

North Yorkshire County Council
Business and Environmental Services

Executive Members

25 September 2020

Petition of Snape with Thorp Parish Council for Road Safety Measures

Report of the Assistant Director – Highways and Transportation

1.0 Purpose of Report

- 1.1 This report presents and considers the petition submitted by Snape with Thorp Parish Council requesting the introduction of additional road safety measures following a fatal collision at Kings Keld Bank, Bedale.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 A fatal collision occurred in October 2019 on the section of the C36 known as Kings Keld Bank, near Bedale. The circumstances of the collision were the driver, travelling southbound lost control of their vehicle on a bend leaving the carriageway to the near side and collided with a tree. There were no passengers or other vehicles involved. Subsequent Police investigations revealed the driver, who was local to the area and thought to be familiar with the road, was not qualified, did not have a driving licence, was uninsured and inexperienced.
- 2.2 Following the incident and in accordance with the County Councils Fatal Collision Inspection Protocol, investigations led by the Traffic Engineering Team were carried out with North Yorkshire police and colleagues from the Area 2 (Hambleton) highways office. The findings of which were formally recorded in a report.
- 2.3 Having assessed the site and reviewed collision records, it was resolved by the inspection team that this was an isolated incident and the highway arrangement and condition was not contributory to the collision occurring. However, in consequence of the collision two minor recommendations were made, these were;
- Refresh the faded central warning lines in the vicinity of the fatal collision site so the quality of the white lining is of a consistent standard throughout.
 - Provide a SLOW marking adjacent to the bend to right ahead warning sign for southbound motorists.
- 2.4 A further recommendation was made in result of site observations, but not associated with the collision, this was;
- Remove the defect forming a bulge in the southbound lane.
- 2.5 All of the above recommendations have been installed.

3.0 The Petition

- 3.1 Concerned about this section of the highway following the collision, Snape with Thorp Parish Council submitted a petition to the County Council requesting additional road safety measures are implemented to prevent future incidents. These requests were also made in person at a site meeting between Parish Council representatives and the Senior Engineer in the Traffic Engineering Team.

3.2 The petition, consisting of 173 signatures states;

We believe that safety measures need to be introduced on the section of road known as King's Keld Bank near Thorpe Perrow, Snape: These may include speed restrictions, chevrons, double white lines plus improved warning signs

3.3 On the basis the petition has below 500 signatures, it is not required to refer it for debate at the relevant Area Constituency Committee. The Corporate Director of Business and Environmental Services in consultation with BES Executive Members is able to make a decision on the proposed course of action.

4.0 Officer Review

4.1 The County Council as local highway and traffic authority has a statutory duty to reduce the number and severity of collisions on its highway network. It's Collision Investigation and Prevention budget is prioritised for investment at those sites and routes which are exhibiting the highest number and severity of collisions.

4.2 On receipt of the petition and communication from the parish council, a review of the circumstances of the collision, the findings of the Fatal Collision Inspection report and any other supporting information was carried out by the Traffic Engineering Team Leader. Having done so, it was concluded that all the appropriate action which could be taken in response to the collision had been taken.

4.3 However, it was noted that further improvements could be made on this section of highway but that funding for which could not be justified through the FCI process or the Collision Investigation and Prevention budget.

4.4 Kings Keld Bank borders Thorp Perrow Arboretum and is surrounded by dense woodland and tree canopy which can make this road appear darker than the surrounding network. Whilst this was not a factor in the collision, measures such as hazard marker posts and additional warning signs could enhance the visual appearance of the route. It is such measures that the parish council would like to be introduced.

4.5 It should be noted however that, the verge bordering the carriageway is not highway land and understood to belong to Thorp Perrow Estate. Any proposal to install and maintain any hazard markers or signs on this land would require their formal agreement.

5.0 Alternative Options

5.1 Notwithstanding the lack of merit for further investment from NYCC, it is agreeable for parish councils to fund highway works subject to approval of type, scale and future maintenance costs with the County Council. However, given the need for 3rd party consent to install any measures on non-highway land, any formal agreement must also be to the satisfaction of NYCC and not incur any additional financial cost.

5.2 Therefore, it is proposed that this option is formally offered to the parish council and that NYCC provides officer time and support in developing and delivering an acceptable scheme.

