

North Yorkshire Council

Environment Executive Members

22 February 2024

Proposed Review of 7.5T Weight Restriction on Norton Level Crossing

Report of the Assistant Director – Highways & Transportation, Parking Services, Street Scene, Parks & Grounds

1.0 PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1 At a meeting of the Business and Environmental Services (BES) Executive Members on 24 January 2020 it was resolved to introduce a 7.5T weight restriction on Norton Level Crossing with the provision that a further review of its impact on traffic flows and air quality would be undertaken when the implications of the increased rail service through Malton are fully appreciated.
- 1.2 As the planned increased rail service through Malton has not occurred and there is currently no date when it will be introduced a decision is sought from the Corporate Director of Environment, in consultation with the Executive Member for Highways and Transportation as to whether or not the review should be brought forward.

2.0 BACKGROUND

- 2.1 An 18 month Experimental 7.5T Weight Restriction Order was introduced on Norton Level Crossing in February 2018. The restriction was sought to reduce the number of large vehicles in the Castlegate area in order to improve the air quality. Castlegate and the Butcher Corner area are covered by an Air Quality Management Plan (AQMA). The location plan is attached as Plan 1.
- 2.2 At the meeting of the Corporate Director - BES and the BES Executive Members on 24 January 2020 a report was considered whether or not an Experimental 7.5T Weight Restriction on Norton Level Crossing should be made permanent.
- 2.3 The report provided information on the impact of the Experimental 7.5T Weight Restriction and the results of a public and stakeholder consultation.
- 2.4 The decision of the Corporate Director - BES, in consultation with the BES Executive Members, was that -
- The 7.5T weight restriction at Norton Level Crossing is made permanent by making a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
 - The weight limit is reviewed again following the increase to the rail service in Malton and a review of the consequent impact on traffic flows and Air Quality.
- 2.5 The increase to the rail service, which could result in the doubling of the service, would be significant due to the additional amount of times the level crossing barriers would be down, resulting in increased queuing traffic on Castlegate through the AQMA.
- 2.6 The Order to make the weight restriction permanent came into force on 17 October 2020.

2.7 A copy of the Report from the 24 January 2020 Committee is attached as Appendix A and the Decision Record is attached in Appendix B.

3.0 PREVIOUS REPORT

- 3.1 The report in Appendix A set out the previous consultation responses which were received during the period the experimental order was in force. Also, the results of an on-line consultation in respect to the question as to whether the experimental order should be made permanent or not.
- 3.2 The main issue raised was the impact of the Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) Traffic which was displaced onto Highfield Road and Pasture Lane, particularly with regard to the two primary schools which are located on this route. Other issues raised were in terms of –
- Narrowness of the road.
 - Congestion.
 - Road damage.
 - Detrimental impact on residential properties
 - Difficulty for resident's crossing over the road
 - Speed of HGV's.
- 3.3 Three Hauliers who responded identified the difficulty HGV's have turning right from Old Maltongate into the B1257 at Butcher Corner due to the tight radius often resulting in mounting the footway. Their other comments were –
- HGVs are being forced to use unsuitable roads
 - HGV's still need to travel through the centre of Malton.
 - Increased travel time and transport costs.
- 3.4 Other comments received were in relation to the impact on the surrounding villages caused by the re-routing of HGVs.
- 3.5 129 Responses were received to the on-line consultation (1% of the population of Malton/Norton). Of these 33 were in favour of the restriction being made permanent and 96 against. Of the 96 against the restriction 24 (25%) were from the area around Highfield Road/Pasture Lane.
- 3.6 The officers response to those objections to the proposal to make the Experimental Order permanent were outlined in the previous report contained in Appendix 1 and these are included here in paragraphs 3.8 to 3.12 again for reference in *italics*.
- 3.7 *The experimental weight limit should not be considered in isolation but must be included as part of a bigger picture in terms of the planned increase in rail services in the town and any potential alterations to the operation of the existing highway network.*
- 3.8 *In terms of HGV impact on the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at Butcher Corner. Whilst no exceedances of the annual mean NO₂ objective have occurred within the Malton AQMA for the last three years, which includes a period before the weight restriction was introduced, Ryedale District Council have stated that they intend to keep the AQMA under review. This is due to the anticipated increases in queuing related congestion at the level crossing as a consequence of the proposed doubling of the rail service.*
- 3.9 *Whilst it is acknowledged that the experimental weight restriction has created some issues elsewhere on the network, its contribution towards improvements to air quality, particularly on Wheelgate and Castlegate cannot be ignored. To revoke the weight restriction before the implications of the increased rail service have been fully appraised could be considered premature.*

- 3.10 *However, the issues which have been raised surrounding the HGV restriction, such as HGV vehicles being displaced onto unsuitable routes are also important points to consider.*
- 3.11 *An extension to the existing experimental weight limit may have been considered the most practical solution in order that the impact of the increase in rail service on the highway network can be fully appraised. However, it is not possible to extend an experimental weight restriction order past the date it expires. It must either be revoked or made permanent.*
- 3.12 Taking everything into consideration, the recommendation to the NYCC Corporate Director – BES and the BES Executive Members was that the permanent Order was made but on the understanding that it will remain under review. A further decision as to whether or not the restriction should remain in force was to be taken when the implications of the increased rail service were fully appreciated.

4.0 Current Position

- 4.1 The former Ryedale District Council's (RDC) 2023 Air Quality Annual Status report acknowledges that concentrations of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) at all monitoring sites within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) have shown an improving picture since 2013. This is considered to be due to a combination of vehicle emissions improvements and the increased use of the Brambling Fields A64 junction, removing traffic from the AQMA. Changes in priority at the junction of Church Street/Welham Road, made in 2016, have enabled eastbound traffic in Castlegate to clear quicker, which is acknowledged as possibly also contributing to air quality improvements in the vicinity of the AQMA. The HGV restriction on the level crossing introduced in a bid to reduce the number of Lorries travelling through the Malton AQMA is also acknowledged.
- 4.2 Whilst no exceedances of the annual mean NO₂ objective have occurred within the Malton AQMA for the last six years, increases in queuing related congestion at the level crossing are anticipated should the doubling of rail services through Malton go ahead. As such the AQMA will be kept under review until it can be demonstrated that compliant concentrations are stable over a sustained period. Should pollution levels remain well below the objectives from 2023 onwards, parts of the AQMA will be considered for revocation.
- 4.3 The former RDC previously acknowledged that the recorded improvements in air quality at the current time could not be attributed to one particular factor and that the contribution made by the HGV restriction cannot be individually identified. Indeed, there is no specific evidence or data at present which provides a direct correlation between the introduction of the restriction and improving air quality, or the extent to which the restriction is contributing to improving air quality.
- 4.4 Presently there is no confirmed date as to when the increase to the rail service in Malton, which could result in the doubling of the service, will come into force.
- 4.5 Concerns are still being raised regarding the impact of diverted HGV traffic, particularly along Highfield Road where it passes two primary schools.

