



To be submitted to the Council at its meeting on 20th March 2025

PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT

16th December 2024 at 10.30 a.m.

Present

Councillor S Swinburn (in the Chair)

Officers in Attendance:

- Paul Thorpe (Operations Director)
- Paul Evans (Assistant Director for Infrastructure)
- Martin Lear (Principal Transport Officer)
- Anthony Snell (Transport and Traffic Manager)
- Keith Thompson (Lead Solicitor)
- Sophie Pickerden (Committee Support Officer)

Also in attendance:

There was one member of the press and one member of the public in attendance at the meeting.

PH.HIT.29 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence for this meeting.

PH.HIT.30 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest from the Portfolio Holder in respect of any items on the agenda for this meeting.

PH.HIT.31 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes of the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport meetings on the 21st October 2024 be agreed as a correct record.

PH.HIT.32 RESPONSE TO BARNOLDBY LE BECK VILLAGE PETITION

The Portfolio Holder considered a report providing a formal response to the petition received by the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport from residents requesting action to address road safety issues in Barnoldby-le-Beck.

Miss Pickerden informed the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport that the petitioner couldn't attend the meeting but had sent an email in response to the report. The Portfolio Holder read the email and passed it on to officers to consider.

RESOLVED – That the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport note the progress made to date in investigating options to address traffic speed and road safety concerns raised through the petition and that he receives a further update once these investigations have been completed.

PH.HIT.33 RESPONSE TO PETITION REQUESTING A PEGASUS CROSSING ON THE A18

The Portfolio Holder considered a report providing a formal response to the petition received by the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport from residents requesting the introduction of a new Pegasus crossing on the A18 south of the Landmark Café.

Ms Brown spoke on behalf of the petitioners. She stated that the aim of the petition was the same as the aim of the Transport department as outlined in the report section Contribution to our Aims. Ms Brown said that she was very disappointed that the council's recommendation in response to the petition was to do nothing. She referred to section 1.2 of the report and stated that the A18 was recognised as a dangerous high-speed road with many livery yards in the vicinity. Ms Brown referred to section 1.3 of the report and stated that there had been a serious accident outside the Landmark Café on Sunday 10th November involving a car and a motorcyclist with the motorcyclist sustaining life changing injuries. Ms Brown explained that this had occurred at the entrance to the Willow Livery Lakes Yard, adjacent to the newly erected warning triangle. She

said that she believed speed was the major factor. Ms Brown referred to section 1.15 of the report and said that whilst visibility might be acceptable on foot, when on horseback the visibility on the Ravendale side of the A18 is far from good as the horse has to venture halfway across the road to obtain a clear view. She further referred to section 1.9 of the report and stated that the data recently collected and used in the decision making did not represent a true picture of the current situation as many horse riders had stopped using the A18 due to it being too dangerous to do so. Ms Brown said that the whole ethos of requesting a safer crossing place to connect the two bridleways was as referred to in the Contribution to our Aims section of the report, to encourage. She said that another reason that the data collected was not representative was due to the time of the year that it was collected and the poor weather conditions meaning there was very few walkers, cyclists, riders and scooters. Ms Brown stated that it was irrelevant whether one or fifty-one crossed the A18, the risk was still there, and it only takes one. She referred to section three of the report and said that whilst she understood the view that the money used to install a Pegasus crossing could be needed elsewhere, she queried what was the cost of a life. Ms Brown said that in regard to the second option as outlined in section three of the report, only one solar VAS sign would be required, on the Ravendale side. She said that when she had spoken to lorry drivers, who had told her that they felt, the signs would have the most impact. Ms Brown said that in regard to the last option as outlined in section three of the report, the hedges would need to be cut down low enough for people to be able to see as far as the bend and whilst the warning triangles should have some impact, they hadn't for the recent accident that occurred. She stated that in regard to near misses, every time you try to cross the A18 on horseback, you literally take your life in your own hands. Ms Brown referred to section ten of the report and queried what the implications would be if a serious incident did occur, and the Council had been made aware of the impending dangers of crossing the A18 on horseback and yet had chosen to do nothing. She stated that the best option for riders would be for the Council to do something and install a VAS sign, lower the speed limit and cut the hedges back and to a lower height. Ms Brown said that the main contributing factor was the speed of the traffic, and she queried whether the speed limit could be lowered from Ashby Hill roundabout to the bend past the crossing as implemented along other stretches of the A18. She said that during the site meeting, the option of a mirror opposite the Ravendale exit was suggested but there was no mention of this in the report. Ms Brown said that she hoped a solution acceptable to both parties could be achieved.

