



## Report to Leader (Transport portfolio)

**Decision Date:** 1 April 2022

**Reference number:** TR14.22

**Title:** **High Wycombe Junction Protection Restrictions**

**Cabinet Member(s):** Councillor Steve Broadbent

**Contact officer:** Ricky Collymore - Technician  
Ricky.Collymore@buckinghamshire.gov.uk

**Ward(s) affected:** Abbey; Booker Cressex and Castlefield; Downley; Terriers and Amersham Hill; Ryemead and Micklefield; West Wycombe.

### Recommendations:

- a. The Leader of the Council authorises the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the scheme outlined in this report. Noting that it is different to the one that was advertised as part of the Statutory Consultation process.
- b. That the Traffic Regulation Order be made as advertised at Statutory Consultation but with the following amendment:
  - *Not to implement the proposed extension of No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions (Double Yellow Lines) on the westbound carriageway of Warren Wood Drive shown in mapping tile HD61.*
- c. That responders to the Statutory Consultation be informed of the Leader's Decision.

### Reason for decision:

These restrictions for the High Wycombe area are to be implemented as per Highway Code Rule 243 on safety grounds. This includes, DO NOT stop or park 'anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services' & 'opposite or within 10

*metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space’, ‘on a bend’ ‘except when forced to do so by stationary traffic.’*

## **1. Executive summary**

On behalf of local members, Transport for Buckinghamshire were commissioned to undertake a waiting restriction review for various junctions, bends, hills and areas of limited visibility in the High Wycombe area. The project scope consisted of proposals to implement changes to the selected locations such as introducing new or amending existing No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions. This Key Decision Report relates to the subsequent review of the Statutory Consultation and makes recommendations to the Leader and Cabinet Member for Transportation.

## **2. Content of report**

- 2.1 Buckinghamshire Council is responsible for the highway network within its boundary; this includes the provision, management and enforcement of waiting restrictions:
- 2.2 It had been established that some areas within the High Wycombe area had issues with regards to vehicle parking in locations that limited the visibility of pedestrians and other road users. Some of these locations reviewed also presented challenges for larger vehicles such emergency and refuse services to access and egress to carriageways.
- 2.3 The No Waiting at Any Time restriction proposals have been developed to comply with Highway Code Rule 243 in order to restrict parking on various junctions, bends and hills as well as create a safer environment for pedestrians and road users.
- 2.4 These measures were advertised and promoted locally through the Statutory Consultation process, carried out between **13<sup>th</sup> October 2021 and 8<sup>th</sup> November 2021** in accordance with the Local Authorities’ Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 (“the TRO Regulations”) Copies of the Statutory Consultation Documents can be found attached as appendices.
- 2.5 The Police, Fire and Rescue Service and Ambulance Service were made aware of the consultation.
- 2.6 In support of the Statutory Consultation, Transport for Buckinghamshire distributed letters to residents of the roads where waiting restriction changes or introductions were proposed. This letter included the methods by which the residents could obtain more information and provide feedback. Letters were also posted to local businesses whose employees may be affected by a change in waiting restrictions.
- 2.7 Notices and posters were placed on site informing the public of the statutory consultation on the road names affected and how they could obtain more information and provide feedback. The draft notice was also advertised in the local press.

- 2.8 During this Statutory Consultation we received a total of **37** responses to the proposals put forward. These responses were received via Online Survey, Traffweb and email.
- 2.9 We received **24** responses in favour of the proposals, **9** against the proposals and **4** that did not commit either way.
- 2.10 There were 3 locations where there were more respondents against the proposals than in favour of them, below is a summary of their comments and the responses to them

- Hithercroft Road

The comments against the proposals in Hithercroft Road included beliefs that the restrictions would eliminate any visitor parking. There was a comment stating that there is no visibility problem at the junctions. However, there were comments in favour of this proposal stating that there are visibility issues at the junctions.