5.2 As part of on-going dialogue, this potential opportunity has already been presented to the Parish Council who acknowledged it and stated it would be considered and a response given. Subsequent information received is that the Parish Council would

be amenable to funding some small scale works on receipt of further technical information.

- 5.3 The communication with the Parish Council included the Elected Member for the Bedale Division, Cllr John Weighell. However, for the purposes of this report he has provided an individual statement expressing his support for the proposed measures.

6.0 Equalities Implications

- 6.1 There are not considered to be any equality implications arising from the proposal.

7.0 Financial Implications

- 7.1 Should Snape with Thorp Parish Council wish to pursue the course of action offered, there would be some financial implications for the County Council in terms of officer time to support, develop and deliver a potential scheme. However, the likely scale of such works is very modest and will be kept to a minimum.

8.0 Legal Implications

- 8.1 As mentioned in paragraphs 4.5 and 5.1 the land adjacent to the highway belongs to Thorp Perrow estate. Any proposal that requires use of this land, for example to install signs, would require a formal agreement to be completed. Snape with Thorpe Parish Council have already been in contact with the owner and have formed an agreement in principle, subject to the provision of further details on the type of feature to be installed.
- 8.2 Further work is required to understand the nature of the consent required and who would be required to formally enter in to that agreement and associated costs. Any agreement must make clear that the County Council is in no way responsible for the maintenance of the marker posts.

9.0 Recommendations

- 9.1 It is recommended that the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services (BES), in consultation with the BES Executive Members, approves that:
- i. The decision not to uphold the request made in the petition submitted by Snape with Thorp Parish Council.
 - ii. To allow Snape with Thorp Parish Council to fund other road safety measures at this site, subject to the approval of NYCC traffic and highways engineers.
 - iii. If required of NYCC, obtain landowner consent for installation of measures in third party land.

BARRIE MASON
Assistant Director, Highways and Transportation

Author of Report: David Kirkpatrick

Background Papers:

<p>Initial equality impact assessment screening form (As of October 2015 this form replaces 'Record of decision not to carry out an EIA')</p> <p>This form records an equality screening process to determine the relevance of equality to a proposal, and a decision whether or not a full EIA would be appropriate or proportionate.</p>			
Directorate		Business and Environmental Services	
Service area		Highways and Transportation	
Proposal being screened		The decision not to uphold the petition submitted by Snape with Thorp Parish Council requesting the county council installs additional road safety measures in result of a fatal collision.	
Officer(s) carrying out screening		David Kirkpatrick	
What are you proposing to do?		Offer Snape with Thorp Parish Council the opportunity to fund a small scale local safety scheme.	
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?		In result of a fatal collision a County Council led investigation with North Yorks' Police was carried out and made recommendations on measures to be taken to reduce or remove risk associated with the occurrence of the collision as well as other general road safety improvements. The measures have all been installed.	
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.		No, however some officer time will be required to support the development and delivery of a scheme should the parish council wish to accept the offer.	
<p>Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYCC's additional agreed characteristic</p> <p>As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> To what extent is this service used by particular groups of people with protected characteristics? Does the proposal relate to functions that previous consultation has identified as important? Do different groups have different needs or experiences in the area the proposal relates to? <p>If for any characteristic it is considered that there is likely to be a significant adverse impact or you have ticked 'Don't know/no info available', then a full EIA should be carried out where this is proportionate. You are advised to speak to your Equality rep for advice if you are in any doubt.</p>			
Protected characteristic	Yes	No	Don't know/No info available
Age		No	
Disability		No	
Sex (Gender)		No	
Race		No	
Sexual orientation		No	

Gender reassignment		No	
Religion or belief		No	
Pregnancy or maternity		No	
Marriage or civil partnership		No	
NYCC additional characteristic			
People in rural areas		No	
People on a low income		No	
Carer (unpaid family or friend)		No	
Does the proposal relate to an area where there are known inequalities/probable impacts (e.g. disabled people's access to public transport)? Please give details.	No.		
Will the proposal have a significant effect on how other organisations operate? (e.g. partners, funding criteria, etc.). Do any of these organisations support people with protected characteristics? Please explain why you have reached this conclusion.	No		
Decision (Please tick one option)	EIA not relevant or proportionate:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Continue to full EIA:
Reason for decision			
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)	Barrie Mason		
Date	15/10/19		