

PORTFOLIO HOLDER
ENVIRONMENT AND
TRANSPORT
DECISION NOTICE

Publication Date: 9th March 2021

At the meeting of the Portfolio Holder – Environment and Transport, held on the 8th March 2021 the following matters were discussed. The decisions of the Portfolio Holder are set out below in each item along with reasons for the decision and other options considered.

DNPH.ETE.23

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest made with regard to any items on the agenda.

DNPH.ETE.24

BEREAVEMENT SERVICES FEES & CHARGES

The Portfolio Holder considered to review the fees and charges in Bereavement Services.

RESOLVED – That, the revised Fees and Charges, be approved for implementation from 1st April 2021.

REASONS FOR DECISION – Approving the proposed revised Fees and Charges will enable Environmental Services to recover cost whenever this is possible, to contribute to the budget available to deliver services. This will allow the service a sustainable budget.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

Retain current fees and charges. This option is not sustainable long term without further budget allocation, due to rising cost and already overstretched resources.

Review fees and charges to improve cost recovery. This is the preferred option presented in this report and will ensure the Council maintains its income base with rising cost and achieve better cost recovery of discretionary services to ensure a free universal service offer is maintained in priority areas.

DNPH.ETE.25

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 19-14: WEST MARSH AREA– WAITING RESTRICTIONS, LIMITED WAITING AND ONE-WAY STREETS

The Portfolio Holder considered a report that proposed various traffic regulation orders to control parking, increase parking capacity and improve traffic flows within the area.

RESOLVED –

- 1) That, subject to formal consultation and no material objections being received, the making of Traffic Regulation Orders to implement the provisions be approved.**
- 2) That, in the event there were unresolved material objections to the Orders, these be referred to the portfolio holder for determination and a decision as to whether or not the Order be confirmed and executed.**

REASONS FOR DECISION –

The measures are being proposed in order to:

- 1) Alleviate the impact of long duration commuter parking by delivering increased parking capacity.
- 2) Provide safety improvements through improved visibility at junctions by upgrading existing parking restrictions which are no longer 'fit for purpose'.
- 3) Enhance traffic flows through the adoption of one-way direction of travel across a small number of residential streets that are not suitable for two-way traffic.
- 4) Reduce the potential for vehicular conflict by ensuring that clear unobstructed access throughout the identified scheme area at all times, particularly for emergency service and refuse vehicles.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

Do nothing – Due to the lack of support towards the introduction of permit parking an argument could be put forwards to keep existing arrangements the same. This would, however, not be prudent given the potential scope to be able to make valuable improvements that

would of significant benefit to the area as a whole.

Introduce timed 'No Waiting' restrictions– An alternative approach, to permit parking that would address the problem of monopolisation of unrestricted parking, would be to consider the strategic use of timed yellow line restrictions. Such measures prohibit waiting (and parking) during their hours of operation. By introducing a yellow line for one hour in the morning on one side of the road and for a different hour on the opposite side it would disrupt those drivers who intend to park all day, thereby making such locations undesirable. This would address perceived long-term commuter parking issues but would be troublesome for residents, as they too would have to move their vehicles several times a day to comply with the restrictions. Similarly, several streets have sufficient road width to accommodate two-sided parking and by introducing such restrictions it would effectively halve the available parking capacity for the two hours the yellow lines are in operation. This is not deemed to be an efficient use of kerbside space.

Introduce time limited parking restrictions – introducing a time restriction for all parking spaces (limited waiting) was also considered, this would prevent commuters from parking continuously for a working day. Again, residents would also have to conform with these restrictions meaning they too would not be able to leave their vehicles in the same place for a full day. This level of disruption would pose a greater level of inconvenience than what they currently encounter.

DNPH.ETE.26

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 20-16 – BRADLEY ROAD – VERGE PARKING & CLEARWAY

The Portfolio Holder considered a report that proposed to address concerns associated with vehicles parking along Bradley Road and surrounding residential streets.

RESOLVED –

- 1) That, subject to formal consultation and no material objections being received, the making of a '24hr Rural Clearway' Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) be approved.**
- 2) That, subject to formal consultation and no material objections being received, the making of a 'Prohibition of Stopping on Verge and Footway' TRO be approved.**
- 3) That, subject to formal consultation and no material objections being received, the making of a '24hr Prohibition of Waiting – No Waiting at Any Time' (Double Yellow Line) TRO be approved.**

- 4) That, in the event there were unresolved material objections to the Orders, those be referred to the Portfolio Holder for determination and a decision as to whether or not the Order be confirmed and executed**

REASONS FOR DECISION – The removal of parking in the affected areas detailed above will, prevent ongoing damage to the footways and verges, preserve the amenities of the area through which the roads run and ensure the free flow of traffic.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

Do nothing – Vehicles will continue to park on verges and footways within Bradley resulting in potential road safety issues, obstruction of the verge and/or footway, damage to the verges and footways and visual obstruction and intrusion of the overall character of this Parish.

