

Meeting:	Executive Member for Transport Decision Session
Meeting date:	12/11/2025
Report of:	Director – Garry Taylor
Portfolio of:	Cllr K Ravilious - Executive Member for Transport

Decision Report: Walker Lane, Wheldrake

Subject of Report

1. A property owner requested Walker Lane, Wheldrake, a two-way road, be changed to a one-way road.
2. The decision is requested as damage was being caused to an adjacent residential property by vehicles failing to negotiate the adjacent junction into/out of the narrow roadway, and, because of the narrow width of the road, opposing vehicular conflicts could occur with an associated risk to any pedestrians also.
3. The report is intended to review the responses from the Statutory Consultation for the proposed introduction of a one-way travel on Walker Lane from Main Street to North Lane and provide a recommendation option.

Benefits and Challenges

4. The benefit is that a one-way road would eliminate or minimise risks of damage being caused to the property concerned and will eliminate the risk of opposing vehicular conflict and any associated risk to pedestrians.
5. The challenge is the introduction of a one-way is not supported by some residents of Wheldrake, as it will increase the distance of some vehicle movements. The initial consultation provided opposing views on which direction the one-way travel should be signed, and whether to allow cyclists to travel in either direction.

Policy Basis for Decision

6. The policy basis for this decision is to achieve a reduction in the likelihood of road traffic collisions resulting in injury and/or damage to residential properties and the highway network. The removal of two-way travel will help to remove the footpath overrun and property damage that has been occurring, which will help to manage effective maintenance of the highway network.

Financial Strategy Implications

7. There are no high-level financial implications of any of the recommendations or long-term financial implications, and the costs of implementation for the required signs will be funded from the department signs and lines budget.

Recommendation and Reasons

8. **Option B approve the amendment to The York Traffic Management Order 2014 to make Walker Lane a one-way from Main Street to North Lane (recommended):** this will introduce a one-way direction of travel south to north, Main Street to North Lane. This will reduce the risk of vehicular conflict with buildings and provides better visibility owing to the 'visplay' available at the Walker Lane/North Lane junction. This is in opposition to the representations received to the proposal but will increase the safety of users of Walker Lane.

Background

9. A property boundary wall along the frontage on Walker Lane, has been hit several times, due to the available width on the lane, the maintenance of the wall has been at the expense to the property owner. The vehicles exiting Walker Lane on to Main Street, Wheldrake have also been witnessed over running the footpath, which is a safety concern for user of the footpath and potentially an additional maintenance cost for the footpath.
10. The width of Walker Lane varies between 3 metres and 3.8 meters (**Annex A**), so it is very narrow for two vehicles to safely pass each other. Walker Lane does not have any footpaths, so all pedestrian and vehicle movements along Walker Lane are required to be undertaken on the carriageway.

11. The decision is requested as damage was being caused to the residential property by vehicles failing to negotiate the adjacent junction into the narrow roadway, and, because of the narrow width of the road, opposing vehicular and pedestrian/cyclist conflicts could occur. There have been no instances of such collision damage occurring since the original request was made in 2023.
12. There has also been a request to maintain two-way cycle travel on Walker Lane should approval be granted to make the road one way. The Cycle Infrastructure Design guidance issued by the Department for Transport (LTN 1.20), states there should be a general presumption in favour of cycling in both directions in one-way streets, unless there are safety, operational or cost reasons why it is not feasible. In urban areas where vehicle speeds are low, the recommended minimum carriageway width is 2.6m, if there is no carriageway parking occurring. Walker Lane does not have any carriageway parking, but one property does have off street parking for one vehicle adjacent to the carriageway. LTN 1.20 does recommend an additional 500mm width at vertical features over 600mm high, whilst this advice is for cycle tracks it may be pertinent to consider it further here, due to the high hedges and walls along the lane.
13. Whilst it may be appropriate to exempt cycles from one-way travel the Officer recommendation here, owing to the high hedges, limited 'escape' routes for cyclists, especially those of a younger age, is not to allow two-way cycling along the lane (see 15 below).
14. The Council undertook an initial consultation with the residents of Walker Lane, to gauge their views on the potential introduction of a One-way system and a preference on the direction of travel. The Consultation was undertaken with all residents with a frontage on to Walker Lane, with all residents responding in favour of the introduction of a One-way system. The majority of the response preferred the introduction of a one-way system from Main Street to North Lane.
15. A report on the responses received from the initial consultation was presented to the Executive Member for Transport at a decision session on 12th November 2024. The report recommended the approval to undertake Statutory Consultation to propose an

amendment of the Traffic Regulation Order for the introduction of a one-way system on Walker Lane.

