HCW/14/30 North Devon Highways and Traffic Orders Committee 25 March 2014

Barnstaple Town Centre - Traffic Regulation Order HATOC Report

Report of the Head of Highways, Capital Development and Waste

Please note that the following recommendations are subject to consideration and determination by the Committee before taking effect.

Recommendation: It is recommended that:

- (a) responses to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order are noted;
- (b) the Traffic Regulation Order, is modified as described in section 5 and advertised as per the modification process.

1. Summary

The purpose of this report is to consider the representations received during the Barnstaple Town Centre Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) statutory consultation and proposals to modify the TRO.

2. Background

In 2011/12 Barnstaple was allocated Local Transport Plan funding to review and rationalise the existing moving prohibitions and parking restrictions within the town centre. The purpose was to make it simpler for drivers to understand where they are permitted to drive or park and to allow for better and easier enforcement to be undertaken by the police and civil enforcement officers.

Following informal consultation with the town council and the taxi licencing committee, the local Member and the Chair of HATOC approved the advertisement of two TROs that aimed to represent such changes. One TRO amended and consolidated the existing vehicle prohibitions and the other TRO amended the current waiting restrictions. During the formal consultation period a number of representations were received as detailed in Section 4.

3. Proposals

Two TROs were advertised with the aim to make the vehicle prohibitions and waiting restrictions within the town centre simpler and to reflect current driver requirements (see Appendix 1a and b for a summary).

To aide this, the design of signs has been carefully considered to the point where some sign designs have had special authorisation from the Department for Transport to ensure that the prohibitions and restrictions are illustrated as simply as possible.

The purpose of amending the waiting restrictions is to make all of the bays single use only and to remove ambiguity as to who can park in each bay. This should reduce the vehicle movements through the town centre.

4. Consultation & Representations

4.1 <u>Consultation</u>

During the Town Council Transport Committee on 27 September 2012, the Town Council made a number of comments (see Appendix 2a) regarding the TRO and these were considered, noted, responded to and the TRO amended where it was felt appropriate.

Similarly the District Council Taxi Licencing Committee also made a number of comments (see Appendix 2b) during their meeting on 16 August 2012 and where possible these comments were included in the proposals.

A delay prior to the formal consultation occurred as a number of the proposed signs required Department for Transport approval, however, this unfortunately took longer than anticipated. Failure to obtain this would have required the proposals to be amended before they were advertised.

The June 2013 meeting of this Committee considered the potential for an amendment to the current vehicle prohibition in The Strand. Subsequently the police and town centre management group indicated they would support the proposals and it was proposed to make the daytime prohibition coincide with other prohibitions in the town centre and make it more prohibitive at night (as described in Section 3).

The local Member met with Market Traders during September 2013 to discuss issues along Butchers Row. At this meeting a number of suggestions were made about the proposed TRO. Officers carefully considered these suggestions but did not feel that they were suitable to incorporate as part of the TRO as they were not deemed beneficial to the overall traffic management of the town centre.

The formal consultation began on 16 October and ended on 13 November. Notices were placed on site and our website, with links to all of the relevant documents and plans made available.

4.2 <u>Representations</u>

During the formal consultation 17 representations were received regarding the moving prohibition TRO. These included 1 representation from the police, 10 pro forma style letters signed independently by local taxi drivers and 6 representations from members of the public (see Appendix 3a & b for a summary of all representations).

138 representations were received regarding the waiting restriction TRO. 128 of these were pro forma style letters individually signed regarding the proposed amendments to Butchers Row (see Appendix 3a & b) for a summary of all representations).

5. Discussion

Following the consultation and the subsequent representations, it is proposed to make a number of modifications to the TROs outlined below:

- **Butchers Row** withdraw the proposal and therefore make no change to the existing parking restrictions.
- Left Turn Ban from Butchers Row into Boutport Street modify the proposal to enable taxi's to continue to make this manoeuvre.

- Vehicle prohibition Boutport Street modify the proposal to enable taxi's to continue to enter Pilton Causeway.
- Vehicle prohibition High Street modify the proposal to reduce the extents of the prohibition to allow vehicles access for the use of Paternoster Row when attending a Church Service.
- Vehicle prohibition Paternoster Row modify the proposal to allow vehicles access for the use of Paternoster Row when attending a Church Service.
- Vehicle prohibition Boutport Street, junction with Queen Street It is also proposed to amend the signing to make it more intuitive for drivers (please see attached plan).

It is recommended that the remaining representations are resolved in line with the officer recommendations as outlined in Appendix 3a &b.

6. Financial Considerations

Local Transport Plan funding has been allocated to implement these proposals.

7. Carbon Impact Considerations

All measures proposed to improve congestion and tackle air quality will have a positive impact in reducing carbon emissions.

8. Legal Considerations

The lawful implications of the proposals have been considered and taken into account in the preparation of this report.

The formal consultation has followed the legal process required for TROs.

9. Risk Management Considerations

No risks have been identified.

10. Alternatives

Do Nothing - this is not recommended as a number of existing prohibitions and restrictions are confusing to motorists and the police and civil enforcement officers find them difficult to enforce effectively.

