

CABINET



Report subject	Traffic Regulation Orders – Sherwood Avenue
Meeting date	27 May 2020
Status	Public Report
Executive summary	To consider representations to the advertisement of Waiting Restrictions in Sherwood Avenue.
Recommendations	The Transportation Advisory Group is asked to consider recommending to the Cabinet that it approves: The Orders are confirmed as advertised
Reason for recommendations	The proposed restrictions will prevent parking on the crest of the hill

SUB REPORT E

Portfolio Holder(s):	Councillor Andy Hadley – Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure
Corporate Director	Bill Cotton – Director of Regeneration and Economy
Service Director	Julian McLaughlin – Director of Growth & Infrastructure
Report Authors	Steve Dean – Senior Engineer Traffic Management
Wards	Parkstone
Classification	For Decision

Background

The scheme has been prompted by requests from residents who are concerned that vehicles parking near the crest of the hill cause safety problems.

Summary of financial implications

The costs associated with both the advertisement and implementation of the TRO will be covered by the Minor Traffic Schemes budget. The cost is estimated to be £1,000.

Summary of legal implications

Highways Authorities are required to give formal consideration to any representations received during the advertisement period.

Summary of human resources implications

None.

Summary of environmental impact

None

Summary of public health implications

None

Summary of equality implications

The Traffic Regulation Orders do not have direct equality implications

Summary of risk assessment

None

Background papers

None

Appendices

Appendix 1 – Summary of representations, and responses to issues raised

Appendix 2 – Plan of proposals

Appendix**Summary of Representations, and Responses to Issues Raised
Sherwood Avenue**

Two local residents wrote representations in support of the proposed restrictions and one resident wrote a representation objecting.

Representations	Response
Two residents wrote to support the proposal. These residents felt that visibility is obstructed over the brow of the hill	
One resident has written to object that the restrictions do not extend far enough to provide satisfactory sightlines.	<p>The Council cannot introduce more restrictions than have been formally advertised without re-advertising the new proposal.</p> <p>A 20mph limit is likely in this area in the next financial year.</p>

Conclusion

There is no objection to the principle of imposing restrictions here, and the Order should be confirmed as advertised.