



Leicester  
City Council

WARDS AFFECTED: Castle & Westcotes

Report for consideration by the  
Planning Development and Control Committee

12<sup>th</sup> May 2021

---

**THE LEICESTER (CONSOLIDATION) TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 2006 (AMENDMENT)  
(ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING BAYS VARIOUS ROADS, LEICESTER) (NO. 305) ORDER 2021  
OBJECTORS' REPORT**

---

**Report for the Director, Planning, Development and Transportation**

**1. Purpose of Report**

- 1.1 To enable the Committee to give their views (if any) for the Director of Planning, Development and Transportation to take into account when considering the recommendations herein and for the Director to approve, or otherwise, the proposals.

**2. Summary**

The Council has identified existing and potential Electric Vehicle (EV) users in the Castle Ward and Westcotes Ward and proposes to install charging sockets either in lamp columns or nearby purpose-built charging posts (bollard type) as appropriate. It is also proposed to mark and sign EV parking bays enforceable by a Traffic Order at each location subject to consideration of objections.

The proposed parking bays were advertised on street and in the Leicester Mercury on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2021. The City Council has received 16 responses that can be considered as formal objections to the proposals, 15 responses to the Castle Ward proposals and one response arising from the Westcotes Ward proposals.

**3. Recommendations**

- 3.1 It is recommended that:
- a. the members of the committee give their views for the Director of Planning, Development and Transportation to take into account when considering whether or not to make the proposed traffic order.

**4. Background**

- 4.1 A key action of Leicester's Air Quality Action Plan (AQAP) is encouraging residents to invest in EV's. Government funds are available to support on-street charging in residential areas. The Council has identified existing and potential EV users in the Castle and Westcotes Wards and proposes to install charging sockets either in lamp columns or nearby purpose-built charging posts (bollard type) as appropriate.
- 4.2 This is a pilot scheme for the City Council to encourage motorists to switch to using Electric Vehicles in areas where there is little or no off-street parking. It is considered as

good practice to provide clusters of chargers following advice from our electrical and equipment suppliers.

- 4.3 It is also proposed to mark and sign EV parking bays enforceable by a Traffic Order at each location subject to consideration of objections. The restriction in the bays will allow an Electric Vehicle to charge in the bay for up to 4 hours between 8am and 8pm, with a no return period of 1 hour. There will be no restriction in parking in the bays between 8pm and 8am.

## **5. Report**

- 5.1 The Traffic Order for the proposed parking bays was advertised on street and in the Leicester Mercury on 22<sup>nd</sup> February 2021 leaflets were also delivered to nearby properties likely to be effected by the bays.

### **Objections**

- 5.2 The City Council received 16 objections to the proposals, of which 9 have now been resolved and are described in the 'Resolved objections' section below. The original text of the remaining 7 unresolved objections are shown in Appendix A, with personal details removed. The resolved objections have not been included.

### **Unresolved objections, 1 – 7, Appendix A**

- 5.3 The remaining unresolved objections all in Castle Ward are shown in Appendix A with personal details removed.
- Objector 1 objected to locations A & B (Plan 1, Appendix B)
  - Objector 2 objected to location C (Plan 1, Appendix B)
  - Objector 3 & 4 objected to locations D & E (Plan 4, Appendix B)
  - Objector 5, 6 & 7 objected to locations F, G, H & I (Plan 3, Appendix B)
- 5.5 All of the unresolved objections objected on the grounds that the bays will reduce the amount of parking in the area which has already been affected by the introduction of an experimental residents parking scheme on the roads surrounding Queens Road. Another concern raised is that the 4 hour stay would not be sufficient for residents to park in the bays. Whilst a number of the objectors saw the need for these bays, they felt that the bays could be placed in locations where there weren't so many properties.
- 5.6 Officers replied, acknowledging the concerns regarding the combination of the proposed bays and the introduction of the residents parking scheme. Officers explained the reasons for the proposals which are to encourage motorists to switch to using Electric Vehicles in areas where there is little or no off-street parking. The chargers and proposed bays are distributed throughout these areas where a survey showed there was the most interest from EV or potential EV owners, and that following advice from the City Council's electrical and equipment suppliers it is considered as good practice to provide clusters of chargers.
- 5.7 As far as the EV bays are concerned, overall, as more residents make the change to EV's, there should still be the same amount of parking available on street for the same number of vehicles, just with more capacity for EV's.

- 5.8 The proposed signed parking bays are to help to ensure that the EV charging points are available to the right type of vehicle. Although the 4 hour stay available during the daytime is not sufficient to fully charge an EV, on average it will provide sufficient charge for an estimated 100 miles of travel. As the bays are unrestricted between 8pm and 8am the 4 hour time limit does allow an EV to park in the bay just after 4pm, and remain overnight until just before noon the following day whilst charging.
- 5.9 In addition, it is possible that the City Council may extend the residents' parking scheme to streets where a number of the objectors live.
- 5.10 Officers e-mailed the objectors explaining the reasons for introducing the parking bays and the objectors were asked if they would reconsider their objections.
- 5.11 Objector 2 replied to say that they wished to continue with their objections. No response was received from the other objectors and it is therefore assumed that they wished to continue with their objection.

