

# Report to Deputy Leader & Cabinet Member for Transportation

---

**Decision to be taken on or after 27 June 2018**

**Decision can normally be implemented at least  
3 working days after decision has been signed.**

**Cabinet Member Report No. T12.18**

<b>Title:</b>	<b>Roberts Lane, Chalfont St Peter - Prohibition Of Motor Vehicles</b>
<b>Date:</b>	19 June 2018
<b>Author:</b>	Mark Averill, Head of Highways
<b>Contact officer:</b>	Scott White, <a href="mailto:t-scwhite@buckscc.org">t-scwhite@buckscc.org</a> , 01296 382416
<b>Local members affected:</b>	Chalfont St Peter;

*For press enquiries concerning this report, please contact the media office on 01296 382444*

## Summary

Recommendation to implement prohibition of motor vehicles following concerns that the creation of temporary haul roads alongside the M25 at Chalfont St Peter, and the closure of Chalfont Lane could increase traffic on the narrow Roberts Lane.

## Recommendation

**That the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Transportation;**

- **Overrules the objections, as detailed in this report**
- **Approves the making of the Traffic Regulation Order as for Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on Roberts Lane, Chalfont St Peter.**
- **Instructs TfB to inform the responders to the statutory consultation of the decision and implement the traffic regulation order and associated works.**

## **A. Narrative setting out the reasons for the decision**

- A.1 The requirement for the closure of Roberts Lane to through traffic has come from a concern in the community that the construction of the new HS2 haul road beside the M25 and the closure of Chalfont Lane will cause additional traffic to use Roberts Lane. To prevent this, HS2 have provided an assurance of £185,000 to close Roberts Lane to through traffic.
- A.2 The objective is to close Roberts Lane to through traffic and provide a turning circle or appropriate facility for turning at the closure point, large enough to accommodate refuse vehicles.
- A.3 No access is to be maintained through the road other than for pedestrians. The Order does not prevent direct vehicular access from a public road to any property.
- A.4 The road is proposed to be closed from a point 137m north of West Hyde Lane for distance of 235m. Refer to drawing TEE17021/PLN/02 in Appendix 1.
- A.5 Negotiations are on-going with the private land owner for the potential provision of a turning head on the western side of Roberts Lane to the north of the closure.
- A.6 There is currently a turning area at the entrance to the single property access at the southern end of the proposed closure; therefore no further turning provision is proposed at this end.

## **B. Other options available, and their pros and cons**

- B.1 No alternative other than to keep road open.

## **C. Resource implications**

- C.1 HS2 have provided an assurance of £185,000 to close Roberts Lane to through traffic. Land acquisition for the Provision of a turning head is currently being negotiated with landowner.

## **D. Value for Money (VfM) Self Assessment**

- D.1 Sign installation work will be carried out by Transport for Buckinghamshire.

## **E. Legal implications**

- E.1 A statutory consultation was carried out in accordance with The Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996.
- E.2 If approved, this key decision will be the authority for Legal Services to 'seal' the TRO's and advertise the Notice of Making in the local press in accordance with the Procedure Regulations. The order is to be made under Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and in accordance with the 1996 Regulations

## **F. Property implications**

- F.1 The prohibition of motor vehicles is contained within the current highway extents.
- F.2 Note, further land negotiations are ongoing to the potential provision of a turning head. [This should outline property implications, if any, with regard to the decision and should indicate that advice has been sought from Property Services.]

## G. Other implications/issues

G.1 Equality and Diversity Issues – ease of access affected for residents in either direction on Roberts Lane – see comments within Consultation section below.

G.2 No other issues.

## H. Feedback from consultation, Local Area Forums and Local Member views

H.1 Early informal consultation has been carried out with the residents of Roberts Lane, County Cllr David Martin, Chiltern District Council and Chalfont St Peter Parish Council. To date the community have supported the decision to close the road to through traffic and have no objections to the proposed location of the closure and turning points.

H.2 Through early informal consultation, the emergency services have also been informed and they have confirmed they will not require through access along Roberts Lane.

H.3 A statutory consultation was undertaken from 3 May to 24 May 2018. Full details of the content and advertisement of the statutory consultation are contained within Appendix 1.

