

Meeting of Executive Members for City Strategy and Advisory Panel

15 January 2007

Report of the Director of City Strategy

DUNNINGTON WEIGHT LIMIT PETITION

Summary

1. This report advises the Advisory Panel of the receipt of a petition that requests the more effective enforcement of the weight restriction through the village of Dunnington.

Background

2. Councillor Greenwood presented a 343 signature petition to the meeting of the full Council on 5th October 2006. Those signing the petition support Councillor Greenwood's campaign for more effective enforcement of the weight restriction on vehicles which attempt to short cut through Dunnington village. An example of the petition is shown in Annex A.
3. The plan in Annex B shows the extent of the existing 7.5 tonnes weight limit that was introduced in Dunnington for environmental reasons (i.e. not because there was a weak structure that needed protecting) to prevent the village being used as a through route by HGV's. For weight restrictions put in for environmental reasons there has to be an exemption for vehicles that require access to properties within the area, hence some of the vehicles in the village will have a legitimate right to be there.
4. At present, enforcement of weight restrictions can only be carried out by the Police, but this responsibility may at a later date be transferred to the Local Authority in much the same way as the enforcement of waiting restrictions was a few years ago. The task of enforcing weight restrictions is quite labour intensive because the Police have to demonstrate that a vehicle has passed through an area without stopping before they can take enforcement action. As a result this type of enforcement has a very low priority. In addition, because the police do not support the introduction of access restrictions, which makes them very ineffective, the city council has a policy of no longer putting such proposals forward.
5. It is also worth noting that the difference between a vehicle below the 7.5 tonne limit and one above can be very little due to modern vehicle design. Hence

some of the vehicles local residents see travelling through the village that appear to be HGV's may in fact not be prohibited from using the village roads.

6. Some work on the signing of the weight limit and route to the Industrial Estate has been carried out and further work will be carried out when resources permit.

Consultation

7. A petition of over 300 signatures clearly demonstrates that there are local concerns over the use of the village roads by HGV's; hence this information has been passed to the Police for them to consider when allocating their resources. In addition, a letter has been sent to the businesses at the Dunnington Industrial Estate (see Annex C), as this is a likely source of potential HGV journeys, asking business owners to ensure their suppliers and contractors are aware of the restrictions in advance of them travelling to the Industrial Estate and also making them aware that the Police have been requested to take enforcement action.
8. The Ward Councillors views on this petition are that many villagers feel that the signage at the entrances to the village are inadequate. The number of lorries which have to access the industrial estate at the Hull Road end of Common Road should follow the directed route. For HGV's coming from Stamford Bridge on the A166, this involves the use of Grimston Bar roundabout, but many seem to miss or ignore the signs. The Councillor hopes that the Council will reposition the signs and add additional information indicating the authorised route. The Councillor also asks that traffic lights be provided on the A166 leg of Grimston Roundabout so hopefully this will also make that route attractive for larger vehicles. The Councillor intends to write to the local Police asking for increased enforcement in the village.

Options

9. As can be seen from the above information, the options available are very limited and are set out below:
 - A. Request police enforcement. This has already been done.
 - B. Improved signing of both the restriction and the route to the Industrial Estate. This work is ongoing at present.
 - C. Reconsider the enforcement of such restrictions when these powers are transferred to the Local Authority. This is a long term option that cannot be tackled at present.
 - D. Take no further action.

Analysis

10. As noted above, options A and B have already been initiated and will be completed in due course. Option C should be considered along with other restrictions of similar type to determine enforcement priorities when the

enforcement role becomes the duty of the Local Authority. Option D is unlikely to be well received given the level of support for some action to be taken.

Corporate Priorities

11. The enforcement of traffic restrictions in cases such as this one ties in with the corporate priorities of customer focus and safety concerns. However as mentioned in paragraph 4 above the city council does not have the authority to carry out enforcement of the restrictions.

Implications

The implications of the recommendations in this report are as follows:

Financial

12. There are no financial implications as any additional signing can be funded through the traffic signs budget.

Human Resources (HR)

13. There are no HR implications.

Equalities

14. There are no Equalities implications.

Legal

15. There are no legal implications.

Crime and Disorder

16. There are no Crime and Disorder implications.

Information Technology (IT)

17. There are no IT implications.

Property

18. There are no Property implications.

Other

19. There are no other implications.

Risk Management

20. The removal of HGV's may contribute to improved safety on narrow village streets. But, although improved signing aimed at reducing abuse of Traffic Regulation Orders may reduce the amount of drivers ignoring the restrictions, the City Council does not take on the responsibility for risk if HGV's continue to

travel through the village. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy there are no risks associated with the recommendations in this report.

Recommendations

21. That the Advisory Panel advise the Executive Member to note and support the action taken as detailed in Options A, B & C as detailed in paragraph 9 of the report.

Reason: To address the issues raised in the petition.

Contact Details

Author:

Alistair Briggs
Traffic Engineer
Network Management
Tel No. 01904 551368

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Damon Copperthwaite
Assistant Director (City Development and Transport)

Report Approved

Date 15/12/2006

Wards Affected: Derwent

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers: None

Annexes:

- Annex A – An extract from the petition.
Annex B – A plan of the area covered by the existing weight restriction.
Annex C - A copy of the letter sent out to the Dunnington Industrial Estate