

DECISION NO:	<i>For Member Services use only</i>
---------------------	-------------------------------------

Concurrence No:	066487
-----------------	--------

Action under delegated authority of Chief Executive	
Action under delegated authority of Director of Finance and Cabinet Member for Finance	
Action taken by Chief Executive in consultation with Cabinet Member(s)	X

Subject: Amend the Traffic Regulation Order Policy

Signature and designation of officer(s) taking action:

10/08/2021	28/07/2021
_____ Chief Executive	_____ Director of Finance
Date	Date
	20/07/21
	_____ Head of Finance
	Date

Name of Cabinet Member(s) Consulted:

I have been consulted and concur with the proposals set out below:

12/08/2021
_____ Councillor David Holliday
_____ Cabinet Member for Environment and Transformation
Signature: _____ Date: _____
_____ Councillor
_____ Cabinet Member for
Signature: _____ Date: _____

Name of any member who has declared a conflict of interest in relation to this decision: _____

THIS DOCUMENT WILL BE PUBLISHED ON THE COUNCIL'S WEBSITE

The report overleaf sets out the decision to be taken, the reasons for the decision, and the details of alternative options, if any, considered and rejected. Officer decisions are available for public inspection, both at the Borough Offices and on the Council's website.

Officer decisions are kept for a period of six years at the Borough Offices and for six months on the website after the decision is made. Background papers are available for four years.

RECOMMENDED that: the approved policy for processing Traffic Regulation Orders be amended.

Purpose

To propose alternative wording to a section of the approved policy for processing Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO).

Background

At its meeting of March 2021, Cabinet resolved that that the updated policy for processing Traffic Regulation Order requests be approved.

The new TRO policy was designed to simplify the process and to provide residents with an easy to understand guide as to how TROs will be implemented.

The Proposal

The new policy for processing TROs includes a scoring procedure will allow a desktop exercise for the initial evaluation of a change to an existing or a proposal for a new TRO.

The current wording of one of the scoring criteria is ambiguous and may imply that more points will be awarded for that element, than is the case.

It is therefore proposed to change the wording for that element (Ref B) of the scoring to make it clearer.

The current scoring table is as follows:

Ref.	Description	Score
A	For each unique request by a resident	+1
B	For each person making/supporting the request	+1
C	If a request is made by the Police	+1
D	If a request is made by HCC	+1
E	Adjustment based on the parking team's judgement	+/- 1
F	For every 12 months since first requested, if an issue is still being reported	+1
G	For every 12 months since last requested, if no further reports are received	-2
H	If a request made relates solely to one property	-2

The highlighted text (reference B) is not clear and could be taken by a member of the public to mean that for each person supporting it, there is an additional point added e.g. if five people, other than the proposer, are supporting it, it would gain an additional five points. This is not the case, it would still receive one point under that criteria if there was one person or 10 people supporting it. This is because a proposal in a large residential street would score more points than a small residential street but the smaller residential street may have a higher proportion of residents supporting the proposal.

It is proposed to change this wording to read "If more than one person is making/supporting this request". This will help to ensure that the scoring system is fair and clear.

Financial, Legal and Risk Management Implications

There are no financial, legal or risk management implications to this amendment. Not making the change might lead to misunderstanding and challenges arising from decisions made based on the scoring system.

Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

The alternative option would be to leave the wording as it stands, however, as detailed above, the current wording could be misinterpreted, which could ultimately lead to challenges to the procedure.

Contribution to the Council's Objectives and Environmental Sustainability Priorities

This contributes to the Council's priority of 'an effective Council, efficient and responsive to the needs of residents:

14. engage effectively with residents to understand their priorities

17. be transparent and ensure effective scrutiny

Conclusion

It is appropriate for the policy wording to be changed to ensure the correct interpretation by members of the public and to avoid unnecessary challenges to the outcome of the desktop scoring exercise.

Contact Officer: Nichola Needs

Ext: 5592

Date 15/07/2021

Action reported to the Cabinet on:
