### North East Derbyshire District Council

#### **Cabinet**

#### **23 November 2016**

#### Parking Issues at Churchside Calow

# Report of Councillor J Austen, Portfolio Holder with Responsibility for Information Technology, E-Information and Asset Management

This report is public

#### Purpose of the Report

 To consider an approach from a developer with proposals for resolving parking issues on Churchside Calow to allow conditions attached to a planning consent on an adjacent field to be discharged so that development can proceed

# 1 Report Details

- 1.1 Churchside Calow is an adopted highway within an existing Council estate and is shown on the plan linked at paragraph 8. The field at the end of Churchside has planning consent for development with residential dwellings, the proposed access being via Churchside. As a condition of the grant of that permission the developer has to provide a traffic management plan to alleviate the on-street parking issues.
- 1.2 The street itself is narrow and used by residents for parking as the orientation of the properties means that they can only be accessed by foot and vehicle parking is the only available on the highway. The developers have proposed to create 14 parking bays for residents within the grass verges alongside the highway which belong to NEDDC and an additional 3 in the turning head which would become redundant when the new road is constructed. The scheme would need to be considered further by the County Council's Planning Officer to assess its viability but the developer is confident that a workable scheme as proposed is possible.
- 1.3 Calow is situated close to Chesterfield Hospital and the roads around the Council's housing estate are frequently used by staff and visitors as free parking to avoid parking charges at the hospital. Congestion on these roads presently causes problems for local residents. Within the planning consent for the development site a foot access to the hospital would be left. Opinion is that when this becomes known the route will be viewed as a shortcut which may lead to further congestion on the estates in Calow.

1.4 Rykneld Homes have considered the scheme and the matter has been discussed at Asset Management Group on 8<sup>th</sup> September where the recommendation was to reject the proposals on the basis that the parking bays would not be economically viable to maintain and that the control of the spaces would be problematic as there is no managed resident parking scheme available nor the finances to establish one.

# 2 Conclusions and Reasons for Recommendation

2.1 That the proposal is rejected in line with Asset Management Group recommendation for the reasons highlighted in the report.

#### 3 Consultation and Equality Impact

3.1 Local members and asset management group have been consulted on the proposals in accordance with the Acquisitions and Disposal policy

#### 4 Alternative Options and Reasons for Rejection

4.1 The developers have not presented any other options.

# 5 **Implications**

#### 5.1 Finance and Risk Implications

5.1.1 The creation of the parking bays would add an unwanted management and financial burden to existing budgets managed by Rykneld Homes Ltd. if approval to support the application was made then it is possible that a financial arrangement could be discussed with the developer to off-set the financial burden but this would not assist in management of the parking and potential conflict which could emerge.

# 5.2 Legal Implications including Data Protection

5.2.1 There is no onus on the Council to provide the solution to the planning conditions imposed on the developer under the Planning procedures.

#### 5.3 Human Resources Implications

5.3.1 None

#### 6 Recommendations

6.1 That the proposal is rejected and the applicant informed of the decision

# 7 <u>Decision Information</u>

Is the decision a Key Decision?  (A Key Decision is an executive decision which results in income or expenditure to the Council of £50,000 or more or which has a significant impact on two or more District wards)	No
Is the decision subject to Call-In? (Only Key Decisions are subject to Call-In)	No
District Wards Affected	Calow
Links to Corporate Plan priorities or Policy Framework	

# 8 <u>Document Information</u>

Appendix No	Title	
	Churchside, Calow plan	
<b>Background Papers</b> (These are unpublished works which have been relied on to a material extent when preparing the report. They must be listed in the section below. If the report is going to Cabinet (NEDDC) or Executive (BDC) you must provide copies of the background papers)		
Report Author		Contact Number
Susan Cooper,	Senior Valuer	01246 217195

AGIN 6(a) (CAB 1123) Parking at Churchside, Calow/AJD