Implement as advertised - this is not recommended as a number of representations have raised concerns about the original proposals. A number of these can be rectified by modifying the proposals.

Modify the TRO - this is recommended as a number of representations can be resolved by modifying the proposals.

11. Reason for Recommendation

The purpose of modifying the TRO is to make the prohibitions and restrictions it simpler for drivers to understand to allow for better and easier enforcement to be undertaken by the police and civil enforcement officers. By modifying the proposed TROs a number of representations (as outlined in Appendix 3a & b) can be resolved.

It is therefore recommended that the proposed modifications are advertised on street and in the event of no objections being received then the TRO would be implemented.

David Whitton Head of Highways, Capital Development and Waste

Electoral Division: Barnstaple North

Local Government Act 1972: List of Background Papers

Date

Contact for enquiries: Matthew Pilsbury

Room No: ABG Lucombe House

Tel No: (01392) 382176

Background Paper

File Ref.

Nil

mp270214ndh sc/cr/Barnstaple town centre tro 03 140314

APPENDIX 1 - SUMMARY OF TRO PROPOSALS

Appendix 1a

Env 5263 Devon County Council (Barnstaple Town Centre) (Vehicle Prohibitions) Order

The Strand - it is proposed to amend the current prohibition of motor vehicles 10am – 6pm to 'Prohibition of Motor Vehicles, 10am – 4pm and 10pm – 3am except for buses, taxi and permit holders.

Footpath from Market Street to Butchers Row (the thoroughfare from Butchers Row and Market Street) - Amend the prohibition of vehicles from 10am – 4pm to prohibition of all vehicles, at any time. This is to respond to the highway/footway area evolving to a more pedestrian orientated space.

High Street (south of its junction with Cross Street) – Remove the existing one way relaxation that is operational daily between 10am and 4pm except for Saturdays.

Boutport Street at its junction with Queen Street – amend the location of the start of the prohibition of motor vehicles to permit access into Paternoster Row.

Butchers Row into Boutport Street – The no left turn except taxis has been amended so that it is no left turn for all vehicles. The current arrangement cannot be signed legally and it is considered that preventing all traffic from this turn is the most appropriate measure.

Well Street/ Diamond Street - Remove the existing no right turns at the District Council Car Park and from Well Street into Diamond Street. This is to reflect the existing physical layout of the road.

Commercial Road into Castle Road – Remove the no left turn for vehicles over 24ft in Length as it was introduced for environmental reasons and long vehicles no longer make the turn on a regular basis.

Wells Street and Diamond Street - Remove the existing part day/ time prohibition of motor vehicles from within Wells Street and Diamond Street as it is not anticipated vehicle numbers will increase due to the narrow nature of these roads.

Paternoster Row - amend the existing vehicle prohibition to prohibition of motor vehicles 'except for access'. The intention of this is amend the TRO so that is reflects existing signage and the existing demand.

Maiden Street - it is proposed to remove the prohibition of motor vehicles between 10:00am and 6:00pm as access is achieved through The Strand. Motor vehicles are already prohibited from accessing the Strand between 10:00am and 6:00pm and therefore unable to reach Maiden Street in the first instance.

North Walk - It is proposed to remove the prohibition of U-turn along North Walk as this manoeuvre is no longer deemed necessary

Appendix 1b

Env 5350 Devon County Council (Barnstaple Town Centre) (Waiting Restrictions) Amendment Order

Overall it is intended to reduce the number of mixed use parking/ loading/ taxi bays to make it easier for drivers to understand where and when they are eligible to use them. The following rules are to be applied only to the locations specified in the TRO:

- Loading only bays are to be operational 24/7
- Taxi only bays will be operation 24/7
- Disabled only bays will be operation 24/7

Plan 1 Butchers Row, from West to East

North Side - It is proposed to reduce the length of the loading bay in an attempt to prevent vehicles from striking the canopy. Vehicle tracking has identified that preventing vehicles from parking/ loading along this length will prevent this from occurring.

It is also proposed to rationalise the mixed use bays along Butchers Row and make them single use. Currently the existing bays have the combined restrictions of part day loading only; part day taxis only and part day unrestricted. It is proposed to provide two loading only bays, a disabled only bay and taxi only bay.

South Side - It is proposed to convert the existing no waiting 8am to 6pm to no waiting at anytime. By removing any part day parking it is intended to improve the flow of traffic.

Boutport Street

West side - Outside the Queens Theatre it is proposed to amend the loading bay so it is operational 24/7. It should be noted that the existing loading and coach sign is not enforceable and therefore this element is being removed, however, coaches will legally be able to load/ unload passengers within this bay at any time.

East Side - Outside The Panniers pub, it is proposed to remove the part day loading and taxi bay and introduce a 24/7 loading bay. It is also proposed to make the disabled bay 3 hours maximum stay, 24/7.

Boutport Street

East Side - It is proposed to make the loading bay between Maiden Street and High Street operational 24/7 and remove use by taxies.

West Side - Opposite the cinema, it is proposed to remove the existing part day waiting restriction and replace this with a 24/7 taxi rank. Adjacent to this it is proposed to make the existing mixed use bay a 24/7 loading bay.

