

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, Place
Cabinet, 26 January 2022**

THE A628 MANCHESTER ROAD - ROAD/SAFETY IMPROVEMENT SCHEME

Includes: A628 BARNSELEY ROAD, Penistone, Barnsley

**A628 MANCHESTER ROAD, LEAPINGS LANE, HEDGEHILL ROAD,
SAVILLE LANE, HIGH BANK LANE & TOWNGATE, Thurlstone, Barnsley**

**A628 MANCHESTER ROAD, LEE LANE &
MILLHOUSE LANE, Millhouse, Barnsley**

**Proposed Speed Limit extension &
Prohibition of 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions**

Objection Report

1. Purpose of Report

- 1.1 To consider the 40 objections received to the overall road safety improvement scheme for A628 Barnsley Road, Penistone, and the A628 Manchester Road in Thurlstone and Millhouse.
- 1.2 To seek approval to amend the original restrictions in relation to the part of the overall scheme that relates to Thurlstone following consultations with residents/visitors/public and Ward Councillors.
- 1.3 To reconsider the overall proposals in light of the amendments and consider the remaining, unrelated objections and implement the restrictions as originally advertised for Penistone and Millhouse, and as amended for Thurlstone.

2. Recommendation

It is recommended that the Cabinet:

- 2.1 **Agrees that following the Internal and Public Consultation, the scheme in relation to the Thurlstone section of A826 Manchester Road be slightly amended to the proposals as shown in, 'APPENDIX – Thurlstone Revised' of the report submitted.**
- 2.2 **Agrees, that, for the purposes of, 'The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996', Part II, Sec 14 (3) – 'Modification', the above amendments do not constitute a, 'significant change' to the original proposals, (as shown in, 'APPENDIX – Thurlstone Original' of the submitted report), and therefore, do not require further**

Public Consultation to take place (i.e. the form of the amendments do not change the nature of the scheme and respond directly to feedback received from the Ward Councillors and the residents/visitors/public).

- 2.3 Agrees, that the remaining objections, not directly related to 2.2 above, and those also relating to Penistone and Millhouse be rejected for the reasons set out in the report and the objectors informed accordingly.**
- 2.4 Approves the amended overall proposals to enact a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to:**
- Extend the current 40mph Speed Limit at Penistone, (as shown in, 'APPENDIX – Penistone' of the report submitted), and**
 - To introduce prohibition of 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions in Thurlstone (as amended), and**
 - To introduce prohibition of 'No Waiting at Any Time' restrictions in Millhouse, (as shown on, 'APPENDIX - Millhouse' of the report submitted).**
- 2.5 Authorises the Head of Highways and Engineering and the Legal Service Director and Solicitor to the Council to make and implement the Traffic Regulation Order.**

3. Introduction/Background

- 3.1** The A628 is a major road connecting Greater Manchester and South Yorkshire. It starts to the east of Manchester at the end of the M67 motorway and A57 road. It leaves Greater Manchester, passes through Derbyshire, and enters Barnsley Metropolitan Borough via Millhouse.
- 3.2** From the Barnsley MBC boundary the road routes through Millhouse, Thurlstone, around Penistone before joining the M1 motorway at Junction 37.
- 3.3** Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council has received a UK Government grant to improve road safety, ease congestion and improve the free flow of traffic along the A628 (within the borough boundary).
- 3.4** Historically, the A628 through Penistone, Thurlstone and Millhouse has experienced congestion, delays, inconsiderate and obstructive parking leading to pinch-points and significant impacts on visibility at junctions and obstruction and inconvenience for pedestrians and pushchair/wheelchair users and other vulnerable road users.
- 3.5** The objections received overall were considered and assessed as part of the post-consultation phase of the TRO process. As a result, a minor amendment was possible to the original scheme in Thurlstone.
- 3.6** The original overall scheme, as shown in, 'APPENDIX – Penistone', 'APPENDIX – Thurlstone Original' and, 'APPENDIX – Millhouse' of the report submitted, was advertised publicly between the 5th to the 29th November 2021. A total of 38 objections were received and recorded.

4. Consideration of Objections

The 40 objections below were recorded during the public consultation period.

Each objection is summarised below along with the location of the respondent.

