

**9 January 2020****Agenda Item:13****REPORT OF CORPORATE DIRECTOR, PLACE****RESPONSES TO PETITIONS PRESENTED TO THE CHAIRMAN OF THE  
COUNTY COUNCIL****Purpose of the Report**

1. The purpose of this report is to recommend to Committee the responses to the issues raised in petitions presented to the County Council at its 10 October 2019 meeting.

**Information****A. Road surface at the entrance to Lydney Park (Ref: 2019/0359)**

2. A petition consisting of 28 signatures was submitted by Councillor Gordon Wheeler requesting that the entrance to Lydney Park is resurfaced.
3. This site does not currently feature on the County Council's 'candidate list' of sites for potential inclusion in a future works' programme as there are currently no actionable defects. The condition of the whole of Lydney Park is such that a micro-asphalt treatment would be the best option for this type of road in the future, as this treatment provides a thin overlay which removes imperfections in the carriageway surface and improves ride quality. We will continue to monitor the site and keep the road safe until such time as it can be included in a future works' programme.
4. It is recommended that the leading petitioner be informed.

**B. Road resurfacing on Nottingham Road, Cropwell Bishop (Ref: 2019/0360)**

5. A petition consisting of 839 signatures was presented by Councillor Neil Clarke. The petition requested that Nottingham Road is resurfaced from its junction with Church Street to the Memorial Hall.
6. Nottingham Road, Cropwell Bishop is on the County Council's 'candidate list', its condition having been highlighted initially by the annual technical survey, along with subsequent recommendations from the Highway Inspectors and Councillor Clarke. Consequently, a maintenance scheme is already included in the 2019/20 capital maintenance programme (as described in the petition) and is scheduled to be delivered in February 2020.
7. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

**C. Vehicle speed and HGV traffic management Blyth Road, Ranskill (Ref: 2019/0361)**

8. A 45-signature petition was presented by Councillor Tracey Taylor expressing concern about excessive speed on the B6045 and the use of that road as a through-route by lorries.

9. Section 5.11.13 of the County Council's Highway Network Management Plan states that:

*Environmental Weight Restrictions will be considered to overcome problems of the use of unsuitable roads by heavy goods vehicles provided that:*

- i. a restricted area can be defined which does not transfer the problem from one community to another*
- ii. a suitable alternative route exists which does not create such a major increase in route mileage for operators such that their economic viability would be seriously affected, does not result in increased highway maintenance costs and does not increase safety risks.*

*Advisory signing of suitable lorry routes and of unsuitable routes will be provided where appropriate.*

10. The B6045 acts as a key east-west route across Bassetlaw, providing a link between Gainsborough and Worksop, and as such it is expected that it will carry HGV traffic. More locally, the road provides access to the A1 for businesses located in the Ranskill and Sutton cum Lound areas.

11. The alternative route would be along the A638 and A634 via Barnby Moor. On the face of it, this would appear to be the more appropriate route given the higher classification of the roads that form it. However, this alternative route would add approximately 4.3km to each journey and would cause lorry traffic to pass the frontages of an additional 40 residential properties.

12. It is clear that the alternative route fails to meet both of the above tests: that is, it will transfer the problem from one community to another and will create a major increase in route mileage for operators.

13. The B6045 presently has an excellent safety record (only one accident involving injury in the last three years) which suggests that the presence of lorry traffic is not in itself a safety concern.

14. It is considered, therefore, that a lorry ban on the B6045 Blyth Road is not appropriate.

15. The petition also raises concern about excessive speed on the road. A survey carried out in November 2018 confirmed that speeds are indeed high. The survey, sited 200m within the 30mph limit recorded the 85<sup>th</sup> percentile speed (i.e. the speed at or below which 85% of traffic travels) was recorded as being over 40mph in both directions.

16. Requests for vehicle activated speed signs are prioritised at locations that have both high speeds and high volumes of traffic. Whilst the recorded speed of traffic met the existing criteria traffic flows on Blyth Road are low, with the peak traffic flow over 100 vehicles lower than the minimum threshold for prioritisation. As a result, it wasn't possible to include this location in the current financial year's programme of works, it will, however, be considered for inclusion in the 2020/21 programme of work (alongside all other requests for interactive speed signs) which will be considered by Communities & Place Committee in April 2020.

17. Given the high speed of traffic, it is suggested that the local police are contacted with a view to carrying out enforcement.

18. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

**D. Extend an existing residents' permit parking scheme on Queen Street, Retford (Ref: 2019/0362)**

19. A 29-signature petition was presented by Councillor Mike Quigley requesting a residents' permit scheme on the section of Queen Street between Clumber Street and Prince of Wales Street. Queen Street is located near the railway station, and this section comprises the southern end of the street, nearest to the station.

