

**WARDS: Kingswinford South**

**AGENDA ITEM NO. 11**

**DUDLEY METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL**

**BRIERLEY HILL AREA COMMITTEE – 3 FEBRUARY 2005**

**REPORT OF THE DIRECTOR OF THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT**

**COT LANE, KINGSWINFORD**

**PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF WAITING ORDER**

**1. PURPOSE**

- 1.1 To seek area Committee's support for the introduction of prohibition of waiting order on Cot Lane and its junctions with adjoining side roads near the Glynne Primary School.

**2. BACKGROUND**

- 2.1 Cot Lane is a local distributor which provides access to many residential streets. Cot Lane is mainly residential and carries bus services through the area.
- 2.2 The length of Cot Lane covered by the advertised proposals is adjacent to the Glynne Primary School and has a public house fronting it.
- 2.3 The advertised proposals also cover short lengths of Earl Street, Mount Pleasant and New Street at their junctions with Cot Lane.
- 2.4 The existing problems relate to both school start and finish times and night and weekend parking.
- 2.5 A 200 signature petition was received regarding traffic conditions on Cot Lane and particularly at the junction with Mount Pleasant. The petition requested double yellow lines to prevent obstructive parking.
- 2.6 The advertised proposals were for a prohibition of waiting the extent of which is shown on the attached drawing TM/2183.
- 2.7 **Consultation**
- 2.7.1 Letters and plans describing the proposals were sent to Ward Member on 10<sup>th</sup> May 2004.

- 2.7.2     A letter formally consulting the Police was sent on 13<sup>th</sup> May 2004.
- 2.7.3     The proposals were advertised in the Express and Star on 7<sup>th</sup> July 2004 and on Street during the period 7<sup>th</sup> July to 2<sup>nd</sup> August 2004.
- 2.7.4     Five letters of objection to the proposals were received. Three from residents of New Street and two from residents of Cot Lane.
- 2.7.5     The objections from New Street are from residents without off road parking spaces. They are concerned that the proposals reduce available parking spaces and would not improve road safety.
- 2.7.6     The objections from Cot Lane state that problems only occur for very short periods during schools term time. They believe that the proposals are an unnecessary inconvenience for residents. They also complained that there was no personal consultation with residents before the advertised consultation period.

## **2.8        Conclusions**

- 2.8.1     The advertised proposals for New Street were for 15 metres into the street from the kerb of Cot Lane. This length is used to provide clear access for vehicles leaving the street and visibility for both pedestrians and drivers. However, this could be reduced to 10 meters which is the distance from a junction that the Highway Code recommends no vehicle should be parked.
- 2.8.2     Cot Lane in its function as a local distributor carries traffic to a large area of housing. Therefore, it is important that the roadway should be kept clear.
- 2.8.3     The proposals have been advertised in the same manner as all other normal Traffic Regulation Orders within the Borough. The current procedure does not specify personal consultation of frontagers but uses street notices so that all the public have an equal opportunity to obtain further information on proposals.
- 2.8.4     There is no specific right to park on a public highway, any vehicle could be considered as an obstruction by a Police Officer. However, normal practise is that a parked vehicle is unlikely to be considered an obstruction if other road users can still pass by.

## **2.9        Sustainable Transport**

Measures to improve safety and local environment support policies of sustainability.

## **3.0        PROPOSAL**

- 3.1        That having fully considered the views of the objectors, members support the making of the amended Traffic Regulation order as shown on drawing number TM/2183A.

3.2 That the Cabinet Member for Transportation be recommended to introduce the scheme.

**4.0 FINANCE**

4.1 The cost associated with the making and introduction of Traffic Regulation Orders can be met from the years Minor Works Capital allocation.

**5.0 LAW**

5.1 Traffic Regulation Orders are made under Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

**6.0 EQUAL OPPORTUNITIES**

6.1 The proposal contained within this report complies with the Council's equal opportunities policy.

**7.0 RECOMMENDATION**

7.1 That the proposals set out within Section 3.0 of this report be approved.



.....  
**JOHN B. MILLAR – DIRECTOR OF THE URBAN ENVIRONMENT**

Contact Officer:                      Graham Isherwood – Ext 5459  
   Bob Morris – Ext 4475

**Background documents used in the preparation of this report:-**

1. 200 signature petition dated 28/7/03
2. Letters to Ward Members dated 10/5/04
3. Letters to Police dated 13/5/04
4. 5 letters of objection