



# **PORTFOLIO HOLDER HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT DECISION NOTICE**

Publication Date: 17th December 2024

At the meeting of the Portfolio Holder – Housing, Infrastructure and Transport held on 16<sup>th</sup> December 2024 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.

**Present:** Councillor S Swinburn (in the Chair)

## **DNPH.HIT.28 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

No apologies of absence were received for this meeting.

## **DNPH.HIT.29 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest in relation to items on the agenda for this meeting.

## **DNPH.HIT.30 RESPONSE TO BARNOLDBY LE BECK VILLAGE PETITION**

The Portfolio Holder received 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.

**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.**

REASONS FOR DECISION - To provide an update to the Portfolio Holder Housing, Infrastructure and Transport and petitioners on progress made, to date, in response to the resident's petition (DNPH.HIT.22).

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

- Introduce physical (vertical or horizontal) speed reduction measures. It is recommended that such measures can only be introduced in an area that has street lighting. There is currently no street lighting provision along much of the C418 through Barnoldby-le-Beck and the costs to introduce such measures would be prohibitively expensive compared to other less costly measures.
- Introduce rumble strips. Whilst rumble strips would be effective in encouraging lower traffic speeds, the noise and vibration created by the strips is likely to cause annoyance and a poorer quality of life for residents in the immediate vicinity, noting the 6000+ vehicles a day that are travelling through the village.
- Introduce a fixed speed camera enforcement system. Guidance and policy around speed cameras is very strict and involves an analysis of injury collisions along roads that are to be monitored. Although there is generally poor compliance with the posted speed limit, the number of injury collisions in this location does not approach the number required to consider introducing a fixed speed camera system.

**DNPH.HIT.31**

## **RESPONSE TO PETITION REQUESTING A PEGASUS CROSSING ON THE A18**

The Portfolio Holder received 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.

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

REASONS FOR DECISION - This report seeks to provide a formal response to the resident's petition (DNPH.HIT.19). The decision has been reached on the basis the PV<sup>2</sup> calculation does not result in a score where national guidance indicates a controlled crossing was necessary. In addition the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges

(DMRB) also indicates that a standalone crossing would not be suitable for the proposed location due to the high vehicle speeds.

#### OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –

- Do maximum - Install a Pegasus crossing at an estimated cost of around £250,000
- Do something - Install a pair of new solar VAS signs on the approaches to where the bridleways exit onto the carriageway at a cost of around £25,000
- Do minimum – Ensure that visibility sight lines are maintained and monitor the impact of the recently installed ‘Accompanied horses or ponies likely to be in or crossing the road ahead’ signs (Ref 550.1). Seek information about ‘near misses’ from local riders and walking groups to inform a future review of the site.

**DNPH.HIT.32**

### **NWAAT – PHASE 1 -TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 23-02 AREA WIDE NO WAITING AT ANY TIME RESTRICTIONS– CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS**

The Portfolio Holder received a report that requested consideration of objections and sought 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.**

REASONS FOR DECISION - The introduction or extension of existing 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, ensuring clearer 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.HIT.33      SPEED LIMIT ORDER – 25-03: BUTT LANE,  
AYLESBY/LACEBY**

The Portfolio Holder received a report that sought 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.**

REASONS FOR DECISION - The review of current de-restricted (national) speed limit section on Butt Lane given the characteristics of the road layout and following the recent completion of a new footway in the immediate vicinity.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED - Do nothing. This is not recommended based on the available data and given the road characteristics as outlined above.

**DNPH.HIT.34      TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 23-33:  
PETERHOUSE ROAD AREA - INTRODUCTION OF  
WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

The Portfolio Holder received a report that sought approval to introduce new Prohibition of Waiting restrictions at several identified streets around the Peterhouse Road area

**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.

REASONS FOR DECISION - The introduction of parking restrictions is proposed, to improve road safety for all road users, by keeping the area free of parked vehicles. Which will in turn ensure clear visibility at junctions and improve pedestrian safety for vulnerable road users living in the area.

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

**DNPH.HIT.35**

## **TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER 24-14: ABBEY PARK ROAD, GRIMSBY – AMENDMENT TO WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

The Portfolio Holder received a report that sought 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.

REASONS FOR DECISION - The amendment of the current waiting restrictions on a section of Abbey Park Road, Grimsby is necessary to facilitate the installation of a residential vehicle access.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED - Take no action. This would though, prevent delivery of the approved residential access and would create conflict between vehicles trying to exit the property and any parked vehicles.