16. The recommended option within the report was approved and the Statutory Consultation was advertised on 23rd May 2025. The consultation documents were sent to residents with a frontage onto the area, Ward Councillor, Parish Council and statutory consultees. The Notice of Proposal was also printed in a locally circulated newspaper and on the Street.

Consultation Analysis

17. A letter was sent to all property owners with a frontage on to Walker Lane on 23rd May 2025 (**Annex B**), to advise them of the Statutory Consultation and advise on how representation on the proposal can be submitted to the Council.
18. The consultation received 14 responses all in objection to the proposal (**Annex C**). The objections received varied in points, although a number of representations received highlighted the fact that the initial request was submitted by a resident who does not live in the village but rents out a property in the village.
19. The representations received highlighted concerns about an increase in vehicle speeds, if the proposal was introduced, as currently vehicles travel slowly along Walker Lane due to the potential for vehicles to travel in both directions along the road. This has led to concerns for pedestrian safety as there is not a footpath on Walker Lane and residents are concerned that vehicles will begin to travel at greater speed, if they are aware that vehicles will not be travelling in both directions.
20. A couple of representations raised concerns about an increase in vehicle movements on the neighbouring streets, and a potential delay for emergency services vehicles accessing the area if required.
21. A resident did raise a concern about the impact on a local business, as Walker Lane does have a hairdresser, which operates from the lane. The proposed introduction of a One-way system should not have a negative impact on the business, as Walker Lane does not have any on street parking available, so any customers currently accessing the business would need currently

need to park on either Main Street or North Lane during the appointment.

22. One representation received was not in objection to the proposed introduction of the one-way but in objection to the proposed direction of travel along the street. The resident requesting that the introduction should be from North Lane to Main Street.
23. The representations received did acknowledge that the car port had previously been hit, with some representations advising that the current tenants parking on Main Street, do cause an issue with visibility for vehicles exiting Walker Lane.
24. The original request was made due to the damage caused to a property at the Main Street end of Walker Lane. The traffic authority has a duty when making an Order to prevent damage to the road or any building on or near the road. This risk has been raised by the original request and acknowledged in the representation that damage has occurred.
25. The traffic authority also has to consider that any Order made is done so for avoiding danger to person or other traffic using the road. The proposal will reduce the number of vehicle movements on Walker Lane, as they would only be able to access from Main Street, due to the narrow width of the road, vehicles are unlikely to begin accessing the street at higher speeds.

Options Analysis and Evidential Basis

26. **Option A take no further action (not recommended):** this would acknowledge the representations received in objection the proposal but would leave the road as a two-way road, this would leave in place the potential conflict between pedestrian and vehicles. This would leave in place the risk of road traffic collision with potential injury to pedestrians and or damage to properties/vehicles.
27. **Option B approve the amendment to The York Traffic Management Order 2014 to make Walker Lane a one-way from Main Street to North Lane (recommended):** this will introduce a one-way direction of travel south to north, Main Street to North Lane. This will reduce the risk of vehicular conflict with buildings and provides better visibility owing to the 'visplay'

available at the Walker Lane/North Lane junction. This is in opposition to the representations received to the proposal but will increase the safety of users of Walker Lane.

Organisational Impact and Implications

28. The report has the following impacts and implications:

- **Financial:** None, the cost of implementation will be met from existing available signing and lining budget, if approved.
- **Human Resources (HR):** None. The work will be undertaken by existing CYC staff trained to complete such installations if approved.
- **Legal:** The Council regulates traffic by means of traffic regulation orders (**TROs**) made under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 which can prohibit, restrict, or regulate the use of a road, or any part of the width of a road, by vehicular traffic. In making decisions on TROs, the Council must consider the criteria within Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and, in particular, the duty to make decisions to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians).

The proposal would require an amendment to the York Traffic Management Order 2014.

