

Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council

This matter is not a Key Decision within the Council's definition and has not been included in the relevant Forward Plan.

Report of the Executive Director, Growth and Sustainability.

7th of January 2025:

Bank End Road and Grove Street, Worsbrough

Proposed Access Restrictions

Objection Report

1. Purpose of Report

The purpose of this report is to consider the sixteen (16) objections received during the Public Consultation stage of the proposal for access restrictions on Grove Street, at its junction with Bank End Road, Worsbrough.

- 1.1** To seek approval to progress the revised proposal, based upon the observations and wishes of the respondents.

2. Recommendation

It is recommended that the Cabinet:

- 2.1** Agrees that the revised layout reflects the consultation feedback and mitigates the issue of vehicles getting stuck when turning into or out of Grove Street, whilst not negatively affecting access for residents.
- 2.2** Approves the proposal to enact a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce turning restrictions as shown on the revised drawing and described in the revised schedule.
- 2.3** Authorises the Head of Highways and Engineering and the Legal Service Director to the Council to make and implement the Traffic Regulation Order.

3. Introduction/Background

- 3.1** Drivers travelling south on the B6100, with the intended destination of Grove Street, or one of the roads accessed from it, are sometimes opting to do so via Bank End Road.
- 3.2** The angle between the roads and the difference in gradient makes the left-turn manoeuvre extremely difficult. Many vehicles are becoming stuck, either on the wall between Bank End Road and Grove Street or are striking the wall to the south side of Grove Street. The same problem has also occurred due to vehicles turning right out of Grove Street, to travel east on Bank End Road.
- 3.3** Much anecdotal evidence plus some videos and photographs has been supplied to BMBC by residents. The numerous incidents have caused obstruction of the highway, together with damage to both private property and highway assets.
- 3.4** BMBC have made site observations and considered various options to mitigate these occurrences, which have been discussed with South Yorkshire Police.
- 3.5** It was agreed that as a minimum, banning left-turns into Grove Street, and right-turns out of Grove Street, should be considered to mitigate the problems. It was suggested that to implement one-way traffic on Grove Street, with traffic permitted to travel in a westerly direction only would provide a further deterrent and remove a potential conflict point on a very narrow section of Grove Street.
- 3.6** The proposed one-way section of Grove Street is the short length between its junction with Clarkson Street and Bank End Road. The section of Grove Street to the east of this point, between its junction with Clarkson Street and Pantry Hill is to remain unchanged, with two-way traffic permitted.
- 3.7** The proposals are regarded as an appropriate solution to address the issues being experienced on Bank End Road, at its junction with Grove Street. The proposals will prevent the manoeuvres that often lead to vehicles getting stuck and causing damage.
- 3.8** This proposed scheme was advertised to the public between 18th of October 2024 and the 8th of November 2024. Sixteen objection responses were received and recorded.

4 Consideration of Objections

Following public consultation of the proposal, there are sixteen (16) outstanding objections to consider. The main concerns raised are listed below along with the Head of Highways and Engineering's comments in response in **bold**.

Objection 1: Resident 1, Clarkson Street

The objector expressed concern that long vehicles would struggle to turn right or left at the top of Clarkson Street, particularly if vehicles are parked towards the top. Currently, most large vehicles accessing Grove Street do so by reversing from Bank End Road, which they would no longer be permitted to do if the proposed one-way system was implemented.

Response: Noted, this concern aligns with those raised by other residents.

The objector alleges that South Yorkshire Police stated: 'at least 8 years ago' (it is not known to whom this was stated) that they did not have sufficient resources to enforce movement restrictions on Bank End Road and Grove Street. The objector expressed incredulity that such restrictions can now be enforced and suggested that if they could, this was not a good use of police resources.

Response: We have not put forward this proposal without the knowledge of South Yorkshire Police (SYP). Prior to beginning any consultation with the public, we liaised with statutory consultees, including the emergency services. Additionally, this proposal was discussed at length with SYP at a dedicated meeting. Every restriction of which a breach constitutes a moving traffic offence must have police approval, as it places an expectation of enforcement upon them. SYP acknowledge that perpetual surveillance of this location, like many other locations, would be impossible. As suggested, this would not be a responsible use of police resources. However, SYP have stated that they are satisfied that the restriction, when signed to standard, will provide a level of deterrent that will prevent many of the injudicious manoeuvres. It is likely that the measures will not prevent all instances, however it is expected to be more effective than doing nothing. Clearly many of the drivers coming to grief here are doing so due to being unfamiliar with the awkward geometry of the junction, the appropriate regulatory signing will bring this to drivers' attention. That every breach of a restriction will not be acted upon by the police is not a reason to not implement the restriction.

