

<b>EXECUTIVE MEMBER RESPONSE TO THE INVESTIGATION INTO TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS</b>	
<b>NAME OF INVESTIGATION: TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS (TRO's)</b>  <b>CHAIRMAN: TERRY HONE</b> <b>EXECUTIVE MEMBER: TERRY DOURIS</b>  <b>SCRUTINY OFFICER: CHARLES WEIR</b>	<b>DATE OF SCRUTINY: 16<sup>TH</sup> JULY 2015</b>
	<b>DATE REPORT PUBLISHED: 1<sup>st</sup> September 2015</b>
	<b>DATE OF RESPONSE RETURNED: 13<sup>th</sup> November 2015</b>
<b>Recommendations:</b> e.g. To undertake a customer survey in the Autumn of 2015	<b>Outcomes/further action:</b> e.g. To carry out the survey in September 2015
2.1 For Environment Department to investigate speeding up the TRO process by: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The removal of the additional 7 days allowed for postal delays.</li> <li>• Setting a time of 2 months for engineers to review and negotiate the objections for TROs.</li> <li>• Setting an advisory guideline for one month beyond the 2 month period given to the engineer, for the reviewing officer to negotiate</li> </ul>	Agreed  Agree in principle to a target of 2 months, noting that the law allows up to 2 years for a scheme to be finally sealed.  Agree subject to the comments above

<p>with an objector.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Making sealing more readily available than once a week. (Conclusion 4.1)</li> </ul>	<p>Sealing more frequently will gain little and potentially put unnecessary pressure upon the legal team and should not impact on booking of space in the relevant media.</p>
<p>2.2 For Environment to create parameters and guidelines for members to deal with objections and proposals for TROs. (Conclusion 4.2)</p>	<p>Agreed, would suggest that officers contact Broxbourne Borough Council to benefit from their experience</p>
<p>2.3 For TROs promoted at the Members' discretion i.e. Highways Locality Budget (HLB), for Environment Department to look at ways of encouraging members to take on board residents aspirations before commencing informal/formal consultation so as to maximise the opportunity to address those aspirations during the legal process. (Conclusion 4.3)</p>	<p>Whilst I accept this and additionally would promote the idea of the development of a self-help pack, members should be positively encouraged to seek the input from those affected prior to the commencement of the process to minimise the potential for changes and delays during the TRO process.</p>
<p>2.4 For the Environment Department look at the costs incurred outside of the TRO team and provide a breakdown of the project costs involved in 6 HLB scenarios which will then be assessed for acceptability and to look into where reductions in costs can be made. (Conclusion 4.4)</p>	<p>I am keen to minimise the costs of TRO's but I accept that every situation has the potential to be different. That said, I have asked officers to produce a set of 6 scenarios which will provide an indication of costs.</p>

<p>2.5 For the Executive Member to lobby the LGA and write to the minister requesting that all legal restrictions on TROs be removed including the requirement to advertise in newspapers. (Conclusion 4.5)</p>	<p>I am concerned that the recommendation as written could create a number of un-intended consequences. Whilst I am happy to write to the LGA and the Minister in the same way that we have written before to request that the obligation to advertise in newspapers be removed I do not believe that it would be appropriate to request the abolition of all legal requirements.</p>
<p><b>Do you have any other comments on the report or scrutiny?</b></p>	<p>I feel that this has been a positive and helpful exercise and I am pleased that I have been broadly able to accede to the majority of the recommendations.</p>