

Record of operational decision

Decision title:	Decision to introduce a Prohibition of Motor Vehicles (Except for Access) restriction on Pilley Road, Clifton Road & Carless Close, Hereford, Herefordshire.
Date of decision:	3 rd November 2025
Decision maker:	Group Manager - Streetscene, Public Rights of Way and Traffic Management
Authority for delegated decision:	<p>Economy and Environment Scheme – Highways and Transport 75. To act on behalf of the council in respect of the legislation specified in the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>The authorisation limit is within the financial procedure rules and is sufficient for the decision and that the officer has authority under the contract procedure rules.</p>
Ward:	Aylestone Hill
Consultation:	<p>An informal residents & businesses consultation exercise was undertaken from 19th May 2025 to 16th June 2025. A total of 18 responses were received. Of these, 13 were in support of the proposal, one was non-committal and 4 raised objections to the proposal. A summary of the responses received during the informal residents & businesses consultation is included as Appendix C.</p> <p>Following the conclusion of the informal residents & businesses consultation exercise, officers shared the feedback received with the Ward Councillor. Consequently, it was agreed to proceed to the next stage of the TRO process, given the majority support for the proposal received.</p> <p>A formal (Statutory) consultation process was undertaken from 30th June 2025 to 21st July 2025, whereby an initial consultation letter and proposal plan was sent to all Statutory Consultees via email. During this process, no objections were raised. A summary of the responses received during the Formal (Statutory) Consultation process is included as Appendix D.</p> <p>The Notice of Proposal stage allowing the general public and Statutory Consultees to issue comments/concerns was undertaken from 21st August 2025 to 12th September 2025. During this process no objections were raised from the Statutory Consultees and two objections were raised from members of the public. A summary of the responses received during the Notice of Proposal stage is included as Appendix E. The responses from Statutory Consultees are also summarised below.</p> <p>Ward Councillor – Supports the proposal and has been actively involved throughout the TRO process.</p> <p>Cabinet Member - Issued no response to the consultation.</p> <p>Hereford City Council – Issued no response to the consultation.</p> <p>Traffic Management Advisor (TMA), West Mercia Police – Offered no objections to the proposals based on the order being “self-regulating” and not reliant on Police enforcement to ensure its success. They stated that if the police received subsequent complaints that the order is being contravened, then they will ask for some form of physical deterrent to be introduced to stop the “rat-running” issue.</p>

	<p>Hereford and Worcester Fire and Rescue Service – Offered no objections to the proposals but noted that the proposal may increase traffic on Folly Lane.</p> <p>Road Haulage Association – Issued no response to the consultation.</p> <p>Freight Transport Association – Issued no response to the consultation.</p> <p>West Midlands Ambulance Service – Issued no response to the consultation</p>																									
Decision made:	<p>Consideration has been given to the receipt of two objections arising from the formal Notice of Proposal for the above-titled order. Notwithstanding the receipt of these objections, for the reasons as set out below, it is recommended that a new Traffic Regulation Order be implemented as proposed in the Notice of Proposal. The effect of the Order will be to introduce a Prohibition of Motor Vehicles (Except for Access) restriction on Pilley Road, Clifton Road & Carless Close, Hereford.</p> <p>The proposal plan is included as Appendix A. The Notice of Proposal documents including a full schedule of the proposals are included as Appendix B.</p>																									
Reasons for decision:	<p>This scheme was initiated following a request from the Ward Councillor to assess the feasibility of implementing a one-way Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) on Pilley Road and Clifton Road. The aim was to prevent “rat-running” between Folly Lane and Ledbury Road, where drivers were using these roads to bypass the signal-controlled junction. Consequently, a review of the situation on the site was undertaken by officers and it was decided that details should be entered onto the prioritised TRO Waiting List.</p> <p>As a result of its entry onto the TRO Waiting List, this scheme was identified for commencement of investigations in the 2024/25 Annual Plan. Therefore, Herefordshire Council set about investigating the potential for a new Traffic Regulation Order that would necessitate any changes within the area under investigation.</p> <p>An on-site assessment and meeting with the Ward Councillor were undertaken in March 2025. During the assessment, officers considered the practicalities of a one-way system to solve the “rat-running” issue and the impact this restriction would have on residents. Officers also considered the surrounding environment and road geometry, along with where it was practicable to site new terminal signage. To support the assessment, two Automatic Traffic Count (ATC) Surveys were undertaken, one at the Pilley Road & Ledbury Road junction with the other at the Clifton Road & Folly Lane junction. These were undertaken to determine traffic flows, volumes and direction. The survey data is summarised in the table below:</p> <table><tr><th></th><th>7-day average Northbound peak AM</th><th>7-day average Northbound peak PM</th><th>7-day average Southbound peak AM</th><th>7-day average Southbound peak PM</th></tr><tr><td>Clifton Road</td><td>92</td><td>85</td><td>40</td><td>76</td></tr><tr><td>Pilley Road</td><td>100</td><td>100</td><td>53</td><td>83</td></tr><tr><td>Assumed through traffic</td><td>92</td><td>85</td><td>40</td><td>76</td></tr><tr><td>Assumed local traffic</td><td>8</td><td>15</td><td>13</td><td>7</td></tr></table> <p>In the traffic survey, all recorded vehicle movements in each direction were assumed to be through traffic, meaning vehicles were assumed to enter from one road and exit via another, continuing their journey without stopping. The difference between the total number of vehicles travelling in each direction, entering one road and exiting via the other were attributed to local access</p>		7-day average Northbound peak AM	7-day average Northbound peak PM	7-day average Southbound peak AM	7-day average Southbound peak PM	Clifton Road	92	85	40	76	Pilley Road	100	100	53	83	Assumed through traffic	92	85	40	76	Assumed local traffic	8	15	13	7
	7-day average Northbound peak AM	7-day average Northbound peak PM	7-day average Southbound peak AM	7-day average Southbound peak PM																						
Clifton Road	92	85	40	76																						
Pilley Road	100	100	53	83																						
Assumed through traffic	92	85	40	76																						
Assumed local traffic	8	15	13	7																						