5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

- 5.1 The cost of appointing our consulting partners to undertake the review on Air Quality and Traffic Flows, estimated to cost £5,000 will be funded from ring fenced Section 106 monies accrued for the purposes of addressing air quality/traffic issues in Malton & Norton.

6.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

6.1 There are no Legal Implications of undertaking the review.

7.0 EQUALITIES IMPLICATIONS

7.1 It is the view of officers that the recommendation does not have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010. A screening form has been included in Appendix C.

8.0 CLIMATE CHANGE IMPLICATIONS

8.1 It is the view of officers that the recommendation does not have an adverse impact on Climate Change and a copy of the Climate Change Impact Assessment decision form is attached as Appendix D.

9.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

9.1 While there is uncertainty regarding any increase in rail service through Malton, the issues on the surrounding network through the introduction of the HGV restriction on the level crossing remain. As such a review of the impact of removing HGVs from Castlegate and the AQMA measured against the downward trend of NO₂ monitoring site levels would provide evidence on the ongoing appropriateness of the restriction.

10.0 RECOMMENDATION

10.1 It is recommended that the Corporate Director of Environment, in consultation with the Executive Member for Highways and Transportation, approves that the review of the 7.5T weight restriction on the level crossing, in terms of its impact on traffic flows and air quality, is brought forward considering the uncertainty regarding the proposed increase in rail services.

APPENDICES:

Appendix A - Copy of 24 January 2020 Report to the Corporate Director, BES and the BES Executive Members

Appendix B - Decision Record from the 24 January 2020 meeting of the Corporate Director, BES and the BES Executive Members

Appendix C - Equalities Impact screening form

Appendix D - Climate Change Assessment screening form

BACKGROUND DOCUMENTS: Copies of reports referred to are held by the Kirby Misperton Area 4 Highways Office.

Barrie Mason
Assistant Director – Highways & Transportation, Parking Services, Street Scene, Parks & Grounds
County Hall
Northallerton
22 February 2024

Report Author and Presenter – Tim Coyne - Improvement Manager

Note: Members are invited to contact the author in advance of the meeting with any detailed queries or questions.

North Yorkshire County Council

Business and Environmental Services

Executive Members

24 January 2020

7.5T Weight Restriction – Norton Level Crossing

Report of the Assistant Director – Highways and Transportation

1.0 Purpose Of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to advise the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services (BES) and the BES Executive Members of;
- The reason why, following the decision by the Corporate Director, BES and the BES Executive Members at the meeting of the 26 July 2019 to make the previous experimental weight restriction permanent that the Order was not made.
 - And for a decision to be made whether a new Order to make the 7.5T Weight Restriction should be made in view of the previous decision.
- 1.2 A decision of the Corporate Director, BES is sought, in consultation with the BES Executive Members regarding the recommended option.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 At the meeting of the Corporate Director, BES and the BES Executive Members on the 26 July 2019 a Report was considered whether or not an Experimental 7.5T Weight Restriction on Norton Level Crossing should be made permanent.
- 2.2 The Report provided information on the impact of the Experimental 7.5T Weight Restriction and the results of a public and stakeholder consultation.
- 2.3 The decision of the Corporate Director, BES, in consultation with the BES Executive Members, was that -
- The 7.5T weight restriction at Norton Level Crossing is made permanent by making a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
 - The weight limit is reviewed again following the increase to the rail service in Malton and a review of the consequent impact on traffic flows and Air Quality.
- 2.4 A copy of the Report from the 26 July 2019 Committee is attached as Appendix 1 and the Decision Record is attached in Appendix 2.
- 2.5 The Traffic Regulation Order was made to make the restriction permanent but was subsequently found to contain an error which meant the restriction could not be enforced.
- 2.6 It was advised by Legal Services that the proposal to make a permanent 7.5T Weight Restriction on Norton Level Crossing would need to be re-advertised.

3.0 Previous Consultation

- 3.1 The Report in Appendix 1 sets out the previous consultation responses which were received during the period the experimental order was in force. Also, the results of the on-line consultation in respect to the question as to whether the experimental order should be made permanent or not.
- 3.2 18 responses objections were received to the weight restriction during the period of the experimental order.
- 3.3 The main issue raised is the impact of the Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) Traffic which was displaced onto Highfield Road and Pasture Lane, particularly with regard to the two primary schools which are located on this route.

Other issues raised were in terms of –

- Narrowness of the road.
 - Congestion.
 - Road damage.
 - Detrimental impact on residential properties
 - Difficulty for resident's crossing over the road
 - Speed of HGV's.
- 3.4 Three Hauliers who have responded have identified the difficulty HGV's have turning right from Old Maltongate into the B1257 at Butcher Corner due to the tight radius often resulting in mounting the footway. Their other comments have been –
- HGV's are being forced to use unsuitable roads
 - HGV's still need to travel through the centre of Malton.
 - Increased travel time and transport costs.
- 3.5 Other comments received were in relation to the impact on the surrounding villages caused by the re-routing of HGVs.
- 3.6 129 Responses were received to the on-line consultation (1% of the population of Malton/Norton). Of these 33 were in favour of the restriction being made permanent and 96 against. Of the 96 against the restriction 24 (25%) were from the area around Highfield Road/Pasture Lane.

4.0 Re-Consultation

- 4.1 The proposal was re-advertised on 4 December 2019 and the objection period ended on 27 December 2019. No objections have been received to the advertisement of the permanent Order.
- 4.2 Key stakeholders were advised that their previous responses to the making of a permanent Order would be taken into account and no further response was necessary unless there was a change of view.
- 4.3 The only key stakeholder who objected to the previous consultation to make the Order permanent was County Councillor Keane Duncan. However, no grounds were presented with the objection. Councillor Duncan has been invited to attend this meeting.