H.4 There were 17 responses to the Statutory Consultation as follows:

- 13 agreed with the proposal (76%)
- 3 objected to the proposal and provided grounds for objection (18%)
- 1 objected to the scheme, but did not provide relevant grounds (objection to HS2) and therefore has been discounted (8%).

H.5 Comments arising from the objections include:

- Concern that refuse vehicles and other vehicles would not be able to turn (Chiltern District Council) (x1)  
**TfB Response:** *Refuse vehicles currently are reported to turn in the existing highway and available accesses without provision of turning head. Provision of an adequate turning head to accommodate large vehicles including refuse vehicles is being considered pending land acquisition.*
- Comment that there are no traffic concerns (Residents). (x2)  
**TfB Response:** *Significant concerns raised by public to County Councillor and majority in agreement for proposed restriction.*
- Concern for access by emergency services (Resident) (x1).  
**TfB Response:** *Emergency services were contacted in both informal consultation and statutory consultation and no objections received. The order does not prevent vehicular access from a public road to any property.*
- Concern for encouraging fly-tipping (Resident) (x1).  
**TfB Response:** *The most remote locations would be closed off from motor vehicles under the proposals.*
- Concern that the proposals will disadvantage the two traveller communities at the southern end of Roberts Lane; both in terms of ease of access and also driving horse and traps along Roberts Lane (Resident) (x1).  
**TfB Response:** *The additional distance from one end of Roberts Lane to the other is approximately 2km via West Hyde Lane, Denham Lane and Rickmansworth Lane.*

H.6 Buckinghamshire County Council Rights of Way and also representative from British Driving Society Rights of Way Officer for Beds, Bucks and Herts have both responded to the statutory consultation requesting the provision of Kent Carriage Gaps instead of gateways to allow access for horse carriage drivers along Roberts Lane.

**TfB Response:** *There is insufficient width in the highway for the provision of a separate wider public access gateway or Kent Carriage Gap to the side of a vehicle barrier. Therefore any gateway/barrier provision is required to be located directly across the carriageway. A Kent Carriage Gap in the direct line of the current highway as the height of the barrier/bollard would be relatively low and less conspicuous compared with a gateway. Therefore due to safety concerns, particularly at night along this length of unlit highway, a gateway is preferred. An advanced gateway warning sign and reflective banding on the gate are also proposed.*

H.7 County Cllr David Martin has confirmed his agreement with the proposed scheme based upon his discussions with the Parish Council and local residents. Prior to the public consultation he stated:

*“We should close the road without further delay and continue with the negotiations to purchase the land for the turning area; then install it later.*

*Whether we install a turning area or not, CDC refuse lorries will continue to drive into the Barns to collect the rubbish, then reverse out, turning to enable exiting the same way they came in, never using the proposed turning area anyway. Most other lorries would be able to three point turn at the gate to the field; and in the unlikely event that anything larger, like a six axle artic had to drive up the lane for some reason, it would have to reverse out – which would probably have to happen anyway even after the turning area is installed.*

*The gate and the turning circle are not interdependent; they can be installed at different times.”*

H.8 No comments were received from other statutory consultees.

## **I. Communication issues**

I.1 Those who responded to the consultation and provided contact details will be informed of the final decision and an update will be added to the web page.

## **J. Progress Monitoring**

J.1 Following a decision on this report, the implementation of the scheme will commence with the making and advertising of the order and required signing/gateway works.

## **K. Review**

K.1 None

---

## **Background Papers**

None

## **Appendices to Report:**

Appendix 1 - Consultation details, letter, plan, Notice and statement of reasons

---

## **Your questions and views**

*If you have any questions about the matters contained in this paper please get in touch with the Contact Officer whose telephone number is given at the head of the paper.*

*If you have any views on this paper that you would like the Cabinet Member to consider, or if you wish to object to the proposed decision, please inform the Democratic Services Team by 5.00pm on 26 June 2018. This can be done by telephone (to 01296 382343), or e-mail to [democracy@buckscc.gov.uk](mailto:democracy@buckscc.gov.uk)*