

MINUTES OF A MEETING OF THE APPEALS PANEL HELD IN COMMITTEE ROOM 1,
CIVIC OFFICES, ANGEL STREET, BRIDGEND ON MONDAY, 23 JANUARY 2012 AT
10.00AM

Present:-

Councillor R D Jenkins - Chairperson

Councillors

E Dodd
C Westwood

Officers:-

M Toozer - Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager
T Taylor - Traffic Management and Road Safety Team Leader
T Godsell - Client and Business Manager
J Dessent - Legal Officer
A Rees - Senior Democratic Services Officer - Committees

Invitees:-

Councillor R D L Burns - Ward Member Oldcastle
Councillor E Hughes - Ward Member Oldcastle
Councillor M Winter - Ward Member Aberkenfig

322 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

None.

323 PROPOSED INTRODUCTION/REVISION OF TRAFFIC ORDERS EWENNY
ROAD/WYNDHAM CRESCENT/FAIRFIELD ROAD/ST MARIE STREET/
BRYNTEG AVENUE/GROVE ROAD - MERTHYR MAWR ROAD, BRIDGEND

The Chairperson welcomed everyone to the meeting and outlined the procedure that would be followed.

The Chairperson invited the Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager to present the case on behalf of the Authority.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager drew the Panel's attention to an amendment to be made to Appendix F of the report summarising the objections in that the words 'do not' be added prior to the word 'compare' in the objections made by Christine Lloyd of 41 Ewenny Road.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager sought a resolution to the formal objections received in relation to the traffic regulation order proposals at Ewenny Road/Wyndham Crescent/Fairfield Road/St Marie Street/ Brynteg Avenue/Grove Road/Merthyr Mawr Road. He stated that Cabinet at its meeting on the 3 November 2009 considered a report on Local Traffic Management Schemes Prioritisation (Minute No. 329 refers) to assist in developing a list of local Traffic Management schemes and to ensure they are targeted to meet the needs of the community. All Ward Members were invited to submit up to three schemes which they considered important. Councillor E M Hughes had indicated that the

introduction of waiting restrictions in Wyndham Crescent, Ewenny Road and Fairfield Road was her number one priority scheme. Councillor R D L Burns had indicated that the introduction of waiting restrictions in Ewenny Road, Merthyr Mawr Road and Brynteg Avenue was his number two priority scheme. Additionally, representations regarding obstructive parking in the same area of Bridgend had been received from Bridgend Town Council, the Head Teacher of Brynteg Comprehensive School, local residents and members of the public.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager reported that Cabinet at its meeting on the 22 June 2010 approved 10 schemes which warranted priority consideration in 2010/11, including the introduction of waiting restrictions in Wyndham Crescent, Ewenny Road and Fairfield Road area of Bridgend. Parking issues in that area were subsequently investigated by the Traffic Management Team and an appropriate scheme was drawn up. It was considered that the provision of additional waiting restrictions at a number of locations would be of benefit to road safety and would assist in the flow of traffic. Additional waiting restrictions were proposed along Ewenny Road, Wyndham Crescent, Fairfield Road, Brynteg Avenue and also at the Grove Road/Merthyr Mawr Road junction. In addition, Oldcastle Primary School has no school transport and as a result of representations from local residents, Officers were of the opinion that the proposals should include the removal of part time restrictions in St Marie Street which were introduced in 1976 to accommodate buses involved in school transport buses. In order to alleviate some of the difficulties that residents had encountered in finding parking spaces, the proposals included the removal of a 'No Waiting 8am - 6pm Monday to Saturday' restrictions alongside numbers 7 to 31 St Marie Street. In accordance with the requirements of the legislation, consultation letters and a plan showing the proposals was sent to the statutory consultees in August 2010 and at the same time letters and plans were sent to a wide range of additional persons/organisations, including the occupiers of all properties along Ewenny Road, Wyndham Crescent, Fairfield Road, St Marie Street, Brynteg Avenue, Grove Road and Merthyr Mawr Road which fell within the extent of the proposals and also to the Local Ward Members. As a result of the consultation process, 20 representations were received. The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager informed the Panel that one of the consultation responses was from the Police who supported the scheme. Responses had also been received from some of the residents of St Marie Street over the proposal to remove the 'No waiting 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturday' Monday to Saturday restrictions alongside numbers 7 to 13. Residents were concerned that the absence of restrictions would merely encourage more parking by non-residents and would create additional problems in the street. The responses from the residents of St Marie Street were considered to be valid and the proposal to remove the 'No Waiting 8am to 6pm Monday to Saturday' restrictions was removed from the scheme.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager informed the Panel that of the remaining responses, many of the residents had requested the implementation of additional/alternative measures that were not part of the original consultation process. Officers were of the opinion that it would not be appropriate at the present time to consider the requests that were not part of the consultation proposals, which were shown as Drawing Number T10/03/A in Appendix C. As a consequence, Delegated Powers to proceed with the revised proposals were obtained on the 22 November 2010 and the proposals were published in the local press and notices erected on site on numerous street lighting columns within the extent of the proposals on 28 February 2011. In addition, letters attaching copies of the Public Notice were sent to all those who had responded at the consultation