traffic. This refers to vehicles that entered the area via one road but did not exit via the other, likely for local access (e.g. residents).

The survey data determined that most vehicle movements on Pilley Road and Clifton Road are through traffic movements with peak flows occurring during the morning & afternoon commuting times. The survey data also determined that thorough traffic was travelling in both directions. Therefore, officers determined that a one-way restriction would not be the most suitable restriction to tackle the through traffic issue, given “rat-running” would still be permissible in one direction. It would significantly impact residents and create additional traffic and accessibility issues for those living within the affected area. Similarly, introducing a physical barrier at the junction of Pilley Road & Ledbury Road or Clifton Road & Folly Lane would result in comparable negative impacts for those living nearby.

Consequently, officers, together with the Ward Councillor, determined that the most appropriate restriction would be a Prohibition of Motor Vehicles (Except for Access) restriction. This would prevent vehicles without a legitimate need to access Pilley Road or Clifton Road from entering, effectively stopping drivers from using these roads as a cut-through. However, residents, their visitors, and delivery vehicles would still be permitted to use the roads as usual. As a result, the restriction would have no impact on residents, while successfully deterring non-resident through traffic from using the area as a “rat run.” This restriction would also allow the council to introduce camera enforcement at a later stage, should the council wish to do so.

Following the completion of the initial assessment, an informal residents & businesses consultation exercise was undertaken from 19th May 2025 to 16th June 2025. A total of 18 responses were received. Of these, 13 were in support of the proposal, one was non-committal and 4 raised objections to the proposal. A summary of the responses received during the informal residents & businesses consultation is included as Appendix C.

The objectors expressed concern that the TRO and its signage alone would be insufficient to deter non-resident drivers from using the route as a “rat-run”, particularly in the absence of active enforcement. Additionally, concerns were expressed about the potential displacement of traffic onto nearby roads, such as Folly Lane. Objectors also questioned the overall effectiveness and fairness of the scheme, while others advocated for more permanent enforcement measures, including bollards and camera-based enforcement.

In response to the objections raised, it is acknowledged that concerns about enforcement are valid. However, these concerns do not justify delaying or abandoning the proposed TRO. The TRO establishes the legal framework necessary for enforcement by the police and makes it unlawful for drivers with no legitimate access requirement to use the route as a through route. Even without immediate enforcement measures, the presence of the restriction itself is likely to deter some drivers, resulting in a reduction in through-traffic. Additionally, the TRO will already be in place, should the council decide to implement camera enforcement in the future, enabling swift deployment of such measures. Physical barriers, such as bollards, fall outside the scope of this TRO and would not align with its objectives, particularly the need to maintain access for those with legitimate reasons.

Regarding concerns about traffic displacement, it is important to note that Folly Lane & Ledbury Road are designated primary routes and are better suited to accommodate through-traffic than the residential streets currently affected. Redirecting vehicles to more appropriate routes helps to preserve

the safety and character of residential areas, which are not designed to accommodate through-traffic movements.

Finally, whilst some respondents questioned the fairness and effectiveness of the scheme, the consultation process demonstrated a significant level of support from the community. The volume and nature of positive feedback received indicates that the proposal is both necessary and proportionate in addressing the issue.

