

PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT

DATE	19 th August 2025.
REPORT OF	Councillor Stewart Swinburn, Portfolio Holder for Housing, Infrastructure & Transport.
RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	Carolina Borgstrom – Director for Environment, Economy and Infrastructure.
SUBJECT	Traffic Regulation Order 25-02: Freeman Street, Grimsby- Waiting and Loading Restrictions – Consideration of Objection.
STATUS	Open.
FORWARD PLAN REF NO.	PHHIT 08/25/02

CONTRIBUTION TO OUR AIMS

A review of the current waiting and loading restrictions at this location, will support stronger businesses within the area as well as contributing to the health and wellbeing of all road users, business owners and visitors to the area by creating, and maintaining, a safer highway environment by implementing appropriate waiting and loading measures.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Following formal advertisement of Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) 25-02 'The North East Lincolnshire Borough Council (Waiting & Loading Restrictions) (Freeman Street area, Grimsby) (No. 25-02) Order 2025' on 28th May 2025, one material objection was received to the Order. This report requests consideration of this objection and seek approval to progress with the advertised schemes as shown on the drawings in Appendix 1.

RECOMMENDATIONS

It is recommended that:

- a) Following consideration of the received objection, approval be granted for the sealing of Traffic Regulation Order 25-02 as advertised without amendment, for the introduction of various waiting restrictions imposed on Garibaldi Street, Freeman Street, Albert Street West, Railway Street, Nelson Street and Wood Street in accordance with the plans at Appendix 1 (Ref: ADHR – FS-01-01 & ADHR- FS-01-2).

REASONS FOR DECISION

Implementation of the restrictions will ensure better visibility for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists entering or exiting junctions off Freeman Street and it will ensure traffic flows are maintained, particularly as Freeman Street is a high frequency bus route.

1 BACKGROUND AND ISSUES

- 1.1 Following recent resurfacing works in the borough, it has come to the Traffic Team's attention that the current parking and waiting restrictions around Freeman Street & Garibaldi Street need reviewing to ensure they are still appropriate and an effective measure for the area.
- 1.2 During the statutory 21-day objection period, which closed on the 18th of June 2025, one material objection was received. The objection received was in relation to the proposed 'No Waiting at Any Time' restriction on a section of Freeman Street between the junction of Albert Street West and Church Street as shown on drawing ADHR – FS-01-01.
- 1.3 If the recommendations of this report are accepted and approval is given to progress with the sealing of this TRO, the authority is required to:
 - include amongst the deposited documents for public inspection a copy of the Order as actually made.
 - publish in a local newspaper a public notice stating that the Order has been made.
 - write to any objectors within 14 days of making the order, to notify them the order has been made and, where the objection has not been wholly acceded to, shall include in that notification the reasons for the decision.

The objection

- 1.4 The objector states they are the owner of a business on Freeman Street. They state that they are deeply concerned that adding further parking limitations would negatively affect the accessibility, convenience, and the vitality of the local commercial community. The objector states many of their customers, employees, and delivery services depend on the availability of nearby on-street parking to conduct business efficiently.
- 1.5 The objector states that restricting parking could discourage foot traffic, reduce impulse visits, and ultimately harm small businesses that are still recovering from recent economic challenges. The objector says that in commercial zones like ours, convenient parking is not a luxury, and it is a critical part of our ability to serve the public.
- 1.6 Also, they have stated there is no clear data demonstrating that current parking conditions are problematic enough to justify stricter measures. They state the proposed changes risk solving a problem that may not exist whilst unintentionally creating real barriers to business operations.
- 1.7 The objector strongly urges the Council to reconsider this proposal and instead consult with local business owners to explore alternatives, such as time-limited parking, improved signage or increased enforcement of existing rules before enacting new restrictions that could stifle economic activity in a key commercial area.

The objection response

- 1.8 The purpose of this proposal is to ensure better visibility for drivers, pedestrians and cyclists entering or exiting junctions off Freeman Street and it will ensure sight

lines and traffic flows are maintained, particularly as Freeman Street is a bus route. The section of Freeman Street where the objector's business is located is already covered by a limited waiting restriction (single yellow line) between 8am-6pm. Therefore, there should be no parking on the restrictions between these hours. Unfortunately, these restrictions are regularly being ignored and are not having the desired effect. Parked vehicles are obstructing visibility splays and blocking access for buses causing traffic to build up.