North of build out - it is proposed to make the existing disabled bay operational 24/7

Boutport Street

East Side - Boutport Street at the junction with Queen Street, it is proposed to make the loading bay operational 24/7 and remove the taxi element.

Queen Street

It is proposed to introduce an evening taxi rank on Summerland Street outside the night club.

Cross Street

West Side - Similarly to Butchers Row it is proposed to rationalise the existing mix use bays and make them single use. A 24/7 taxi bay is proposed to be introduced at the south western end of Cross Street followed by a 24/7 disabled bay. The mixed use loading bay/ taxi bay/ SYL is being removed to allow for loading only bay and an additional disabled bay.

High Street

North of Butchers Row and South of Joy Street - It is proposed to revoke the existing part day waiting and loading restrictions and replace with a 24 hour loading only restriction at the northern and southern entrance into the pedestrianised zone.

Boutport Street/ Mermaid Walk

It is proposed to introduce no loading and no waiting along Boutport Street (Mermaid Walk) with the exception of a loading bay only outside the northern properties.

Appendix 2a -

Informal Consultation - Barnstaple Town Council Response

It was decided at the Planning and Transportation Committee meeting on Thursday 27th September 2012:

"PT104 DEVON COUNTY COUNCIL TRAFFIC ORDERS

The Planning Clerk reported that the Devon County Council (Traffic Regulations) Amendment Orders 2012 were now available for comment.

DCC are reviewing and amending some of the town centre parking restrictions and moving prohibitions within Barnstaple. The intention is to improve traffic, better reflect the demands incurred on the road and ensure that restrictions and prohibitions are legally enforceable.

Members made the following comments and resolutions:

Mermaid Walk: the loading only at any time section	, outside numbers 1-3, should have tighter restrictions
and should be loading only for a period of 20 Mins.	
	(6.3)

Mermaid Walk: Members wished the Committee Clerk to write to DCC regarding the replacement of bollards in this area.

Butchers Row: should be no left turn for all vehicles.

Diamond Street/Taw Vale (beginning bit of the Square): need clearer signage/road markings to highlight the TRO in this area.

George Street: need new signs in place to say no left turn, as there are an increase number of cars driving the wrong way down King Edward Street.

RESOLVED that the (a) Committee Clerk sends the above suggestions to DCC, (b) Information be received and noted. (NC) (NC)

(6.3)

(NC)

(NC)

Appendix 2b

Informal Consultation - Barnstaple Taxi Licensing Committee Response

It was decided at the Planning and Transportation Committee meeting on Thursday 16th August 2012:

"PT75 DCC - TAXI RANK REVIEW, BARNSTAPLE

Members considered information regarding DCC's taxi rank review, Barnstaple.

The Committee Clerk informed members that DCC and NDC are looking to address concerns regarding the confusion over signage in certain areas of the town centre, focusing in this instance on taxi ranks.

Mr Fitzsimmons informed members this item is not set in stone, as consultation needs to take place with the Police, Highways Authorities and public consultation via the local newspaper.

Currently 24/7 taxi ranks are not to be touched.

A map was shown to members highlighting these areas:

- Cross Street
- Butchers Row

DCC proposal to remove the "shared" bay, and these four spaces would become loading only; to put in one 24/7 taxi rank space at end of Cross Street (near the Strand junction).

Thoughts:

It was suggest that there was potential to use this area and have more 24/7 taxi ranks spaces. However, other members felt, that these would not be utilised, as members of the public tend not to pick up taxis here but in the Square area. Members did not want to see a loss of any disabled parking spaces.

It was proposed by Councillor Mrs L Brown, seconded by Cllr S Upcott, that:

- The three disabled parking bays remain (preferable closer to the junction with the High Street),
- Install five 24/7 taxi ranks spaces,
- One loading bay space.

The Vote was tied (3.3)

The motion fell with the Chairman's casting vote. (3.4)

Councillor R Hawes proposed, seconded by Councillor Miss C Upcott, and it was RESOLVED that:

- No 24/7 taxi rank spaces are installed in Cross Street
- There are equal loading and disabled bays (with the minimum of three disabled parking spaces)
- If there is room to install some metered parking spaces (4.2abs)

Butchers Row

DCC proposal to remove the "shared" bay, and these five spaces would become loading only; to put in one 24/7 taxi rank space, at end of Butchers Row (near the Boutport Street junction).

Councillor Miss C Upcott proposed, seconded by Councillor Mrs L Brown, and it was RESOLVED that:

- One 24/7 taxi rank space is provided at the top of Butchers Row,
- Behind this there are disabled parking spaces (minimum of three spaces),
- The remaining spaces to be loading or public use.
 - (NC)

Boutport Street

DCC proposal to remove the "shared" bay (opposite the Queen's Theatre), and these two spaces would become loading only; to put in one 24/7 taxi rank space, next to the Queen's Theatre.

Thoughts:

Members wondered if the taxi space could be on the other side (where Wetherspoons, etc, are situated).