Following the conclusion of the informal residents & businesses consultation exercise, officers shared the feedback received with the Ward Councillor. Consequently, it was agreed to proceed to the next stage of the TRO process, given the majority support for the proposal received.

A Formal (Statutory) Consultation process was undertaken from 30th June 2025 to 21st July 2025, whereby a consultation letter and proposal plan were sent to all Statutory Consultees via email. During this process, no objections were raised.

During the consultation, the Traffic Management Advisor for West Mercia Police offered no objections to the proposals, based on the order being “self-regulating” and not reliant on Police enforcement to ensure its success. They stated that if the police receive subsequent complaints that the order is being contravened, then they will ask for some form of physical deterrent to be introduced to stop the “rat running” issue. A summary of the responses received during the Formal (Statutory) Consultation process is included as Appendix D.

The Notice of Proposal stage allowing the general public and Statutory Consultees to issue comments/concerns was undertaken from 21st August 2025 to 12th September 2025. During this process no objections were raised from the Statutory Consultees and two objections were raised from members of the public. The Traffic Management Advisor for West Mercia Police also reiterated their previous comments made during the Formal (Statutory) Consultation. A summary of the responses received during the Notice of Proposal stage is included as Appendix E.

The first objection stated that the proposal’s justification is subjective and lacks a comprehensive supporting analysis. The objector believes that the scheme will not enhance the amenity of the area and will have a negative impact on residents living adjacent to the proposal area. They also believe that the councils reasoning of “To prevent accelerated damage to the highway” implies that the council will no longer undertake any maintenance on these sections of highway, thereby rendering the EINA inaccurate. Additionally, the objector raises concerns about the proposal’s potential to significantly disrupt traffic flow on surrounding roads, increasing congestion and the risk of gridlock. They ask whether any monitoring or modelling has been done regarding this impact. They also note that not all traffic uses the roads as a through-route, with some vehicles utilizing them for student drop-offs or parking. They state these actions will likely migrate to other roads if this proposal is introduced. They also highlight the lack of reference to the existing residents’ parking zone 9 in the proposal and question why this is the case.

In response to the objection, the scheme has been proposed as a result of a request made by the Ward Councillor for a solution to the “rat-running” issues on Pilley Road & Clifton Road, following feedback made to them by residents. Additionally, as detailed above in this report, a comprehensive on-site assessment together with analysis of ATC surveys data has been undertaken. This determined traffic flows, volumes, directions as well as assumed through-traffic and local access movements. The proposal has

garnered a majority support throughout the TRO process and is supported by the Ward Councillor, suggesting that the proposal will improve the amenity of the area for the majority of those consulted. Therefore, the proposal has been justified by a comprehensive site assessment, meetings with the Ward Councillor, survey data and positive consultation feedback.

In response to the objectors' comments regarding maintenance on these sections of highway, the introduction of this TRO does not mean that the council will not undertake further routine maintenance. The council will continue to maintain these highways in accordance with its routine maintenance strategy. Therefore, there will be no impact on the ENIA regarding maintenance of the highway.

In response to the comments surrounding traffic flow and the risk of gridlock, Folly Lane and Ledbury Road are designated primary routes and are better suited to accommodate traffic than Pilley Road & Clifton Road. Additionally, the survey data suggests that the proposed restrictions will have minimal impact on overall traffic flow and transport network efficiency in the surrounding area, given that the numbers of vehicles using these roads as a through route are low in comparison to the total vehicle volumes on these primary routes. However, the restriction will have a significant impact on the number of vehicles utilising Pilley Road & Clifton Road, which will help to improve road safety and preserve the amenity of this residential area, which is not designed to accommodate a high number of traffic movements.

In response to the comments surrounding parking and student drop off, the TRO aims to restrict all vehicle movements into Pilley Road & Clifton Road except for residents and those who require legitimate access (e.g. deliveries). Whilst some displacement is inevitable, it is likely vehicles will be displaced evenly rather than into one location. Parking controls are subject to different legislation and a separate static TRO. Therefore, consideration of parking restrictions is not within the remit of this moving traffic TRO, hence their omission.

The second objection expressed support for the principle of restricting through-traffic on Pilley Road and Clifton Road but did not endorse the proposal in its current form. They state that the proposal will not work as intended without active enforcement, as drivers will ignore the signage. As an alternative, they suggested that the junction of Clifton Road and Folly Lane be physically closed to motor vehicles using bollards, while remaining accessible to cyclists.