(The Head of Highways & Engineering's comments in response follow the objections in section 5).

1. (Location of objector: Resident – Penistone – address unknown).

- *It is the presence of parked vehicles that moderates the speed of flowing traffic and protects vulnerable pedestrians.*
- *Removing the parking will allow two-way traffic to flow and increase vehicle speeds.*
- *3 slight injury vehicle collisions registered on this section of Manchester Road, none of them pedestrian related.*
- *Believes there is a lack of consideration for the impact on residents parking and the displacement of traffic on to the other side roads.*
- *Suggests restrictions only on the road junction mouths north and south side of Manchester Road.*
- *Suggests either bollards or double height kerbs to prevent vehicles encroaching on to footways.*
- *Suggests and formally requests investigation in to an Environmental Weight Limit based on residents support for such a measure. Enforcement by ANPR.*

2. (Location of objector: Resident – Millhouse – Lairds Way).

- *Daily visitor to Millhouse Primary School.*
- *Believes there is a speeding issue through Millhouse Green which will be made worse by stopping parking.*
- *Believes it is only the presence of parents parked vehicles that speeds are kept below the speed limit.*
- *Believes speed limit should be 40 not 30mph.*
- *Believes there should be a Zebra crossing and flashing lights on the A628.*
- *Adamant that the free flow of traffic should not come before children's lives.*

3. (Location of objector: Resident – Millhouse – Millhouse Lane).

- *Private vehicles already park 15m from junction. Proposal will move it further away.*

4. (Location of objector: Resident – Millhouse – Lee Lane).

- *Removing parked cars will speed up traffic along Lee Lane.*

- *Traffic approaching the A628 along Lee Lane will slow down much later than they do now.*
- *If the scheme goes ahead, would recommend reducing speed limit on Lee Lane to 30mph.*

5. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – High Bank Lane).

- *Agrees about the junctions at Towngate and High Bank Lane.*
- *Disagrees about the congestion.*
- *Feels safer with a line of parked cars between the footway and live traffic.*
- *Where will Manchester Road residents park?*
- *Not willing to walk children to school in bad weather. Vehicle access?*

6. (Location of objector: Business – Thurlstone – Unknown).

- *Concerned over the loss of available space for resident parking.*
- *Displacement to nearby roads, especially Towngate.*
- *Can half-pavement parking be considered for residents?*
- *Homeowners with land available should be allowed to build drives/garages more easily through planning consent.*
- *Risk of increased speeds along Manchester Road if parked vehicles are removed.*
- *No traffic islands available through the village for help with crossing the road.*

7. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Would mean nowhere for resident to park his private car. No alternative parking available.*
- *Makes more sense to have a Weight Limit in place, forcing HGV's to use the Stockbridge bypass.*
- *Recommends a 20mph Speed limit with camera enforcement.*
- *Request only one side of the road is restricted with numbered parking spaces.*

8. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Complains of not being informed of proposals 'personally'.*
- *Parked cars act as traffic calming and slows vehicles down.*
- *Increased speeds mean increased vehicle emissions.*
- *Increased speeds increase risks to the elderly, children and animals trying to cross the road.*
- *Where do residents parks their vehicles and where can it be parked free from break-ins?*
- *Will BMBC provide additional resident's parking?*
- *Displacement within the village will move the problem, not solve it.*

9. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Measures outside own property on junction of Towngate.*

- *Believes extended speed limit should have speed bumps as an added measure.*
- *Parked cars act as traffic calming and slow vehicles down.*
- *Increased speeds increase risks to pedestrians.*
- *Displacement of vehicles will take place.*
- *Impact on resident's parking along Manchester Road.*
- *Proposals massively favour traffic rather than pedestrians and reducing congestion.*
- *Would increase traffic speeds and volume and be less safe for residents.*

10. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Removal of parked cars will increase traffic speeds.*

11. (Location of objector: Business – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Previously a homeowner on Manchester Road in Thurlstone and understands and supports the proposals to restrict parking.*
- *However, they own a business which relies on passing trade and the restrictions at the junction of Towngate would cripple their trade.*
- *Has previously requested the Bus Stop be moved to opposite side of Towngate, allowing them to purchase land next to the shop and allow for customer parking.*
- *Towngate restrictions may put us out of business!*
- *Additional: requests that 15m of kerb be left open to parking west along Manchester Road for customer parking.*

12. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Questions where the 39 displaced residents' cars will park?*
- *Manchester Road will become a 'death-trap' and the section between Millhouse and Thurlstone will become a car park.*

13. (Location of objector: SY F&RS).

