

## APPENDIX A

### TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS

Report subject	<b>Traffic Regulation Orders – Dunyeats Road</b>
Meeting date	12 July 2019
Status	Public Report
Executive summary	To consider representations to the advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the Dunyeats Road improvement scheme
<b>Recommendations</b>	<b>It is RECOMMENDED that:</b>  <b>The Orders, shared cycle footway and pedestrian crossing changes are confirmed as advertised</b>
Reason for recommendations	The overall scheme will provide improved and safer access for pedestrians and cyclists using Dunyeats Road. The Traffic regulation Orders are necessary for the scheme to take place.

Portfolio Holder(s):	Councillor Andy Hadley – Cabinet Member for Transport and Infrastructure
Corporate Director	Bill Cotton – Director of Regeneration and Economy
Contributors	Steve Dean – Traffic Management Engineer
Wards	Broadstone
Classification	For Decision

## **Background**

1. Dunyeats Road is due to be re-surfaced and this work gives the opportunity to reallocate carriageway/footway space to improve cycle and pedestrian access along the route. The Traffic Regulation Orders are needed to allow cyclist to use the new shared path, and to manage traffic in the narrower carriageway

## **Summary of financial implications**

2. Financial provision has already been made, through the Capital programme for the scheme to go ahead. The financial implications of the Traffic Regulation Orders are minor, and have been included in the cost of the scheme

## **Summary of legal implications**

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

## **Summary of human resources implications**

4. None

## **Summary of environmental impact**

5. The scheme will provide a wider cycle/footway along the northern side of Dunyeats Road, and could encourage more people to cycle/walk along Dunyeats Road

## **Summary of public health implications**

6. Encouraging walking and cycling enhances healthy lifestyles

## **Summary of equality implications**

7. The Traffic Regulation Orders do not have direct equality implications

## **Summary of risk assessment**

8. The Scheme will be Safety Audited after completion

## **Appendices**

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

Appendix 2 - Plan

## Appendix 1

### Summary of Representations, and Responses to Issues Raised

The advertisement prompted:-

- 13 Objections (from 11 Households)
- 4 letters of support
- 9 letters with comments about elements of the scheme

The Objections to the Traffic Regulation Orders are summarised below:-

1. Removal of the 30minute Limited Waiting bays outside No 18 Dunyeats Road – **ten** respondents expressed concern about this.

They feel that the bays are used by customers making short visits to the shops, and that their removal would affect the vitality of the shopping area. One of the respondents has asked if 30 minute free parking could be offered in the car parks

**Response** – The bays cannot be retained if the carriageway is reduced in width. The shopping centre is served by:-

- Two car parks
- Free, 30 minute parking bays in the Toastrack
- 2hr limited waiting bays in most of the roads surrounding the shopping centre

It is recommended that the Order is made as advertised

2. Imposition of No Waiting at Any Time restrictions along the southern side of Dunyeats Road between No 58 and Gravel Hill – there have been **four** objections to this (3 from one extended family)

The objectors feel that the restrictions will prevent residents, visitors and tradespeople parking outside the homes in this stretch of road..

The driveways are steep, and residents need to park in the road during snow/icy periods.

They feel that clearing parking will lead to higher vehicle speeds

**Response** – The narrowed carriageway will not be wide enough to accommodate parking. There are already yellow lines in front of many of the homes in Dunyeats Road.

The narrowed carriageway will discourage speeding along the whole length of the road, rather than just where parking occurs.

3. Cycle /Footway – **One** respondent felt that cyclists shouldn't be allowed to use the footway, even when widened. Two other respondents felt that there was no need to widen the footway to allow cyclists to use it.

Respondents also raised issues that do not directly relate to Traffic Regulation Orders:-

1. Narrowing the carriageway – **Eight** respondents objected to the carriageway being narrowed. They felt that the road was an important bus route and access to Broadstone.
2. Crossing at Station Approach – **Three** respondents felt that this would cause queuing
3. Funding – **Two** respondents felt that the scheme was a waste of money.