5.0 Officers Response

- 5.1 The Officers response to those objections to the proposal to make the Experimental Order permanent were outlined in the previous Report contained in Appendix 1 and these are included here in paragraphs 5.2 to 5.6 again for reference.
- 5.2 The experimental weight limit should not be considered in isolation but must be included as part of a bigger picture in terms of the planned increase in rail services in the town and any potential alterations to the operation of the existing highway network.
- 5.3 In terms of HGV impact on the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at Butcher Corner. Whilst no exceedances of the annual mean NO₂ objective have occurred within the Malton AQMA for the last three years, which includes a period before the weight restriction was introduced, Ryedale District Council have stated that they intend to keep the AQMA under review. This is due to the anticipated increases in queuing related congestion at the level crossing as a consequence of the proposed doubling of the rail service.
- 5.4 Whilst it is acknowledged that the experimental weight restriction has created some issues elsewhere on the network, its contribution towards improvements to air quality, particularly on Wheelgate and Castlegate cannot be ignored. To revoke the weight restriction before the implications of the increased rail service have been fully appraised could be considered premature.
- 5.5 However, the issues which have been raised surrounding the HGV restriction, such as HGV vehicles being displaced onto unsuitable routes are also important points to consider.
- 5.6 An extension to the existing experimental weight limit may have been considered the most practical solution in order that the impact of the increase in rail service on the highway network can be fully appraised. However, it is not possible to extend an experimental weight restriction order past the date it expires. It must either be revoked or made permanent.
- 5.7 Taking everything into consideration, the recommendation to the NYCC Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services and the BES Executive Members is that a permanent Order is made but on the understanding that it will remain under review. A further decision as to whether or not the restriction should remain in force will be taken when the implications of the increased rail service are fully appreciated

6.0 Equalities

- 6.1 Consideration has been given to the potential for any equality impacts arising from the recommendation. It is the view of officers that the recommendation does not have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010 and an Equalities Impact Assessment Screening form is attached in Appendix 3.

7.0 Finance

- 7.1 The cost of making and advertising the Traffic Regulation Order is estimated at approximately £300.

8.0 Legal

- 8.1 The Council has powers under Sections 1(1), 2(1), 2(2), 2(4) and 3(2) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and Part IV of Schedule 9 to the 1984 Act to make a permanent Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to prohibit any heavy commercial vehicle (ie, any goods vehicle which has an operating weight exceeding 7.5 tonnes) from driving along any road or length of road, except for certain permitted purposes (including exemptions for permit holders) which include the conveyance of goods/access to or from premises situated on or adjacent to any of those roads or for the garaging, servicing or repairing of a vehicle at premises accessible from and only from any of those roads.
- 8.2 The process for the consideration of objections to traffic regulation orders was approved by the Executive on 29 April 2014 and County Council on 21 May 2014. The consideration of objections to Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) is now a matter for the Executive and the role of the Area Constituency Committee is changed to a consultative role on wide area impact TROs. The consideration of objections has been delegated by the Executive to the Corporate Director of Business and Environmental Services (BES) in consultation with BES Executive Members. The decision-making process relates to the provision and regulation of parking places both off and on the highway where an objection is received from any person or body entitled under the relevant statute. A wide area impact TRO is classed as a proposal satisfying all three criteria set out below:
- The proposal affects more than one street or road and,
 - The proposal affects more than one community and,
 - The proposal is located within the ward of more than one County Councillor.
 - This proposal is not considered to be a wide area impact TRO therefore.
- 8.3 In recommending the implementation of the proposed TRO, officers consider that it will preserve or improve the amenities of the area through which the road runs and enable the County Council to comply with its duty under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 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. A copy of the Statement of Reasons for the TRO is contained in Appendix 4.
- 8.4 Where an Order has been made (sealed), if any person wishes to question the validity of the Order or any of its provisions on the grounds that it or they are not within the powers conferred by the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, or that any requirement of the 1984 Act or of any instrument made under the 1984 Act has not been complied with, they may apply to the High Court within 6 weeks from the date on which the Order is made.
- 8.5 The relevant local member has been provided with a copy of this report and has been invited to the meeting on 24 January 2020.

9.0 Recommendations

- 9.1 A 7.5T weight restriction at Norton Level Crossing is made by making a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the objectors are notified of the decision within 14 days of the Order being made.
- 9.2 The weight limit is reviewed again following the increase to the rail service in Malton and a review of the consequent impact on traffic flows and Air Quality.

BARRIE MASON
Assistant Director
Highways & Transportation

Author of Report: Tim Coyne

Background Documents: Responses to the Experimental Order are held in the scheme file held by the Kirby Misperton Area 4 Highways Office.

North Yorkshire County Council
Business and Environmental Services

Executive Members

26 July 2019

Experimental 7.5T Weight Restriction – Norton Level Crossing

Report of the Assistant Director – Highways and Transportation

1.0 Purpose Of Report

- 1.1 The purpose of the report is to advise the Corporate Director, Business and Environmental Services (BES) and the BES Executive Members with;
- information on the impact of the Experimental 7.5T Weight Restriction at Norton Level Crossing which has been in force since February 2018 and is due to expire in August 2019.
 - the outcome following public and stakeholder consultation in regard to whether or not the Order should be made permanent when it expires.
 - and for a decision to be made whether or not the weight restriction order should be made permanent in view of the information provided
- 1.2 The Corporate Director, BES and the BES Executive Members decision is sought regarding the recommended option.

2.0 Background

- 2.1 On 9 February 2018 an Order was made for the prohibition of heavy commercial vehicles with an operating weight exceeding 7.5 tonnes at Norton Level Crossing for an experimental period of eighteen months.
- 2.2 The experimental weight limit Order cannot be extended in time or amended in any way. It must be made permanent or revoked.
- 2.3 While the statutory six month period for objecting to the indefinite continuation of the Order expired, NYCC agreed to take any further representations up to 1 May 2019.
- 2.4 An on-line consultation via the NYCC website has also taken place between the 3 and 24 May 2019 which sought public views and reasons as to whether or not the weight limit should be made permanent.
- 2.5 The views were also sought from key stakeholders such as, Ryedale DC, Town Councils, Local Members, Parish Councils, Haulage Operators, Emergency Services and Network Rail.
- 2.6 The location of Norton Level Crossing is shown on Plan 1

3.0 Consultation Responses

- 3.1 A total of 18 responses in the form of objections to the Order were received to the weight restriction.