- 1.9 The implementation of double yellow line restrictions in and around junction areas are a nationally recognised road safety measure used by many authorities to improve visibility and sight lines.
- 1.10 Double yellow lines are a 'prohibition of waiting' restriction not a 'no stopping' restriction. In this regard, there are various statutory exemptions to allow vehicles to stop temporarily on this type of restriction. These include the boarding or alighting of passengers (including taxis), trades people with a waiver, loading and unloading of goods, and access and egress to residential properties, providing these actions can be performed safely and that no vehicles are parked within 10 metres of a junction.
- 1.11 In respect of parking for customers, there are several nearby side streets that allow up to 2 hours free parking. There is also limited waiting parking bays on the opposite kerb line of Freeman Street which allow free parking for up to 1 hour. For employees requiring parking for longer, there is a public car park available nearby and there is also unrestricted kerb side parking available on Railway Street.
- 1.12 It is acknowledged that the proposed restrictions may result in inconvenience for some businesses in the area, however, the road safety and traffic benefits that the proposed restrictions would bring to all road users (including the objector's customers, the objector themselves and their staff), needs to be balanced against these inconveniences.
- 1.13 Officers therefore conclude that the road safety and traffic benefits that are likely to be realised outweigh the potential inconvenience for some local businesses and the proposal should be approved unamended.

2 RISKS, OPPORTUNITIES AND EQUALITY ISSUES

2.1 Should this proposal be adopted, the opportunities are:

- To implement restrictions that are of adequate length and duration to ensure they are respected by drivers.
- To prevent parking and improve visibility.
- To provide traffic flow benefits.
- To give improved visibility for pedestrians of approaching vehicles and vice versa.
- To allow robust enforcement of restrictions, backed by a legal TRO, by NELC Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs).

2.2 Should these proposals not be implemented, the risks are:

- that visibility for all road users, particularly those more vulnerable users may continue to be impaired because of parked vehicles increasing the likelihood of

accidents and/or personal injury collisions.

- 2.3 There are no implications under the Equality Act 2010, European Directive 2001/42/EC and transposed into UK law through the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulation 2004 or The General Data Protection Regulation 2018 as a result of this proposal.

3 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 3.1 Do nothing. This is not recommended given the traffic and road safety issues that are currently being observed along Freeman Street.

4 REPUTATION AND COMMUNICATIONS CONSIDERATIONS

- 4.1 It is expected there will be little potential for negative reputational implications resulting from the decision. The proposals are as a direct result of a request by residents and Ward Councillors to address parking and visibility issues, who have already been made aware of the intention to progress the recommended scheme.
- 4.2 The purpose of the highway is to allow vehicles to pass and repass and there is no expressed right to park. It is understood that any displaced parking can be accommodated in surrounding off-street car parks or nearby side streets which allow parking.
- 4.3 All proposed restrictions will be clearly marked on street. The types of markings to be introduced are common throughout the country, so are easily identifiable and understood by drivers.
- 4.4 Previous communication has been undertaken with Ward Councillors and residents in the area.

5 FINANCIAL CONSIDERATIONS

- 5.1 All costs associated with the making of this TRO will be covered through existing Council revenue budgets.

6 CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The proposals will not have any specific implications for children and young people above those realised by all highway users in the area.

7 CLIMATE CHANGE, NATURE RECOVERY AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPLICATIONS

- 7.1 The proposals are not expected to have any significant impact.

8 CONSULTATION WITH SCRUTINY

- 8.1 There has been no consultation with Scrutiny in relation to this matter.

9 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 As outlined in section 5, the costs associated with the making of this TRO are to be met from within existing revenue budget provision.

10 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 Under Section 1 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 traffic authorities are empowered to make Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) for (inter alia) the reasons set out at the beginning of this report. Section 2 specifies what TROs may require and the recommended order is within those powers.
- 10.2 The procedure for making TROs is set out in Schedule 9 Part III of the 1984 Act and the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and provides for advertisement and consideration of any objections before making a final decision on the proposed TRO.
- 10.3 Regulation 8 makes provision for objections and regulation 14 allows the Council to modify a TRO before it is made.
- 10.4 If it is decided to make the TRO, notwithstanding any objections made, it can only be challenged by Judicial Review in the Administrative Court.

11 HUMAN RESOURCES IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 There are no direct HR implications.

12 WARD IMPLICATIONS

- 12.1 The proposals relate to issues within the East Marsh Ward.

13 BACKGROUND PAPERS

[Local Authorities' Traffic Orders \(Procedure\) \(England and Wales\) Regulations 1996](#)

[Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984](#)

[The Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016 No 362](#)

14 CONTACT OFFICER(S)

- Paul Evans, Assistant Director - Infrastructure, 01472 323029
- Martin Lear- Head of Highways and Transportation, 01472 324482

COUNCILLOR STEWART SWINBURN

PORTFOLIO HOLDER FOR HOUSING, INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT

Appendix One