20. The County Council received an initial request for a permit scheme in the vicinity of the railway station in 2010. A consultation was carried out in August 2010 on a proposed area-wide residents' parking scheme that included Queen Street as well as Albert Road, Artillery Terrace, Clumber Street, Cobwell Road, Darrel Road, Pelham Road, Prince of Wales Street, Station Road, and Victoria Road.

21. Even though residents were warned of the possibility of migration of parking by station users if the scheme did not cover the entire area, objections were received from residents living in the streets further away from the station. As a result, the roads further away from the station were removed from the proposed scheme which was reduced in size to cover Clumber Street, Darrel Road, part of Cobwell Road, part of Victoria Road, and one side of Station Road. Prior to being implemented all residents (including those on the roads omitted from the revised proposal) were consulted again. The revised proposal received an appropriate level of support from residents and was introduced.

22. As anticipated, the County Council received complaints from residents on streets outside the permit area for several years. In 2017, the creation of additional parking spaces in the station site allowed the council to consider extending the scheme to cover the roads that were removed from the original proposal. A proposal to extend the scheme to include Queen Street (including the section subject to the present petition), Cobwell Road and Victoria Road was included in the 2017/18 integrated transport programme but was not implemented because once again it failed to receive sufficient support from residents.

23. The County Council's policy regarding the implementation of permit schemes requires that, in any consultation, 35% of those consulted respond and, of those responses, 65% are in favour. While the threshold for responses was met (37% returned the questionnaire), only 58% were in favour. An analysis of the responses confirmed that there were no streets where the target was met and, as a result, the proposal was abandoned.

24. Given that residents have been consulted twice – the last time only two years ago – and have twice failed to demonstrate that a permit scheme would command sufficient levels of support to be delivered, it is not clear that any further consultation would achieve a different outcome. As a result, it is not considered appropriate to propose a permit scheme again.

25. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

**E. Request for a partial road closure on Landcroft Lane, Sutton Bonnington (Ref: 2019/0363)**

26. A 57-signature petition was submitted by Councillor Andrew Brown requesting that if planning permission is granted for a nearby housing development that a partial road closure is introduced on Landcroft Lane, Sutton Bonnington.
27. The County Council, as Highway Authority, provided formal comments with regard to the proposed development to Rushcliffe Borough Council on the 16 October 2019. The County Council's comments highlighted a number of issues with the proposed development which would need to be resolved in order to attract a recommendation of approval. Amongst the issues highlighted was the apparent lack of consideration within the applicant's 'Transport Assessment' to the potential increase of traffic on Landcroft Lane. The Council has highlighted the fact that Landcroft Lane provides an attractive link from development to East Leake and beyond and will likely result in increased traffic levels should the development proceed. The Council has also highlighted that Landcroft Lane is a single track for much of its length and is not considered suitable to accommodate the likely additional vehicle movements associated with the development.
28. The planning process is ongoing and the County Council is yet to receive a response from the applicant. Nonetheless, the County Council will highlight the concerns of local residents and the content of the petition to the developer when undertaking future discussions on the matter. It should be noted, however, that whilst the County Council, as the Highway Authority, are able to recommend mitigation measures they consider necessary to make a development acceptable, the final decision as to whether such measures are secured via the planning process lies with the local planning authority, in this case Rushcliffe Borough Council. Therefore, should residents have concerns about the planning application the County Council would strongly recommend they make representations directly to Rushcliffe Borough Council so their objections can be formally noted by planners and considered as part of the planning process.
29. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

**F. Dangerous parking outside Brinsley Primary School (Ref: 2019/0364)**

30. A 125-signature petition was presented by Councillor John Handley. The petitioners raised concerns at the lack of road safety measures and requested the provision of a zebra crossing or school crossing patrol outside Brinsley Primary School.
31. Typically formal crossings are provided where there are much higher numbers of pedestrians crossing throughout the day, not for just two very short periods of time during Monday to Friday; and where there are much higher volumes of traffic. Therefore for this location to be prioritised for a formal crossing the numbers of pedestrians crossing the road in the vicinity of the school throughout the day, and the volume of traffic would need to increase significantly. The installation of a zebra crossing would also not be appropriate for a residential road as the requirements for the controlled area (zig-zag markings) would have a negative impact on residents with limited off-street parking.
32. The school crossing patrol site at this location has been vacant since 2008 due to the low number of children using it, making it unsustainable as a school crossing site. The road safety

team will, however, undertake a new survey shortly to determine if the site meets the necessary criteria for a crossing patrol. The lead petitioner will be updated on the results of the survey once it has been undertaken.