- 3.2 The main issue raised is the impact of the HGV Traffic which has been displaced onto Highfield Road/Pasture Lane with 12 of 18 responses raising concerns which can be summarised as follows –
- Detrimental impact on the two primary schools (pollution, noise pollution, road safety, intimidation)
 - Narrowness of road at the Old Malton end causing blockages and undesirable reversing movements back onto Old Malton Road.
 - Traffic jams as HGV's have difficulty manoeuvring around parked cars particularly at the start and end of the school day.
 - Damage to the road.
 - Detrimental impact on residential properties (pollution and noise pollution when HGV's rattle over the speed humps)
 - Damage to residential properties caused by the vibrations of HGV's as they rattle over the speed humps.
 - Difficulty for resident's crossing over the road due to increased numbers of HGV's.
 - Speed of HGV's.
- 3.3 Three Hauliers who have responded have identified the difficulty HGV's have turning right from Old Maltongate into the B1257 at Butcher Corner due to the tight radius often resulting in mounting the footway. Their other comments have been –
- HGV's are being forced to use unsuitable roads e.g. Highfield Road and the roads through Settrington and Scagglethorpe.
 - The restriction defeats the object in terms of air quality as HGV's still need to travel through the centre of Malton.
 - Increased travel time and transport costs.
 - HGV's are now one of the lowest polluting vehicles on the road.
- 3.4 Other comments received identify the following issues –
- Detrimental impact on Harton Village and the Howsham and Brasenthwaite bridges.
 - Quarry traffic having a detrimental impact on Welham Hill/Moor Hill through Burythorpe then Westow and Howsham.
 - Detrimental impact on roads through Settrington and Scagglethorpe.
 - Increase in traffic on Scarborough Road.
- 3.5 129 Responses were received to the on-line consultation (1% of the population of Malton/Norton). Of these 33 were in favour of the restriction being made permanent and 96 against. Of the 96 against the restriction 24 (25%) were from the area around Highfield Road/Pasture Lane.
- 3.6 The responses from stakeholders and the on-line consultation are summarised in Appendix A.
- 4.0 Enforcement**
- 4.1 The weight restriction has been monitored by the NYCC Trading Standards Team. The monitoring regime has been over and above any monitoring undertaken elsewhere in the County. The Trading Standards Team have had to divert staff from other duties to provide an enhanced programme of monitoring at the crossing.
- 4.2 To date there have been 36 prosecutions for contravening the restriction.

5.0 Air Quality

- 5.1 Information provided by Ryedale District Council identifies that concentrations of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) levels at all monitoring sites within the Air Quality Management Area (AQMA) at Butcher Corner have shown a general downward trend since 2012/13.
- 5.2 Monitoring of NO₂ levels during 2018 has demonstrated that:
- The health-based annual mean NO₂ objective of 40 micrograms per cubic metre (µg/m³) was not exceeded at any monitoring location.
 - The highest annual mean concentration of NO₂ was 33 µg/m³ on Wheelgate and Yorkersgate.
 - 7 locations monitored lower concentrations in 2018 than in 2017. The greatest improvement was seen on Wheelgate, where there was a 15% reduction in annual mean NO₂ concentration between 2017 and 2018. Minor increases in NO₂ were observed at Old Maltongate and Yorkersgate, where levels increased by 3% and 9% respectively. On average, concentrations of NO₂ decreased by 4% across the AQMA.
 - The number of exceedances of the annual mean NO₂ objective in the AQMA has gradually fallen between 2012 and 2018 (7 exceedances in 2012, 3 in 2013, 2 in 2014, 1 in 2015 and no exceedances in 2016, 2017 or 2018).
 - Although there have been no exceedances since 2015, Ryedale District Council have stated that they intend to keep the AQMA under review. This is due to the anticipated increases in queuing related congestion at the level crossing as a consequence of the proposed doubling of the rail service.

6.0 Traffic Flows

- 6.1 Traffic surveys have been undertaken on a 3 monthly basis since the Order was implemented.
- 6.2 Impact on Butcher Corner
- 6.2.1 Flows along Yorkersgate have remained more or less constant during the Order period. The likely reason could be due to the fact that the weight restriction has not caused HGV traffic to significantly re-route, it has just required HGV's to travel straight ahead onto Old Maltongate instead of turning right onto Castlegate.
- 6.2.2 Old Maltongate has shown an increase in HGV traffic both directions, (11% towards town, 28% out of town). The likely reason could be that HGV traffic at Butcher Corner can no longer turn into Castlegate from Yorkersgate or Wheelgate. Also, Old Malton Road/Old Maltongate is the alternative route into Malton from the A64 instead of travelling over the level crossing and via Castlegate.
- 6.2.3 Flows on Wheelgate have shown a reduction in both directions, (49% into town, 58% out of town). This is likely due to HGV vehicles which would usually travel south towards Butcher Corner and onto Castlegate, re-routing along Pasture Lane/Highfield Road to access Old Malton Road and the A64. Similarly HGV vehicles which would usually enter Wheelgate from Castlegate are likely diverting along Highfield Road/Pasture Lane from Old Malton Road to avoid making a tight right turn at Butcher Corner.
- 6.2.4 Flows on Castlegate have fluctuated over the period of the restriction. HGV traffic appears to have decreased southbound towards the level crossing (50%). However, travelling north towards Butcher Corner surveys have only recently shown an identifiable decrease in HGV vehicles (15%). Trading Standards have also reported that over recent weeks recently there has been an identifiable decrease in infringements at the level crossing.

6.2.5 The increase in HGV traffic on the Old Maltongate arm of the AQMA is offset by the reductions on Wheelgate. Whilst there has been a reduction in HGV traffic heading south on Castlegate from the AQMA, HGV traffic heading north has only recently shown a reduction. With HGV traffic on Yorkersgate being largely consistent, it appears that the overall impact of the experimental Order is only now showing a reduction in HGV traffic on the roads adjacent to the AQMA.

6.3 Impact on other routes in Malton/Norton.

6.3.1 Highfield Road/Pasture Lane

Counts undertaken in September 2018 and December 2018 showed a significant increase in HGV traffic along this route (24% increase). However it must be borne in mind that Taylor Wimpey and Linden Homes are undertaking significant residential development off Pasture Lane, there has also been an extension to the Primary School. Many of the HGV trips along this route are likely contributable to construction traffic, particularly in relation to the significant off-site highway improvement works which were undertaken. The latest counts indicated an increase of just 2% over the baseline data. This may be a result of the off-site highway works being complete.

