

Name of meeting: Cabinet Committee - Local Issues

Date: 20 September 2017

Title of report: Objection to Kirklees (TR) (No 8) Order 2016, proposed Permit Parking, Albany Street, Macham Street, Bland Street, Mount Pleasant, St Stephen's Road, Garden Street, Lockwood

Is it likely to result in spending or saving £250k or more, or to have a significant effect on two or more electoral wards?	No
Is it in the Council's Forward Plan ?	No
Is it eligible for "call in" by Scrutiny ?	Yes
Date signed off by Strategic Director & name	Naz Parkar - 11.09.17
Is it signed off by the Service Director - Finance, IT and Transitional Services?	Debbie Hogg - 11.09.17
Is it signed off by the Service Director - Legal, Governance and Commissioning?	Julie Muscroft - 12.09.17
Cabinet member portfolio	Corporate

Electoral [wards](#) affected: Newsome

Ward councillors consulted: Yes

Public or private: Public

1. Purpose of report

To provide an update on current parking patterns, which will allow the consideration of objections that were received to Kirklees (TR) (No 8) Order 2016. These objections were received in response to the public advertisement, in May/June 16, for a proposed 'Permit Parking zone' on Albany Street, Macham Street, Bland Street, Mount Pleasant, St Stephen's Road, Garden Street, Lockwood.

2. Key points

- (a) In 2014/15 complaints were received that commuters to the town centre, visitors and staff of local businesses, an increased in parking associated with Kirklees College, and visitors to the local mosque regularly park on these streets, and prevent residents parking near their homes for large proportions of the day. Site visits were done in 2015 which showed that parking was at a premium during the day, and double parking on St

Stephen's Road at peak times obstructed access to the private parking area at the rear of flat nos. 5 to 19.

- (b) To resolve the problem, a Permit Parking Zone was proposed, together with a short section of waiting restrictions on one side of the spur off St Stephen's Road.
- (c) Following informal consultation and changes to the scheme, the proposals were formally advertised 27 May – 24 June 2016.
- (d) During the advertising period twelve formal objections and a petition were received opposing the introduction of the scheme

2.1. The objections were as follows;

- (i) A petition was received from The Markizi Jamia Masjid Ghausia Mosque located at 73 Victoria Road. (Appendix 1) along with 9 individual objection letters from their worshippers. (Appendix 2).
- (ii) Mr Lewis Burns, Replacement Services, 1 Garden Street, Lockwood (Appendix 3).
- (iii) Mr Seton Waddington, 153 Huddersfield Road, Meltham (Appendix 4).
- (iv) The Madni Jamia Masjid, 12 Macham Street, Lockwood (Appendix 5).

2.2. **(i)** The Markizi Jamia Masjid Ghausia Mosque is located at 73 Victoria Road. (Appendix 1). Their concern is that they have a large congregation, and a reduction in parking would have a detrimental impact on the functioning of the mosque, and cause difficulties for visitors.

(ii) Of the nine objections from the worshippers at the Markizi Jamia Masjid Ghausia (Appendix 2), 5 were from residents of the Dalton area and 1 from Winton Street. They believe there is ample parking available at prayer times, and a scheme would have a detrimental effect. 3 individual objections were also received from residents of Victoria Road who attend the mosque, expressing concern that visitors will park on Victoria Road and move the problem there.

(ii) Mr Lewis Burns (Appendix 3) objects on the grounds that he believes there will be insufficient parking to accommodate all the associated business and staff parking, in this area.

(iii) Mr Seton Waddington (Appendix 4) has objected on the grounds that residential vehicle numbers are low at off-peak times, with on-street parking spaces always available, and the scheme is not needed.

(iv) The Madni Jamia Masjid (Appendix 5) at 12 Macham Street has objected on the grounds that the scheme would severely affect the services they offer, and they require unrestricted on-street parking to meet their needs. They believe that if a scheme was implemented, a 2 hour length of Limited Waiting would assist, and they would need a minimum of 4 permits solely for the use of their Imams.

2.3 In response to the objections above, additional monitoring visits have taken place to determine whether residents have difficulty parking near their homes when special events are not taking place at the mosque. Monitoring visits were undertaken between Jan and June 2017, on random dates and at various times of the day. During these visits it was noted that parking patterns have changed over the last 12 months, and that when special events are not taking place at the mosque there is sufficient on-street parking for residents (Appendix 6). It is however noted that the parking may not be directly outside their own homes, and that it can be more difficult to park on Friday during prayer time. Residents of Garden Street also continue to struggle to park outside their home due to parking associated with a local business.

The Council's Permit Parking Policy (Appendix 7) states that permit parking will only be considered in residential areas where it can be shown that a nearby 3rd party influence impacts on the ability of local residents to park in reasonably close proximity to their homes for the majority of the time. As parking is usually available for local residents with the exception of times when Friday prayers or special events take place, the introduction of permit parking can no longer be justified here. The approved permit parking application pack (Appendix 8) states that permit parking cannot also be considered on individual streets so although parking is at a premium on Garden Street for the majority of the time, as there is usually parking available nearby, unfortunately permit parking can no longer be justified here.

3. Implications for the Council

As this scheme now no longer meets the criteria set by the Permit Parking Policy, if the proposals are progressed, the scheme will be introduced in contravention of it, which would set a precedent for future decisions.

4. Consultees and their opinions

Cllrs Andrew Cooper, Julie Stewart-Turner and Karen Allison have been consulted and their comments on the report are.

“We are unhappy that the proposed permit parking scheme is now being shelved, and are confident that the parking problems remain. They will also be made worse by the implementation of further waiting restrictions for Victoria Rd and Lockwood Rd, if the current schemes being proposed/advertised are successful.

We would like officers to explore the introduction of shared use restrictions – Permit Parking + 2 hrs limited waiting, as a compromise.”

5. Next steps

If the objections are over-ruled the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) will be implemented, as advertised, and restrictions provided as soon as the TRO is sealed.

If the objection is upheld, the scheme will be abandoned.

6. Officer recommendations and reasons

That the objections to the proposals are upheld and in line with current policy, the scheme is abandoned

Officers will continue to work with the Mosques to assist them in developing travel plans and sustainable transport alternatives and the area will continue to be monitored

7. Cabinet portfolio holder recommendation

Portfolio Holders note the contents of this report, and in particular the difficulties of parking demands in this area.

As always, there is a fine line to be drawn between the needs of local residents, businesses, and community facilities. When this is then impacted by additional parking, which is generated by outside influences, the answer is never an easy one.

8. Contact officer and relevant papers

Contact Officer: Karen North

Tel: (01484) 221000

Email: karen.north@kirklees.gov.uk

9. Service Director responsible

Joanne Bartholomew - Service Director

Commercial, Regulatory and Operational

(01484) 221000

joanne.bartholomew@kirklees.gov.uk