**G. Request for crash barriers along Hoveringham Road, Hoveringham (Ref: 2019/0365)**

33. A petition consisting of 4,755 signatures was presented by Councillor Roger Jackson requesting that crash barriers should be installed along a section of Hoveringham Road that runs adjacent to the River Trent. A fatal road traffic collision occurred here on 24 September 2019 and, as Councillor Jackson has noted, the circumstances are still under investigation.
34. Central Government have charged local highway authorities with reducing accidents involving death and serious injury and this is where resources are targeted within Nottinghamshire. Locations where there is a pattern of accidents receive detailed investigations, and where appropriate remedial measures are implemented.
35. The County Council collects, maintains and analyses reported injury road traffic accident data. The data at this location has been investigated and there have been no previously reported injury accidents involving vehicles leaving the road on the river side at this location in almost 30 years. Investigations are, however, ongoing and the conclusion of the police's investigation and Coroner's inquest will inform any appropriate mitigation in due course.
36. It is recommended that Communities & Place Committee and the lead petitioner will be updated once the investigation and Coroner's inquest are completed, and any recommendations coming from these are considered.

**H. Request for resurfacing the B6030, Mansfield Road through Clipstone (Ref: 2019/0366)**

37. A petition consisting of 195 signatures was presented by Councillor John Peck. The petition requested that Mansfield Road, Clipstone is repaired.
38. The B6030 Mansfield Road through Clipstone is on the County Council's 'candidate list', its condition having been highlighted initially by the annual technical survey, along with subsequent recommendations from the highway inspectors and Councillor Peck. The condition of this particular section of road has been monitored and kept safe through routine safety inspections in the interim while major works were carried out on the higher priority sections of the B6030. The main section of Mansfield Road through Clipstone itself is currently being considered for inclusion in the provisional 2020/21 capital maintenance programme which will be considered for approval at this meeting.
39. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

**I. Request for a residents' parking scheme for Redwood Crescent, Beeston (Ref: 2019/0367)**

40. A 31-signature petition was presented by Councillor Kate Foale. The petitioners raised concerns with obstructive parking on Redwood Crescent from non-residents and drivers parking on the road to utilise the railway station. The petitioners have requested a residents' parking scheme to address this; and have also requested 'Give Way' lining at the entrance to the Crescent.

41. Requests for residents' parking schemes are prioritised in locations where residents do not have off-street parking and where a scheme won't negatively affect nearby streets and town centres, or increase rat running or traffic speeds. Nearly all of the properties subject to this request have off-street parking and therefore this request would not be considered a priority for inclusion in a future year's integrated transport programme; and so no further assessment will be undertaken. If residents are experiencing issues with people parking across their driveways they are, however, able to pay to have white H-bar markings installed to help ensure access to their driveways.
42. It is, however, acknowledged that the entrance to the Crescent may benefit from the provision of parking restrictions to reinforce the fact that vehicles should not be parking obstructively on the junctions at its entrance and across the tactile pedestrian dropped crossings near to the Ireland Avenue junction.
43. The introduction of double yellow lines at the Redwood Crescent junction with Ireland Avenue; in addition to junction protection markings at the entrance to Redwood Crescent itself (adjacent to numbers 2 and 37 Redwood Crescent) have therefore been included in the provisional 2020/21 traffic management revenue programme which will be considered for approval at this meeting. Should the scheme be approved consultation on the proposals will be undertaken in due course.
44. The introduction of 'Give Way' lining at the junction adjacent to numbers 2 and 37 Redwood Crescent, to mirror the existing junction lining where Ireland Avenue junction meets Redwood Crescent, is also included in the provisional 2020/21 traffic management revenue programme which will be considered for approval at this meeting.
45. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed.

#### **J. Gypsy Traveller and Show People Site, Sherwood Hall (Ref: 2019/0368)**

46. A petition sent to Mansfield District Council was presented by Councillor Stephen Garner.
47. The County Council has already informed Mansfield District Council, in response to a consultation on site options for Gypsy and Traveller development, that it does not consider the site to be appropriate for Gypsy and Traveller development and that it has alternative plans to bring the site forward for residential use.
48. Mansfield District Council are currently considering all responses to the consultation, including this petition, will be reviewing sites following the consultation, and will be preparing a Plan in 2020. The County Council will continue to engage with Mansfield District Council as necessary. The petition has been sent to the Council's property team for information and it is recommended that the lead petitioner is notified accordingly.

#### **K. Concerning traffic calming on Bransdale Avenue, Forest Town (Ref: 2019/0369)**

49. A 26-signature petition was presented by Councillor Vaughen Hopewell on behalf of residents of Bransdale Avenue, Forest Town requesting the introduction of traffic calming measures, as residents are becoming concerned with the increase of traffic and safety for residents, pedestrians and school children.