The Statutory Consultation process for TROs requires public advertisement through the placing of public notices within the local press and on-street. Formal notification of the public advertisement is given to key stakeholders including local Ward Members, Town and Parish Councils, Police and other affected parties.

The Council, as Highway Authority, is required to consider any objections received within the statutory advertisement period of 21 days. When considering whether to make or amend a TRO, the Council as the Traffic Authority needs to consider all duly made objections received and not withdrawn before it can proceed with making an order. Those objections are included for consideration in this report.

A TRO may be made where it appears expedient to the Council to do so for the reasons set out in section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act. These are:

- (a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or
- (b) for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or
- (c) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or
- (d) for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property, or
- (e) (without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or
- (f) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs or
- (g) for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality).

Where the Council does not “wholly accede” to any objection, it is required to provide reasons for this in its notification of the making of an order to any person that has objected.

The Council has discretion to amend its original proposal if considered desirable, whether or not, in the light of any objections or comments received, as a result of such Statutory Consultation. If any objections received are accepted, in part or whole, and/or a decision is made to modify the original proposals, if such a modification is considered to be substantial, then steps must be taken for those affected by the proposed modifications to be further consulted.

The recommendation in this report is for the decision maker to consider the objections received and approve the amendment to the to The York Traffic Management Order 2014 to implement a change of traffic-flow on Walker Lane.

The validity of an order can be challenged at the High Court within 6 weeks of the date of the making of the order on the grounds that the Council has acted outside the powers conferred on them by the Act (*ultra vires*) or that they have not followed the prescribed procedure for the making of the order.

Further to the **Procurement Implications** below, any contracts with any third party suppliers of works, goods or services may require the input of Legal Services, or should be entered into using a form of contract previously approved by Legal Services.

- **Procurement:** Any public works contracts required at each of the sites as a result of a change to the TRO (e.g. signage, road markings, etc.) must be commissioned in accordance with a robust procurement strategy that complies with the Council's Contract Procedure Rules and (where applicable) Public Contract Regulations 2015. Advice should be sought from both the Procurement and Legal Services Teams where appropriate.
- **Health and Wellbeing:** None.
- **Environment and Climate action:** None.
- **Affordability:** None.
- **Equalities and Human Rights:** The Council recognises its Public Sector Equality Duty under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (to have due regard to the need to eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other prohibited conduct; advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it and foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it in the

exercise of a public authority's functions). The impact of the recommendation on protected characteristics has been considered as follows:

- Age – Positive, the recommended option will remove two-way vehicle movements from the street and allow more space for walking on the street, which will make a safer environment for all road users;
- Disability – Positive, the introduction of a one-way restrictions will remove some vehicle movements and increase the available area for use by all users;
- Gender – Neutral;
- Gender reassignment – Neutral;
- Marriage and civil partnership– Neutral;
- Pregnancy and maternity - Neutral;
- Race – Neutral;
- Religion and belief – Neutral;
- Sexual orientation – Neutral;
- Other socio-economic groups including :
 - Carer - Neutral;
 - Low income groups – Neutral;
 - Veterans, Armed Forces Community– Neutral

It is recognised that individual traffic regulation order requests may impact protected characteristics in different ways according to the specific nature of the traffic regulation order being considered.

- **Data Protection and Privacy:** None. The outcome of a decision does not involve any particular named individual.
- **Communications:** Consultation has taken place and any subsequent decision will be published and advertised accordingly.
- **Economy:** None.

Risks and Mitigations

17. There are no known risks.

Wards Impacted

18. Wheldrake Only.

Contact details

For further information please contact the authors of this Decision Report.

Author

Name:	Garry Taylor
Job Title:	Director of City Development
Service Area:	
Telephone:	
Report approved:	
Date:	

Co-author

Name:	Peter Marsland
Job Title:	Traffic Projects Officer
Service Area:	Highway Regulation
Telephone:	
Report approved:	
Date:	

Background papers

All relevant background papers must be listed.

A 'background paper' is any document which, in the Chief Officer's opinion, discloses any facts on which the report is based, and which has been relied upon to a material extent in preparing the report. See page 5:3:2 of The Constitution.

Annexes

Annexes

Annex A – Walker Lane Wheldrake Road Width

Annex B – Walker Lane Consultation Letter

Annex C – Consultation Responses