

ROTHERHAM BOROUGH COUNCIL – REPORT TO MEMBERS

1.	Meeting:	Cabinet Member for Regeneration and Development
2.	Date:	14th February 2014
3.	Title:	Results of the consultation about the proposed Rotherham Hospital Residents Parking Zone
4.	Directorate:	Environment and Development Services

5. Summary

To inform Cabinet Member of the outcome of resident consultations on the proposed hospital parking zone

6. Recommendations

Cabinet Member is asked to resolve that

- (i) Subject to further consultations, residents only parking Monday – Friday 9am to 4pm be introduced on Queensway, Norfolk Way, part of Hallam Road and Sitwell Drive as shown on drawing No 126/18/TT589**
- (ii) No waiting at any time parking restrictions be introduced on Sitwell Grove as shown drawing no 126/18/TT589**
- (iii) No waiting at any time parking restrictions be introduced on Beaconsfield Road as shown on drawing No 126/18/TT590**
- (iv) That the petitioners and residents be informed accordingly.**

7. Proposals and Details

Following complaints about parking difficulties for residents living on Queensway and adjacent roads surrounding Rotherham District General Hospital, we wrote to residents on the Duke of Norfolk estate and in Broom Valley to seek their views on a potential scheme that would create residents only parking zones in these areas. The proposals are shown on the attached drawing No. 126/18/TT234. The rationale for consulting such a large area was the concerns we have about displaced parking. In total 1059 letters and questionnaires were sent to residents.

These proposed operational hours and terms and conditions would be the same as other residents' parking zones around the Town Centre; Monday to Friday 9am to 4pm. Residents can purchase up to two permits to be displayed in vehicles parked on street during the operational hours.

A total of 531 responses were received from Broom Valley and Duke of Norfolk estate residents. Also a 33 signature petition from 23 Rencliffe Road objecting to the proposal was received. This is attached as appendix A.

Typical comments made by residents included:

- Parking facilities at the hospital are insufficient, more parking here would solve the problem
- Too many non-resident cars parked in the area cause the problems (entering and leaving the estate)
- I am totally fed up of people parking inappropriately on the road, sometimes blocking driveways and making it impossible to come out of our properties
- One permit should be free with the option to purchase two more
- The hospital should build a multi storey car park
- The problem is caused by hospital staff
- The problem is caused by visitors to the hospital not wanting to pay a fee
- Why is parking only restricted to 4pm
- I have a driveway and do not experience problems
- Why should I pay for parking outside my home
- The problem is already solved with double yellow lines
- The scheme would cause problems for those on limited incomes
- There are no problems on the bottom of the Duke of Norfolk Estate, why should I pay?
- Involving the whole of the estate is excessive
- The idea is a stealth tax
- Parking zones will move the problem into other areas
- I strongly disagree with resident parking permits we already pay car tax and Council tax

Analysis of the responses on a street by street basis is attached as appendix B. The responses indicate that:

Duke of Norfolk Estate including Sitwell Grove and Sitwell Drive

A total of 331 responses were received giving a return rate of 62%. Overall only 41% of these were supportive of the proposal, so an area wide parking zone could not be justified here. However there were 5 roads where 50% or more of the responses supported the proposal. When the responses were further considered as a percentage of all properties on that street, there were two roads on which there was significantly high support.

- 78% of all Queensway residents were in favour.
- 64% of all Sitwell Drive residents were in favour

There were three other streets where 50% or more responses supported the proposal, these being Lymister Avenue, Norfolk Way and Sitwell Grove.

It is therefore proposed to create a smaller resident's parking zone. In an effort to make this zone as self regulating as possible, it will be based on the boundaries of Queensway and Norfolk Way with Moorgate Road and include part of Hallam Road, as shown on drawing No 126/18/TT505. However it should be noted that the positive responses received, only represent the views of 22% of Hallam Road and 20% of Norfolk Way residents. Since these responses do not represent the views of all residents on these roads, they will be further consulted during the Statutory Consultation process and given the opportunity to be excluded from the proposal. Queensway Court is a private street and has not been included in the proposals. A separate residents parking zone will be created on Sitwell Drive.

Lymister Avenue has been excluded from the proposal. Although 58% of responses were supportive this only represented 35% of all residents.

The support for residents parking on Sitwell Grove was not considered sufficient to justify resident only parking. Whilst 50% of the responses supported the proposal this represented only 18% of all Sitwell Grove residents. However, a number of responses from residents suggested that no waiting at any time parking restrictions on part of Sitwell Grove should mitigate the concerns about inconsiderate non residential parking. These proposed restrictions are shown on drawing 126/18/TT589.

Broom Valley area

A total of 200 responses were received giving a return rate of 19%. Of these there were only three roads where a large percentage of responses supported the proposal; these were Mile Oak Road (70%), Oakwood Road West (67%) and Beaconsfield Road (60%). However when considered against the number of properties on each street, the overall support was quite small. When expressed as a percentage of all residents, on Mile Oak Road only 19% of residents

supported the proposal, on Oakwood Road West it was 22% and on Beaconsfield Road 23%.

On all other roads consulted the majority of those responding to the consultation were not in favour of parking controls.

In view of this it is considered that was insufficient support to justify implementing a residents' parking zone in the Broom Valley area. However there are parts of Beaconsfield Road in the vicinity of its junction with Carlingford Road where non residential parking is obstructing the safe and free flow of traffic. It is therefore proposed to implement no waiting at any time parking restrictions at the locations shown on drawing No 126/18/TT590.

8. Finance

The proposal will cost in the region of £30,000 and will be funded by the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Block grant for 2013/14.

9. Risks and Uncertainties

Non residential parking maybe displaced on to adjacent streets

10. Policy and Performance Agenda Implications

The proposals are in line with objectives set out in the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy / Local Transport Plan 3; policy S "to encourage active travel and develop high quality cycling and walking networks", policy W "to encourage safer road use and reduce casualties on our roads", policy Y "to focus safety efforts on vulnerable road groups".

11. Background Papers and Consultation

Appendix A – Analysis of responses

Appendix B - Petition from 23 Rencliffe Avenue

The proposals have been discussed with the Boston Castle and Sitwell Ward Members.

Contact Name: *Simon Quarta, Assistant Engineer, Ext 54491*