

DERBYSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

**MEETING OF CABINET MEMBER – JOBS, ECONOMY AND
TRANSPORT**

15 April 2014

Report of the Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Environment

**REPORT INTO THE PROVISION OF PROTECTIVE ENTRANCE
MARKINGS**

(1) **Purpose of the Report** To bring before the Cabinet Member for consideration the report into the provision of Protective Entrance Markings (PEMs).

(2) **Information and Analysis**

Background

The access protection marking was first introduced in the Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 1994 with the diagram number 1026.1. The marking, extending no more than 1 metre either side of the dropped kerb, has no legal force and is intended as an advisory marking only. Chapter 5 of the Traffic Signs Manual emphasises the need to ensure that this is only used sparingly and recommends against using excessively long markings or over-providing as this would bring them into disrepute and compromise their effectiveness.

The County Council will install private entrance markings if a resident pays the charge for the road marking, currently £97.78.

Officer Comments

Since its introduction in 1994, diagram number 1026.1 has been used in different ways by different authorities. Some have adopted a policy of non-provision for private driveways, others charge for their provision and some use them to protect each driveway in a street. The most common requests involve obstructive parking and difficulty using an access. These cases and the effectiveness of PEMs are listed below.

- i) Obstructive parking across the access – this is an offence which the Police have powers to deal with. Civil Enforcement officers are also able to issue Penalty Charge Notices if a dropped kerb area is obstructed. If

Public

the access is already obvious to the driver then it is questionable whether the markings would influence their choice to park across it.

- ii) Obscured visibility when using the access – the markings should not extend more than 1 metre either side of the access and so could not be used to improve this type of situation.

Additionally, the provision of PEMs creates added assets on the highway. The initial cost to the applicant does not include any provision for re-laying the marking should it fade, which introduces an element of future maintenance costs. These can be difficult to determine as the type and frequency of traffic using the access will vary from site to site. The provision of the markings to highlight private driveways can also be said to contribute to clutter on the highway.

The cost breakdown applies to a straightforward PEM application, which most are. However, there are occasions where extra staff time has been required, in some cases to process the works order, in others to ensure the payment of the fee prior to works. Each time this occurs it represents a cost to the Authority which is not recovered.

In conclusion, the provision of PEMs for private accesses should be discontinued for the reasons listed above. Applications received up until 31 March 2014 should still be processed, but no more should be considered after that date.

The County Council does occasionally provide markings to diagram number 1026.1 to highlight dropped kerb/dropped crossings provided for pedestrians if there is a problem with the area being obstructed by motorists. It is not proposed to change this, as the markings help pedestrians by keeping dropped kerbs clear of obstructive parking.

(3) **Financial Considerations** No longer providing the markings for private entrances will save the Authority money in terms of staff time and future maintenance.

In preparing this report the relevance of the following factors has been considered: prevention of crime and disorder, equality and diversity, human resources, environmental, health, property and transport considerations.

(4) **Key Decision** No.

(5) **Call-In** Is it required that call-in be waived in respect of the decisions proposed in the report? No.

Public

(6) **Background Papers** None. Officer contact details – Dan O'Neill, extension 38166.

(7) **OFFICER'S RECOMMENDATIONS** That:

- 7.1 The County Council no longer installs Protective Entrance Markings for private accesses.
- 7.2 The County Council will continue to install diagram number 1026.1 to highlight dropped kerb areas provided for pedestrians to counteract problems caused by obstructive parking.

Mike Ashworth
Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Environment