- *Penistone - no impact on emergency response.*
- *Thurlstone - displacement onto minor roads may obstruct emergency response - Special concern over displacement to, or near, Windmill Lane which is already an issue.*
- *Millhouse - no impact on emergency response - slight improvement.*

14. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Vehicle speeds will increase putting many residents at increased risk.*
- *No parking outside homes will prevent loading and visitor parking.*
- *Displacement of vehicles on to the other areas of the village.*

15. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Sandringham Close).

- *Parked vehicles act as traffic calming through the village.*

16. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Agrees that the traffic situation in the village needs sorting.*
- *Believes Double Yellow Lines will divert traffic problem somewhere else.*
- *Agrees Double Yellow Lines through the pinch-point, but not to the extents elsewhere.*
- *Requests 20mph and/or traffic lights.*

17. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – address unknown).

- *BMBC has failed to comply with 'Sec 122 RTRA 1984' - non-provision of alternate parking facilities for residents who live along 'no waiting' areas.*
- *Suggests reducing the amount of HGV's that use the route instead.*

18. (Location of objector: Route user – Penistone – address unknown).

- *Removing parked cars will speed up traffic.*
- *On narrow pavements, parked cars create a safety barrier from traffic.*
- *Displaced cars will go into the side streets where it is already congested.*
- *Customer parking outside the Huntsman PH will be negatively affected as residents will be parked there instead.*
- *If proposals go ahead, recommends a 20mph limit be installed.*

19. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Believes proposals will cause more, not less accidents, even fatalities.*
- *Will increase the flow of HGV traffic along with noise and pollution from HGV's.*

20. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Displacement of over 30 residents cars will cause chaos for residents.*
- *Only recently moved to Manchester Road and being able to park at the front of the is essential to us.*
- *Run a business from home which means equipment is loaded/unloaded to/from their cars each morning and evening.*
- *Believes lack of access to parking and your car affects mental health.*

21. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road. Identical objection to 20 above)).

- *Displacement of over 30 residents cars will cause chaos for residents.*
- *Only recently moved to Manchester Road and being able to park at the front of the is essential to us.*
- *Run a business from home which means equipment is loaded/unloaded to/from their cars each morning and evening.*
- *Believes lack of access to parking and your car affects mental health.*

22. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone).

- *Vehicle speeds would increase.*
- *Large Goods Vehicles seen mounting kerb.*
- *Requests 20mph speed limit as it is a residential road.*
- *HGV's are the problem, not parked vehicles.*
- *Currently, do get 4/5 cars parked on the pavement outside house at the moment, so would another layby (a previously dropped kerb area from an old factory access) be possible opposite house?*

23. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Wants to park private car outside house.*
- *“If I have to park further away and my car is involved in a collision, is broken in to, or the alarm goes off, how will I know?”*
- *Road not suitable for purpose of so many HGV's. Deal with the problem, not the symptoms.*
- *Displacement of parked vehicles will cause other problems within the village.*
- *Displacement may occur further out the village to within the 40mph section, how is that safer than parking within a 30mph section?*
- *Does not believe there is any safety issues with the current Manchester Road.*

24. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Relies on the road to park 2 out of 3 cars outside the house.*
- *Where will everyone park their cars if the parking is reduced?*
- *Removing car parking will not stop HGV's using the road or mounting the kerb.*
- *HGV's should be restricted from going through the village.*
- *BMBC continue to allow house building in this area with no regard for the extra traffic.*
- *The Huntsman PH relies on road parking for its customers. This will have a huge impact on their business.*

25. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *“Will mean I may have to park a lot further away from my house which will effect partner’s quality of life. They suffer from a number of medical issues (not mobility related) which means it is difficult to get them outside.”*

- *Will mean competition for parking will increase pressure/stress between neighbours.*
- *Issues due to too many HGV's along road, not parked cars. HGV's should be made to use Stocksbridge Bypass, not the village.*
- *Should reduce the speed limit along Manchester Road and install speed cameras to encourage HGV's to use the Stocksbridge Bypass.*

26. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *“Where will I and the rest of the residents park our cars?”*
- *Removing the parking will increase vehicle speeds making it more dangerous to cross the road.*
- *No reason for these proposals given that there is a bypass over the hill for use by HGV's.*
- *Local businesses which rely on road parking will all suffer.*
- *No reason to do this because there have been no pedestrian casualties on this road.*

27. (Location of objector: (Possible) Resident).

