



A514 Proposed Weight Restriction – Consideration of Objections

SUMMARY

- 1.1 This paper outlines the progress which is being made in progressing the A514 weight restriction agreed by Council in March 2005.
- 1.2 Two objections have been raised which Cabinet needs to consider before deciding whether to proceed.
- 1.3 Cabinet also has an option to choose whether to proceed with signing the City and County roads in advance of the A50 if the Highways Agency is not able to move as quickly as the local authorities.
- 1.4 Subject to any issues raised at the meeting, I support the following recommendations:

RECOMMENDATION

- 2.1 To overrule the objections from the Freight Transport Association and Mr Pratt of 175 Chellaston Road and they be informed accordingly.
- 2.2 To authorise the Director of Corporate Services to make the necessary Traffic Regulation Order as advertised, subject to the agreement of Derbyshire County Council
- 2.3 That, in the event of the Highways Agency not being able to proceed with the A50 signing, Cabinet considers whether it would prefer the implementation to take place in two stages.

REASON FOR RECOMMENDATION

- 3.1 From consideration of the objections and the alternative routes available, it can be concluded that the benefits of making the order outweigh the disadvantages.
- 3.2 As the Order covers part of the County Council's administrative area it is necessary to have their agreement.
- 3.3 So that Members can determine whether to implement the Order once the signing on non-trunk roads has been erected.



A514 Proposed Weight Restriction – Consideration of Objections

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

- 1.1 In March 2005 Cabinet resolved that the introduction of a weight restriction should be pursued on the A514 between its junctions with the A50 and Boulton Lane/Merrill Way. Subsequently, the necessary statutory consultation was undertaken in May 2005 with the proposal being advertised for public comment the following month.
- 1.2 Following this consultation exercise, objections to the proposal have been received from the Freight Transport Association and Mr D M Pratt of 175 Chellaston Road. A copy of both objections are included as an appendix to the report.
- 1.3 The Freight Transport Association have stated that they have serious concerns regarding weight restrictions as they have the potential to cause severe problems for goods vehicles servicing retail premises in the area. They went on to request further details about the volume of goods vehicles using the A514; the likely effects of the proposal on nearby commercial vehicle operations and the reasons why the Council has found it necessary to propose a weight restriction.
- 1.4 A response was sent to the Freight Transport Association on 7 June 2005, answering the queries that had been raised. The opportunity was also taken to explain that, prior to the opening of the A50, goods vehicle access to the south of the city was satisfactorily gained via the A38, A6 and A5111. The introduction of a weight restriction on the A514 would simply mean that goods vehicles would be required to revert to those routes.
- 1.5 No further comments have been received from the Freight Transport Association. However, it is considered that the access difficulties that they feared, are unlikely to materialise due to the existence of close and appropriate alternative routes to the A514. For this reason, it is proposed that their objection should be overruled.
- 1.6 Mr Pratt is concerned that the proposal will bring about the transfer of traffic from the A514 to roads such as Raynesway, Shardlow Road and Harvey Road and that this will bring unnecessary congestion to those areas, causing considerable delay to bus services and compromising pedestrian safety.

- 1.7 Mr Pratt is correct that the proposed weight restriction should lead to many of the 450 goods vehicles that currently use the A514 each day being transferred to other roads such as the A38, A5111 and A6 Alvaston Bypass. However, this level of traffic is relatively low compared to existing flows on those streets and hence will have no significant effect in terms of delays or congestion. Further, it is considered that the A38, A5111 and A6 provide more suitable routes for goods vehicles than the A514, hence it is for these reasons that it is considered that Mr Pratt's objection should be overruled.
- 1.8 It is important to note that the proposal for a weight restriction on the A514 involves the amendment of existing Traffic Regulation Orders that affect roads within the County as well as the city. Consequently, it will be necessary for the County Council to consider the validity of these objections before further progress can be made and this is in progress.
- 1.9 If it is resolved that the weight restriction Order should proceed, there is a further complicating factor in that it will be necessary for traffic signs to be erected on the A50, where the Highways Agency is the Highway Authority. Signs are necessary on the A50 approach in order to give advance warning, prior to negotiating the roundabout, that the weight restrictions will apply and allow enough notice for drivers to consider their alternative route.
- 1.10 Discussions have taken place with the Highways Agency who have been unable to give an assurance that they can give these signs the same level of priority as the Council in terms of completing their actions which include checking proposed sign designs and arranging for the signs to be erected.
- 1.11 Subject to Council agreement to proceed with the proposals today, it is likely that the signing on City and County roads would be completed by the end of November and we will seek to agree the erection of signs on the A50 at the same time.
- 1.12 There is no doubt that implementation of the complete scheme, including the A50 signs, would be desirable but I am conscious of the urgency which Members attach to introducing the restriction. We will, of course, continue discussions with the Highways Agency to attempt to deliver the A50 signs in the timescale which we can deliver the rest of the signs. If this is unsuccessful however, I would welcome guidance from Cabinet Members on whether they would prefer to erect the City and County signs at the earliest timescale, with the A50 signs following as soon as they Highways Agency can achieve that.

For more information contact:	Neil Palfreyman Tel. No. 716090 e-mail neil.palfreyman@derby.gov.uk
Background papers:	None.
List of appendices:	Appendix 1 – Implications

Comment [D2]: Make sure this appears at the foot of the page, following the body of the report and before the appendices.

IMPLICATIONS

Financial

1. The introduction of the weight restriction Order and associated traffic signing will cost approximately £30,000.

Comment [D3]: Where there is only one sub-paragraph, number it 1., where there are two or more, number them 1.1, 1.2, 1.3 and so on.

Legal

2. None.

Personnel

3. None.

Equalities impact

4. None.

Corporate objectives and priorities for change

5. The introduction of a weight restriction on the A514 will contribute to the Council's objective of healthy, safe and independent communities.

Comment [D4]: Tap F11 to highlight next option – tap the Delete key to delete if not appropriate.