stage inviting objections in writing by 25 March 2011. By the closing date, 124 formal objections to the proposals were received, with a 113 of those responses in the form of a standard letter circulated to his parishioners by Father Isaac, the Parish Priest of St Mary's Catholic Church and Dean of Bridgend objecting to the proposals to introduce waiting restrictions along Ewenny Road due to the unreasonable hardship which they considered would be caused to users of the Church.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager reported that a summary of the objections was sent to the local Members who had met with Father Isaac to discuss the objections raised on behalf of the Church. It became clear at the meeting with Father Isaac on 24 August 2011 that he had mistakenly thought that the 'No Waiting' proposals would extend along both sides of Ewenny Road alongside Heronsbridge School and thus considered that it would have severely hampered worshippers attending religious events throughout the week and on Sundays. It became clear that the current view of the Church is one of understanding the overall needs and the reasons behind the proposals, but Father Isaac suggested the need for time control over the length of Ewenny Road that is to remain unrestricted to ensure that it would not be 'commandeered' by staff and pupils of Brynteg School. The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager stated that the Panel could not agree to make such changes to the proposed scheme due to the Church's objections, as what was being suggested was more restrictive than the current proposal to leave that length of Ewenny Road unrestricted and had that change been part of the original proposals, it may have a fundamental impact on the views/objections received from other people. Making a change would require a new consultation process to be undertaken. He stated that although Father Isaac's suggestion may be of benefit to parishioners who attended church, it would undoubtedly have a negative impact on residents who would be denied long term parking opportunities along that section of Ewenny Road. In addition whilst Brynteg School is open 188 days a year, the impact on residents could be felt up to 365 days per year. The issue relating to the Church's proposals is whether the adverse impact on residents, combined with the likelihood that school parking would simply migrate to other locations, would outweigh the benefits to church-goers.

He reported that Officers were of the opinion that despite these implications and subject to the availability of funding, the implementation of limited waiting restrictions along Ewenny Road could be considered separately as a future scheme. Any such proposals would be subject to a statutory legal process requiring consultation and invitation to object and there could be no guarantee that the desired change would be made. He stated that Father Isaac would be advised of the potential to bring forward a separate scheme in future but that he should also be advised that as part of the current proposals, the short section of Ewenny Road south of the access to St Mary's Church would become subject to a prohibition of waiting with an exemption permitting waiting by vehicles directly associated with weddings and funerals at the Church. It was hoped that these objections would be of benefit to churchgoers.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager concluded that there had been significant parking problems in the area over a considerable period of time and the proposals take a balanced view, both about the need for the changes and the positive or adverse effects that will arise from making those changes. The proposals had been developed by experienced officers who had witnessed many of the issues that they wish to resolve by introducing the changes. In the circumstances, although the objectors' comments and concerns are an important

consideration for the Panel, there had been long standing issues and complaints about significant parking problems in this area. It was considered essential that, in order to address such issues, and in the interests of maintaining the free flow of traffic and an acceptable level of road safety, the objections be rejected and the proposals detailed in Appendix D of the report be implemented in their entirety.