- *Appalled that £1.2 million has been spent on Double Yellow Lines!*
- *Proposals will prevent residents parking outside their properties.*
- *Residents' bought their homes in good faith and that parking was available outside homes.*
- *Parked vehicles keep traffic from thundering down the road.*
- *Road will become more dangerous and make it nearly impossible to cross the road.*
- *Enforcement will mean residents will struggle to receive deliveries or load their property into their cars.*
- *The proposals will devalue the properties effected.*
- *Will seek legal advice due to the devaluation of property and will advise others to do the same. Will bring a collective legal action forcing the council to compulsorily buy all the properties affected.*

28. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Removing car parking will create huge competition for parking and result in bad feeling between neighbours.*
- *Vehicle speeds will increase if you remove parked cars.*
- *In the future of Electric vehicles, where will we park to be able to charge it?*
- *“You do not care that 'we' will not be able to run a private vehicle anymore and are trying to run them all off the road.”*
- *The new 'Woodhall Pass' improvement works will already reduce traffic volumes through the village, so these proposals are not necessary.*

29. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Highbank).

- *People will not be able to park outside their houses which discriminates against the disabled, elderly and people with children.*

- *Delivery drivers will not be able to deliver, which also discriminates against the same groups as above.*
- *Local businesses will suffer, including the window cleaner, Little Bakery and The Huntsman PH.*
- *The houses do not have off-road parking and people will have to park their cars elsewhere, so parking problem will get moved further along Manchester Road on to Towngate or Highbank, where it gets narrower.*
- *Once everyone has to have an electric car, all terraced property, such as those on Manchester Road, will be blighted unless a cable can be laid under the pavement so that residents can charge their car. That will only be possible if residents can park outside their house.*
- *There have been no accidents, to my knowledge, caused by parked vehicles on the roads in the village.*
- *Removing parked cars will mean that drivers will be able to go faster, causing accidents.*
- *Once HGV drivers realise that the way through the village has been made easier, they will use it as a way to the M1 rather than using the bypass, causing more pollution and danger to pedestrians.*
- *Traffic through the village could be reduced very cheaply, by signage at the Flouch roundabout, pointing all M1 traffic towards the bypass rather than the M1 south.*
- *A pedestrian crossing at one of the bus stops, would also slow traffic down and make the road safer.*

30. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road)

- *Supports the measures around the Towngate junction.*
- *Removal of parked cars will result in an increase in vehicle speeds.*
- *Removing parked cars and allowing more free flow of traffic will increase the number of HGV's and encourage its use as a 'rat run'.*
- *Displacement of resident's cars on to the minor roads which are already choked.*
- *About 35 cars will be displaced, where will they park?*
- *Asks for Residents Parking Permit Scheme?*
- *Proposal favours road users and not residents.*

31. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Narrow footways outside property means that the parked cars provide protection from what would be traffic passing very close to pedestrians.*
- *The width of the carriageway is 6m and a HGV is 3m. There is little or no room for error when HGV's would be passing each other. This would put pedestrians at risk of being hit.*
- *Removing parked vehicles would improve visibility but also increase vehicle speeds.*
- *Complaints raised in the past about the working of the speed camera but have been ignored or dismissed.*
- *Also concerned over the lack of crossing facilities (none) between Penistone and Millhouse Green.*

- *A lot of residents in terraced houses do not have off-street parking, where will they park?*
- *The competition for parking will increase stress between neighbours.*
- *Proposal will not deal with impatient drivers, poor driver judgement, drivers pushing through, and failing to give way to each other.*

32. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road. Identical objection to 26 above).