Councillor Miss C Upcott proposed, seconded by Councillor Hawes, and it was RESOLVED that, the Committee accepts the proposed changes. (NC)

Lower Boutport Street

DCC proposal to remove the "shared" bay, and these five spaces would become loading only; to create four 24/7 taxi rank spaces, which will also act as a "feeder rank"

Councillor Miss C Upcott proposed, seconded by Councillor Mrs L Brown, and it was RESOLVED that the Committee accepts the proposed changes. (5.1abs)

Queen Street

DCC proposal to remove the "shared" bay, and these two spaces would become loading only

Councillor Miss C Upcott proposed, seconded by Councillor Mrs L Brown, and it was RESOLVED that the Committee accepts the proposed changes (NC)

Other suggested areas:

- The Strand = Mr Fitzsimmons explained about the problems with this idea, due to the road layout/Cafe Culture in this area
- Mermaid Walk = one 24/7 taxi rank space
- Bear Street, junction with Boutport street = one 24/7 taxi rank space,
- Upper Boutport street (along the road way outside Green Lanes area) = one 24/7 taxi rank space

RESOLVED that

- The suggestions for Cross Street, Butcher Row, Boutport Street, Lower Boutport Street and Queen Street are taken to DCC
- The other suggested sites, Mermaid Walk, Bear Street and Upper Boutport Street, are forwarded to DCC for consideration,
- Members thank Mr Fitzsimmons, Mr Tucker, Cllr Mathews and Cllr A Bradford for attending the meeting (NC)

Appendix 3a

Summary of Objections – Barnstaple Town Centre TRO (ENV 5263 & 5350)

Env 5263 Objection Ref	ENV 5350 Objection Ref	Location	Representation Summary (ENV 5263) Vehicle Prohibitions	DCC Response (ENV 5263)	Representation Summary (ENV 5350) Waiting Restrictions	DCC Response (ENV 5350)
2	1	Northam Bideford	 a) Objection – proposed vehicle prohibition in Butchers Row (Mon – Sat, 10am to 4pm) – The proposal will prevent shoppers from being able to load/unload their vehicles, resulting in a loss of trade. b) Objection – proposed vehicle prohibition in Butchers Row (Mon – Sat, 10am to 4pm) and reduced loading bay will put more pressure on the limited loading space. c) Objection on procedures – Market traders were not aware of the proposed prohibition – this is a failure in the required consultation with affected parties. 	 ENV 5263 a) The vehicle prohibition already exists and the purpose of this proposal is to reduce the extents of the prohibition to allow vehicles to exit High Street via Butchers Row b) Vehicles accessing Butchers Row for loading and unloading will be exempt from the Cross Street/Castle Street vehicle prohibition. c) Legally, DCC are obliged only to advertise notices within the press. In addition to this, DCC have consulted with Town Centre Management, the Town Council and placed notices on affected streets. 	 Objection – reducing the loading bay will make the situation harder for the market traders and could force its closure. The proposals could be the death blow to the Pannier Market 	 i) Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row.
n/a	2	llfracombe Devon			 i) Objection – reducing the loading and waiting bays in Butchers Row will make it more difficult for market traders and increase traffic through the town as they complete circuits of the town to find loading space. ii) North Side – the only way to protect the canopy is to limit the size of the vehicles. The damage is not caused because a vehicle is parked in the loading bay but because of the vehicles are too large for the street. 	 i) Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row. ii) An order to restrict the size or class of vehicles may be considered in the future.
3	3	Newton Abbot Devon	 a) Objection – proposed vehicle prohibition in Butchers Row (Mon – Sat, 10am to 4pm) – The proposal will prevent shoppers from being able to load/unload their vehicles, resulting in a loss of trade. b) Objection – proposed vehicle prohibition in Butchers Road (Mon-Sat, 10am to 4pm) – will put more pressure on the limited loading space. c) Objection – proposed vehicle prohibition in Butchers Row (Mon – Sat, 10am to 4pm) and reduced loading bay will put more pressure on the limited loading space. 	ENV 5263 The vehicle prohibition already exists and the purpose of this proposal is to reduce the extents of the prohibition to allow vehicles to exit High Street via Butchers Row Vehicles accessing Butchers Row for loading and unloading will be exempt from the Cross Street/Castle Street vehicle prohibition.	Objection – reducing the loading bay would make the situation worse for market traders and could threaten the existence of the market and result in the loss of income for the District Council and the loss of Barnstaple's main tourist magnet. Objection – proposed vehicle prohibition in Butchers Row (Mon – Sat, 10am to 4pm) and reduced loading bay will put more pressure on the limited loading space.	Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row.
n/a	4	Barnstaple Devon			Objection – reducing the loading bay will prevent traders from parking to unload their goods, we feel we shall eventually lose our pannier market which we feel would be a disaster for Barnstaple.	Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row.
n/a	5	Barnstaple Devon			Objection – reducing the loading bay is not the answer. A weight and length restriction should be introduced instead. The type of delivery vehicles used by large supermarkets should not be using these roads and reducing the loading bay will not help out local/ small stall holders.	Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row.

