Information obtained via the Information Commissioners Office following Freedom of Information request by BGPC

Background

20.08.20 BGPC receive email from LCC proposing a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for double yellow lines on Silver Street outside the Post Office

18.09.20 BGPC respond following consideration at the Full Council Meeting;

'BGPC support any road safety measures proposal in our area, however the council have concerns over the proposal for Silver Street as it is currently drawn up. It must be noted that the proposal will also remove two parking spaces on a layby.

'BGPC would very much welcome the opportunity to have an open and constructive dialogue with LCC Highways and for our local knowledge to be heard and applied, in order to improve the current situation for local residents.'

21.09.20 As a TRO can only be requested by either a parish council, a county councillor or to address a history of traffic incidents, LCC advise BGPC that the request did not come from a member of the public. Unfortunately the subsequent ICO investigation provides no evidence of a history of traffic incidents and BGPC has not requested the TRO, therefore this means that the lines were proposed by the County Councillor for our area, ClIr Ian Fleetwood.

12.10.20 Following a complaint by BGPC to LCC asking as to why the TRO was being considered when it was not requested by the parish council or had a history of incidents, the county council advised that the would be a period of monitoring and that '..all objections will be reported to the planning committee'. BGPC also verbally informed that if there were many objections the proposal would not be pursued.

09.11.20 The result of a FOI has LCC claiming that observations were made at the site on 06.06.20, 17.07.20, 25.09.20 and 14.10.20. Unfortunately the subsequent ICO investigation provides no evidence this.

A public consultation for the TRO takes place with two formal objections and a petition containing 97 signatures.

30.06.21 The TRO is scheduled to be considered by the Planning and Regulation Committee on the 6th July. LCC confirm that BGPC can speak at the Committee.

05.07.21 The Officers report which was submitted to the Committee contains many inaccuracies including that BGPC requested the TRO and that there are no objections. LCC subsequently pull the item from the agenda.

29.07.21 The item is considered at the Planning and Regulation Committee with a revised Officers report, however BGPC are not allowed to speak (as LCC claim that this was offered in error). The item is considered by the committee and proposed by Councillor Ian Fleetwood. The discussion and voting of this issue takes 2.04 minutes with Cllr Fleetwood speaking for 1minute 5 seconds.

Residents objections are overruled and the proposal is accepted, claiming that it will benefit OMEX and local farms. **OMEX state that they have never raised this issue with anyone and the junction is not regarded as a problem.**

31.07.21 BGPC informed that the Program Leader would be in contact to meet with BGPC to discuss issues. No contact was made despite being informed that It would happen on 10/8, 24/8, 27/8.

01.10.21 Representatives of BGPC meet with the Highways Manager who advised that the lines would not be installed until issues were addressed. BGPC repeatedly ask for a copy of the LCC policy or criteria for implementing double yellow lines. **The subsequent ICO investigation advises that these documents do not exist.**

03.11.21 At lunchtime a team of contractors arrive to install the double yellow lines. The Clerk attends and stands at the War Memorial in front of the Post Office and attempts to speak with the Highways Manager, Street works Manager and other contacts, for clarification of the situation, following the previous reassurances. The Chairman speaks with the contractors whilst stood in his doorway as he is shielding for medical reasons. The conversation is amenable and the workmen were convivial when they left. There are witnesses to these events. **The subsequent ICO investigation provides copies of correspondence between the contractor and LCC, where BGPC representatives are accused of being threatening and aggressive to the workmen. These allegations are strongly refuted by the Clerk and Chairman.**

04.11.21 At 9pm it was discovered that the contractors had been back at 8.30pm and carry out the work without the necessary Traffic Management, local residents were mot notified and the existing layby markings not removed. The subsequent ICO investigation advises that someone (whose name is redacted) is sent to witness the work and call the police if representatives of BGPC are seen in the area.

10.12.21 Representatives of BGPC meet with the Highways Manager, the Program Leader and a Highways Officer. The meeting discusses aspects of the double yellow lines and the fact that school buses use the area (something that the Program Leader was not aware of; NB School buses are arranged via LCC). The officers agree to monitor the area and remove the lines if necessary as they were unaware of the presence of school buses in the area (a fact which was stated in the original objections). **The subsequent ICO investigation shows that this did not take place.**

January 2022 BGPC submit a further Freedom of Information Request to LCC. They respond with minimal documents and a selection of photographs from other areas of Bardney.

ICO involvement

This complaint was then raised with the Information Commissioners Office. The outcome was as follows;

- No evidence of any traffic surveys or visits
- No evidence of any monitoring of the area
- No evidence of reconsidering the decision

- False allegations that representatives of BGPC were aggressive and threatening towards the contractors
- Repeatedly and deliberately mislead BGPC and local residents.
- That the request for the TRO could only have been implemented by Cllr Fleetwood, as County Councillor.
- That there is no criteria or policy in relation to implementation of double yellow lines. Meaning that the decisions are simply at the discretion of someone who does not possess or seek out the facts.