6.3.2 Welham Road

Counts have revealed a reduction (33%) of HGV traffic heading north towards the level crossing and an increase (12%) of HGV traffic heading south away from the level crossing.

6.3.3 Church Street

Counts have revealed a reduction in HGV traffic along this section of road (16% fewer travelling towards Castlegate and 8% fewer heading away from the junction).

7.0 **Other considerations**

7.1 Rail service frequencies are due to increase to two trains per hour in each direction from December 2019, therefore doubling the number of trains stopping in Malton each hour. This will result in the level crossing barriers being down for a greater overall duration across the hour which has the potential to create significant queuing, impacting on journey times, creating congestion and resulting delay.

7.2 The recent Malton & Norton Infrastructure and Connectivity Study identifies a set of priority interventions that could potentially be taken forward to reduce levels of congestion within the two towns. This included an “Internal Junction and Traffic Signal Strategy”, to look at the impact of measures to change how the road network currently operates. There is also the need to fully understand the impact of the increase in rail usage, and related traffic growth, on the network performance of the two towns. A micro simulation Traffic Model was identified as being necessary to accurately reflect the impact of such changes will have on the highway network.

7.3 At the time of writing the Traffic Model is approaching completion.

8.0 **Conclusion**

8.1 The experimental weight limit should not be considered in isolation but must be included as part of a bigger picture in terms of the planned increase in rail services and any potential alterations to the operation of the existing highway network.

8.2 The traffic model will be used to test alterations to the highway network and how these may affect HGV routing.

- 8.3 Whilst no exceedances of the annual mean NO₂ objective have occurred within the Malton AQMA for the last 3 years Ryedale District Council have stated that they intend to keep the AQMA under review. This is due to the anticipated increases in queuing related congestion at the level crossing as a consequence of the proposed doubling of the rail service.
- 8.4 Whilst it is acknowledged that the experimental weight restriction has created some issues elsewhere on the network its contribution towards improvements to air quality, particularly on Wheelgate and Castlegate cannot be ignored. To revoke the weight restriction before the implications of the increased rail service have been fully appraised could be considered premature.
- 8.5 However, the issues which have been raised surrounding the HGV restriction, such as HGV vehicles being displaced onto unsuitable routes are also important points to consider.
- 8.6 Taking the above considerations into account, an extension to the existing experimental weight limit may have been considered the most practical solution in order that the impact of the increase in rail service can be fully appraised. However, as stated in 2.2 above, it is not possible to extend the experimental weight restriction order past the date it is due to expire on 9th August 2019. It must either be revoked or made permanent.
- 8.7 It is therefore the view of officers that the Order should be made permanent but on the understanding that it will remain under review. A further decision as to whether or not the restriction should remain in force can then be taken when the implications of the increased rail service are fully appreciated.

9.0 Equalities

- 9.1 Consideration has been given to the potential for any equality impacts arising from the recommendation. It is the view of officers that the recommendation does not have an adverse impact on any of the protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010 and an Equalities Impact Assessment Screening form is attached in Appendix B.

10.0 Finance

- 10.1 The cost of making and advertising the Traffic Regulation Order is estimated at approximately £300 and this can be funded using existing allocated funding for Brambling Fields Complimentary Measures.

11.0 Legal

- 11.1 The Council has powers under Section 9(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to impose an Experimental Traffic Order to restrict the weight of vehicles passing a particular point in a street. An Experimental Traffic Order is like a permanent traffic order in that it is a legal document which imposes traffic and parking restrictions.
- 11.2 An Experimental Traffic Order cannot continue in force for longer than 18 months and any person may object within 6 months of the day on which the Order came into force.
- 11.3 The Council must follow the provisions set out under Regulation 22 of The Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 and if the Order is to be made permanent, Regulation 23 of the same. Regulation 23 specifies a shortened procedure for making an Order giving permanent effect to an Experimental Order, providing certain conditions are met. All conditions have been

met in this case, therefore the Council can proceed to make the proposed order without further consultation or giving Notice of Proposals, or inviting and considering further objections.

- 11.4 In the event that the BES Executive Members and the BES Corporate Director resolves to follow the recommendations contained in this report, then in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996, the County Council will be required to make the relevant Traffic Regulation Order and publish a notice of making the Order in the local press.
- 11.5 In recommending the implementation of the proposed TRO, officers consider that it will preserve or improve the amenities of the area through which the road runs and enable the County Council to comply with its duty under Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 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. A copy of the Statement of Reasons for the TRO is contained in Appendix C.

12.0 Recommendation(S)

12.1 It is recommended that the Corporate Director, BES, in consultation with the BES Executive Members approves that;

(i)The 7.5T weight restriction at Norton Level Crossing is made permanent by making a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

(ii)The weight limit is reviewed again following the increase to the rail service in Malton and a review of the consequent impact on traffic flows and Air Quality.

BARRIE MASON
Assistant Director Highways & Transportation

Author of Report: Tim Coyne

Background Documents: Responses to the Experimental Order are held in the scheme file held by the Kirby Misperton Area 4 Highways Office.

Norton Level Crossing - 7.5T Weight Restriction

02 July 2019



Scale 1 : 2179



Stakeholder Response

Consultee	Make Restriction Permanent	Additional Comments
Ryedald District Council	Yes	Discontinuation of the restriction could be premature due to the forthcoming increase in rail services. Any reconsideration of the restriction should not be carried out until air quality monitoring is undertaken post the introduction of the increased rail services.
Norton Town Council	Yes	Address problem affected areas, specifically Highfield Road.
Malton Town Council	Yes	Address negative impact on Highfield Road, Town Street, Old Maltongate, Pasture Lane and Yorkersgate.
Settrington Parish Council	No recommendation	Plans for development between Beverley Road and Norton Ind. Estate to include a "through road" Improve Brambling Fields roundabout to make more amenable to HGV's. Upgrade gritting route through the village to a P1 status. Assess strength of Settrington road bridge and consider weight limit.
Network Rail	Yes	
County Councillor Lindsay Burr	Yes	Improve signage and address issues on Highfield Road
County Councillor Keane Duncan	No	
NFU	No recommendation	Agricultural Vehicles not affected

