

# OFFICER DECISION REPORT - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER (TRO)

5a

## OUTCOME OF TRO PROCESS – DECISION (following objections)

PREPARED BY: Traffic Management Team, Highways and Traffic Group

<b>TITLE OF REPORT:</b>	Manor Road, Keynsham
<b>PROPOSAL:</b>	Amend sealed Order to match restrictions on-site
<b>SCHEME REF No:</b>	24-026
<b>REPORT AUTHOR:</b>	Traffic Management Team

### 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:

<b>Section A</b>	The Chief Executive, Strategic Directors, Divisional Directors and Heads of Service have delegated power to take any decision falling within their area of responsibility....”
<b>Section B</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.
<b>Section D9</b>	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 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	
(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 modify the existing sealed Order 2414 so that it corresponds with the parking restrictions which are already in place on the eastern side of Manor Road, Keynsham.

### 4. **BACKGROUND**

The last Keynsham Area TRO Review (24-003) included a proposal to extend the existing parking restrictions along the eastern side of Manor Road, from the common boundary of house numbers 17 and 19 to the common boundary of house numbers 23 and 25.

Several objections were received in response to the public advertisement of this particular proposal, so a decision was made to reduce the length of the proposed additional parking restrictions to the common boundary of house numbers 19 and 21, rather than house numbers 23 and 25. It should be noted that any proposed parking restrictions can be reduced in length without the need to re-advertise.

However, it has since been brought to our attention that the double yellow line parking restrictions which are already in place on Manor Road, which were introduced in August 2022, do not correspond with their associated TRO (2215), being 2 to 3m shorter than they should be.

Unfortunately, the recent area TRO (2414) had already been sealed when this anomaly was brought to our attention, so it was not possible to correct it at that time. A decision has been made, therefore, to progress a stand-alone TRO to rectify this anomaly.

The double yellow line parking restrictions which are already in place in Manor Road are shown on the attached drawing.

### 5. **SOURCE OF FINANCE**

This proposal is being funded by the capital Parking budget, project code TCJ0009S.

### 6. **INFORMAL CONSULTATION REQUIREMENT**

Informal consultation was carried out with the Chief Constable, 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))**

The objections received have been summarised below with the technical responses in italics underneath each one.

**Plan Manor Road, Keynsham – No Parking At Any Time markings (Double Yellow Lines) - Amending previous Order so that a new Order accurately reflects the restrictions currently on-site.**

**Objections received during public consultation – 1**

**Objection main points raised:**

- The objector made reference that in their opinion the council failed to maintain records relating to the parking restrictions in Manor Road. They believe the TRO report documentation is not acceptable because it reports to approximate distances. The objector refers to objections to previous TRO proposals for parking restrictions on Manor Road.

*Officer response: The council uses map-based TROs for parking restrictions showing where parking restrictions are located. The written description in the TRO report does not form part of the TRO. The objections made previously do not relate to this TRO proposal.*

- The objector also states that the proposed TRO has errors. They go onto state that the proposed TRO is an unnecessary expense and that the lines on the road should be adjusted to match the existing TRO documentation. They go onto state that the report's reference to the legal reasons for the restriction are a false justification and that officers have been misleading residents.

*Officer response: We are not aware of any errors with the TRO or the documentation that relates to it. As stated in the report, the purpose of the amendment is to ensure the TRO is consistent with where the lines are marked on the road.*

- The objector refers to a speeding problem on Wellsway and that this is the issue that needs to be addressed.

*Officer response: This proposal is limited to amending the TRO so that it matches the parking restriction lines on the road. It will not alter the parking restrictions. Although road layout and the position of parked vehicles can influence vehicle speeds, this proposal will make no changes to the road or where vehicles can park. Such changes to influence vehicle speeds are beyond the scope of this particular proposal.*

*Recommendation: The objector wishes to progress onto the stage 2 complaint procedure regarding the TRO process which first implemented these restrictions on Manor Road near the junction with the Wellsway back in 2020.*

This will be formally picked up with the objector separate to this TRO consultation. This TRO amends the current legal Order to ensure that it accurately matches the restrictions on-site. There will be no physical amendments to the restrictions on-site as part of this TRO. It is therefore the recommendation of this report as we only received one objection, who's concerns will be addressed separately to this TRO process that the proposed admin amendments are made, and the new Order sealed.

8. **ADDITIONAL COMMENTS FROM WARD MEMBERS AND CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS (in response to the above)**

**Parking Services**

No comment.

**Ward Members**

Keynsham East:

Cllr Andy Wait – No comment.

Cllr Hal MacFie – This looks OK now.

**Town Council**

No comment.

**Cabinet Member for Highways**

Cllr Manda Rigby – I'm happy for this to go forward on the grounds it regularises what is there already whilst not precluding any future amends which may be consulted on.

9. **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised is sealed.



Paul Garrod  
Traffic Management & Network Manager

Date: 9<sup>th</sup> January 2025

10. **DECISION**

As the Officer holding the above delegation, I have decided that the objections / comments be not acceded to and the Order as advertised be sealed.

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.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Chris Major', located below the main text.

Chris Major  
Director for Place Management

Date: 09/01/25