- *Removing car parking will create huge competition for parking and result in bad feeling between neighbours.*
- *Vehicle speeds will increase if you remove parked cars.*
- *In the future of Electric vehicles, where will we park to be able to charge it?*
- *You do not care that 'we' will not be able to run a private vehicle anymore and are trying to run them all off the road.*
- *The new 'Woodhall Pass' improvement works will already reduce traffic volumes through the village, so these proposals are not necessary.*

33. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road. Identical objection to 24 above).

- *Volume and speed of traffic will increase if parking is removed.*
- *Where will the displaced cars go to park?*
- *Why is the A616 not being used for this traffic?*
- *Trying to cross the road will become riskier, especially for kids.*

34. (Location of objector: Unknown).

- *Traffic would flow faster if parked vehicles were removed.*
- *Removing the ability to park outside your house will impact property prices.*
- *Many residents are tenants and can't make any structural changes to allow parking, so would be hardest hit by the changes.*
- *Displaced vehicles will make the minor roads even more congested with parked cars.*
- *Would impact people's ability to use their cars for commuting to work.*

35. (Location of objector: Unknown. Identical objection to 34 above).

- *Traffic would flow faster if parked vehicles were removed.*
- *Removing the ability to park outside your house will impact property prices.*
- *Many residents are tenants and can't make any structural changes to allow parking so would be hardest hit by the changes.*
- *Displaced vehicles will make the minor roads even more congested with parked cars.*
- *Would impact people's ability to use their cars for commuting to work.*

36. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *“I am of a 'certain age' and need my vehicle to be as close as possible to my house.”*
- *Other residents are in similar difficulty.*
- *Visitors will also have difficulty in finding parking.*
- *Deliveries will be more difficult.*
- *Suggests a single yellow line between the bottom of the hill and The Huntsman PH.*

37. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *I would not be able to park outside my house.*
- *The removal of parked cars will increase vehicle speeds.*
- *What alternative parking arrangements will the council be giving to residents?*
- *Suggests a resident parking permit scheme would work better.*

38. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Prospect).

- *Believes the scheme will make the road more, not less, dangerous.*
- *Parked vehicles act as a traffic calming - speeds will increase and break the limit.*
- *Residents will be displaced to the side streets which are already at capacity.*
- *Believes the parking problem relates to double and poor parking by residents and customers in the vicinity of the 'Pizz2Nite' takeaway.*
- *Ban on-footway parking and only one side of the road should be restricted.*

39. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Partner registered disabled and a BBH and they have no off-street parking. Believes they would become increasingly housebound.*
- *Where would displaced vehicles park?*
- *Concerned over issues of double-parking caused by vehicles near Durran's Works.*
- *Too many large goods vehicles use the A628 through the village and should use Stocksbridge bypass instead. Only small goods vehicles need access to local business.*
- *Signs should be improved to restrict access to the village for local traffic only.*

40. (Location of objector: Resident – Thurlstone – Manchester Road).

- *Lived in Thurlstone for over 40 years and never seen any problems with access along the road.*
- *No alternative parking places for displaced vehicles.*
- *Has severely restricted walking ability and cannot leave the house without a guaranteed parking place outside the house.*

- *Would remind the authority that the Stocksbridge Bypass was specifically built to act as a goods vehicle diversion route for Thurlstone.*
- *States relatively few accidents except an elderly lady who was killed 20yrs ago whilst crossing the road over the bridge, on a bend and a motorist just didn't see her.*
- *Second incident occurred a few years ago when a car travelling at speed towards Barnsley crashed into a parked car on the brow of a hill.*
- *A third accident occurred 5 or 6 years ago when a young man was fleeing from a gang, lost control of his car at 3 o'clock in the morning.*
- *There have been minor skirmishes when wing mirrors have been knocked off.*

5. Head of Highways and Engineering Response

- 5.1** *"The A628 Manchester Road - Road/Safety Improvement Scheme has been designed to address an injury collision history, congestion, delays, inconsiderate and obstructive parking leading to pinch-points and significant impacts on visibility at junctions and obstruction and inconvenience for pedestrians and pushchair/wheelchair users and other vulnerable road users.*

The area of the A628 covered by this TRO scheme has a collision history of 8 Serious Injury and 3 Minor Injury collisions over the previous 5-year period (to 31/12/2020). The UK Government has deemed it necessary to address this injury collision record by awarding £1.4m to BMBC Highways to design, develop and install various measures intended to address the issues stated above. This TRO scheme is one part of a series of measures being undertaken. Most of which do not require TRO's.