On-Line Consultation

Against Making the Restriction Permanent	For Making the Restriction Permanent
96 (74%)	33 (26%)
Total Number of Respondents	- 129 (1% population of Malton/Norton)

Reasons Against Making the Restriction Permanent	
Impact on Highfield Road	51
Moved the problem elsewhere/unsuitable roads	26
Longer Routes for HGVs	13
No Improvement	15
HGVs now use Cleaner Fuel	8

Initial equality impact assessment screening form	
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.	
Directorate	Business and Environmental Services
Service area	Highways & Transportation
Proposal being screened	To make an Experimental Weight Restriction Order a permanent Order.
Officer(s) carrying out screening	Tim Coyne
What are you proposing to do?	An 18 month Experimental 7.5T Weight Restriction Order came into force in February 2018 at Norton Level Crossing. As the Order expires in August 2019 a decision has to be made as to whether the Order will be revoked or made permanent. The recommendation is that the Order is made permanent But that it continues to be reviewed.
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?	The restriction was sought to reduce the number of large vehicles in the Castlegate area in order to improve the air quality. Castlegate and the Butcher Corner area are covered by an Air Quality Management Plan. There has been a year on year improvement in Air Quality at Butcher Corner and the restriction may have contributed to this. However, there are other issues around the routes HGV's are using to avoid the restriction. The matter is complicated by a Network Rail proposal to double the frequency of train services at Malton Station after Christmas 2019. This will result in the barrier at the level crossing coming down twice every hour. The increased occurrence of vehicles queuing may have a detrimental effect on the Air Quality Management Area at Butcher Corner. Although the proposal is to make the Weight Restriction permanent it will be reviewed once the implications of the increased rail service are known.
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.	No
Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYCC's additional agreed characteristics	
As part of this assessment, please consider the following questions:	
<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 an 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	Potential for adverse impact		Don't know/No info available
	Yes	No	
Age		No	
Disability		No	
Sex		No	
Race		No	
Sexual orientation		No	
Gender reassignment		No	
Religion or belief		No	
Pregnancy or maternity		No	
Marriage or civil partnership		No	
NYCC additional characteristics			
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	The proposal is simply to make permanent a weight restriction which has been in force for 18 months. No other changes are proposed.		
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)	<i>Barrie Mason</i>		
Date	11/07/19		

**PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF 7.5T WEIGHT LIMIT AT NORTON LEVEL CROSSING
FOLLOWING OF EXPIRY OF TIME LIMIT OF EXPERIMENTAL ORDER.**

STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR PROPOSING TO MAKE THE ORDER

LEGAL POWERS AND DUTIES

Under Section 1(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 the County Council, as traffic authority for North Yorkshire, has powers to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) where it appears expedient to make it on one or more of the following grounds:-

- (a) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or
- (b) for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or
- (c) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or
- (d) for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property, or
- (e) (without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or
- (f) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs; or
- (g) for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of Section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality).

Section 122(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 also provides that it shall be the duty of every local authority upon whom functions are conferred by or under the 1984 Act so to exercise those functions 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.

REASONS FOR MAKING THE ORDER

The County Council considers that it is expedient to make this TRO on grounds (f) above, having taken into account its duty under Section 122(1) of the 1984 Act, for the following reasons:-

Location(s) of Proposed Order

Norton [Plan 1]

The introduction of a permanent order to restrict vehicles over 7.5T travelling over Norton Level Crossing is sought to reduce the number of large vehicles in the Castlegate area in order to improve the air quality. Castlegate and the Butcher Corner area are within an Air Quality Management Area. Local Authorities have an obligation under the Environment Act 1985 to try to improve air quality in an Air Quality Management Area.

Traffic Officer: Tim Coyne (Area 4 Highways, Kirby Misperton)

CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

Under the County Council's Constitution, the consideration of objections to a proposed TRO is delegated to the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services (BES) in consultation with the BES Executive Members. For each TRO where there are objections, it will be necessary to bring a report to the Corporate Director - BES and the BES Executive Members seeking a decision on the consideration of the objections. The report will include the views of the relevant local member who will also be invited to the meeting that considers the report. The Corporate Director - BES may wish to refer the matter to the Council's Executive for a final decision.

A report to the relevant Constituency Committee will only be necessary when there are objections to a wide area impact TRO.

A wide area impact TRO is defined as a proposal satisfying all of the three criteria set out below:

- The proposal affects more than one street or road and,
- The proposal affects more than one community and,
- The proposal is located within the ward of more than one County Councillor

The report will seek the views of the Constituency Committee and these views will then be included in a report to the Corporate Director - BES and the BES Executive Members seeking a decision on the consideration of the objections. The Corporate Director - BES may wish to refer the matter to the Executive for a final decision.

The existing arrangements for members of the public wishing to attend or speak at committee meetings will apply and it may be appropriate for the Corporate Director - BES to have his decision making meetings open to the public, so that the public and in particular those with objections, have the opportunity to put their views across directly.

N.B. The Corporate Director - BES has delegated powers to make decisions on TROs where there are no objections.

Reference Number: BES only - 26/19

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – Business and Environmental Services

DECISION RECORD

Experimental 7.5T Weight Restriction – Norton Level Crossing

The following decision has been taken: -

- a) The 7.5T weight restriction at Norton Level Crossing is made permanent by making a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- b) The weight limit is reviewed again following the increase to the rail service in Malton and a review of the consequent impact on traffic flows and Air Quality.

By whom: David Bowe, Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services in consultation with Executive Members, County Councillors Don Mackenzie and Andrew Lee

On: 26 July 2019

Reasons for decision: -

The experimental weight limit should not be considered in isolation but must be included as part of a bigger picture in terms of the planned increase in rail services and any potential alterations to the operation of the existing highway network.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the experimental weight restriction has created some issues elsewhere on the network its contribution towards improvements to air quality, particularly on Wheelgate and Castlegate cannot be ignored. To revoke the weight restriction before the implications of the increased rail service have been fully appraised could be considered premature.

Although an extension to the existing experimental weight limit may have been considered the most practical solution in order that the impact of the increase in rail service can be fully appraised, the Road Traffic Regulation Act does not allow such an extension.

Making the Order permanent will allow a further review of its impact to be undertaken when the implications of the increased rail service are fully appreciated.

Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: -

None.

Signed:

.....

