



PORTFOLIO HOLDER HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT DECISION NOTICE

Publication Date: 25th March 2026

At the meeting of the Portfolio Holder – Housing, Infrastructure and Transport held on 24th March 2026 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.43 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

No apologies of absence were received for this meeting.

DNPH.HIT.44 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

DNPH.HIT.45 MINUTES

RESOLVED – That the minutes from the meeting of the of the Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure and Transport meetings on 10th February 2026 be agreed as an accurate record.

DNPH.HIT.46 SPEED LIMIT ORDER – 26-02: PETERHOUSE ROAD AREA, GRIMSBY

The Portfolio Holder considered a report proposing that the current 30mph speed limit be replaced with a lower 20mph speed limit.

RESOLVED –

- 1. That the making of a Speed Limit Order to introduce a 20mph speed limit in the Peterhouse Road, Grimsby area be approved, the extent of which is detailed in the plans in Appendix One (Refs: PR-SPC-001 & PR-SPC-002).**
- 2. That physical speed reduction measures be installed at the entry points of the estate for a six-month trial period.**
- 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 – Following receipt of concerns raised by Ward Councillors and residents regarding speeding vehicles and the safety of vulnerable road users, a review of the current speed limit extents within the Peterhouse Road area of Grimsby has been undertaken. As a result, it is proposed that the current 30mph speed limit be replaced with a lower 20mph speed limit. The proposal outlining that the speed limit be reduced to 20mph, also outlined that associated physical speed reduction measures be installed but following consultation, it was now recommended that the physical speed reduction measures be installed at the entry points of the estate for a six-month trial period.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED – Do nothing. However, this is not recommended given the road safety benefits outlined in the report.

DNPH.HIT.47

TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER – 26-08: MILL ROAD, CLEETHORPES - AMENDMENT TO NO LOADING AT ANY TIME RESTRICTION

The Portfolio Holder considered a report proposing that the restriction length be shortened to facilitate business loading activities.

RESOLVED –

- 1. That the making of a Traffic Regulation Order to amend the extent of the 'No Loading at Any Time' restriction on Mill Road, Cleethorpes be approved, the extent of which is detailed in the plan in Appendix One (Ref: ADHR-26-07).**
- 2. 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 – Following receipt of feedback from a business on Mill Road, Cleethorpes as a result of the implementation of the Cleethorpes Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ), a review of the extent of the current ‘No Loading at Any Time’ restriction on Mill Road has been carried out and it is proposed that the restriction length be shortened to enable loading/unloading to take place.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED – Do nothing. However, this is not recommended given the operational difficulties reported by the business.

DNPH.HIT.48

URGENT BUSINESS – PETITION – CLEETHORPE ROAD AGAINST SHUTDOWN

The Portfolio Holder considered a petition opposing the proposed extension of Cleethorpe Road Bus Lane as detailed under DNPH.HIT.28.

RESOLVED –

- 1. That the petition be received.**
- 2. That the proposed extension of Cleethorpe Road Bus Lane as detailed under DNPH.HIT.28 be refused.**

REASONS FOR DECISION – The Portfolio Holder took into account the representations made by petitioners and the concerns expressed regarding both the scope and conduct of the consultation. He was not satisfied that the consultation provided a sufficiently sound evidential or procedural basis to support progression of the scheme and, having regard to those concerns, determined that the proposed extension should not proceed.

OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED –. The option to defer the decision and request further work on the consultation was considered but not pursued, as the Portfolio Holder was not satisfied that the consultation issues identified could be resolved so as to support progression of the scheme. The option to proceed with the proposed extension was also considered and rejected for the same reasons.