The 40mph Speed Limit is being extended further east from Penistone to allow for earlier awareness by drivers of the approaching narrow bridge arch, especially for large goods vehicles which need to adopt a centre-of-carriageway position to fit underneath the arch. A high-visibility speed limit entry feature on the road surface will also be installed to highlight the Speed Limit and raise awareness of the approaching low bridge arch.

The A628 through the village centre of Thurlstone is a significant congestion and pinch-point for large vehicles. This section of road has 2 Serious Injury collision directly associated with drivers pulling out on to the opposing lane to avoid/pass parked vehicles and colliding head-on to oncoming traffic. The carriageway width through the centre of the village is below current standards for such a road and traffic levels have increased over the years.

The current level of congestion, delays, inconsiderate parking and obstruction of the highway and footway has reached levels that require direct action to improve overall safety for all road users and improve the flow of traffic.

In order to fully address the situation in Thurlstone, it was necessary to have extensive no waiting restrictions along the pinch-point section of road. This would result in approximately 35 resident's vehicles being displaced. Following the feedback from the public consultation and meetings with the

Local Ward Councillors, it was possible to slightly amend the proposed restrictions and reduce them by 30 metres on one side of the road. Thereby, increasing the availability of space available for on-street parking but still allow the majority of traffic to be freer flowing.

This amendment is accepted and supported by the Network Manager and considered an appropriate and proportionate response to public objections whilst still allowing the remaining restrictions to have a significant affect on traffic flow and safety.

The Millhouse section of the A628 requires some current no waiting restrictions to be improved and extended which will have benefit to the nearby primary school, as well as addressing historic injury collisions near the junction of Lee Lane. This will improve overall visibility at junctions and prevent inconsiderate and obstructive road and footway parking.

No individual has a legal right to park on the public highway or outside their property, nor should they have the expectation to do so. Essentially, the purpose of the 'public highway' is to facilitate the passage of traffic and should not be relied on as a parking area. Businesses must be able to operate their business within their own premises/land and not rely on the public highway to provide customer parking.

The regulations relating to the prohibition of 'No Waiting' (Double Yellow Lines) allows for the immediate loading/unloading and the picking-up/setting-down of passengers within the restriction.

The potential for extra signing on Flouch roundabout to highlight a different route for large goods vehicles is to be considered post-scheme installation. There is already large goods vehicle diversion signing in place along the A628 on the approach to Flouch roundabout and Penistone due to the low and narrow bridge arch at Penistone.

The 'Stocksbridge Bypass' was not built to act as a diversion route for large goods vehicles to avoid Penistone, Thurlstone and Millhouse; it was specifically built to bypass Stocksbridge village.

The point about traffic speeds increasing when parked vehicles are removed is a point of fact because the road is no longer obstructed. However, it is not a point that necessarily makes a road safer. The A628 through Thurlstone village centre does not operate at or near its posted speed limit of 30mph for the majority of the time. The congestion and obstruction created by inconsiderately and obstructively parked vehicles creates a false sense of security.

Congestion and having to deal with badly and illegally parked vehicles cause driver frustration and distraction, not to mention damage to parked cars. Large goods vehicles have been witnessed mounting the footways, this in order to pass jammed oncoming traffic, or free themselves from the traffic gridlock. If this section of road could move more freely and the road operate more 'as intended', then drivers would become less frustrated and able to negotiate Thurlstone more safely and efficiently.

The A628 and A616 service very different parts of the Barnsley area and ultimately South Yorkshire. Goods vehicles travelling to/from Manchester along the A628 do so to/from the centre and north of Barnsley and the north of South Yorkshire. To promote or actively divert traffic via the A616 from Barnsley (M1 J37) would involve a 14-mile detour via M1 J36.

The Council has a duty to maintain and improve the free flow of traffic and improve road safety on its roads.