Name: David Bowe

Directorate - Business and
Environmental Services

Note: This is not a key decision and therefore this decision record does not follow the publication procedures that "formal" decision records do and is just a record of the decision taken for BES.

Contact for further information: tim.coyne@northyorks.gov.uk

Contact for copy of report considered: area4.kirbymisperton@northyorks.gov.uk

Initial equality impact assessment screening form			
<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 & Transportation		
Proposal being screened	7.5T Weight Restriction Order		
Officer(s) carrying out screening	Tim Coyne		
What are you proposing to do?	Introduce a 7.5T Weight Restriction Order on Norton Level Crossing. With the proviso that it will be reviewed once the implications of the increased rail services through the town are known.		
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?	<p>The restriction is sought to reduce the number of large vehicles in the Castlegate area in order to improve the air quality. Castlegate and the Butcher Corner area are covered by an Air Quality Management Plan. There has been a year on year improvement in Air Quality at Butcher Corner and the restriction may have contributed to this. However, there are other issues around the routes HGV's are using to avoid the restriction. The matter is complicated by a Network Rail proposal to double the frequency of train services at Malton Station in May. This will increase the frequency of the barrier at the level crossing coming down. The increased occurrence of vehicles queuing may have a detrimental impact on the Air Quality Management Area at Butcher Corner. Although the proposal is to make the Weight Restriction permanent it will be reviewed once the implications of the increased rail service are known.</p>		
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.	No		
<p>Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYCC's additional agreed characteristics</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 an 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	Potential for adverse impact		Don't know/No info available
	Yes	No	
Age		No	
Disability		No	
Sex		No	
Race		No	
Sexual orientation		No	

Gender reassignment		No	
Religion or belief		No	
Pregnancy or maternity		No	
Marriage or civil partnership		No	
NYCC additional characteristics			
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	The proposal is to introduce a permanent order for a weight restriction which has previously been in force for 18 months. No other changes are proposed.		
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)	Barrie Mason		
Date	16/01/20		

PROPOSED INTRODUCTION OF 7.5T WEIGHT LIMIT AT NORTON LEVEL CROSSING

STATEMENT OF THE COUNCIL'S REASONS FOR PROPOSING TO MAKE THE ORDER

LEGAL POWERS AND DUTIES

Under Section 1(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 the County Council, as traffic authority for North Yorkshire, has powers to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) where it appears expedient to make it on one or more of the following grounds:-

- (h) for avoiding danger to persons or other traffic using the road or any other road or for preventing the likelihood of any such danger arising, or
- (i) for preventing damage to the road or to any building on or near the road, or
- (j) for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), or
- (k) for preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the existing character of the road or adjoining property, or
- (l) (without prejudice to the generality of paragraph (d) above) for preserving the character of the road in a case where it is specially suitable for use by persons on horseback or on foot, or
- (m) for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs; or
- (n) for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of Section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality).

Section 122(1) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 also provides that it shall be the duty of every local authority upon whom functions are conferred by or under the 1984 Act so to exercise those functions 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.

REASONS FOR MAKING THE ORDER

The County Council considers that it is expedient to make this TRO on grounds (f) and (g) above, having taken into account its duty under Section 122(1) of the 1984 Act, for the following reasons:-

The introduction of a permanent order to restrict vehicles over 7.5T travelling over Norton Level Crossing is sought to reduce the number of large vehicles in the Castlegate area in order to improve the air quality. Castlegate and the junction intersection (known as Butcher Corner) are within an Air Quality Management Area (AQMA). The roads in the AQMA are narrow and are lined with buildings. The area experiences regular queuing and congestion around Butcher Corner. Queuing is exacerbated by the level crossing just outside Malton Railway Station that causes traffic to back up into the AQMA. The rail service in Malton is planned to double in May 2020 which will result in the level crossing barrier being lowered twice as often as it is presently. Local Authorities have an obligation under the Environment Act 1985 to try to

improve air quality in an Air Quality Management Area. Reducing the number of large vehicles in this area will also improve the amenity of the travelling public in the area who choose to use non-vehicular modes.

Location(s) of Proposed Order

Norton Level Crossing [Appendix 1, Plan 1]

Traffic Officer: Tim Coyne (Area 4 Highways, Kirby Misperton)

CONSIDERATION OF OBJECTIONS

Under the County Council's Constitution, the consideration of objections to a proposed TRO is delegated to the Corporate Director - Business and Environmental Services (BES) in consultation with the BES Executive Members. For each TRO where there are objections, it will be necessary to bring a report to the Corporate Director - BES and the BES Executive Members seeking a decision on the consideration of the objections. The report will include the views of the relevant local member who will also be invited to the meeting that considers the report. The Corporate Director - BES may wish to refer the matter to the Council's Executive for a final decision.

A report to the relevant Constituency Committee will only be necessary when there are objections to a wide area impact TRO.

A wide area impact TRO is defined as a proposal satisfying all of the three criteria set out below:

- The proposal affects more than one street or road and,
- The proposal affects more than one community and,
- The proposal is located within the ward of more than one County Councillor

The report will seek the views of the Constituency Committee and these views will then be included in a report to the Corporate Director - BES and the BES Executive Members seeking a decision on the consideration of the objections. The Corporate Director - BES may wish to refer the matter to the Executive for a final decision.

The existing arrangements for members of the public wishing to attend or speak at committee meetings will apply and it may be appropriate for the Corporate Director - BES to have his decision making meetings open to the public, so that the public and in particular those with objections, have the opportunity to put their views across directly.

N.B. The Corporate Director - BES has delegated powers to make decisions on TROs where there are no objections.

Reference Number: BES only - 01/20

NORTH YORKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL – Business and Environmental Services

DECISION RECORD**7.5T Weight Restriction – Norton Level Crossing****The following decision has been taken: -**

- a) A 7.5T weight restriction at Norton Level Crossing is made permanent by making a Traffic Regulation Order under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- b) The weight limit is reviewed again following the increase to the rail service in Malton and a review of the consequent impact on traffic flows and Air Quality.

By whom: David Bowe, Corporate Director – Business and Environmental Services in consultation with Executive Members, County Councillors Don Mackenzie and Andrew Lee

On: 24 January 2020

Reasons for decision: -

The proposed weight limit should not be considered in isolation but must be included as part of a bigger picture in terms of the planned increase in rail services and any potential alterations to the operation of the existing highway network.