The objector expressed concern that the one-way system, if implemented, would cause a lot of eastbound traffic to turn down High Street, which would exacerbate the congestion already experienced here at peak times. Further consternation was conveyed that vehicles that go to the junction with the B6100 at the eastern extent of Bank End Road will be required to make a dangerous right-hand turn at the road end. It is not clear why the

proposed measures would encourage drivers to make such a manoeuvre or why the measures would make the said movement any more difficult than it is now.

Response: The proposed one-way section is only to a short length of Grove Street, if implemented, two-way traffic would still be permitted on Bank End Road as it is now, and vehicles would not be forced to divert via High Street. None of the proposed measures would cause more vehicles to need to make a right turn out of Bank End Road onto B6100.

A further worry highlighted was that the measures would cause congestion at the junction of High Street and Bank End Road and force more traffic to use both Clarkson Street and possibly Pantry Hill. Both of which are narrow, residential streets and not particularly suited to carrying large volumes of traffic.

Response: Delays at the junction that High Street forms with Bank End Road would only be exacerbated by an increase in westbound traffic on High Street. No element of the proposal will increase the amount of westbound traffic on High Street. The limited capacity of both Clarkson Street and Pantry Hill are noted.

Resident 1 stated that he had been a resident of Clarkson Street for over 40 years and in his opinion, the best way to prevent vehicles getting stuck on the corner of Bank End Road and Grove Street would be to: 'extend the already existing barrier of metal railings (or replace the railings with a more substantial motorway style crash barrier) approximately a few metres and install a no left turn sign.' Physically restricting the manoeuvre would possibly be more effective than signing alone.

Response: Tubular railings, such as those currently adjacent to the wall to the eastern side of the wall would not be visible enough to extend in a peninsular arrangement across part of the junction mouth. A more substantial barrier would require a minimum of 450mm clearance to the traffic lanes to each side (this would require kerbs to delineate in this situation), combined with the width of the barrier, this would equate to a width of ~1.2m. Grove Street, at the part that interfaces with Bank End Road is only ~2.7m wide – scarcely wide enough to be a single-track road. To apply even a short length of barrier would in effect stop-up this junction to vehicular traffic.

He concluded by stating that he felt disappointed that an extended barrier was not being offered as a possible solution and that signing alone was: 'a complete waste of time'. Resident 1 stated that he has seen many instances of vehicles getting stuck at the junction when attempting to turn into or out of Grove Street.

Response: We have considered the suggestion of a barrier, and this is discussed in our response to the previous point. It is agreed that changes in geometry, in addition to regulatory signing, would be more effective than signing alone. However, due to the existing geometry of the junction, these cannot be accommodated. Furthermore, the available budget is severely limited, and further

measures would not be cost-effective. We are aware of the numerous incidents at the junction, this is the reason for the scheme. Also, the sign in isolation would not be 'a complete waste of time'. As it will be supported by a Traffic Regulation Order, any driver making the manoeuvre will be guilty of a moving traffic offence. This will give the adjacent householders the ability for some redress through the law if their properties are damaged again. It will also enable BMBC to recover the costs of damage to highway assets.

Objection 2: Resident 2, Grove Street

The objector states that they have lived on Grove Street for 33 years. They feel that the proposed one-way system will generate further traffic issues on Grove Street and the surrounding area especially during the winter months. They believe that a more suitable way forward would be to have no left turn from Bank End Road into Grove Street but still allow eastbound traffic on Bank End Road to turn into Grove Street.

Response: The potential for access issues in bad weather have been raised by several residents and this is something that we have noted.

Similarly, the suggestion to ban the left turn into Grove Street for westbound traffic on Bank End Road is something that several residents have expressed support for.

Objection 3: Resident 3 and Resident 4, Grove Street

Resident 3 and Resident 4 (same address) both responded separately but, both expressed identical views on the proposal; objecting to the proposed one-way system but, expressing support for prohibition of both left turns from Bank End Road onto Grove Street and right turns from Grove Street onto Bank End Road.

Resident 3 also suggests that double yellow lines on Bank End Road, opposite the junction with Grove Street, would be a beneficial as vehicles parking here often exacerbate the access and egress issues.

They both object to the proposed one-way system due to the inconvenience that this would create for residents. They would have to drive through narrow, congested streets to reach their homes.

They are particularly concerned that the proposed arrangement could cause access issues in winter if there was a one-way system from Grove Street to Bank End Road. The only way to access Grove Street would be via either Clarkson Street or Pantry Hill – both of which could be impossible if there is ice or snow on the ground.

