

Report to the Cabinet

Meeting to be held on Thursday, 9 July 2020

Report of the Head of Service - Highways

Part I

Electoral Divisions affected:
Burnley Central East; Clitheroe
Great Harwood, Rishton &
Clayton-le-Moors; Poulton le
Fylde; Preston Central West;
Ribble Valley North East;

Lancashire County Council (Various Roads, Burnley, Hyndburn, Ribble Valley and Wyre Boroughs and Preston City) (Revocations and Various Moving Restrictions (May 2019 No1)) Order 201*
(Appendices 'A' - 'I' refer)

Contact for further information:

Chris Nolan, Tel: (01772) 531141, Highway Regulation - Highways and Transportation
chris.nolan@lancashire.gov.uk

Executive Summary

The proposal is to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order that removes a number of redundant regulations that are either duplicated on the system, redundant due to a change in the road layout, or are no longer necessary. The Traffic Regulation Order will include some work where regulations will be revised to address anomalies and some proposals for new regulations. The items to be revoked are in Electoral Divisions Preston Central West and Ribble Valley East. The new proposals along with orders that will be revoked and reintroduced are in Burnley Central East, Clitheroe, Great Harwood, Rishton, Clayton-le-Moors and Poulton le Fylde.

This is deemed to be a Key Decision and the provisions of Standing Order C19 have been complied with.

Recommendation

Cabinet is asked to approve the proposals included in the draft order (Appendix 'A') and indicated on the plans attached (Appendices 'B' to 'H') that will be introduced for the reasons set out in the Statement of Reasons (Appendix 'I').

Background and Advice

Traffic Regulation Orders that are in force throughout the county have been introduced over several years. When work is undertaken in any area these existing Traffic Regulation Orders are checked and it sometimes becomes apparent that there are regulations that are incorrect or no longer required due to changes on the highway network. It is important that once such items have been identified that these should be revoked. This is the case with two such items in Preston and an item in Chatburn. The proposed order will remove these items.

Where, due to a similar process, it is found that some orders are not correct either due to changes in road layouts or errors have been found in the necessary documentation, but that the restrictions are still required, it is necessary to revoke these orders and reintroduce the restrictions. This has been found to be the case with items in Hyndburn town centre and Clitheroe.

In addition to the corrective work, two new restrictions are proposed. One proposal in Poulton le Fylde for a one way street to support safe access on a road where there is excessive double parking. In this case it was considered that the introduction of one way traffic would be preferable to restricting the available parking that would impact on local residents.

New orders are also proposed for Burnley town centre to support the shared area on St James Street, Manchester Road and Park Lane. These proposals include both one way traffic orders and prohibition of driving.

Consultations

Formal consultation was carried out between 11 December 2019 and 10 January 2020. This was advertised in the local press. Notices were displayed on site for all areas where the new restrictions were proposed. Divisional county councillors were consulted along with the council's usual consultees and the consultation documents posted on the council's website.

Notices were not placed at the locations of the existing restrictions where no material change to the restrictions as currently indicated on site are proposed.

During the consultation period four objections were received, along with an e-mail that expressed adverse comments. There was also three communications expressing that they had no objections to the proposals.

Objections

Park Road, Poulton Le Fylde

The four objections were received with regard to the proposed one way working on Park Road, Poulton le Fylde.

One of the objections raised concerns that the proposal would make it difficult to use their garage at the rear of their property as they have to reverse out of the garage and along the back street eventually reversing on to Park Road. The Objector says

that presently they reverse on to Park Road towards Station Road then exit on to Victoria Road. The objector says that to reverse on to Park Road to drive up to Station Road would not be possible due to cars parked up to the end of the present H bar marking. They ask for consideration to be given to mark the H bar longer and to introduce waiting restrictions to ease the manoeuvre from Back Victoria Road on to Park Road in the manner that would be required.

Three objections were all concerning the need to turn from Park Road to Station Road as would become necessary should the proposal be accepted. Objections stated that exiting from Park Road on to Station Road either to turn left or right is difficult due to the amount of traffic on Station Road, along with the speed of the vehicles and the number of parked cars close to the junction. There was a report that a previous collision had happened when exiting from Park Road to Station Road and they are concerned that it would not be safe to make Park Road one way until the problems at the junction of Park Road with Station Road are addressed.

Two of the objectors are concerned that Park Road is used as a "rat run" or "cut through" and that the introduction of one way working will only make this situation worse.

Complaints also included that the properties on Victoria Road that use Park Road for access to their off street parking provision were not consulted as part of the informal consultation.

Engineers Response

The proposal was raised to improve safety on a narrow road that did not support two way traffic with the current parking situation. It was considered that making the road one way was a more suitable solution than placing waiting restrictions that would reduce the available parking by at least 50%. It was decided that to have a north bound traffic flow would ensure that there were no difficulties with traffic turning into Park Road causing a problem with the traffic signals at the junction of Station Road with Breck Road.

With regard to the problems that drivers may have exiting from Back Victoria Road to Park Road in either forward or reverse gear. This junction is considered to be adequately protected by H Bars and the manoeuvre is possible. It is considered that the present provision will be adequate.

The reported difficulties exiting Park Road on to Station Road have not been previously reported to the traffic team and were not raised when informal consultation was undertaken with the residents of Park Road. There are adequate no waiting at any time restrictions in place at this junction to preserve suitable sightlines. The concerns with regard to the parked vehicles contravening the regulations have been passed to Parking Services to ensure such problems are addressed. Similarly, the concerns regarding speeding were passed to the speed tasking group.

Looking at the information that we presently hold there are no records of any injury collisions at this junction.

Adverse Comments

Town Hall Street and Curate Street, Great Harwood

One response was received in relation to the proposals on Town Hall Street on the basis that the proposal is a step in the right direction, however, whilst not an objection, the respondent feels that the proposed restrictions are not sufficient to deter poor parking and so they request parking restrictions for the whole square. The message also asked for clarification regarding the definition of the provisions in the order and how these would be enforced.

Engineer Response

The proposal only relates to the extent of the publicly maintained highway. The remaining area of the Town Square is owned and managed by Hyndburn Borough Council and it is considered that it is for them to decide on the most appropriate form of control for that area and it is therefore outside the remit of this proposal.

The definition of the provisions in the order along with information on enforcement have been clarified to the respondent.

Implications:

This item has the following implications, as indicated:

Financial

The costs of the Traffic Regulation Order will be funded from the 2019/20 highways budget for new signs and lines at an estimated cost of £10,000.

Risk management

Failure to approve this proposed order may compromise road safety with regard to the new proposed items and would prevent the enforcement of existing regulations.

List of Background Papers

| Paper | Date | Contact/Tel |
|-------|------|-------------|
|-------|------|-------------|

| | | |
|------|--|--|
| None | | |
|------|--|--|

| | | |
|---|--|--|
| Reason for inclusion in Part II, if appropriate | | |
|---|--|--|

| | | |
|-----|--|--|
| N/A | | |
|-----|--|--|