Env 5263 Objection Ref	ENV 5350 Objection Ref	Location	Representation Summary (ENV 5263) Vehicle Prohibitions	DCC Response (ENV 5263)	Representation Summary (ENV 5350) Waiting Restrictions	DCC Response (ENV 5350)
	rici					An order to restrict the size or class of vehicles may be considered in the future.
6	6	Landkey Devon			Objection – Reducing the loading bay is not the answer. The canopy is only struck because delivery vehicles are not lowering their air suspension. The canopy is also several inches shorter than it should be due to the repair works. Reducing the loading bay will only result in it being struck further up the street. Do not punish the stallholders because of one company.	Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row. An order to restrict the size of vehicles may be considered in the future.
n/a	7	High Bicklington Umberleigh			Objection – the shareholders of the Barnstaple Country Markets are very concerned about the proposed reduction of the loading bays Butchers Row, particularly on Fridays. The traffic wardens are very unhelpful and intimidating when they are there. Once unloaded the traders park in the car parks. We hope that DCC support the small stallholders.	Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row.
n/a	8	Miss Katy Nicholls Civic Centre North Walk Barnstaple Devon EX31 1EA kate.nicholls@nor thdevon.gov.uk (North Devon licensing committee)	 a) Objection to the proposed No Left Turn, Butchers Row into Boutport Street, inclusive of taxis, will increase fares. The current arrangement works well. b) Objection to the proposed prohibition of vehicles, except for buses, taxis and cycles at the Northern/Braunton Rd at the end of Boutport Street where it meets Pilton Causeway. Exception for taxis has been omitted and we object as this will increase in fares. c) Support – proposed exemption for Taxis on The Strand. 	 a) Due to the representations received we intend to modify the prohibition to enable taxi's to continue to turn left into Boutport Street b) Due to the representations received we intend to modify the prohibition to enable taxi's to be exempt. c) Noted 		
n/a	9	Shirwell, Devon,	No objection to the order as long as it is being done to encourage trade and traffic flow. Complaint regarding the HGV movements in Barnstaple and North Devon. There needs to be restrictions on their movements to encourage smaller sized vehicles. This works in South Bucks.	Noted	No objection to the order as long as it is being done to encourage trade and traffic flow.	Noted
n/a	10	Barnstaple Town Centre Management	 a) Objection to Prohibition of Motor Vehicles, 10:00am - 4:00pm as it affects High Street from its junction with Cross Street, southwards to its junction with Boutport Street. This will prohibit vehicles from leaving the Parish churchyard. Vehicles (especially funeral hearses) are unable to turn around within the churchyard and need to exit via the High Street. Would support the church proposal of an exemption for a vehicle being used in connection with a service that has taken place in the church. b) Objection to Prohibition of vehicles, 	 a) Due to the representations received we intend to reduce length of the restriction so that the extent of the restriction terminates before the entrance into the church. b) The advertised proposal aimed to remove the confusing signs and allow vehicles to legally turn right out of Paternoster Row into Boutport Street. Upon consideration of the representations it is proposed to modify the TRO and signing arrangement to allow vehicular access from Queen Street into Boutport Street and 	not feel that all avenues have been looked into to prevent damage to the building.	proposals regarding the loading bay we

Env 5263 Objection Ref	ENV 5350 Objection Ref	Location	Representation Summary (ENV 5263) Vehicle Prohibitions	DCC Response (ENV 5263)	Representation Summary (ENV 5350) Waiting Restrictions	DCC Response (ENV 5350)
			Boutport Street. Vehicles exiting from the church, not in connection with a procession, onto Paternoster Row will not be able to turn left into Boutport Street or right against the one-way flow.	Paternoster Row. This will also allow vehicles to turn right on exit from Paternoster Row into Boutport Street. Additionally this will simplify the signing at the junction of Queen Street and Boutport Street.		
1	n/a	Westward Ho! Bideford	Objection to No Left Turn from Butchers Row to Boutport Street, including taxis, as this will increase fares to the public	Due to the representations received we intend to modify the prohibition to enable taxi's to continue to turn left into Boutport Street		
4	n/a	Barnstaple Devon	 a) Objection to Prohibition of Motor Vehicles, 10:00am - 4:00pm as it affects High Street from its junction with Cross Street, southwards to its junction with Boutport Street This will prohibit vehicles from leaving the Parish churchyard. Vehicles are unable to turn around within the churchyard and need to exit via the High Street. Would support an exemption for a vehicle being used in connection with a service that has taken place in the church. Objection to Prohibition of vehicles, Boutport Street. Vehicles exiting from the church, not in connection with a procession, onto Paternoster Row will not be able to turn left into Boutport Street or right against the one-way flow. Would support the start of the prohibition to commence on the north sides of its junction with Paternoster Row and an exemption to be for a vehicle being used in connection with a service that has taken place in the church. 	 a) Due to the representations received we intend to reduce length of the restriction so that the extent of the restriction terminates before the entrance into the church. b) The advertised proposal aimed to remove the confusing signs and allow vehicles to legally turn right out of Paternoster Row into Boutport Street. Upon consideration of the representations it is proposed to modify the TRO and signing arrangement to allow vehicular access from Queen Street into Boutport Street and Paternoster Row into Boutport Street. Additionally this will also allow vehicles to turn right on exit from Paternoster Row into Boutport Street. Additionally this will simplify the signing at the junction of Queen Street and Boutport Street. 		
5		North Devon Police	Due to the volume of the objection it has been included in appendix 3b	See separate appendix 3b	See separate appendix 3b	See separate appendix 3b
7		Town Council	RESOLVED that the following detailed representations be made to the Responsible Officer DCC:- i Coaches be allowed to access the Strand ii There should be improved signage to the Lower Boutport Street/Queen Street junction in relation to 'Access Only' iii Litohdon Street signage needs clarification in relation to accessibility for Heavy Goods Vehicles and remaining One Way Only Iv Maiden Street should be pedestrian only with removable bollards to prevent vehicular access and parking v The pedestrian area at Mermaid Cross (where the Post box and Cycle parking are) requires bollards to prevent vehicular access and parking vi there should be no change to the 10am to 6pm private vehicle access prohibition times along the Strand	 i) Coaches are exempted from the prohibition ii) It is proposed to amend the signing to simplify the signing arrangement iii) This has not been included as part of this order iv) This was not part of the remit but could be considered as part of a future scheme v) This is outside the scope of these works vi) This was requested by the police and supported town centre management to reduce the number of vehicles being driven along The Strand at times when pedestrian activity increases for the night time economy. vii) Due to the number of objections to the proposed No Left Turn from Butchers Row into Boutport Street it is the intention to modify the 		