In response to a question from the Panel, the Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager clarified that an exemption to the prohibition of waiting or parking on double yellow lines was provided for in the proposed order in respect of official vehicles associated with funerals and emergency services.

Councillor Hughes addressed the Committee on behalf of Mrs E Burrows of 16 Preswylfa Court, who was requesting an exemption to the prohibition of waiting on Sundays and for weddings and funerals. Councillor Hughes stated that the barrier at Heronsbridge School was lifted on Sundays to enable parishioners of St Mary's Church to park there whilst attending church. The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager informed the Panel that there would be an exemption from waiting restrictions for weddings and funerals but no exemptions for the parishioners attending church. He stated that the Police would not support an exemption to the 'No Waiting' restrictions on Sundays, although holders of blue badges could park there for up to three hours as long as they were not causing an obstruction.

Councillor Burns asked the Officers to identify the road safety and traffic flow problems which they had identified in drawing up the proposals for the traffic orders. The Traffic Management and Road Safety Team Leader informed the Panel of instances of cars being parked close to the mouth of junctions and traffic being parked on both sides of Ewenny Road. Complaints had been received and which had also been witnessed by officers of Ewenny Road becoming gridlocked with traffic at certain times of the day, officers had also witnessed cars parked around bends and at the junctions of Fairfield Road and Wyndham Crescent. He stated that the proposals had been developed in order to increase road safety in the area. The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager informed the Panel that Brynteg School had offered the sum of £500 towards the implementation of the traffic orders. He stated that Officers were discussing the development of a travel plan at Brynteg School to achieve a more sustainable means of travelling to and from the school.

Councillor Burns informed the Panel that he had been requested to speak on behalf of Mrs Christine Lloyd of 41 Ewenny Road, Bridgend who had objected to the proposed traffic order. He stated that he and Councillor Hughes had responded to residents some time ago in respect of their concerns regarding traffic and on street parking. He commented that he was in the position of being an advocate for the proposals and a spokesperson for other residents in the constituency and referred the Panel to the public speaking arrangements in place at meetings of the Development Control Committee.

Councillor Burns referred to the response to the proposals by Mr A Ross of 59 Ewenny Road who is concerned at the loss of displacement parking with the inability of residents' visitors to park and students who drive to school should be provided with parking at the school and not park on Ewenny Road.

Councillor Burns summarised the objections in that some residents had acknowledged that there is congestion and other residents had agreed that controls needed to be put in place, whilst other residents had agreed that there

would be better traffic flow. He stated that Brynteg School has an increased responsibility for parking on the site of the school. The effect of the objections would be parking displacement. He stated that Mr Price of 1 Wyndham Crescent had made his objection to the proposals to extend the parking restrictions of the junction with Ewenny Road to 9 Wyndham Crescent. The overflow of cars would move to Fairfield Road where the road is narrower than Wyndham Crescent. Councillor Burns stated that the primary reason for the proposed scheme is for road safety and to improve traffic flows from the A48 and that he was sitting before the Panel both as an advocate for the proposed order and as a spokesperson for the objectors.

Councillor Burns then proceeded to read out a statement which he had agreed to read on behalf of Mrs Christine Lloyd of 41 Ewenny Road who is objecting to the proposals. Mrs Lloyd had consulted with residents affected by the scheme, in particular those from Ewenny Road and Wyndham Crescent.

In relation to the scheme's connection to the Corporate Improvement Objectives, residents welcomed the introduction of new traffic management and road safety measures and in particular made reference to 'the Strategic Themes - Strong Communities, where the aim is to build safe and inclusive communities', residents felt that the communities within the scheme location particularly in Ewenny Road, has its own particular needs and desires. These relate to how the proposals would affect their parking because of the difference in the traffic flow and road safety concerns on Ewenny Road from the other areas in the proposal.

