

**PORTFOLIO HOLDER  
ENERGY AND ENVIRONMENT  
DECISION NOTICE**

At the meeting of the Portfolio Holder – Energy and Environment, held on the 12<sup>th</sup> September, 2016 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.EE.1 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interests in respect of items on the agenda.

DNPH.EE.2 **ELM ROAD/ ELM AVENUE RESIDENTS PARKING SCHEME**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report recommending the introduction of a Residents' Parking Scheme on Elm Road and Elm Avenue, Cleethorpes.

**RESOLVED –**

- (1) That, subject to consultation and no objections being received, approval be granted to the making of a “Resident Parking Scheme” Traffic Regulation Order as shown on drawing TR701/16-24/01 in Appendix 1 of the report now submitted.**
- (2) That the eligible addresses be the residents of Elm Road and Elm Avenue, Cleethorpes primarily and that the power to decide on the eligibility to purchase residents permits be delegated to Parking Services. Consideration for businesses and nearby residents should be given only if there is a sufficient space available.**
- (3) That, in the event that there are unresolved objections to the Order, these be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for determination and decision as to whether or not the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed.**

REASONS FOR DECISION - To improve parking conditions for residents in the Elm Road / Elm Avenue area.

**OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –**

The area concerned could have been left as unrestricted parking, allowing anyone to park in the street. However, this would not resolve the problems the residents currently experience in trying to find parking near to their homes as well as access issues for residents and local businesses.

Another alternative would have been to advise the residents to seek alternate parking when all spaces in these streets are full. However, all other parking nearby has some form of restriction/time restraint attached. In addition the majority of properties in Elm Road/Avenue also do not possess driveways/off-street parking. Therefore, the residents do not have the facility to park elsewhere at present that is in relatively close proximity to where they live.

DNPH.EE.3

**GLEBE ROAD, CLEETHORPES – RESIDENT PARKING SCHEME**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report recommending the introduction of a Residents' Parking Scheme on Glebe Road, Cleethorpes,

**RESOLVED –**

- (1) That, subject to consultation and no objections being received, approval be granted to the making of a “Resident Parking Scheme” Traffic Regulation Order as shown on drawing TR701/16-09/01 in Appendix 1 of the report now submitted.**
- (2) That the eligible addresses be the residents of Glebe Road, Cleethorpes primarily and that the power to decide on the eligibility to purchase residents permits be delegated to Parking Services. Consideration for businesses and nearby residents should be given only if there is a sufficient space available.**
- (3) That, in the event that there are unresolved objections to the Order, these be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for determination and decision as to whether or not the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed.**

REASONS FOR DECISION - To improve parking conditions for residents in the Glebe Road area.

#### OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

The area concerned could have been left as unrestricted parking, allowing anyone to park in the street. However, this would not resolve the problems the residents currently experience with access or trying to find parking near to their homes.

Another alternative would have been to advise the residents to seek alternate parking when all spaces in Glebe Road are occupied. However, all other parking nearby has some form of restriction/time restraint attached. In addition the majority of properties in Glebe Road also do not possess driveways/off-street parking. Therefore, the residents do not have the facility to park elsewhere at present that is in relatively close proximity to where they live.

DNPH.EE.4

#### **LOCAL TRANSPORT PLAN (LTP) CAPITAL PROGRAMME (QUARTER ONE UPDATE)**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report setting out progress in delivery of the Council’s LTP capital programme during Quarter 1 (April – June) of 2016/17,

**RESOLVED – That the LTP Quarter 1 update be approved for circulation to all Members for information.**

REASONS FOR DECISION – To ensure transparency in the delivery of the Council’s Local Transport Plan and provide an opportunity for formal challenge of the programme.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED - Do nothing, and not amend the LTP programme. Opportunities to minimise disruption would be missed resulting in increased levels of disruption for residents.

DNPH.EE.5 **SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL ACCESS FUND BID**

This item was deferred as the bid had been taken forward as an officer decision. The matter would be referred to Cabinet if the bid was successful.

DNPH.EE.6 **ENFIELD AVENUE, NEW WALTHAM**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report proposing to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order for waiting restrictions on Enfield Avenue, New Waltham leading up to the junction with Station Road.

**RESOLVED –**

- (1) That, subject to a formal consultation and no objections being received, approval be granted to the making of a “No Waiting At Any Time” Traffic Regulation Order as listed in Schedule 1 given in Appendix 1 of the report now submitted and shown on drawing TR101/16-25/01.**
- (2) That, In the event that there are unresolved objections to the Order, these be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for determination and decision as to whether or not the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed.**

REASONS FOR DECISION – To ensure unhindered access to and from Enfield Avenue and create a safer environment for all road users.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

Parking can be better controlled through the use of “no loading” restrictions. These would require additional road markings and the provision of upright signs. Whilst recognised as effective and easily enforced it is considered that, at this time, such restrictions would be out of place in the residential area. In addition, the parking issues arising in Enfield Avenue appear to be localised and most prevalent when Grimsby Town FC have scheduled away matches.