Env 5263 Objection Ref	ENV 5350 Objection Ref	Location	Representation Summary (ENV 5263) Vehicle Prohibitions	DCC Response (ENV 5263)	Representation Summary (ENV 5350) Waiting Restrictions	DCC Response (ENV 5350)
			vii agree to the prevention of taxis turning left at the top of Market Street into Boutport Street viii there should be no right turn into Taw Vale from Belle Meadow/The Square. (NC)	TRO to allow taxi's to continue to turn left onto Boutport Street. viii) This prohibition was included as part of this TRO.		
8		Boutport Street Barnstaple X10 letters, same content	 a) Objection to the proposed No Left Turn from Butchers Row into Boutport Street, inclusive of Taxis, if imposed, taxis drivers will conduct 3 point turns outside Barclays Bank and it will add to passenger fares. b) Objection to proposals from Pilton Causeway into Boutport Street - if imposed, taxi fares will increase for all passengers and add to the congestion on the A361. c) Many private and delivery vehicles ignore the existing prohibitions, these should be enforced instead of penalising taxis drivers. 	 a) Due to the representations received we intend to modify the prohibition to enable taxi's to continue to turn left into Boutport Street b) Due to the representations received we intend to modify the prohibition to enable taxi's to be exempt. c) Noted 		
	11	Barnstaple			Objection to reduction in Loading Bays as it will have a detrimental effect on the businesses and loading is already difficult. Butchers Row is not a suitable route for articulated vehicles and the size of vehicles should be restricted.	 i) Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row. ii) An order to restrict the size or class of vehicles may be considered in the future.
	Butchers Row Batch 1	Various locations, X45 letters			Objection to reduction in Loading Bays as it will have a detrimental effect on the businesses and loading is already difficult. Butchers Row is not a suitable route for articulated vehicles and the size of vehicles should be restricted.	 i) Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row. ii) An order to restrict the size or class of vehicles may be considered in the future.
	Butchers Row Batch 2	Unknown address, X44 letters			Objection to reduction in Loading Bays as it will have a detrimental effect on the businesses and loading is already difficult. Butchers Row is not a suitable route for articulated vehicles and the size of vehicles should be restricted.	 i) Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row. ii) An order to restrict the size or class of vehicles may be considered in the future.
	Butchers Row Batch 3	Various locations, X6 letters			Objection to reduction in Loading Bays as it will have a detrimental effect on the businesses and loading is already difficult. Butchers Row is not a suitable route for articulated vehicles and the size of vehicles should be restricted.	 i) Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row. ii) An order to restrict the size or class of vehicles may be considered in the future.
	Butchers Row Batch	Unknown address,			Objection to reduction in Loading Bays as it will have a detrimental effect on the businesses and	 i) Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we

Env 5263 Objection Ref	ENV 5350 Objection Ref	Location	Representation Summary (ENV 5263) Vehicle Prohibitions	DCC Response (ENV 5263)	Representation Summary (ENV 5350) Waiting Restrictions	DCC Response (ENV 5350)
	4	X17 letters			loading is already difficult. Butchers Row is not a suitable route for articulated vehicles and the size of vehicles should be restricted.	are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row. ii) An order to restrict the size or class of vehicles may be considered in the future.
	Butchers Row Batch 5	various, X 23 letters			Objection to reduction in Loading Bays as it will have a detrimental effect on the businesses and loading is already difficult. Butchers Row is not a suitable route for articulated vehicles and the size of vehicles should be restricted.	 i) Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row. ii) An order to restrict the size or class of vehicles may be considered in the future.
	Butchers Row Batch 6	Various locations, X 23 letters			Objection to reduction in Loading Bays as it will have a detrimental effect on the businesses and loading is already difficult. Butchers Row is not a suitable route for articulated vehicles and the size of vehicles should be restricted.	 i) Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row. ii) An order to restrict the size or class of vehicles may be considered in the future.
	Butchers Row Batch 7	Various locations, X26 letters			Objection to reduction in Loading Bays as it will have a detrimental effect on the businesses and loading is already difficult. Butchers Row is not a suitable route for articulated vehicles and the size of vehicles should be restricted.	 i) Due to the number of objections to the proposals regarding the loading bay we are currently not progressing any amendments to the waiting restrictions along Butchers Row. ii) An order to restrict the size or class of vehicles may be considered in the future.