*The restrictions for Hithercroft Road are to be implemented as per Highway Code Rule 243 on safety grounds. This includes, DO NOT stop or park 'anywhere you would prevent access for Emergency Services' & 'opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space', 'on a bend' **except** when forced to do so by stationary traffic.*

- Plumer Road

The respondent against the proposals for Plumer Road stated that their husband has Alzheimer's and needs his carers to be able to park and access their property. The respondent stated that there is not much in the way of cars parked during the day and was quoting prescribed hour changes, which would create difficulties for the husband's carers.

*The restrictions for Plumer Road are to be implemented as per Highway Code Rule 243 on safety grounds. The proposed No Waiting at Any Time restrictions on Plumer Road were leading up to and around the chicanes on the carriageway. There are no proposals to change any restriction hours within this consultation.*

- Warren Wood Drive

*The respondent against the proposals for Warren Wood Drive stated that the proposals to extend restrictions on the eastbound carriageway would be a good idea in that it would improve visibility and access/egress to/of the nearby property. However, the respondent also believed that the proposed extension of double yellow lines on the westbound carriageway was unnecessary. The respondent stated that the lane next to Wyck Lodge does not constitute as a junction and therefore there is no need to extend the current restrictions that already run 10 metres from the said lane.*

*The proposals were reviewed, and it was agreed to **amend the restrictions advertised by removing the extension of No Waiting at Any Time Restrictions proposed on the westbound carriageway (Map Tile HD61). The proposal on the eastbound carriageway to remain as advertised.***

- 2.11 Other comments received against the proposals during the Statutory Consultation are summarised as follows:

- *Beliefs that there wasn't a parking issue on their relevant road.*
- *One respondent advised that the proposals could have a detrimental effect on elderly live-in relatives, stating that the elderly relatives require access to the road at all times. They also stated that the proposals seem to be targeting the BAME community and will affect female and child occupants who will have to walk further to the property.*
- *Comments stating that they believe the proposals are not needed and that they will not be effective in creating a safer environment.*
- *Comments stating that any new restrictions will have to be enforced vigorously.*
- *Comments against the proposals cited a fear of increased speeds due to less on-street parking.*

- 2.12 Comments received during this Statutory Consultation that were in favour of the proposals are summarised as follows:

- *Comments that strongly agree due to their experience of inconsiderate parking especially during the school pick up and drop off times.*
- *Some respondents in favour of the proposals requested measures to be introduced to other areas not involved in the consultation as they thought the current proposals did not extend far enough in their relevant road.*

- *There were some respondents who cited issues accessing and exiting their driveways due to parking issues that these proposals should alleviate so therefore support the proposals for restrictions near to their properties.*
- *Many respondents had been anticipating restrictions being introduced for a while.*
- *Comments stating that cars parked on the footpath caused parents taking their children to the Bambinos Nursery to have to walk in the carriageway which is hazardous especially with young children.*

### **3. Other options considered**

- 3.1 Not to proceed with any of the proposed restrictions; this would not address the issues raised by members and neighbourhood working groups.
- 3.2 To partially implement the proposed restrictions; this would only partly address the issues raised by members and neighbourhood working groups which may lead to parking displacement issues.

### **4 Legal and financial implications**

- 4.1 Section 122 of the Road Traffic Act 1984 places a duty on Buckinghamshire Council to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.
- 4.2 Regulation 14 of the TRO Regulations state that an Order making authority may modify an Order. Whether in receipt of any objections or otherwise, before it is made.
- 4.3 When the decision is taken and recommendations agreed, the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be made and signed. The responders to the consultation and persons likely to be affected will be informed of the decisions made and representations considered. The Traffic Regulation Order will be signed and re-advertised by Buckinghamshire Council.
- 4.4 Any further reviews or any other waiting restrictions TRO would require a Project Initiation Document and further agreed funding streams.
- 4.5 Any income from Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) will be retained by Buckinghamshire Council and will contribute to the running cost of parking enforcement and activities across the County.