50. Nottinghamshire County Council have not received any previous requests or concerns in relation to traffic calming, traffic issues or parking for Bransdale Avenue, Forest Town. Fortunately, there have been no reported road traffic collisions resulting in injuries during the period January 2016 through to July 2019 and therefore there is currently no justification for the introduction of traffic calming on this road. This road will, however, continue to be monitored (as are all roads in the county) for further reported injury accidents in order that prompt action can be taken if a pattern of treatable injury accidents occur.

51. It is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.

**L. Request for a compulsory speed restriction/interactive speed sign and weight restriction on Moore Road, Mapperley (Ref: 2019:0370)**

52. A 105-signature petition was presented by Councillor Muriel Weisz requesting the introduction of a 20mph speed limit and lorry ban, along with an interactive speed sign on Moore Road, Mapperley.

20mph speed limit

53. 20mph speed limits (with associated traffic calming measures) are introduced to help reduce vehicle speeds at locations where there is a pattern of reported road traffic collisions that result in injuries to road users; and where there they are the most appropriate measure to address the cause of the accidents. During the last three years, up to and including end of August 2019, there have been only three injury accidents along the whole length of Moore Road; one of which was at its junction with Porchester Road and one was at its junction with Westdale Lane. Analysis of these accidents shows that speed of traffic was not a contributory factor in any of them and therefore there is currently no justification for the introduction of a lower speed limit or traffic calming on this road to address a pattern of road traffic accidents. This road will, however, continue to be monitored (as are all roads in the county) for further reported injury accidents in order that prompt action can be taken if a pattern of treatable injury accidents occur

Interactive speed sign

54. Interactive speed signs are generally only introduced where they meet both a minimum speed and flow criteria. The flow threshold is 250 vehicles in any direction in the peak. Speed surveys have not been undertaken as the very low flow on Moore Road (only 133 vehicles in the peak hour) mean that an interactive speed sign would not currently be prioritised at this location.

Lorry ban

55. A traffic survey undertaken in October 2018 recorded only one lorry on Moore Road; and this lorry would not have been subject to a ban had one been in force. Even if this number was not representative of 'normal' circumstances, it is unlikely that the volume of lorries on Moore Road is sufficiently high to justify a lorry ban. In any event, such a ban would merely serve to move such traffic on to other adjacent roads, requiring an area-wide ban. There is currently no evidence that such a ban is necessary in this vicinity.

56. As a result of the above assessments, it is not considered appropriate to introduce any of the proposals requested and it is recommended that the lead petitioner be informed accordingly.

## **Statutory and Policy Implications**

57. This report has been compiled after consideration of implications in respect of crime and disorder, data protection and information governance finance, human resources, human rights, the NHS Constitution (public health services), the public sector equality duty, safeguarding of children and adults at risk, service users, smarter working, sustainability and the environment and where such implications are material they are described below. Appropriate consultation has been undertaken and advice sought on these issues as required.

## **RECOMMENDATION/S**

It is recommended that:

- 1) the proposed actions be approved, and the lead petitioners be informed accordingly;
- 2) the outcome of Committee's consideration be reported to Full Council.

**Adrian Smith**  
**Corporate Director, Place**

**For any enquiries about this report please contact:** Sean Parks, Local Transport Plan Manager, Tel: 0115 977 4251

## **Constitutional Comments (SJE – 21/11/2019)**

58. This decision falls within the Terms of Reference of the Communities & Place Committee to whom responsibility for the consideration of petitions concerning matters falling under the remit of that Committee and the reporting back to Full Council in relation to the same has been delegated in accordance with the County Council's Petition Scheme.

## **Financial Comments (RWK 21/11/2019)**

59. There are no specific financial implications arising directly from the report.

## **Background Papers and Published Documents**

- None

## **Electoral Division(s) and Member(s) Affected**

- Arnold South – Cllr John Clarke and Cllr Muriel Weisz
- Beeston and Central Rylands – Cllr Kate Foale
- Bingham West – Cllr Neil Clarke
- Greasley and Brinsley – Cllr John Handley
- Leake and Ruddington – Cllr Andrew Brown and Cllr Reg Adair
- Mansfield East – Cllr Vaughan Hopewell and Cllr Martin Wright
- Mansfield South – Cllr Stephen Garner and Cllr Andy Sissons
- Misterton – Cllr Tracey Taylor
- Retford West – Cllr Mike Quigley
- Sherwood Forest – Cllr John Peck



- Southwell – Cllr Roger Jackson
- West Bridgford West – Cllr Gordon Wheeler