Appendix A2 ENV 5263 Police Objection

	Objection	DCC Response
Ref		
5	Part 4. Green Lane, Joy Street & High Street, however, please see Part 5 below.	Part 4 noted and see Part 5 below
	Part 5. Boutport Street	Part 5. Boutport Street
	 a) The advanced warning sign (D) gives no indication of what the restrictions are. The "No Motor Vehicles" sign (E) positioned at the junction with Paternoster Row will be seen too late by drivers of restricted vehicles, leaving them a choice of either contravening the sign or reversing out of Boutport Street as there is no facility (nor could there ever be) for vehicles to turn around. b) I do not feel the wording of this is correct. It reads "Pedestrian Zone" then states "No Motor Vehicles" and goes on to show the exemptions. By allowing any vehicle (even the exempt ones) this means the area is NOT a pedestrian zone. By stating it is could lead to conflict between pedestrians under the impression it is a pedestrian zone and vehicles. c) If a resident who lives on the High Street above the shops wishes to park their car outside their address they can lawfully drive along the High Street before 10am and after 4pm. However, in order to reach the High Street, they will have to contravene the "No Motor Vehicles" or Boutport Street. They will not be exemption only refers to "servicing or loading goods to premises in or adjacent to that length of road" (Boutport Street). High Street is a separate street and therefore not covered even by the "adjacent". 	 a) (Sign E) The use of Pedestrian Zone signs with exemptions is fully described in Chap Three of the Traffic Signs Manual. The proposals have removed all unrestricted parking within the Pedestrian Zones thus reducing the temptation for motorists to drive through during the operating times of the zone looking for parking spaces. The use of pedestriar zone signing generally has more impact than just the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles (flyin motor bike) sign as the motorist sees a justification for the use of the sign. The advanced warning (Sign D) - The pedestrian zone signing cannot be used on a map type sign. However, a possible alternative sign is attached. b) The Pedestrian Zone sign cannot be used with an "Except for access" exemption (wh Paternoster Row has) hence the setback location of the proposed signs in Boutport St. Therefore a revised proposal, shown on the attached plan, could be considered as the section of Boutport St between Queen St and Paternoster Row cannot be made two wa for safety reasons. The removal of any parking spaces (part of the existing waiting restriction proposal) that are not Loading, Blue Badge and Taxis aims to stop other motorists driving through Boutport St looking for parking spaces thus reducing the amou of through traffic. All other reasons for the using Boutport St. (Rat Running etc.) have be removed it could be considered that the presence of a moving order for Boutport St is academic as it should be self-enforcing. c) The current order prevents vehicles, except those exempted from Boutport St, accessing the lower part of High St from Boutport St. On effect they have been contravening the current order since its introduction unless the High St was treated as "adjacent" to Boutport St. However, the existing proposed order will be amended to allow access to Boutport St ar High St. For clarification, only the same types of vehicles that can use Boutport St can use the lower part of the High St ic. Loading, taxis and blue b
	Part 6. Castle Street & Cross Street.	Part 6. Castle Street & Cross Street.
	again could lead to confusion and conflict between pedestrians and exempt vehicles. It is NOT a pedestrian zone.	a) See explanation for Part 5 (a). Please note that Cross St is completely pedestrianised every Saturday and with the High St pedestrianised between 10am and 4pm it means Butchers Row is also pedestrianised fully every Saturday between 10am and 4pm.
	 b) The order proposes that there are "No Motor Vehicles" with exemptions, at any time Monday to Friday and between 10am and 4 pm on Saturday with no restriction whatsoever on Sunday. We had hoped that the timings and restrictions would be standardised across the town area for ease of understanding for the motorist, and for ease of enforcement. c) This section allows for loading or for "servicing or loading goods to premises in or adjacent to that length of road" (Castle Street & High Street). This effectively prevents loading/unloading in Butchers Row – possibly also access to 	b) Standardised timings would be useful for enforcement however, residents/shop owners/church attendees needs are varied and often cannot be standardised. Standardisation has been tried before and the numerous objections had to be consider. The remit of this review was only to make the existing restrictions enforceable with limit minor changes wherever it was not practicable to sign the restriction.
	Butchers Row for people intending to load/unload there - as this is a separate street and the properties are not adjacent	1 1917년 - 1918년 - 1918년 1917년 - 1918년 1918년 1917년 - 1917년 1917년 - 1917년 1917년 - 1917년 1917년 - 1918년 1917년 - 1

