

**Decision Session –
Executive Member for Transport and Planning**

14 January 2016

Report of the Acting Director of City and Environmental Services

**Burdyke Avenue – Better Bus Area Fund Improvement Scheme
(Traffic Regulation Order – Objections)**

Summary

1. The Executive Member is requested to consider an objection raised as part of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) consultation process and make a decision on whether to proceed with the parking restrictions as advertised. The restrictions form part of a larger improvement scheme to address concerns raised by both local residents and the bus companies running services along the route.

Recommendation

2. *Option i.* Consider the objection but approve the introduction of the advertised parking restrictions as detailed in **Annex C**.

Reason: The parking restrictions would complement the recently installed layby and reduce parking opportunities which delay buses and frustrate local residents.

Background

3. In February 2015 a scheme was approved by the Director, Sarah Tanburn aimed at addressing complaints from Burdyke Avenue residents and bus companies about parking and traffic congestion on the street.

The approved scheme (shown in **Annex A**) comprised the introduction of a 43m long layby in the northern verge just to the east of the junction with St. Philips Grove.

The Director also gave approval for the advertisement of a TRO for “no waiting at any time” restrictions to protect the junction from parked vehicles and further reduce the delays to buses.

The Director, at the time, asked for Officers to investigate if the layby could be made longer. The results of this investigation were reported back (via email shown in **Annex B**) to the Director in June 2015 on the basis that the layby couldn't be extended without incurring an unacceptable cost increase.

The Director agreed to the implementation of the scheme as originally approved, including the advertisement of the TRO.

The layby was installed in September 2015.

Consultation

4. The TRO was advertised between 3rd and 24th July 2015, the advertisement documentation is shown in **Annex C**. Notices were placed on street and in “The Press”. Ward Councillors were consulted and details hand delivered to residents living close to the proposed restrictions. The extent of the delivery area is shown in **Annex D**.

A single objection was received from the Clifton Ward Councillors, D. Myers and M. Wells. A copy of the objection letter is attached as **Annex E**. The main points of objection are:

- Residents have not been fully consulted regarding the proposed restrictions.
- The extents of the consultation were not adequate to cover streets which may be affected by the relocation of parking.

They also requested further time to carry out their own consultation with residents and other interested parties. To date no further consultation results have been provided to Officers dealing with the scheme.

Officer response

A larger number of residents on Burdyke Avenue were consulted on the proposals during the design stage which included more extensive parking restriction proposals. The extent of the delivery area is shown in **Annex F**.

Feedback received at this stage was considered, and resulted in a reduction to the extents of the proposed 'no waiting at any time' parking restrictions (see background papers for full details).

The introduction of this parking restriction has the potential to have a small negative impact on nearby streets through the displacement of parked vehicles. However, the number of vehicles involved is small, and displaced parking will tend to move to places where there is least difficulty in parking. It is assumed that residents in adjacent streets will generally be opposed to restrictions which may displace parking to their street. Therefore it is usual practice to only consult the properties which front onto the proposed restrictions and will be directly affected, but to monitor the effects in the wider area after the restrictions are implemented.

In addition to the consultation mentioned earlier, the authority must consult the following organisations when amending a TRO to ensure compliance with the associated regulations; North Yorkshire Police, Fire and Rescue Service, Ambulance Service, Haulage Association, Freight & Transport Association. This was carried out for this proposal.

Options

5. *Option i.* Consider the objection but approve the introduction of the advertised parking restrictions as detailed in **Annex C**.

Option ii. Agree with the objection and approve further consultation.

Analysis

6. The parking restrictions would complement the recently installed layby and reduce parking opportunities, which continue to delay buses and frustrate local residents even with recent the introduction of the layby.

The consultation carried out for the scheme is considered appropriate to the size of the proposals and was aimed at the people directly affected. No objections were received from local residents and no further consultation results have been presented to officers from the Ward Councillors.

The proposed restrictions reinforce guidance in the Highway Code which states – DO NOT park: opposite or within 10 metres (32feet) of a junction, except in an authorised space. Therefore, the introduction should not be considered controversial.

Council Plan

6. The scheme proposals relates to the Council Plan with regards:

- **A Council That Listens To Residents –**

The scheme was developed to address residents concerns and throughout the scheme development residents have been consulted and the proposals amended based on comments received.

Implications

7. This report has the following implications:

- **Financial** - The cost of introducing the restrictions is approx £500. This is affordable from the BBAF 15/16 programme.
- **Human Resources (HR)** There are no human resources implications.
- **Equalities** There are no equalities implications.
- **Legal** There are no legal implications.
- **Crime and Disorder** There are no crime and disorder implications.
- **Information Technology (IT)** There are no IT implications.
- **Property** There are no property implications.
- **Other**

Risk Management

8. In compliance with the Council's risk management strategy, the following risks associated with the recommendations in this report

have been identified and described in the following points, and set out in the table below:

9. *Authority reputation* – this risk is in connection with public perception of the Council not undertaking a project that has been consulted upon and is assessed at 2.
10. *Stakeholder* – this risk is in connection to local residents being negatively affected by the introduction of the restrictions and is assessed at 8.

Risk Category	Impact	Likelihood	Score
Organisation/ Reputation	Minor	Remote	2
Stakeholders	Minor	Unlikely	8

11. The highest of the risk scores, fall into the 6-10 category and means the risk has been assessed as being “Low”. This level of risk requires regular monitoring, which would be undertaken as part of the regular review of traffic regulation orders within the authority.

Contact Details

Author:

Ben Potter
Engineer
Transport Projects
 01904 553496

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Neil Ferris
Acting Director CES

**Report
Approved**



Date *5 January 2016*

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

Jayne Close
Principal Accountant (CANS & CES Finance)
Tel No. 01904 554175

Wards Affected: *Clifton*

All

For further information please contact the author of the report

Background Papers:

Director Decision Session – 2 February 2015 Burdyke Avenue Improvement Scheme

Annexes

- Annex A Approved scheme plan
- Annex B Email record – Sarah Tanburn Decision
- Annex C TRO consultation documents including plan
- Annex D Consultation Area
- Annex E Objection Letter
- Annex F Original Consultation Extents