Introduce ‘No Waiting’ restrictions throughout the whole affected area, although this type of restriction would prohibit the waiting of vehicles on both the carriageway, footway and verges it would involve the installation of Double Yellow Lines. Such road markings would be unsightly and spoil the aesthetics of the area.

Install bollards or posts – By installing measures such as bollards or posts it would physically prevent access to the affected areas. In order for these devices to work they need to be respected. There is the risk that such assets may become damaged over time, the repair or replacement of which would place a financial burden on the Councils maintenance reserves. Similarly, in the event that one bollard is damaged or stolen this has the potential to provide sufficient space for vehicles to access the verge again until the problem is remedied.

DNPH.ETE.27

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 19-08: CHEAPSIDE, WALTHAM – SPEED LIMIT CHANGES

The Portfolio Holder considered a report that as part of the approved planning application for the Carr/Strawson development, there is a condition that the developer must install a traffic calming feature in the vicinity of the development access on Cheapside. The report proposes that the current 30mph and 40mph speed limit extents be changed to support this feature.

RESOLVED –

- 1) That, the making of a Traffic Regulation Order to revoke the current 40mph speed limit on Cheapside be approved.**

- 2) That, the making of a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce a new 40mph speed limit on Cheapside between the points detailed in Schedule 2 of the main report be approved.
- 3) That, in the event there were unresolved material objections to the Order, those be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for determination and a decision as to whether or not the Order be confirmed and executed.

REASONS FOR DECISION - A review of the current speed limit restrictions is proposed in order to improve road safety for all road users. The gateway feature will highlight entry into the 30mph village speed limit, and to act as a speed reduction measure for vehicles entering the village from the A16.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED – Do nothing This would though prevent delivery of the approved gateway feature as stipulated in the planning consent.

DNPH.ETE.28

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 20-03: NO WAITING AT ANY TIME - VARIOUS STREETS

The Portfolio Holder considered a report that proposed to address road safety by introducing new or extended 24-hour Prohibition of Waiting restrictions at a number of identified junctions in the Borough.

RESOLVED –

- 1) That the making of a Traffic Regulation Order to revoke the current 24hour Prohibition of Waiting (double yellow line) restrictions be approved.
- 2) That, the making of a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce 24hour Prohibition of Waiting (double yellow line) restrictions be approved.
- 3) That, in the event there were unresolved material objections to the Order, those be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for determination and a decision as to whether or not the Order be confirmed and executed.

REASONS FOR DECISION –

The introduction or extension of existing of 24-hour Prohibition of Waiting restrictions is proposed in order to improve road safety for all road users, by keeping the area free of parked vehicles, which will in turn ensure clear visibility for drivers exiting or egressing the junctions identified.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED – Do nothing. This is not recommended given the road safety issues identified.

DNPH.ETE.29

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER: - SCARTH ROAD CONGESTION PROGRAMME

The Portfolio Holder considered a report that proposed to seek approval to grant the making of a permanent order which reproduces and continues in force indefinitely the provisions of ETRO 19-05A

RESOLVED – That the making of a permanent order which reproduced and continued in force indefinitely the provisions of ETRO 19-05A be approved.

REASONS FOR DECISION – In light of increasing traffic growth, the permanent removal of the Scartho Road bus lane in conjunction with the supplementary measures to control parking is considered to be the most appropriate option to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

Option 1 - Make ETRO 19-05A permanent as advertised - to make the ETRO permanent as advertised is the recommended option. Once finalised, this will formally approve the removal of the bus lane detailed in Appendix A to the report.

Option 2 - Reinstate Scartho Road bus lane – This is not recommended given the local authority has a duty to ensure the expeditious movement of traffic under the Traffic Management Act (2004). The bus lane would be reinstated and provide for local bus services and other priority users. However, the perceived congestion along Scartho Road would remain as the volume of non-priority vehicles are restricted to one lane.

DNPH.ETE.30

TRACKING REPORT

The Portfolio Holder considered the tracking report tracking the recommendations of this Portfolio and to agree any items for sign off.

RESOLVED – That the report was noted.