In relation to the background to the report, some of the occupiers of properties along Ewenny Road did not receive consultation letters and a plan showing the proposals that were sent in August 2010. As a result those residents feel they have not been part of the consultation process. Out of those who were able to respond, four Ewenny Road residents had not requested the implementation of any additional/alternative measures. Their responses were valid in terms of the consultation process and as such consider that these items could be removed from the scheme. When the public notice of the proposals were published in the local press and notices erected on the 28 February 2011, this was the first time that some of the residents in the scheme location became aware of the proposal and were able to respond.

In respect of the current situation, consultation had taken place with Father Isaac in an attempt to seek a resolution within the area affecting the churchgoers. Father Isaac had made reference to the 'negative impact on residents who would be denied long term parking opportunities'. This was echoed in the response from the Ewenny Road residents as was the fact that whilst Brynteg School is open 188 day per year, the impact on residents could be felt up to 365 days a year. They also referred to the adverse impact on residents, combined with the likelihood that parking would simply migrate to other locations. The residents of Ewenny Road were confused as to why there has been no attempt to include them in a consultation process as part of the 'inclusive community' which the Corporate Improvement Plan is promoting. The residents would also like to draw attention to other policies which the Local Transport Plan refers to the 'speed management programme' would also be strengthened to reduce the incidents and severity of accidents and improve people's perceptions of a safe walking and cycling environment thus resulting in more journeys being made by these modes'. Opposition to the proposal, expressed concern about the increase in the flow of traffic encouraging speeding traffic on Ewenny Road, which will be seen as a

through road from one set of traffic lights at the A48 to another set of traffic lights at Cowbridge Road and vice versa.

Officers' opinion was welcomed on the implementation of alternative solutions along Ewenny Road being considered separately as a future scheme with the potential to bring it forward as a separate scheme in future. As part of the current proposals, the short section of Ewenny Road south of the access to St. Mary's Church would become subject to a prohibition of waiting and would have an exemption permitting waiting by vehicles directly associated with weddings and funerals at the Church. It was hoped that these exemptions would be of benefit to churchgoers. On this pretext residents feel that due consideration should be given to exemptions and permits for their access and parking needs.

The residents referred to the Council's website which states that it 'promotes a parking strategy that facilitates fair and equitable access' and the report of the Director of Environmental and Planning Services to Cabinet on the 24 January 2006 which states that 'improving the management of the available kerbside parking space to better provide for residents, residential and commercial business on local businesses and residential in and around the town centres can assist those living in the area and make town centres and the surrounding area a more pleasant place to live'.

The residents referred to the conclusions of the report in that the proposals had been developed by the Officers may have witnessed many of the issues that they wished to resolve. The difference in the traffic flow and safety concerns on Ewenny Road have not taken into consideration the strategic themes of the strong communities, that they are aiming to build as safe and inclusive communities and the other strategies that the Council is promoting. The residents' responses are very much part of the consultation proposals and valid and the items they have referred to should be removed from the scheme. It was considered essential that, in order to address such issues and in the interests of maintaining the free flow of traffic and acceptable level of road safety, the implementation of alternative solutions along Ewenny Road and Wyndham Crescent should be considered separately as a future scheme. The residents requested that the proposals referred to in Appendix D, Schedule 2 (Prohibition of Waiting at any time) Wyndham Crescent 2 (i), (ii) and (iii) at Ewenny Road 4 (i), (ii) and (iv) be rejected and the rest of the proposals detailed in Appendix D be implemented in their entirety.

The residents felt that in the context of the equality impact assessment, the process of consultation has not provided them with the opportunity to express their concerns as equally and as inclusively as other parties and that they have been excluded from some of the consultations. The residents also feel that the financial contributions from Brynteg School may have had an impact on the proposals.

In the context of the recommendations, the residents requested that the objections to the County Borough Council's intention to make a permanent traffic regulation order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to restrict parking in Ewenny Road/Wyndham Crescent should be considered separately as a future scheme and the Order be made to implement the rest of the proposals in Appendix. Councillor Burns stated that concluded the statement provided by Mrs Lloyd.

