

Report of Corporate Director of Economy and Place

Annual Review 2017/18 Traffic Regulation Order Representations

Summary

1. To consider the representations made during the formal advertising period for a set of Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) and determine the course of action to take for those items objected to (list in Annex A). These proposals were approved for advertising by the Executive Member for Transport and Planning at the September 2017 meeting.

Recommendation

2. It is recommended:
 - i. To implement the restriction as advertised (see Annex B):

St Olave's Road (x2),	Moorcroft Road,
Barbican Mews,	Farrar Street,
Pasture Farm Close,	St Leonard's Place,
Windsor Drive / Ripley Gr,	Dodsworth Avenue (x5),
Melrosegate (near Harington Ave),	Redmires Cl. / Ebsay Dr,
Esk Drive,	White Rose Way Lay-by
St James Place	

Reason: To resolve the concerns put forward in the original request for restrictions.

- ii. To implement a lesser restriction than advertised (see Annex C):

Copmanthorpe Ln/ Kirkwell	Main Street, Fulford,
St Saviourgate R43,	Clifton Moor industrial estate

North Field Lane

Reason: To try to resolve the issues brought to our attention and to respond to the concerns put forward during the advertising period.

- iii. To uphold the objection and take no further action or to include in the next review for further investigation (see Annex D):

Barlow Street,

Railway Terrace,

Shipton Road / Manor Lane

Barley Rise, Strensall (shops)

Geldof Road

Reason: To respond the concerns put forward in during the advertising period.

Background

3. At the September 2017 Executive Member for Transport and Planning meeting approval was given to advertise a large batch of proposed waiting restrictions. In addition several other minor items from other decisions were advertised at the same time.
4. A large majority of these items were raised as a concern by members of the public for investigation. Generally a minimal set of restrictions is put forward to try to resolve specific site issues rather than instigating widespread reviews of all potential issues in an area that could result if wholesale changes to the parking availability are made.
5. It should also be noted that our role is to aid the flow of traffic, improve safety and resolve obstruction issues rather than provide parking facilities for vehicle owners. Parking is and always has been the vehicle owners responsibility not the highway authority's, hence loss of parking opportunity is not something that we can resolve.
6. Of the 211 items advertised, 24 were objected to and there were a total of 95 representations made. The other items have proceeded to the implementation stage of the process. The items objected to are listed in Annex A and show which of the following Annexes B, C and D they are discussed in, in more detail.
7. A précis of the main areas of objections for each item along with officer comments, a plan of the area and a recommended course of action is in Annexes B, C and D

Consultation

8. The proposed changes to the Traffic Regulation Order were put out for consultation in the usual way (advertised in the local press, on street, to organisations and details delivered to adjacent properties). This exceeds the legal requirements.
9. Objections to the proposals put forward have to be considered before decisions are taken on how to proceed.

Options for Consideration

10. For each item the options that can be considered are:
11. Option 1 – Proceed as proposed and implement the restrictions as advertised. These are shown in Annex B.
12. Option 2 – Approve a lesser restriction to that advertised (which would not require re-advertising). These are shown in Annex C
13. Option 3 – Approve for re-advertising a different set of proposals that are more extensive than the previous proposal. This option has not been put forward for any item.
14. Option 4 – uphold the objection and take no further action. These are shown in Annex D.

Council Plan

15. The above proposals contribute to the Council Plan of:
 - A prosperous city for all,
 - A council that listens to residents

Implications

16. This report has the following implications:

Financial – None

Human Resources – None

Equalities – None.

Legal – None

Crime and Disorder – None

Information Technology - None

Land – None

Other – None

Risk Management - None.

Contact Details

Authors:

Alistair Briggs
Traffic Team Leader
Transport
Tel: (01904) 551368

Chief Officer Responsible for the report:

Neil Ferris
Corporate Director of Economy and Place

Report Approved: ✓

Date 10.4.18

Specialist Implications Officer(s)

None.

Wards Affected:

All

For further information please contact the author of the report.

Background Papers: The full text of the objections made for each item.

Annexes:

- Annex A List of proposals objected to.
- Annex B Sites with recommendation to proceed as proposed
- Annex C Sites with recommendation to proceed with a lesser restriction
- Annex D Sites with recommendation for no further action