Resident 3 suggests that a one-way system to the eastern end of Grove Street, allow vehicles to travel east on Grove Street and south on Pantry Hill, would be more beneficial.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted.

We also note the support for a turning ban.

Objection 4: Resident 5, Grove Street

Resident 5 and his family access their home on Grove Street from Bank End Road daily. He is concerned that the proposed one-way system, if implemented, would cause them difficulties, especially in winter. Even with small quantities of snow on the ground, the steep gradients of both Clarkson Street and Pantry Hill can be difficult to drive up.

Response: Noted. The potential for difficulties in wintry weather has been raised by numerous residents.

Objection 5: Resident 6, Grove Street

Resident 6 expressed concern about access in icy weather. The proposed one-way system will mean that the only vehicular access to Grove Street will be by either Clarkson Street or Pantry Hill, both of which present a steep incline that is difficult to drive up in winter. She also expressed concern over access for the emergency services.

Resident 6 did state that she believed the turning ban into and out of Grove Street at its junction with Bank End Road was a good idea.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted.

We also note the support for a turning ban.

Objection 6: Resident 7, Grove Street

Resident 7 objects to the one-way element of the proposal as during wintry weather, when there is snow or ice on the ground, this will make vehicular access to Grove Street very difficult. She did though, express support for the turning ban.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted.

We also note the support for a turning ban.

Objection 7: Resident 8, Grove Street

Resident 8 expressed concern over the potential for access to Grove Street via Clarkson Street or Pantry Hill becoming difficult in wintry weather, leaving residents unable to gain vehicular access to their properties if the one-way system were to be implemented. Particularly as these two roads are not part of a gritting route. He also suggested that this may lead to residents' vehicles being abandoned in hazardous locations when access to Grove Street was not achievable.

He did though, express support for the proposed turning ban.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted.

We also note the support for a turning ban.

Objection 8: Resident 9, Grove Street

Resident 9 suggested that the one-way system is unnecessary and that the implementation of the turning ban, in isolation, would mitigate the problem of vehicles getting stuck at the junction. Also, when large vehicles access Grove Street to make deliveries then they cannot do so via Clarkson Street or Pantry Hill and so need to reverse into Grove Street from Bank End Road.

Resident 9 also expressed concern over the ability of vehicles to use Clarkson Street or Pantry Hill in wintry weather.

He concluded by requesting that we do not implement the one-way system but that we do progress the turning ban.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted, as is the need for access to be achievable by large vehicles.

We also note the support for a turning ban.

Objection 9: Resident 10, Grove Street

Resident 10 stated that he has lived in the vicinity of Grove Street for 16 years and concurs that the issue of vehicles getting stuck at the junction with Bank End Road is a regular problem that warrants remedial measures.

However, he is concerned if the one-way system is implemented, then the only way for vehicles to access Grove Street will be via Clarkson Street or Pantry Hill which, due to the gradient of both these roads, would be very difficult in icy weather, leading to the possibility of cars getting stuck or damaging parked vehicles.

Since living on Grove Street, Resident 10 has seen delivery vehicles struggle to access these roads. This also raises a concern regarding access for emergency vehicles.

Resident 10 concluded that he is in favour of the turning ban, but not the one-way system.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted, as is the need for access to be achievable by large vehicles.

We also note the support for a turning ban.

Objection 10: Resident 11, Bank End Road

Resident 11 is opposed to the proposed one-way system as he believes it will: 'cause more problems than it will solve'. He did not specify the nature of problems that he anticipates however, it is notable that Resident 11's property is one of those at risk of damage from the injudicious manoeuvres that the scheme seeks to mitigate.

He concluded by stating that he believed that the proposed turning ban was all that is needed to address the regular issues at the junction.

Response: The opposition to the one-way system but support for the turning ban is noted.

Objection 11: Resident 12, Grove Street

Resident 12 objects to the proposed one-way system as during wintry weather it will force vehicles to access and Grove Street via a steep, upward gradient. Access from Bank End Road is a shallow descent.

She does however express support for the proposed turning ban.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted.

We also note the support for a turning ban.

Objection 12: Resident 13, Grove Street

Resident 13 objects to the proposed one-way system as she believes that it will prevent residents of Grove Street gaining vehicular access to their properties in icy or snowy conditions due to the steep incline of Clarkson Street and Pantry Hill.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted.

Objection 13: Resident 14, Bank End Road

Resident 14 objects to the proposal to turn a short section of Grove Street into a one-way street as this will force traffic from Barnsley town centre to travel via High Street and then ascend Clarkson Street in order to reach Grove Street. Clarkson Street is a steep hill that becomes impossible to drive up more than halfway with even a minor snowfall. The proposal will make it impossible for traffic caught in such circumstances to reach houses at the top of Clarkson Street - including those on Bank End Road (46, 48, 50, 52) whose garages/parking spaces are at the back of their properties and accessed from Clarkson Street.