Councillor Hughes then commented that the Chair of the PACT had sent in an analysis of where people live and it was found that very few of the objectors lived near Ewenny Road. She also commented that Heronsbridge School is available for the parking of parishioners' vehicles when attending Church at the weekends. The PACT meetings had considered it a high priority that parking restrictions be implemented to the bend in Fairfield Road and to the junction of Wyndham Crescent with Ewenny Road as vehicles had to edge out of the junction with Ewenny Road.

Councillor Burns commented on the problems with traffic flow in Ewenny Road with traffic having to edge out onto Ewenny Road between parked cars and the need to implement the proposed traffic order and referred to the problems he had encountered first hand whilst driving in the vicinity. He referred to the difficulties in having to satisfy all the residents' viewpoints in connection with the proposed traffic order but believe that the proposed order should be approved.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager informed the Panel that Mrs Lloyd had introduced new evidence and that objections needed to be submitted during the objection period.

The Legal Officer advised the Panel that in reaching their decision they would need to ignore any new points raised by Mrs Lloyd in the statement read out on her behalf by Councillor Burns.

The Panel adjourned at 11.05am and reconvened at 11.30am.

The Panel deferred consideration of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order pending a site visit being undertaken on the 31 January 2012 at 3.00pm and the meeting of the Panel reconvened at 4.00pm that day.

The Panel reconvened at 4.00pm on 31 January 2012 having undertaken a site visit prior to the meeting to view the proposals contained in the Traffic Regulation Order.

The Chairperson invited the Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager to sum up.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager concluded that there had been significant parking problems in the area over a considerable period of time and the proposals take a balanced view, both about the need for the changes and the positive or adverse effects that will arise from making those changes. The proposals had been developed by experienced officers who had witnessed many of the issues that they wish to resolve by introducing the changes. In the circumstances, although the objectors' comments and concerns are an important consideration for the Panel, there had been long standing issues and complaints about significant parking problems in this area. It was considered essential that, in order to address such issues, and in the interests of maintaining the free flow of traffic and an acceptable level of road safety, the objections be rejected and the proposals detailed in Appendix D of the report be implemented in their entirety.

Councillor Hughes commented that one resident out of the 113 objectors had contacted her requesting an exemption to the prohibition of waiting on Sundays and that she would inform her that parking is available in the grounds of Heronsbridge School. Councillor Hughes endorsed the recommendation of the officers for the Traffic Order to be made and which had also been endorsed at

PACT meetings. Discussions had also taken place on the proposals with Father Isaac in connection with the proposals for Wyndham Crescent and Ewenny Road with an exemption in the Order for weddings and funerals being provided.

Councillor Burns commented on the need to balance the interests of individuals and that he had been asked to feedback to the Panel the further comments of one of the objectors to the proposals. Councillor Burns commented that he concurred with the recommendation of the officers for the making of the Order but stated that there was a likelihood of parking displacement taking place in the Ward.

The Panel adjourned at 4.10pm to consider the matter and reconvened at 4.15pm and on their return it was

RESOLVED: That the Panel considered the objections to the County Borough Council's intention to make a permanent traffic regulation order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, the effect of which will be to restrict parking in Ewenny Road/Wyndham Crescent/Fairfield Road/Brynteg Avenue/Merthyr Mawr Road – Grove Road Junction and to remove the part time restrictions for school transport in St Marie Street be rejected and the Order be made as proposed in Appendix D.

324 PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF A PROHIBITION OF WAITING AT ANY TIME, TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER, ABERKENFIG

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager sought a resolution to a formal objection received in relation to the traffic regulation order proposal to introduce waiting restrictions on Bridgend Road on its junction with the south eastern side of East Street, south-westwards for a distance of approximately 10 metres.