## 5 Local councillors & community boards consultation & views

5.1 The proposals put forward during this Statutory Consultation were the result of several months of insight provided from; and engagement with, the relevant local councillors. Responses to the Statutory Consultation proposals received from the relevant local members are outlined below:

Buckinghamshire Council Member	Response (to question on supporting recommendations)
Cllr Andrea Baughan	I feel the suggestions in our Division will make life more pleasant and safe for residents.
Cllr Arif Hussain	I am in support of this report.
Cllr Julia Wassall	I naturally support all the schemes nominated.
Cllr Melanie Smith	I am happy with your proposal regarding junction markings in the Downley ward
Cllr Majid Hussain	With regards to (DYL) on John Hall Way I'm in favour of this to be done.
Cllr Tony Green	I am writing to confirm my support for the proposed projects with the Terriers and Amersham Hill ward.
Cllr Karen Bates	Yes I support these proposals.
Cllr Paul Turner	<p>Councillor Responses – Paul Turner, Downley Ward</p> <p><u>General Comment</u></p> <p>The proposals are all within the Highway Code rule 243 and I support the officer's recommendation for Downley ward in full.</p> <p><u>Specific comments for consideration</u></p> <p>The junction protection markings proposed for the bus route (no.30) through Downley further protects the very important bus service. Buses can find it difficult to negotiate some of the junctions where cars are parked too close, continual impedance or inaccessible routes due to parked cars at junctions may lead to the cessation of the service into the village, this issue has previously been raised as a real possibility.</p>

	<p>Parking close to The Downley School in Faulkner Way (incl.Grays Lane junction and Grays Lane with Plomer Green Lane). The yellow lines are in part, an enforceable replacement for the zig-zags which are already in place in part of the area proposed for double yellow lines. 400 children plus attend The Downley School, and in addition the school site is the location for Chiltern Wood School, the pupils attending Chiltern Wood arrive by car/taxi/minibus and the vehicles need a clear and safe route into the school. Enhancement of the junction protection markings in this area must be a priority for the safety of highway users and pedestrians.</p> <p>Mines Close has a difficult entrance/exit from Plomer Green Lane. Sight lines need to be maintained for the safety of highway users. This issue is being raised by local residents on a frequent basis.</p> <p>Junction protection markings on Hithercroft Road. Hithercroft Road is a busy road and sight lines need to be maintained for the safety of users of the highway.</p> <p>The proposals have been through the Community Boards (HWCB and NWCCB depending on location), discussed and agreed by its members and in the case of the Downley Parish ones, have for the most part been discussed and agreed by the Parish Council. DPC are also part funding some of them.</p>
Cllr Imran Hussain	It's a yes from me.
Cllr Nabeela Rana	It's a Yes from me too.
Cllr Mazamal Hussain	Please go ahead with the plans.

#### **5.1.1 The Localities Team provided the response detailed below:**

High Wycombe has no parishes so all of the junctions in the junction protection scheme were put forward by members. In the last year of the former County Council, we held a couple of workshops for members, and they brought forward all of their requests and rationale. Since moving to unitary this work was taken over by the highways and infrastructure action group which is member led and mostly consists

of members. The final list was amended and agreed with the highways and infrastructure action group and is reflected in this report.

## **6 Communication, engagement & further consultation**

- 6.1 Prior to this Statutory Consultation there were some Informal Consultations in locations such as John Hall Way and Lawsone Rise to ascertain whether there would be any support for resident permit parking being introduced alongside the No Waiting restrictions. Responses to these informal consultations indicated that resident permit parking would not be supported by the residents, and therefore, these proposals were not put forward for Statutory Consultation.

## **7 Next steps and review**

- 7.1 All consultees and responders to the statutory consultation will be contacted by either email or letter and will be informed of the decision and where they can find the details of the Statutory Consultation and the decision taken. This report will be published on the Council's web page.
- 7.2 If implemented, the enforcement of the restrictions would provide ongoing monitoring of the scheme.

## **8 Background papers**

Appendix A – Mapping Tiles

Appendix B – Emailed, online and written responses

Appendix C – Consultation Letter

Appendix D – Amendment Order

Appendix E – Statement of Reasons

## **9 Your questions and views (for key decisions)**

- 9.1 If you have any questions about the matters contained in this report, please get in touch with the author of this report. If you have any views that you would like the cabinet member to consider, please inform the democratic services team. This can be done by telephone 01296 382343 or email [democracy@buckinghamshire.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@buckinghamshire.gov.uk).