He concluded that if a one-way system is thought necessary it should be in the opposite direction. This would automatically prevent any problems of traffic emerging onto Bank End Road from Grove Street.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted.

Objection 14: Resident 15, Pantry Hill

Resident 15 acknowledges that mitigating measures are required at the junction. However, he believes that to simply ban left turns from Bank End Road onto Grove Street and right turns from Grove Street onto Bank End Road – without including the one-way system – would be an adequate measure.

He is concerned that the proposed one-way system would significantly increase traffic on the steep inclines of Pantry Hill and Clarkson Street which, in winter, are difficult and dangerous to ascend in a vehicle.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted.

We also note the support for a turning ban.

Objection 15: Resident 16 and Resident 17, Grove Street

Resident 16 and Resident 17 (same address) object to the proposed one-way system as they envisage it causing access issues during wintry weather.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted.

Objection 16: Resident 18, Grove Street

Resident 18 has been a resident of Grove Street for 61 years. She believes that the proposed one-way system is a bad idea. It will force vehicles to use Pantry Hill or Clarkson Street which, will be difficult and dangerous during wintry weather.

She believes that a better solution would be to implement the suggested turning ban, without the one-way system.

Response: The potential issues in icy weather have been raised by several residents and are noted.

We also note the support for a turning ban.

6. Proposal and Justification

It is proposed and recommended to implement the TRO as per the revised layout – that is, to prohibit left turns into Grove Street from Bank End Road, and right turns out of Grove Street onto Bank End Road, but not to implement the suggested one-way system on the short length of Grove Street as advertised. This revised proposal reflects the wishes of most respondents, as described in section 5 above. This revised layout is shown on the plan and described in the revised schedule at Appendix 3 of the report submitted.

7. Consideration of Alternative Proposals

7.1 Option 1 – proceed with the revised layout of restrictions as described in this document; **This is the preferred option.**

7.2 Option 2 – Decline to introduce restrictions. This option is not recommended for the following reasons:

- It will not improve safety at the junction.
- It will not prevent the occurrences of vehicles becoming stuck and damaging property.

8. Impact on Local People

- 8.1 Lessen the likelihood of collisions that create the risk of personal injury.
- 8.2 Mitigating access issues that occur when a vehicle gets stuck at the junction will be desirable for residents.
- 8.3 The measures will reduce the likelihood of damage to private property and to highway assets.

9. Financial Implications

- 9.1 The financial implications remain the same as previously reported and signed in the TRO and Officer Delegated Report (ODR) of the report submitted.

10. Legal Implications

- 10.1 The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 provides the appropriate powers for the Council to make the proposed TRO and the Council is satisfied it is expedient to make the Order for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the roads and for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, and for facilitating the passage of traffic on the roads.
- 10.2 In determining the extents of the proposed restrictions, the Council has had due regard to the duty imposed on it to exercise the functions conferred on it by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 so as to secure the expeditious convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway (section 122 Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984) and is satisfied the traffic restrictions proposed will achieve those objectives.

11. Consultations

- 11.1 Internal Consultation took place between the 9th of August and 23rd August 2024 – no objections were received.
- 11.2 Public Consultation took place between the 18th of October and the 8th of November 2024 – sixteen (16) objections were received.
- 11.3 No additional consultations are required.

12. Risk Management Issues

Risk	Mitigation/Outcome	Assessment
1. Challenge to the proposals because they infringe the Human Rights Act	It is not considered the proposals have any interference with convention rights. Any potential interference must be balanced with the duty of the Council to provide a safe highway for people to use. The Legal Service Director to the Council has developed a sequential test to consider the effects of the Human Rights Act which are followed.	Low
2. Legal challenge to the decision to make the TRO.	The procedure to be followed in the making of TROs is prescribed by legislation which provides an opportunity to object to proposals which must be reported for consideration by Cabinet and there is an opportunity to challenge an order once it is made by way of application to the High Court on the grounds that the order is not within the statutory powers or that the prescribed procedures have not been correctly followed. Given that the procedures are set out and the Council follows the prescribed procedures the risk is minimal.	Low

13. Compatibility with European Convention on Human Rights

13.1 It is not considered the proposals have any potential interference with convention rights.

14. List of Appendices

Appendix 1 - Officer Delegated Report dated 5th of September 2024.

15. Background Papers

15.1 File ref: 4365.

Officer Contact: Nathan Copley

Date: January 2025.