

Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders

Cabinet 13 September 2012, item 15

**Committee: Cabinet**

**Agenda Item**

**Date: 13 September 2012**

**15**

**Title: Proposed Traffic Regulation Orders**

**Portfolio Holder: Cllr Barker**

**Key decision: No**

---

## **Summary**

1. The North Essex Parking Partnership (NEPP) is responsible for the designation and enforcement of on street parking as well as off-street parking. The Partnership works under delegated powers from Essex County Council as Highway Authority and from the constituent District Councils including Uttlesford. The work of the Partnership is overseen and directed by the NEPP Board consisting of Councillors from the constituent Councils.
2. The process for considering and designating Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) has recently been changed by the NEPP Board and is attached at Appendix 1. Central to the new process is the consideration of the proposed TROs by the individual authorities.
3. The report introduces a range of proposed TROs. Uttlesford needs to consider the proposed TROs and recommend which ones it wishes to pursue to the NEPP Board. The NEPP Board will make the final decision.

## **Recommendations**

4. Approve the TROs numbered 1 – 3 and recommend to the NEPP Board that they are implemented.
5. Approve the TROs numbered 5 and 19 as a comprehensive scheme and recommend to the NEPP Board that they are implemented.
6. Agree not to reconsider declined schemes for a period of 5 years except in the case of exceptional circumstances.

## **Financial Implications**

7. Schemes which are supported by Cabinet and subsequently by the NEPP Board will require advertising and there are costs associated with implementation (e.g. signs and lines). All costs associated with the TROs are covered by the NEPP budget.

## **Background Papers**

8. The following papers were referred to by the author in the preparation of this report and are available for inspection from the author of the report.

Proposed Traffic Regulation Order assessment by North Essex Parking Partnership

Traffic Regulation Order assessment sheet July 2012

**Impact**

9.

Communication/Consultation	The suggestions have come from Parish Councils, Councillors and members of the public. If approved by NEPP formal notification will occur.
Community Safety	Inherent to the assessment process.
Equalities	Inherent to the assessment process.
Health and Safety	Inherent to the assessment process.
Human Rights/Legal Implications	None identified
Sustainability	Inherent to the assessment process.
Ward-specific impacts	District wide.
Workforce/Workplace	Work carried out by NEPP.

**Situation**

10. The report introduces a range of proposed TROs. Uttlesford needs to consider the proposed TROs and recommend which ones it wishes to pursue to the NEPP Board. The NEPP Board will make the final decision.
11. The proposals have been assessed by NEPP officers and scored in accordance with the adopted methodology (Appendix 2). This provides a score out of 100 so that competing schemes can be fairly assessed against other schemes. A score of less than 30 would not normally result in a scheme being supported.

<b>No.</b>	<b>Location</b>	<b>Proposal</b>	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Score</b>
1	Hatfield Broad Oak school	Introduce TRO around the school to enable enforcement	Acceptable and supportable proposal.	45
2	Market Place Saffron Walden	Request to alter restrictions	Alterations requested would conflict with established approach of encouraging parking in local off-street car parks (which are free in the evenings). Relaxation is expected to lead to issues including obstruction given extensive existing parking and should not be supported.	34
3	Station Road Saffron Walden	Extension of double yellow lines	It may be more appropriate to pursue a single yellow line extension.	30
4	Springhill Road/Summerhill Road Saffron Walden	Introduction of yellow lines/residents parking	Single request, not considered to be a significant issue for area. Should not be supported.	29
5	Lower Street Stansted Mountfitchet	Extend double yellow lines	Request based on proposed development rather than existing situation. Should be considered as part of wider scheme.	29
6	Station Road Newport	Introduce residents parking	Would move commuter parking, which should be expected around a station, to other nearby residential roads. Should not be supported.	27
7	Town Street Thaxted	Provision of loading bay to serve shops	Considered suitable space available for loading and short term parking for shoppers is at a premium. Should not be supported.	23
8	Fishmarket Street Thaxted	Introduce residents parking	Limited support and no justification for proposal as other parking available locally. Should not be supported.	22

9	High Fields/Springfields Great Dunmow	Extend double yellow lines at junction	No recorded accidents and low level of support. Other mechanisms available. Should not be supported.	22
10	Woodlands Park Great Dunmow	Introduce parking restrictions	Problem is locally restricted and due to residents not parking in parking spaces provided. Alternative approach recommended via Housing Association. Should not be supported.	22
11	Newcroft Saffron Walden	Introduce residents parking	Limited support and no evidence of issues raised. Should not be supported.	19
12	Hunters Way Saffron Walden	Introduce residents parking	Limited support and relates to residents parking in residential area. Should not be supported.	19
13	High Street Stebbing	Introduce parking restrictions at entrance to car park	Could be progressed along with other schemes being considered by ECC.	16
14	The Green Saffron Walden	Introduce residents parking	Limited support and no justification for proposal. Should not be supported.	14
15	Barnston Green/Rayfield Close Barnston	Install double yellow lines to deter inconsiderate parking	Limited support, no accident statistics and alternative remedial action available. Should not be supported.	11
16	Horn Brook Saffron Walden	Extend double yellow lines at junction	Privately managed and maintained road. Other mechanisms available. Should not be supported.	9
17	Manuden	Double yellow lines	Insufficient details to assess and no further contact. Should not be supported.	0
18	Castle Street Saffron Walden	Provision of 24 hour residents permits as well as 1 and 4 hour.	The change would need to be carried out on a whole District basis. Considerable work and should not be considered as a priority if supported.	*

19	Lower Street Stansted Mountfitchet	Dual use of residents parking bays.	This would be a positive change and provide support for local businesses.	*
----	--	--	--	---

\* These proposals do not have a score as it does not fit into the scoring matrix.

## Risk Analysis

12.

Risk	Likelihood	Impact	Mitigating actions
Complaints raised regarding schemes not supported.	2. There will be some complaints raised.	1. Loss of credibility and disappointment.	Assessment criteria have been considered to assess the schemes. This ensures consistency across the Partnership.  NEEPP will explain the decision to those who raised the concerns.

1 = Little or no risk or impact

2 = Some risk or impact – action may be necessary.

3 = Significant risk or impact – action required

4 = Near certainty of risk occurring, catastrophic effect or failure of project.