Part 5 & Part 6 combined.	Part 5 & Part 6 combined.
My understanding of the order, as advertised, effectively means that only exempt vehicles can be driven along Boutport Street and Cross Street. Because of the wording "being used for the purposes of servicing or loading/unloading goods to premises in or adjacent to that length of road", the properties in High Street and Butchers Row not being in or adjacent to Boutport Street and Cross Street, creates an area (High Street & Butchers Row) where people will need to access, e.g. market traders & shop keepers, but they are not lawfully able to as they are not exempt under the wording of the order for Boutport Street or Cross Street.	Accepted, it is proposed to amend this to include Butchers Row and Cross Street
Part 10.District Council Car Park, North Walk.	Part 10.District Council Car Park, North Walk.
It seems a bit odd to remove the "No Right Turn" from the car park alongside the Police Station, when, if vehicles do turn right, they are then faced with the restriction at Part 6 at Castle Street/Cross Street, and will have to turn around (unless an exempt vehicle) and go back the way they have just come.	A no right turn order is unnecessary now that the road is no longer a primary route. Motorists may want to access Castle St, Commercial Rd and on a Sunday Cross St & Butchers Row. It would be a very complicated banned turn sign listing all the exempted vehicles. There is adequate turning opportunity at Castle St or even Commercial Rd for the traffic leaving the car parks. The existing road layouts at the car parks are adequate to allow right turning movements.
Part 12. Paternoster Row.	Part 12. Paternoster Row.
Is Paternoster Row a public road maintained at public expense? For years we have been trying to establish this point. If it is, it needs to be maintained, which it has not been.	The gated area is not a public road for vehicular access but it is an inspected walking route. The first part of the row from Boutport St (with the double yellows up to the gate) is full public highway with vehicular access.
Assuming the road is a public road and maintained at public expense, the proposed sign "no motor vehicles except for access" needs to face onto Boutport Street not towards the Boutport Street/Queen Street junction as this will lead to confusion (as currently exists) of which sign relates to which street.	The proposal has now been revised
Part 13. Mermaid Walk	Part 13. Mermaid Walk
As mentioned previously, the use of a "Pedestrian Zone" sign is not appropriate where it is not fully pedestrianised. There are exemptions allowed to travel along Mermaid Walk, so this area is NOT a pedestrian zone.	See explanation for Part 5 a)
Part 14.Boutport Street (Mermaid Walk).	Part 14.Boutport Street (Mermaid Walk).
Part 13 proposes to allow taxis (as an exemption) to access Mermaid Walk. The proposal is for only local buses and cycles to be allowed to turn right from Mermaid Walk into Boutport Street (Part 14). The Taxis and other exempt vehicles will be expected to turn left onto Mermaid Cross. Conversely, cycles and local buses only will be able to travel along the length of Boutport Street onto Mermaid Cross. Should Taxis also be an exemption?	Agreed. Taxis should be exempted from Part 14. This will be included in the current proposal as a modification.
Part 15. One way prohibition of heavy commercial vehicles.	Part 15. One way prohibition of heavy commercial vehicles.
a) What is a Heavy Commercial Vehicle? The current weight limit and route relates to 7.5 tonnes.	 a) the articles define what a Heavy Commercial Vehicle. It is any goods vehicle which has an operating weight exceeding 7.5 tonnes.
b) Which way will the one way prohibition operate? Presumably the same as currently exists?	b) the Prohibition will operate in the same direction as currently exists.
c) The exemptions do not list for access, loading or unloading or as previously through this order, "being used for the purposes of servicing or loading/unloading goods to premises in or adjacent to that length of road". Should this be introduced as an exemption to allow for deliveries to commercial premises (hotels, motor dealerships etc)?	c) HGV's will need to access the properties in the opposite direction to the prohibition i.e. from Belle Meadow Road. We don't want exemptions the other way because buses are the only large vehicles that can legally get out at the end onto the Square.
Part 17. The Strand. a) As throughout this order, the use of Pedestrian Zone on the signage is inappropriate. There are exempt vehicles who will be allowed along this road at all times therefore this is NOT a pedestrian zone.	Part 17. The Strand. a) see explanation for Part 5 a)
 b) What provision is are there for allowing loading/unloading? The proposed order shows no motor vehicles between 10am – 4pm and 10pm – 3am. This reflects standardisation of timings through the day, but also for the night time economy traffic. However the signage also states "no waiting at any time". c) We agreed an evening restriction supported by the no waiting to address traffic congestion outside the night time 	 b)Loading can take place at any point within the zone outside of the prohibitions operating hours. No motorist can wait within the zone at any time. c) Taxis can take as long as necessary to pick up and drop off passengers but as there is no provision for a taxi rank they can't wait for a fare. Taxis don't want a rank where we can provide it. Normal bay markings are too wide for the existing sets banding and it is
economy premises. Taxis are allowed along The Strand, but they can not wait (to pick up). Is there provision for a Taxi Rank?	deliberately a restricted zone without road markings for environmental reasons.