a distance of 25 metres in a westerly direction
(nii) south side from its junction with Shawclough Road for a distance of 20 metres in a westerly direction

**Turnpike Close, Healey Ward**

(ni) both sides from its junction with Shawclough Road for a distance of 10 metres in a south westerly direction

**Fallowfield Drive, Healey Ward**

(ni) both sides from its junction with Shawclough Road for a distance of 20 metres in a south westerly direction

**Joseph Street, Healey Ward**

(ni) north west side from its junction with Shawclough Road for a distance of 13 metres in south westerly direction

(nii) south east side from its junction with Shawclough Road for a distance of 22 metres in south westerly direction

**24 hour Bus Stop Clearway**

**Shawclough Road, Healey Ward**

south west side from a point 82 metres north west of its junction with Harridge Street for a distance of 23 metres in a south easterly direction

south west side from a point 5 metres south east of its junction with The Harridge for a distance of 23 metres in a south easterly direction

north east side from a point 33 metres south east of its junction with Shawclough Way for a distance of 23 metres in a south easterly direction

north east side from a point 105 metres south east of its junction with Paton Street for a distance of 23 metres in a south easterly direction

south west side from its junction with Dell Road for a distance of 23 metres in a south easterly direction

north east side from a point opposite the north westerly kerb-line of Fallowfield Drive for a distance of 23 metres in a south easterly direction

south west side from a point 23 metres north west of its junction with Joseph Street for a distance of 23 metres in a north westerly direction

A copy of the proposed Order and a map showing the lengths of roads concerned, together with the Council’s Statement of Reasons for making the Order, may be inspected at the Customer Services Centre, Ground Floor, Number One Riverside, Smith Street, Rochdale, OL16 1XU during normal office hours.

Objections to the proposed Order, stating the grounds on which they are made, must be made in writing and forwarded to trafficorders@rochdale.gov.uk or, alternatively, to Network
Management, Floor 4, Number One Riverside, Smith Street, Rochdale, OL16 1XU to reach
the Council on or before 4th June 2014, quoting H60/1151.

Dated this 7th day of May 2014

[Signature]

Linda Fisher
Deputy Chief Executive
Corporate Services
Rochdale Borough Council

Number One Riverside
ROCHDALE
OL16 1XU
# APPENDIX B

## Objections Received - summary

| Name and address of Objector 1 | Phil Sunderland, 4 Harridge Street  
Supported by 7 residents of Harridge Street and 2 residents of Shawclough Road |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details of objection</td>
<td>Response of the Director of Economy &amp; Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The parking issue to solve is centred around the Healey Hotel some distance away from Harridge Street</td>
<td>The restrictions are aimed at regularising kerb side availability for parking along Shawclough Road, balanced against through traffic flow and kerbside access to bus stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are only occasional instances of isolated parked vehicles on Shawclough Road towards the northern end of the proposed restrictions</td>
<td>Ditto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents have parked without incident on Harridge Street where restrictions are proposed for over 25 years</td>
<td>The junction of Harridge Street and Shawclough Road has poor visibility to the north for an emerging vehicle, and the restrictions are intended to make it easier to turn into and out of Harridge Street and reduce the risk of a potential ‘head on’ meeting of vehicles at this location. A recent service request from a member of the public describes the parking on Harridge Street very close to the Shawclough Road junction as a danger.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name and address of Objector 2</th>
<th>Mike Judge, 170 Shawclough Road</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Details of objection</td>
<td>Response of the Director of Economy &amp; Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Objector does not have any off-street parking</td>
<td>The Council does not have a duty to make parking available on the highway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sole available parking is on Shawclough Road</td>
<td>The specific location on Shawclough Road is at the junction with Dell Road where visibility is adversely affected by parked vehicles, and evidenced by the strength of feeling of the Dell Road residents. The proposals for the greater part only affect one side of Shawclough Road leaving kerb space available for parking where possible including in front of no 170. In the vicinity of Dell Road junction, two bus stops are to be protected by clearways</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requests consideration of residents’ parking</td>
<td>As a point of principle the Council does not introduce residents’ parking schemes on a strategic road such as Shawclough Road</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Objections received

Objection no 1 of 2

Reference H60/1151.

Please find enclosed a report outlining our objections to the implementation of parking restrictions on Harridge Street Rochdale and observations on some other aspects of the order. Please also find enclosed photographs of Shawclough Road taken at its junction with Harridge Street showing views both North and South of that junction at various times of the day. As you can see from these photos there is very little evidence of any vehicles parking on this part of Shawclough Road and certainly no evidence of double parking. It was my intention to photograph this area over several days but it soon became obvious that this was unnecessary.

I would be obliged if you could confirm receipt of this document, my email address is Philsund47@tiscali.co.uk.

Yours Sincerely

[Signature]
Reference No H60/1151.

Parking on Shawclough Road and various side streets.

It is apparent that the trigger for various parking restrictions on Shawclough Road and secondary side roads has been brought about by the parking problems outside the Healey Hotel. This has been brought about by the building of new houses across the road from the Healey Hotel and the change of trade at the licensed premises from being a public house to a restaurant/public house. The houses were in fact built with parking facilities at the rear and this would have been quite successful if double yellow lines had been introduced at this stage. However this was not the case and the result is that cars now park on both sides of the road in that immediate area.

