

Bath & North East Somerset Council

| | | | |
|---|---|-----------------------------------|------|
| DECISION MAKER: | Cllr Roger Symonds, Cabinet Member for Transport | | |
| DECISION DATE: | On or after 19 th January 2013 | EXECUTIVE FORWARD PLAN REFERENCE: | |
| | | E | 2446 |
| TITLE: | Proposed Double Yellow Lines - Park Road, Keynsham. | | |
| WARD: | KEYNSHAM | | |
| AN OPEN PUBLIC ITEM | | | |
| List of attachments to this report: K2/IC - Informal Consultation (overview). K2/FC - Formal Consultation (overview). EIA/PR - Equality Impact Assessment / Equality Analysis Drawing No. TR240081 / 01 - "Existing / Proposed Layout" | | | |

1 THE ISSUE

As part of the new access road design which was approved at the Planning stage for the K2 development, it was agreed to mark double yellow lines along some parts of Park Road, Dunster Road and Giffords Lane, Keynsham. Local residents are not in favour of the proposals, as they believe the yellow line markings will adversely affect their lives.

2 RECOMMENDATION

The Cabinet member is asked to agree that:

- 2.1 The double yellow lines should be included in the proposed access road layout off of Park Road as approved during the Planning process.

3 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 3.1 The installation of the parking restrictions (painting of double yellow lines) are likely to cost c £150; this will be funded through the s106 agreement with the developer of the K2 site, Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd.
- 3.2 It should be noted that the installation of additional parking restrictions will have implications for the Parking Service as this creates an additional area to patrol. This is not quantifiable on an individual TRO basis, but the cumulative effect of a series of similar increases in areas to patrol may result in a requirement for additional resource and therefore additional cost.

4 CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- Building communities where people feel safe and secure,
- Improving transport and the public realm.

5 THE REPORT

- 5.1 The layout of the proposed access road work was submitted and successfully passed through the Planning process. The following Appeal Inquiry agreed with the initial application that the development should go ahead, and listed a large number of reasons to continue, split down into various sub-headings including 'The Sustainability of the Proposed Area' and 'The Effect of the Proposal on the Wider Area'. Amongst the many reasons given in the report, it was stated that the existing parking conditions; the reduction in vehicle speeds and the increase in visibility were grounds for rejecting the appeal.
- 5.2 The proposed Traffic Regulation Order (for double yellow line markings) has been undertaken in accordance with the plans approved by the Planning Inspector during the Appeal Inquiry. It should be noted that the Planning Inspector represents the Secretary of State and their decision is therefore judged to be made in the public interest.
- 5.3 As part of the TRO process, informal and formal consultations with both internal council and external bodies and members of the public were undertaken. The consultation results are summarised as an appendix to this report.
- 5.4 The local residents who have objected are very concerned over the proposed change to the parking arrangements. They do not see the need for the lines, highlighting that the Inquiry said there would be no increase in traffic flow due to the development.

6 RISK MANAGEMENT

- 6.1 The author of this report and the Cabinet member have both reviewed the risk assessment recommendations related to the issue, in compliance with the Council's decision making risk management guidance.

7 EQUALITIES

- 7.1 A proportionate equalities impact assessment has been carried out on the scheme, to see if any discriminatory factors can be highlighted. There are no situations that could be thought of that discriminated against one over another.

8 RATIONALE

- 8.1 The proposal has gone through the Planning process, and no objections were received at the time. In accordance with Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulations Act 1984, the proposals are designed to 'facilitate the passage on the road of any class of traffic and pedestrians', and to 'avoid danger to persons or other traffic using the road or to prevent the likelihood of any such danger arising'.
- 8.2 This proposal will not only reduce the congestion along the stretch of road, but will also improve visibility, and therefore safety, at the Dunster Road junction. The majority of objections to the consultation were from residents complaining at losing their existing parking arrangements. It was felt that the need for public safety overrides the residents' desire for on-street parking outside their properties. Any increase in the safety of the highway has to be of benefit to the public.

9 OTHER OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 9.1 The original application (ref. 09/04351/FUL, dated 13th November 2009) was refused by notice on 15th December 2010. The resulting Appeal (ref. APP/F0114/A/10/2143212) was allowed, with the decision being made on 22nd July 2011.

10 CONSULTATION

- 10.1 Cabinet members; Parish Council; Town Council; Overview & Scrutiny Panel; Staff; Other B&NES Services; Local Residents; Community Interest Groups;
- 10.2 Consultation was carried out by e-mailing internal and external contacts. Notices were also advertised in the local press and erected on the K2 site for a 21 day period. All local residents had the opportunity to participate in the consultation process, and to make their opinions known.

11 ISSUES TO CONSIDER IN REACHING THE DECISION

11.1 Social Inclusion; Customer Focus; Sustainability; Human Resources; Property; Health & Safety; Other Legal Considerations

12 ADVICE SOUGHT

12.1 The Council's Monitoring Officer (Divisional Director – Legal and Democratic Services) and Section 151 Officer (Divisional Director - Finance) have had the opportunity to input to this report and have cleared it for publication.

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Contact person | Andy Coles - (01225) 394208 |
| Background papers | |
| Please contact the report author if you need to access this report in an alternative format | |