**OFFICER DECISION REPORT – TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO)**

5b

**OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS - DECISION (no objections received)**

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **TITLE OF REPORT:** **PROPOSAL:** **SCHEME REF No:****REPORT AUTHOR:** | **Farrington Gurney****20mph speed limit****23-024 / LC****Lewis Cox**  |

**1. DELEGATION**

The delegation to be exercised in this report is contained within **Part 3**, **Section 4** of the Constitution under the **Delegation of Functions to Officers,** as follows:

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Section A** | The Chief Executive, Strategic Directors, Divisional Directors and Heads of Service have delegated power to take any decision falling within their area of responsibility….” |
| **Section B** | Without prejudice to the generality of this, Officers are authorised to:serve any notices and make, amend or revoke any orders falling within his/her area of responsibility. |
| **Section D9** | An Officer to whom a power, duty or function is delegated may nominate or authorise another Officer to exercise that power, duty or function, provided that Officer reports to or is responsible to the delegator. |

*For the purposes of this report, the Director of Place Management holds the delegated power to make, amend or revoke any Traffic Regulation Orders.*

**2. LEGAL AUTHORITY**

This proposal is made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, which under Section 1 provides, generally, for Orders to be made for the following reasons, and in the case of this report specifically for the reason(s) shown below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| (a) | for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or | X |
| (b) | for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or |  |
| (c) | for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or | X |
| (d) | for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property, |  |
| (e) | (without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or |  |
| (f) | for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs, or | X |
| (g) | for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality) |  |

**3. PROPOSAL**

To introduce 20mph speed limits into the vicinity of Farrington Gurney primary school and the surrounding neighbourhood.

The extent of the proposed 20mph speed limit is shown on the attached drawing.

The built-up sections of Ham Lane, Chapel Close, Pitway Lane and Hill View are also included for consistency across the parish.

The point where the school crossing patrol is located will also be improved as part of this scheme together with signage to deter HGVs from using Church Lane.

**4. BACKGROUND**

The speed limit changes have been requested by the school as the speed of traffic on Church Lane can sometimes be inappropriate. There is an existing advisory 20mph in place, but the school would like this to become a mandatory 20mph speed limit so that enforcement is possible.

Farrington Parish Council have also requested that the speed limit on the inner village roads be reduced to 20mph, linking to the proposed 20mph in Church Lane, but also to consolidate the whole village into a wider 20 mph scheme.

# 5. SOURCE OF FINANCE

The scheme will be funded through the 2023/24 Transport Improvement Programme.

**6. INFORMAL CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT**

Informal consultation was carried out with the Chief Constable, Parish Council, Ward Members, and the Cabinet Member for Highways.

The responses to the informal consultation can be found in TRO report number 3.

**7. OBJECTIONS / COMMENTS RECEIVED (following the public advertisement of the proposal(s)**

No objections or negative comments have been received following the advertisement of the proposal(s).

Three expressions of support / comment have been received:

1. *I refer to the Notice pinned to a telegraph pole in Meadow Close, Farrington Gurney. The proposal is excellent. I just draw your attention to the dark line drawn within Meadow Close. I live at 15 Meadow Close in a cul de sac with Nos. 12, 14 and 15. That section of the road is not adopted highway. The majority of the road is owned and on the title deed of No. 15 and the remainder up to the road is half on No. 12 and the other half No. 14. That is the road from the cobbles to the wall. I just wished to make you aware, not that we drive over 20mph in our little cul de sac.*

*Officer response: noted.*

1. *In addition to the proposed restrictions, please consider extending the 20 MPH restrictions to include the section of the A37 that passes through Farrington Gurney. There is a well-used nursery (open five days a week and used by many families in the village) on this section of road, and the pavements are very narrow and the crossing unsafe. Although this is currently a 30 MPH zone it is not monitored / there is no speed camera. Safety would be greatly improved by reducing this section through the village to a 20 MPH zone in line with the roads included in the proposed TRO23-024/LC.*

*Officer response: Introducing a 20mph on the A37 through Farrington Gurney is beyond the scope of these proposals.*

1. *BANES has posted notice of the change of speed limit around the village. As per emails and conversations regarding this proposal, Marsh Lane has been missed completely which is extremely important to include. The reference number is TRO 23-024/LC. Please could you make sure this is included?*

*Officer response: Marsh Lane has now been included within the proposals.*

**8. RECOMMENDATION**

That the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised is sealed.

Paul Garrod Date: 21st February 2024

Traffic Management & Network Manager

**9. DECISION**

As the Officer holding the above delegation, I have decided that the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised be sealed.

In taking this decision, I confirm that due regard has been given to the Council’s public sector equality duty, which requires it to consider and think about how its policies or decisions may affect people who are protected under the Equality Act.

The Council’s policy framework has been used as the basis to develop the scheme with full engagement with stakeholders across the area.

I further note that the issue of deciding whether to implement any scheme is a matter of broad judgement, taking into account the wider transport and climate aims of the Council rather than a purely mathematical analysis on the numbers of positive or negative responses.

The arguments both for and against the scheme were clearly identified and were considered fully as part of the decision-making process before I made the final decision as set out above.

Chris Major Date: 23/02/24

Director for Place Management