

Single Member Cabinet Decision

Executive
Forward Plan
Reference

E 2446

Proposed Double Yellow Lines – Park Road, Keynsham.

| | |
|--|---|
| Decision maker/s | Cllr Roger Symonds, Cabinet Member for Transport |
| 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. |
| Decision Date | 23 rd January 2013 |
| The decision | The Cabinet Member agrees that the double yellow lines should be included in the proposed access road layout off of Park Road as approved during the Planning process. |
| Rationale for decision | <p>The proposal had 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 were 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'.</p> <p>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.</p> |
| Financial and budget implications | <p>The installation of the parking restrictions will be funded through the Section 106 agreement with the developer of the K2 site, Taylor Wimpey UK Ltd.</p> <p>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.</p> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Issues considered | Social Inclusion; Customer Focus; Sustainability; Human Resources; Property; Health & Safety; Other Legal Consideration. |
| Consultation undertaken | Cabinet members; Parish Council; Town Council; Overview & Scrutiny Panel; Staff; Other B&NES Services; Local Residents; Community Interest Groups. |
| How consultation was carried out | 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. |
| Other options considered | The original application (ref. 09/04351/FUL, dated 13 th November 2009) was refused by notice on 15 th December 2010. The resulting Appeal (ref. APP/F0114/A/10/2143212) was allowed, with the decision being made on 22 nd July 2011. |

| | |
|---|--|
| Signatures of Decision Makers | |
| Date of Signature | |
| Subject to Call-in until 5 Working days have elapsed following publication of the decision | |