
Decision Session
Executive Member for Transport

22 March 2022

Report of the Corporate Director of Place

Consideration of Representations received in response to advertised amendments to the Traffic Regulation Order

Summary

1. Consideration of representations received, in support and objection, to advertised proposals to amend the Traffic Regulation Order (“TRO”).

Recommendations

2. **It is recommended** that the Executive Member consider the original proposals for each issue together with representations received and make a decision from the options given on the Ward/individual annexes attached, to either:
 - a) implement as advertised;
 - b) uphold the objections and take no further action;
 - c) implement a lesser restriction than advertised; for example a shorter length of restrictions; or
 - d) implement any other options relevant to the proposal and representations received.

Reason: To ensure that appropriate changes are made to traffic restrictions to address concerns raised.

Background

3. Requests for waiting restrictions or other changes to the TRO for minor traffic management issues are placed on a waiting list to be considered at the same time.
4. We advertised 52 separate proposals to amend the traffic regulation Order on the 23rd April 2021 and a further 83 proposals on 22nd October 2021. 94 of the 135 proposals did not receive any representations of objection and these are in the process of being taken through to implementation.

5. 41 of the proposals involving 18 Wards received objections and these are included in this report to the Executive Member for consideration and decision.
6. The proposals and representations received, together with officer recommendations are detailed by ward on the attached annexes.
7. Ward Councillors have received this information and been invited to comment on the issues and officer recommendations. Any comments received have been included within the annex for that ward.

Consultation

8. The advertised proposals for amendment of the Traffic Regulation Orders were advertised in the local press and notices put up on street. Properties adjacent to the proposals were posted details as they are the most likely to be affected.
9. All emergency services, haulier associations, Parish Councils and Ward Councillors receive details on advertisement.

Options

10. The options available for each item are detailed on the annexes but depending on the proposal and representations received will include one or more of the following:
 - a) implement as advertised;
 - b) uphold the objections and take no further action;
 - c) implement a lesser restriction than advertised; for example a shorter length of restrictions; or
 - d) implement any other options relevant to the proposal and representations received.

Highway Regulations will only permit the Council to implement the restriction as advertised or a lesser restriction. We are unable to implement a more restrictive restriction through this process without re-advertising.

Analysis

11. Officer comments and analysis are included on the individual annexes.

Council Plan

12. Considering this matter contributes to the Council Plan in the following areas:

a) An open and effective council.

Implications

13. Financial

There are costs associated with the advertising and implementation of any proposal. These will be met by the budget allocation within the department for "New signs and lines"

14. Human Resources (HR)

Any proposals which are implemented will become enforceable by the Council's Civil Enforcement Officers in the same way as existing waiting restrictions. This will have an impact on the available resources of this department.

15. Equalities

16. The proposals for Landalewood Road in Rawcliffe and Clifton (Annex N) were not about disabled access. However, officers have been informed third hand that the proposals will improve the disabled access for a specific individual.

17. No other impacts have been identified.

18. Legal

The proposals require amendments to the York Parking, Stopping and Waiting Traffic Regulation Order 2014. The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 & the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (procedure) (England & Wales) Regulations 1996 apply.

19. Crime and Disorder

There are no Crime and Disorder implications .

20. Information Technology (IT)

There are no IT implications.

21. Property

There are no Property implications.

22. Other

There are no other implications identified.

Risk Management

14 In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy there is a low risk associated with the recommendations in this report.

Contact Details

Geoff Holmes

Traffic Projects Officer,
Traffic Management

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

James Gilchrist
Director of Transport, Environment and Planning.

**Report
Approved**

Date 14 March 22

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Financial:

Name: Patrick Looker
Title: Finance Manager

Legal:

Name: Dan Moynihan
Title: Senior Solicitor

Wards Affected (as detailed on the annexes)

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: N/A

Annexes:

Annex A: Acomb Ward

Annex B: Bishopthorpe Ward

Annex C: Clifton Ward

Annex D: Drinhouses & Woodthorpe Ward

Annex E: Fishergate Ward

Annex F: Guildhall Ward

Annex G: Haxby & Wigginton Ward

Annex H: Heworth Ward

Annex I: Heworth Without Ward

Annex J: Holgate Ward

Annex K: Hull Road Ward

Annex L: Huntington Ward

Annex M: Micklegate Ward

Annex N: Rawcliffe & Clifton Without Ward

Annex O: Rural West Ward

Annex P: Strensall Ward

Annex Q: Westfield Ward

Annex R: Wheldrake Ward

Abbreviations used in the Report

TRO = Traffic Regulation order