He reported that for many years the existing waiting restrictions that are currently marked on the site in Bridgend Road, Aberkenfig had borne little or no resemblance to the provisions of the associated Traffic Regulation Orders that are in force in respect of these provisions. This is due to the fact that when the Aberkenfig By-pass was built prior to Local Government re-organisation, Bridgend Road which is the A4063 route through the village was also completely resurfaced. Rather than repaint the double yellow lines for the entire length of both sides of Bridgend Road, which strict adherence to the Traffic Regulation Order would have required, Mid Glamorgan County Council took account of the anticipated greatly reduced traffic flow through the village. A decision was made by the predecessor authority, in consultation with the local Member at that time, to repaint only the double yellow lines that were considered appropriate after the transfer of traffic onto the new by-pass took place. Consequently double yellow lines were omitted from the majority of the length of Bridgend Road. It was the intention of the Mid Glamorgan County Council that the road markings would be regularised swiftly by changes to the traffic orders, however such changes had yet to be implemented.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager reported that Cabinet at its meeting on the 3 November 2009 (Minute No. 329 refers) considered a report on Local Traffic Management Schemes and to assist in ensuring that these schemes were targeted to meet the needs of the community, all Ward Members were invited to submit up to three schemes which they considered important.

Councillor M Winter, the local member indicated that a review of waiting restrictions on Bridgend Road and its junctions with adjacent streets was his number one priority scheme. Cabinet at its meeting on 22 June 2010 approved 10 schemes which warranted priority consideration in 2010/11, which included the review of waiting restrictions in Bridgend Road and adjacent junctions. Representations were received from South Wales Police regarding the high levels of obstructive parking in Bridgend Road and the problems it created for the School Crossing Patrol for children and also the difficulty of enforcement due to the anomalies between the traffic orders and the signs/markings on the road. Complaints had also been received from bus operators whose routes were frequently obstructed by vehicles parked in the village. In addition, many of the junctions with side roads which had no waiting restrictions on them had resulted in vehicles being parked on Bridgend Road right up to the side street junctions where they obstructed the view of drivers attempting to turn onto that road, to the detriment of road safety. Local residents and members of the public had also raised concerns about parking problems in the key shopping area and the difficulty in finding an on-street parking space there because vehicles are parked there all day without moving.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager reported that in order to address the concerns officers had developed a revised scheme of traffic management proposals with the emphasis on resolving known problems whilst seeking to cause the minimum disruption possible by leaving the orders which can be retained in place. It was considered that the provision of additional waiting restrictions at a number of locations would be of benefit to road safety and would assist the free flow of traffic. In accordance with legislation, consultation letters and plans showing the proposals were sent to the Statutory Consultees, local Ward Members and to a wide range of additional persons/organisations, including the occupiers of all properties along Bridgend Road and adjacent streets that fell within the extent of the proposals on the 19 January 2011.