The area concerned could be left as unrestricted parking, allowing anyone to park in the street up to the prescribed limit set out in the Highway Code (not within 10 metres of a junction). However, this would not resolve the safety issues in this instance surrounding access for vehicles entering Enfield Avenue from Station Road, given the width of the road.

DNPH.EE.7

**GATING ORDER RESTRICTING ACCESS TO THE FOOTPATH LINKING QUEEN ELIZABETH ROAD TO GRIMSBY ROAD, HUMBERSTON**

Cabinet considered a report that detailed the results of an annual review of the Gating Order which restricts access to the footpath linking Queen Elizabeth Road to Grimsby Road, Humberston.

**RESOLVED – That the Gating Order imposed on the footpath linking Queen Elizabeth Road to Grimsby Road, Humberston, Grimsby be continued without any variation until the next annual review.**

REASONS FOR DECISION – This Gating Order is continuing to have a positive impact on the levels of crime and anti-social behaviour in the locality and there have not been any objections to its continuation raised by local residents, Ward Councillors or the Police.

.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

Revocation Of The Order - this option would require consultation and advertisement in the local press. It was believed that objections were likely to be raised by the residents, which if unresolved, could result in a Public Inquiry.

Variation Of The Order - this option would also incur an on-going cost implication to manage the variation. The actual cost would depend on the complexity of the variation proposed but an estimation of this cost has previously been provided by our security section. The cost to manage the simplest of variations has been estimated at £2,600 per annum.

DNPH.EE.8

**PUBLIC CONSULTATION OF CLEETHORPES CENTRAL SEAFRONT CONSERVATION AREA, CONSERVATION AREA APPRAISAL 2016 AND MANAGEMENT PLAN 2016.**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report seeking approval to enter into full public consultation on the Cleethorpes Central Seafront Conservation Area, Appraisal and Management Plan 2016.

**RESOLVED – That the Cleethorpes Central Seafront Conservation Area, Appraisal 2016 and Management Plan 2016, as attached to the report now submitted, be approved for public consultation.**

REASONS FOR DECISION –

To satisfy the legal duty placed on the council to review their conservation areas on a regular basis;

To comply with duties placed upon the council to formulate and publish proposals for the preservation and enhancement of their conservation areas;

To assist in good planning and carefully manage appropriate change within the Cleethorpes Central Seafront conservation area; and

To support the current Townscape Heritage Project and to assist with any future heritage led-regeneration for the area.

#### OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

Conservation Area Appraisals can be approved by Cabinet or Council without first having been through public consultation. However, their weight as material planning considerations is severely reduced and the amount of officer time used defending the features identified within it would be increased. The Portfolio Holder could also consider postponing public consultation to allow for amendments to be made.

DNPH.EE.9

#### **BIRCHIN WAY, GRIMSBY**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report proposing to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order for 'No Waiting' on Birchin Way, Grimsby.

#### **RESOLVED –**

- (1) That, subject to consultation and no objections being received, approval be granted to the making of a “No Waiting At Any Time” Traffic Regulation Order as listed in the Schedule given in Appendix 1 to the report now submitted and shown on drawing TR101/16-23/01.**
- (2) That, in the event that there are unresolved objections to the Order, these be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for determination and decision as to whether or not the Traffic Regulation Order be confirmed.**

REASONS FOR DECISION – To improve the safe passage of vehicles along Birchin Way for all road users and to improve accessibility for pedestrians.

#### OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

Parking can be better regulated through the use of “no loading” restrictions. These would require additional road markings and the provision of upright signs. Whilst recognised as effective and easily enforced it is considered that, at this time, such restrictions would be out of place on Birchin Way.

The majority of the area concerned could be left as unrestricted parking, allowing anyone to park in the street up to the prescribed limit set out in the Highway Code (not within 10 metres of a junction) with double yellow lines installed around the junction radii. In order for this to be enforced it would also require a new “no waiting at any time” restriction and associated Traffic Regulation Order. However, this would not resolve the safety issues in this instance surrounding the free flow of traffic. Given the class of vehicles and the width of the road it is recommended that a more substantial waiting restriction is proposed.

**DNPH.EE.10 TRACKING**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report tracking the recommendations of previous meetings.

**RESOLVED –**

- (1) That, in relation to DNPH.ET.14 - Petition, Habrough Flashing Signs, the petitioner be informed that monitoring of the site had given no indication of a significant issue and therefore there were no immediate plans to carry out any works.**
- (2) That in relation to DNPH.ET.16 – Petition, Pedestrian Crossing Stallingborough, the petitioner be informed that the proposed crossing location was not feasible and, as there had been no response to requests to consider alternative crossing locations, this matter would be closed.**
- (3) That in relation to PH.ET.19 - Pelham Road, Immingham weight limit restriction, investigations be made into extending the weight limit restriction to Stallingborough Road and Kings Road, Immingham.**
- (4) That in relation to PH.ET.47 - Traffic Regulation Order Chichester Road, Cleethorpes, this item be removed from the tracking as the order had now been sealed.**
- (5) That, in relation to PH.EE.2 – Petition, Reinstatement of Parking Permit Scheme on Elm Road and Elm Avenue, Cleethorpes, this item be removed from the tracking following the decision earlier in this meeting at DNPH.EE.2.**