### **Resolved objections:**

#### **Bulwer Road**

- 5.12 5 objections were to a bay proposed in a turning head on Bulwer Road location J (Plan 1, Appendix B). Their objection was that this particular bay would leave little room for vehicles to turn and may increase the number of vehicles reversing down the road. Officers carried out a tracking exercise and found that there would be no room for refuse or emergency vehicles to turn. It is likely that large vehicles that enter Bulwer Rd would have to reverse out of this part of Bulwer Rd anyway. However, allowing a vehicle to park in the turning head may force smaller vehicles to have to do this also and therefore add to the potential for accidents. This proposal has therefore been dropped.

#### **Clarendon Park Road**

- 5.13 2 objections to proposed bays on Clarendon Park Road, locations K & L on (Plan 2) have been resolved by issuing the objectors and nearby properties with permits to park in the nearby experimental residents' parking scheme in the streets on the north-west side of Clarendon Park Road. The original objections have been withdrawn.

#### **Avenue Rd Extension & Sykefield Avenue**

- 5.14 2 objections have been resolved by agreeing to relocate proposed bays to alternative locations. On Avenue Road Extension this is across the road where it will not be directly outside terraced houses, (location M, Plan 1).

The two bays labelled 4 & 5 on shown on Plan 5 on Sykefield Avenue and Harrow Road have had no objections. Two bays were originally proposed on Sykefield Avenue, however, a resident objected to one of these bays on the grounds that because the bay was proposed directly outside her home and because she lives alone then the bay could cause her to have to park further from her home which could lead her to become further isolated and vulnerable. This objection has been supported by the ward councilor. It is not shown on the plan to keep the objectors' anonymity. Officers will now look to relocate the proposed charge point to another nearby lamp column.

5.15 There are now no unresolved objections that relate to parking places marked:

- 1 & 2 on Plan 1;
- 3, K & L on Plan 2,
- 4 & 5 on Plan 5.
- Two bays shown on Plan 6
- One bay shown on Plan 7

5.16 Officers are carrying out work to implement these bays sooner.

### **Conclusion**

5.17 Proposals to introduce EV bays were advertised on street and in the Leicester Mercury on 22<sup>nd</sup> March 2021.

5.18 16 objections were received during the following 3-week objection period. 9 of the objections have been resolved.

5.19 In response to objectors' concerns where possible, Officers have abandoned proposals, relocated bays or offered residents' parking permits to park in the nearby residents' parking scheme area.

5.20 The remaining unresolved objections, 1 – 7, Appendix A, have objected to the bays labelled A, to I on plans 1, 3 & 4 on the grounds that the proposed bays will affect their ability to park near to, or directly outside their homes, particularly in light of the introduction of a residents' parking scheme nearby.

5.21 This pilot scheme is being introduced in areas of the City where most interest has been received regarding EV's. The aim is to create a balance between trying not to affect existing parking but also to place the bays close to residential properties to encourage take up of EV's.

5.22 It is considered as good practice to provide clusters of chargers following advice from electrical and equipment suppliers. In identifying locations, Officers are further restricted to where existing infrastructure is located, for example lamp columns must be located at the front of the footway and have enough spare electrical capacity to supply the chargers.

5.23 These locations do not present concerns regarding road safety. Officers cannot easily offer alternative locations and would not wish to abandon these proposals.

5.24 Officers therefore recommend that the remaining objections 1 – 7 should be overruled.

5.25 Bays where there have been no objections, or objections have been resolved, will be introduced sooner.

## **6 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS**

6.1 The estimated cost of implementing the Traffic Order is £10k and will be funded by the On-Street Charging budget in the Council's Capital Programme. This can be reclaimed by a grant from OLEV (Office for Low Emission Vehicles) subject to work being completed by their deadline.

**Stuart McAvoy – Principal Accountant 37 4004**

**7. Legal Implications**

Traffic Regulation Orders are introduced under the 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act and the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. All aspects of that legislation will be complied with in the making of the Order. The legislation requires that all objections made and not withdrawn are taken into consideration before an Order is made. All objections received have been taken into consideration in preparation of this report.

**The legal implications are written and confirmed by John McIvor, Solicitor, Legal Services.**

**8. Powers of the Director**

Under the constitution of Leicester City Council, delegated powers have been given to the Chief Operating Officer to approve the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders as covered by the 'Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedures) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996'. The Chief Operating Officer has arranged for this power to be exercised by the Director; Planning, Transportation and Economic Development

**9. Decision Making**

The power to make a Traffic Regulation Order is delegated to the Director Planning, Development and Transportation having regard to comments made by the Planning Development and Control Committee.

**10. Decision of the Director Planning, Transportation and Economic Development.**

I approve the recommendations set out in Section 3

**Signed .....** **Date.....**

**Andrew L Smith, Director, Planning, Development & Transportation**

**Report Author**

Name: Chris Middleton  
Job Title: Transport Development Officer  
Extension number: 37 3721 (team tel no: 37 3720)  
E-mail address [Chris.Middleton@leicester.gov.uk](mailto:Chris.Middleton@leicester.gov.uk)



ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING BAYS VARIOUS ROADS,  
LEICESTER TRAFFIC ORDER

APPENDIX A

OBJECTIONS 1 – 7





ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING BAYS VARIOUS ROADS,  
LEICESTER TRAFFIC ORDER

APPENDIX B

PLANS 1 - 7