He reported that as a result of the consultation process, nine representations were received from residents and businesses and one from South Wales Police. One of the business representations came from Mr R L Baker, the proprietor of Baker's TV and Electrical shop objecting to the proposal to introduce 10 metres of no waiting at any time restrictions in front of his shop on the basis that it would have a severely detrimental effect on his business by preventing customers from parking. A response was sent to Mr Baker explaining that the proposals were designed to deter long term parking at the junction with East Street to improve visibility and enhance road safety for motorists driving onto Bridgend Road from East Street. It was also explained that in line with guidance in the Highway Code, vehicles should not be parked close to junctions. Mr Baker was also advised that there would be an exemption in the Order to allow for loading/unloading which, in the absence of parked vehicles, could be of benefit to him and his customers. In addition, it was explained that the remainder of Bridgend Road, between Baker's TV and Electrical Shop and number 67, which was a distance of approximately 40 metres, would remain unrestricted. Officers considered that acceding to Mr Baker's request to create a loading bay in front of his shop rather than providing an exemption for loading and unloading on the double yellow lines, were likely to encourage loading vehicles to wait there for longer periods of time. Visibility at the junction is poor and therefore any vehicular obstruction to visibility caused by loading vehicles needed to be reduced to the minimum in the interests of road safety. When not being used for loading/unloading purposes, the proposed restrictions would assist in keeping the junction clear of parked vehicles to assist with driver visibility when leaving East Street.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager informed the Panel that the other nine consultation responses had been closely scrutinised by Officers and it was felt that several of the requested changes to the original proposals were justified. As these justifiable changes were relaxations to the original proposals, it was agreed to accommodate them without the necessity to re-consult, which were subsequently discussed with the Local Member and shown in Appendix C drawing number T10/04/A which shows the final revised version of the proposals. Delegated Powers to proceed with the revised proposals were obtained on the 15 August 2011 and in accordance with the legislative requirements, public notice of the proposals was published in the press and notices erected on numerous street lighting columns within the area covered by the proposals on the 13 October 2011. Letters attaching copies of the public notice were also sent to the 10 persons who had responded at the consultation stage inviting objections in writing by 7 November 2011. The only formal objection to the proposals was from the proprietor of Baker's TV shop who had expressed his disappointment that despite his consultation response, the original proposal to prohibit waiting for 10 metres in front of his shop remained. Mr Baker appreciated the need for waiting restrictions at the junction of East Street and he submitted an alternative proposal which would give his business "a fighting chance to survive". The alternative proposal was that the length of waiting restrictions should be reduced from 10 metres to 5 metres and that a loading bay between 5 and 8 metres in length be created. This would maintain the waiting restrictions at the junction with East Street and gave a clear indication of the provision for deliveries within the frontage of his shop, thereby removing any ambiguity in the waiting restrictions and their potential to be perceived as a "no-go area" for loading and unloading.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager informed the Panel that Officers had considered the objection letter but were of the opinion that the ability of motorists to drive safely out of East Street on to Bridgend Road is already impeded by the poor visibility caused by buildings at this junctions, including the front of Mr Baker's shop and the double yellow lines proposal on Bridgend Road follows the advice in the Highway Code that vehicles should not park within 10 metres of a junction. Officers considered that due consideration had already been paid to his business in so far as the proposed restriction also includes an exemption to allow occasional loading/unloading in front of the shop, even though it was likely that visibility would be further obstructed to some extent at certain limited times of the day. Officers considered that the original proposal struck a necessary balance between road safety and Mr Baker's business needs. It was felt that if the objection was upheld and a loading bay was provided, there was a likelihood that vehicles would park more frequently in that bay and would stay for longer than they would otherwise do so on double yellow lines and Officers recommended that the alternative proposal be declined, the objection being rejected and the current proposals in front of the shop being progressed as planned.

The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager concluded that the original concerns regarding parking issues in Aberkenfig had been raised as an issue by many parties over the years since the construction of the by-pass, as car ownership and traffic flows had increased. In attempting to mitigate those issues, Officers had developed a revised scheme seeking to leave unchanged that which it is considered safe to remain unchanged. There had been wide consultation on the proposals and Officers had listened to those individuals/bodies who had responded during the consultation process, relaxed the original proposals where it was safe and sensible to do so and an explanation given as to why it was

impracticable. Nine representation were received from Aberkenfig residents/businesses initially although only one of those representations led to a formal objection. Officers believed that the proposal in front of Mr Baker's shop struck the necessary balance between road safety and business needs and it was considered essential that, in order to maintain an acceptable level of road safety at this junction the objection be rejected and the proposals detailed in the Appendix C be implemented in their entirety.

Councillor M Winter, the local member was given an opportunity to address the Panel and commented on the parking problems at the location. He referred to difficulties in parking at Church Street, particularly when functions and services were being held at St Johns Church resulting in the street being congested and which proved difficult for emergency vehicles to gain entry into Church Street. He requested that Officers look at restrictions along the partial length of Church Street. The Traffic Management and Road Safety Manager informed the Panel that Officers could look at this issue in conjunction with the Police in terms of enforcing indiscriminate parking, but would not be able to add to the restrictions in the Order.

The Panel adjourned at 12 noon and reconvened at 12.05pm and on their return it was

RESOLVED: That the objection to the County Borough Council's intention to make a permanent Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Act 1984, the effect of which will include the introduction of 'No Waiting at any time' restrictions at the junction of East Street and Bridgend Road, Aberkenfig be rejected and the Order be made as proposed in Appendix C to the report.

The meeting closed at 12.07pm.