Where the road width allows and where is a proven demand for it, there are formal pedestrian crossing facilities on the A628 between Penistone and Millhouse. These are uncontrolled dropped kerbs or centre refuge islands with dropped kerbs. For the volume of pedestrian traffic, the provision of either Zebra crossings or signal-controlled crossings is not deemed appropriate at this time due to the lack of demand (which is monitored) and the availability of a suitable location (road width, visibility splays and infrastructure such as electricity supply)."

6. Proposal and Justification

- 6.1** In Penistone, it is proposed to extend the current 40mph speed limit on the A628 Barnsley Road to the east of the railway viaduct (further towards Hoylandswaine roundabout), this will provide more time for vehicles to reduce speed before negotiating the narrow bridge arch and allow for a high-visibility speed limit entry feature to be installed to highlight the speed limit and approaching narrow bridge arch.
- 6.2** In Thurlstone, it is proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on parts of both sides of A628 Manchester Road and the side junctions between Towngate and Leapings Lane (as amended) - this will improve the free flow of traffic and improve visibility. Inconsiderate and obstructive parking will be prevented, and the footways will be kept clear for pedestrians and vulnerable people
- 6.3** In Millhouse, it is proposed to introduce and extend existing no waiting at any time restrictions between West End Avenue and the western village boundary: - this will improve the free flow of traffic and improve visibility at junctions.
- 6.4** It is also proposed to introduce no waiting at any time restrictions on Lee Lane to further support the 'School Keep Clear' and Bus Stop restrictions: - this will prevent inconsiderate and obstructive parking and the footways will be kept clear for pedestrians and vulnerable people.

7. Consideration of Alternative Proposals

- 7.1** Option 1 – Overrule all the objections and proceed with the restrictions as originally advertised and as shown on, 'APPENDIX - Penistone', 'APPENDIX – Thurlstone Original', and 'APPENDIX – Millhouse', as submitted in the report.
- 7.2** Option 2 – Approve the minor amendment, overrule the remaining and unrelated objections, and approve the proposals as shown on, 'APPENDIX –

Penistone', 'APPENDIX – Thurlstone Revised', and APPENDIX – Millhouse', as submitted in the report. **This is the preferred option.**

7.3 Option 3 – Decline to introduce the restrictions. This option is not recommended for the following reasons:

- It will not address the risks and historical injury collision record of the A628 Barnsley Road/Manchester Road.
- It will not address the current levels of risk, congestion, delays, inconsiderate and obstructive parking evident in Thurlstone.
- It will not fully address the safety concerns highlighted by the UK Government and on which, funds were received by BMBC.

8. Impact on Local People

8.1 The restrictions are intended to reduce the number of casualties along the A628 between Penistone and Millhouse.

8.2 The restrictions will address delays, congestion, inconsiderate and obstructive parking, and the overall safety of all road users with the intent to reduce casualties.

8.2 There will be some loss of on-street parking space at the most vulnerable locations along the A628 in Thurlstone and Millhouse. This cannot be avoided due to the nature, width, and layout of the road.

8.4 Deliveries/Goods vehicles and the public will still be able to load/unload goods and passengers outside properties within the statutory restrictions proposed.

9. Financial Implications

9.1 The financial implications remain the same as previously reported.

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 No additional consultations are required because these have already been carried out, pre-report stage.
- 11.2 All objections were considered and assessed during the post-consultation phase of the TRO process.
- 11.2 Modifications are permitted to be approved at the 'Cabinet' stage and no further consultations are required because the amendments to the original proposals do not constitute a, '*substantial change*' as required by the 1996 Act.

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 has to be balanced with the duty of the Council to provide a safe highway for people to use. The Legal Service Director and Solicitor 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 down 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 – Penistone'** - Scheme plan of the proposed restrictions.
- **'APPENDIX – Thurlstone Original'** – Original scheme plan of the proposed restrictions.
- **'APPENDIX – Thurlstone' Revised'** – Amended scheme plan of the proposed restrictions.
- **'APPENDIX – Millhouse'** – Scheme plan of proposed restrictions.
- **APPENDIX 1** – A628 Improvement - TDPR Signed - dated 2nd September 2021.

15. **Background Papers**

15.1 Traffic Team file – 4143.

Officer Contact: Darren Storr, Traffic Engineer.

Date: December 2021