Whilst it is acknowledged that the previous experimental weight restriction created some issues elsewhere on the network its contribution towards improvements to air quality, particularly on Wheelgate and Castlegate cannot be ignored. To revoke the weight restriction before the implications of the increased rail service have been fully appraised could be considered premature.

Although an extension to the previous experimental weight limit may have been considered the most practical solution in order that the impact of the increase in rail service can be fully appraised, the Road Traffic Regulation Act does not allow such an extension.

Making a permanent Order will allow a further review of its impact to be undertaken when the implications of the increased rail service are fully appreciated.

Details of any alternative options considered and rejected: -

None.

Signed: 27.01.2020

Name: David Bowe

Note: This is not a key decision and therefore this decision record does not follow the publication procedures that “formal” decision records do and is just a record of the decision taken for BES.

Directorate - Business and Environmental Services

Contact for further information: tim.coyne@northyorks.gov.uk

Contact for copy of report considered: tricia.richards@northyorks.gov.uk

BES only – Decision Record 01/20 – 7.5T Weight Restriction – Norton Level Crossing/1

Initial equality impact assessment screening form			
<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	Environment		
Service area	Highways and Transportation, Parking Services, Street Scene, Parks and Grounds		
Proposal being screened	7.5t weight restriction on Norton Level Crossing		
Officer(s) carrying out screening	Tim Coyne		
What are you proposing to do?	To review the weight restriction on Norton Level Crossing in terms of the impact on Air Quality within the Malton Air Quality Management Area.		
Why are you proposing this? What are the desired outcomes?	The weight restriction came into force on 17 October 2010. It is considered appropriate to review the impact of the weight restriction against the continued general downward trend of nitrogen dioxide (NO ₂) at all monitoring sites within the Air Quality Management Area.		
Does the proposal involve a significant commitment or removal of resources? Please give details.	No		
<p>Impact on people with any of the following protected characteristics as defined by the Equality Act 2010, or NYCC's additional agreed characteristics</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 an 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	Potential for adverse impact		Don't know/No info available
	No	Yes	
Age	No		
Disability	No		
Sex	No		
Race	No		
Sexual orientation	No		
Gender reassignment	No		
Religion or belief	No		
Pregnancy or maternity	No		
Marriage or civil partnership	No		
NYCC additional characteristics			
People in rural areas	No		

Appendix C

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:	X	Continue to full EIA:
Reason for decision	The reduced scheme should not create significant negative impacts on people with protected characteristics.		
Signed (Assistant Director or equivalent)	Barrie Mason		
Date	05/02/2024		

Climate change impact assessment

The purpose of this assessment is to help us understand the likely impacts of our decisions on the environment of North Yorkshire and on our aspiration to achieve net carbon neutrality by 2030, or as close to that date as possible. The intention is to mitigate negative effects and identify projects which will have positive effects.

This document should be completed in consultation with the supporting guidance. The final document will be published as part of the decision making process and should be written in Plain English.

If you have any additional queries which are not covered by the guidance please email climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk

Please note: You may not need to undertake this assessment if your proposal will be subject to any of the following:

Planning Permission
Environmental Impact Assessment
Strategic Environmental Assessment

However, you will still need to summarise your findings in in the summary section of the form below.

Please contact climatechange@northyorks.gov.uk for advice.

Title of proposal	Weight Restriction Review – Norton Level Crossing
Brief description of proposal	To review the weight restriction on Norton Level Crossing in terms of the impact on Air Quality within the Malton Air Quality Management Area
Directorate	Environment
Service area	Highways and Transportation
Lead officer	Tim Coyne
Names and roles of other people involved in carrying out the impact assessment	None
Date impact assessment started	30/01/2024

Options appraisal

Were any other options considered in trying to achieve the aim of this project? If so, please give brief details and explain why alternative options were not progressed.

None appropriate.

What impact will this proposal have on council budgets? Will it be cost neutral, have increased cost or reduce costs?

Please explain briefly why this will be the result, detailing estimated savings or costs where this is possible.

The cost of undertaking the review will be funded from ring fenced Section 106 monies for accrued for the purposes of addressing air quality/traffic issues in Malton & Norton.

Appendix D

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</p>	<p>Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>No impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes over and above business as usual Evidence or measurement of effect Figures for CO₂e Links to relevant documents 	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>
<p>Minimise greenhouse gas emissions e.g. reducing emissions from travel, increasing energy efficiencies etc.</p>	Emissions from travel	X				
	Emissions from construction	X				
	Emissions from running of buildings	X				
	Other	X				
<p>Minimise waste: Reduce, reuse, recycle and compost e.g. reducing use of single use plastic</p>		X				
<p>Reduce water consumption</p>		X				
<p>Minimise pollution (including air, land, water, light and noise)</p>		X				

Appendix D

<p>How will this proposal impact on the environment?</p> <p>N.B. There may be short term negative impact and longer term positive impact. Please include all potential impacts over the lifetime of a project and provide an explanation.</p>	<p>Positive impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>No impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>Negative impact (Place a X in the box below where relevant)</p>	<p>Explain why will it have this effect and over what timescale?</p> <p>Where possible/relevant please include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Changes over and above business as usual Evidence or measurement of effect Figures for CO₂e Links to relevant documents 	<p>Explain how you plan to mitigate any negative impacts.</p>	<p>Explain how you plan to improve any positive outcomes as far as possible.</p>
<p>Ensure resilience to the effects of climate change e.g. reducing flood risk, mitigating effects of drier, hotter summers</p>		<p>X</p>				
<p>Enhance conservation and wildlife</p>		<p>X</p>				
<p>Safeguard the distinctive characteristics, features and special qualities of North Yorkshire's landscape</p>		<p>X</p>				
<p>Other (please state below)</p>		<p>X</p>				

Are there any recognised good practice environmental standards in relation to this proposal? If so, please detail how this proposal meets those standards.

N/A

Summary Summarise the findings of your impact assessment, including impacts, the recommendation in relation to addressing impacts, including any legal advice, and next steps. This summary should be used as part of the report to the decision maker.

The proposed data review will not have an impact on the Environment.

Sign off section

This climate change impact assessment was completed by:

Name	Tim Coyne
Job title	Improvement Manager
Service area	Highways & Transportation
Directorate	Environment
Signature	
Completion date	30/01/2024

Authorised by relevant Assistant Director (signature): Barrie Mason

Date: 05/02/2024