Your circulation giving reasons for the extension of these parking restrictions gives the impression that double parking occurs all along Shawclough Road as far up as 82 meters beyond Harridge Street. This is not the case and the only place on Shawclough Road where double parking occurs is outside the premises mentioned above and just beyond the 82 meters north of Harridge Street which is Lowerfold Hamlet. I am not suggesting any restrictions for the Hamlet because they have no other options to park their vehicles.

I will be forwarding photographs of Shawclough Road in due course and these will be taken at different times of the day to show the Councillors the true picture of parking along that stretch of road. As it stands at the moment you do get the odd vehicle parking on Shawclough Road but these are few and far between. Between Harridge Bank and Harridge Street and I have never seen them double parked. In fact the main parking is by the telecom vans that come to work on a box junction halfway up the hill. Most of the properties along this stretch have off street parking.

Some years ago a similar application was made for parking restriction on Shawclough Road and a public meeting was held at the Town Hall. After considerable discussion it was decided not to introduce these restrictions, the main reasons being,

1. Traffic speed along Shawclough Road was the cause of most accidents and that yellow lines would do nothing to reduce the speed of vehicles.
2. It was brought to the attention of the Councillors that the road was already some thing of a racetrack and the introduction of yellow lines would make it into a Grand Prix.
3. That the accident rate was not any worse than on similar roads in the borough.

I am sure that you are aware that the whole area north of the Healey Hotel is residential and whilst all residents will use Shawclough Road they only form a small percentage of vehicles using the road. The majority being from Whitworth, Bacup and onwards. All goods vehicles with the exception of delivery and service vehicles are from outside the area and yet it will be local residents who suffer the consequences.

There is another train of thought that suggests that if you prevent parking on one side of Shawclough Road then it will give the impression that it is ok to park on the other side of the road and this might not always be the case.

I am the resident at 4 Harridge Street and along with my neighbour at number 2 we appear to be the only two people affected by these parking restriction. We have both been long time residents in my case 30 years and my neighbour 26 years. We have both parked outside our respective properties during this time without incident. The parking along Harridge Street is not perfect but has been manageable because the residents have worked together with each respecting each others needs, (a brief history is that the houses on Harridge Street were built in the 1800s and some before that, the houses in Harridge Avenue where built in the 1960s, the latter account for around 60 vehicles) however this workable arrangement is likely to be broken if we are forced to park elsewhere.

You do not mention in your reasons for the yellow lines in Harridge Street whether their
have been complaints about the parking or whether it is purely a mopping up job that whilst you are doing Shawclough Road you may well as do Harridge street and the other junctions.

In the thirty years I have resided at Harridge Street there have been a number of serious accidents on Shawclough Road near to Harridge Street but none of them have involved vehicles entering or exiting Harridge Street they have all been accidents caused by vehicles speeding down Shawclough Road and losing control on what can only be described as a slight bend. The proof of their speed can be seen from the resting point of the vehicles after the crash which varies between 50 and 100 yards further down the road.

The junction at Harridge Street with Shawclough Road is not perfect and does need very careful driving but as it stands it has stood the test of time and its record is good.

I am aware that you do have statutory measures you can introduce should you wish, you have chosen not to take this action at other junctions in Shawclough and I ask that you give this junction the same consideration and remember a very true saying IF ITS NOT BROKE DON’T MEND IT.

Phil Sunderland.

We have read the above report and agree with the contents.

1 No 2 Harridge Street Signed

2 No 6 Harridge Street Signed

3 No 8 Harridge Street Signed

4 No 10 Harridge Street Signed

5 No 12 Harridge Street Signed

6 No 14 Harridge Street Signed

7 No 16 Harridge Street Signed

8 No 369 Shawclough Road Signed

9 No 373 Shawclough Road Signed.
Dear Sirs,

I am writing to object to the above Order. We live at 170 Shawclough Road which is the flat above The Healey Hotel at 172 Shawclough Road.

We have no onsite parking and the only parking available to us is on Shawclough Road which is the subject of your intended parking restrictions. The pub itself has no car park or parking areas available.

Your proposals means that we will have no parking at all anywhere near to our home. If the proposals are to proceed then we would request that you consider issuing residents parking to us.

I look forward to hearing from you and should be obliged if you would acknowledge receipt of our objection.

Yours faithfully,

Mr. M.J. Judge
## Summary of expressions of support

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location of scheme supporters</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dell Road resident</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turnpike Close resident</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowerfold Way</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shawclough Road</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary of supportive points made</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The proposed restrictions are welcomed at the junction of Shawclough Road and Dell Road because visibility at this junction is blocked by parked cars</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The proposed restrictions are welcomed at the bottom of Dell Road because it will assist emergency access and prevent cars meeting ‘head on’ when entering Dell Road</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The bus stop on Shawclough Road (near to Dell Road) is frequently blocked by parked cars</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic cannot freely pass along Shawclough Road due to indiscriminately parked cars</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to other side streets will be improved by the current proposals</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some recent housing developments have off-street parking provision that their owners choose not to use as well as many older premises whose owners choose not to use their driveways</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>