The Portfolio Holder asked whether officers were aware of the accident that took place on the 10th November. Mr Snell responded that the accident was not referred to in the report as the report deadline was prior to that date. Mr Thorpe said that officers would need to speak to the Police and investigate what the route cause of that accident was. Ms Brown

stated that she thought it was the speed that was the issue. Mr Thorpe reiterated that officers would speak to Police about the accident.

The Portfolio Holder asked officers if they had contacted the Grounds Maintenance Team about cutting back the bushes. Mr Thorpe said that the bushes were on private land, but officers could ask the landowners to cut them back as they had done before.

The Portfolio Holder queried whether any warnings signs could be put up. Mr Thorpe responded that some signs had recently been put up and there was the option to put more up, but at the time of writing the report, it wasn't deemed necessary to do so, but that could change following discussions with the Police.

The Portfolio Holder asked whether the speed limit could be reduced similarly to what was done on Keelby Road. Mr Thorpe responded that if that was done, it would have to be done to every bridleway. Mr Thorpe stated that he recommended that officers be given the opportunity to speak to Police and see if the recommendation in the report needs to change as a result.

The Portfolio Holder stated that he took on board the petitioner's concerns and thought that further investigations needed to take place.

RESOLVED – That the report be deferred in order to allow for further investigations to take place.

PH.HIT.34 NWAAT – PHASE 1 -TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 23-02 AREA WIDE NO WAITING AT ANY TIME RESTRICTIONS– CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

The Portfolio Holder considered a report requesting consideration of objections and seeking approval to progress with the advertised schemes as shown on the drawings in Appendices one and two.

RESOLVED –

1. That the sealing of Traffic Regulation Order 23-02 as advertised without amendment, for the introduction of 'No Waiting at Any Time' (Double Yellow Line) restrictions as shown indicatively on drawings HD-00-23-T208 at Appendix 1 be approved.
2. That the sealing of Traffic Regulation Order 23-02 as advertised with amendments, for the introduction of 'No Waiting at Any Time' (Double Yellow Line) Restrictions as shown indicatively on drawings HD-00-23-T201 Rev C at Appendix 2 be approved.

**PH.HIT.35 SPEED LIMIT ORDER – 25-03: BUTT LANE,
AYLESBY/LACEBY**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report seeking approval that the national speed limit be replaced with a lower 40mph speed limit on Butt Lane

RESOLVED –

1. That the making of a Speed Limit Order to revoke the current national speed limit on Butt Lane, Aylesby/Laceby, the extent of which is detailed in the plan in Appendix One (Ref: ADHR-BL-03) be approved.
2. That the making of a Speed Limit Order to introduce a 40mph speed limit on Butt Lane, Aylesby/Laceby, the extent of which is shown indicatively in the plan in Appendix One (Ref: ADHR-BL-04) be approved.
3. That in the event there were unresolved material objections to the Order, these be referred to the Portfolio Holder for determination and a decision as to whether or not the Order be confirmed and executed.

**PH.HIT.36 TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 23-33: PETERHOUSE
ROAD AREA - INTRODUCTION OF WAITING
RESTRICTIONS**

The Portfolio Holder considered a report seeking approval to introduce new Prohibition of Waiting restrictions at several identified streets around the Peterhouse Road area.

Mr Snell informed the Portfolio Holder that the drawing number was wrong in the report and needed amending to TR-PH-01-01-E.

RESOLVED –

1. That the making of a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce 24-Hour Prohibition of Waiting (double yellow line) restrictions as shown indicatively on drawing TR-PH-01-01-E at Appendix 1 be approved.
2. That the making of a Traffic Regulation Order to introduce Prohibition of Waiting (single yellow line) Monday – Friday, 8:30am - 9:30am and 2:30pm - 3:30pm restrictions as shown indicatively on drawing TR-PH-01-01-E at Appendix 1 be approved.

3. That in the event there were unresolved material objections to the Order, these be referred to the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport for determination and a decision as to whether or not the Order be confirmed and executed.

PH.HIT.37 TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 24-14: ABBEY PARK ROAD, GRIMSBY – AMENDMENT TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS

The Portfolio Holder considered a report seeking approval to amend the extent of the current waiting restrictions that front the property concerned.

RESOLVED –

1. That the making of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to extend the No Waiting at Any Time (double yellow line) restrictions as shown indicatively on drawing TR-24-14-001 in Appendix 1 be approved.
2. That the making of a TRO to revoke a section of the Limited Waiting restriction (Monday to Saturday, 8am – 6pm - 2 Hours, No return within two hours) as shown indicatively on drawing TR-24-14-001 in Appendix 1 be approved.
3. That in the event there were unresolved material objections to the Orders, they be referred back to the Portfolio Holder for determination and a decision as to whether or not the Orders be confirmed and executed.

There being no further business, the Portfolio Holder closed the meeting at 10.55am.