In response to the objection, it is acknowledged that concerns about enforcement are valid. However, these concerns do not justify delaying or abandoning the TRO. The TRO establishes the legal framework necessary for enforcement by the police and makes it unlawful for drivers with no legitimate access requirement to use the roads as a through-route. Even without active enforcement measures, the presence of the restriction itself is likely to deter some drivers, resulting in a reduction in through-traffic. Additionally, the TRO will already be in place, should the council decide to implement camera enforcement in the future, enabling a swift deployment of such measures. Physical barriers, such as bollards, fall outside the scope of this TRO and would not align with its objectives, particularly the need to maintain access for those with a legitimate reason to access these roads.

According to the Road Traffic Regulation Act (RTA) 1984, it is the duty of a highway authority to 'manage their road network' and 'to improve road safety'. Section 122 of the RTA 1984 states that local authorities must, so far as is practicable, exercise their functions under the RTA so as to 'secure

	<p>the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic'. The proposal aligns with this guidance.</p> <p>In conclusion, the proposed Prohibition of Motor Vehicles (Except for Access) aligns with the duties set out in Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The proposed restriction will act to improve road safety and amenity for local residents in the area, as well as ensure vehicles utilise more suitable primary routes. The TRO also provides the legal framework for enforcement of the "rat-running" issue, should the council decide to implement camera enforcement in the future, enabling a swift deployment of such measures. Although two objections were raised during the Notice of Proposal stage, these must also be balanced against the unwavering support from the Ward Councillor and majority of local residents throughout the TRO process.</p> <p>It is recommended to survey traffic movements via ATC surveys, to assess the effectiveness of the restriction, 12 months after its implementation.</p> <p>Therefore, it is advised to progress with the recommendations outlined in this report for the reasons set out above.</p>
<p>Highlight any associated risks/finance/legal/equality considerations:</p>	<p>Community impact</p> <p>The recommendations outlined above will have a positive impact on the local community. The implementation of the proposed Prohibition of Motor Vehicles (Except for Access) restriction will seek to improve road safety and amenity. Therefore, the proposals are aligned with Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.</p> <p>Environmental Impact</p> <p>Herefordshire Council provides and purchases a wide range of services for the people of Herefordshire. Together with partner organisations in the private, public, and voluntary sectors we share a strong commitment to improving our environmental sustainability, achieving carbon neutrality and to protect and enhance Herefordshire's outstanding natural environment.</p> <p>The development of this project has sought to minimise any adverse environmental impact and will actively seek opportunities to improve and enhance environmental performance.</p> <p>The implementation of the proposals should result in improved road safety and amenity and provide an environment where people feel it is safer to walk, cycle or ride throughout the area.</p> <p>Equality duty</p> <p>The public sector equality duty (specific duty) requires us to consider how we can positively contribute to the advancement of equality and good relations and demonstrate that we are paying 'due regard' in our decision making in the design of policies and in the delivery of services.</p> <p>The recommendations set out in this report are considered to be low impact with regards to equality. The proposals aim to improve road amenity and safety, thus paying regard to the council's duty according to the Equality Act 2010 as set out below.</p> <p>Under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, the 'general duty' on public authorities is set out as follows:</p> <p>A public authority must, in the exercise of its functions, have due regard to the need to -</p>

- (a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- (b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- (c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

Any impact as a result of the scheme will be equal to all parties.

See Appendix F of this report for Equality Impacts and Needs Assessment (EINA).

Resource implications

The cost of the implementation of the proposals is approximately £12,000. This includes costs for statutory consultation, preparing and making the TRO, signage, and advertising. This cost has been identified from this year's existing budgets in the current Annual Plan.

Legal implications

The introduction of a new Traffic Order under Sections 1, 2 and 4 and Part IV of Schedule 9 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (the 1984 Act) and the Traffic Management Act 2004 (the 2004 Act) will be required.

Part 2 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 ('the 1996 Regulations') lays out the procedure prior to making an order. Regulations 6 and 7 require the Council as Highway Authority to undertake a formal consultation on the Traffic Order and publish the proposals. Regulation 8 allows for any person or persons to make objections and requires that the Council, as Highway Authority, consider any objections received after the formal statutory consultation process, (which includes advertising in a local newspaper). A subsequent report will include any such objections or comments, for consideration.

The Council has discretion to amend its original proposals if considered desirable, whether or not in the light of any objections or comments received, as a result of such statutory consultation. If any objections received are accepted, in part or whole, and/or a decision is made to modify the original proposals, if such a modification is considered to be substantial, then steps must be taken for those affected by the proposed modifications to be further consulted in accordance with Regulation 14 of the 1996 Regulations. Following consideration of the consultation responses the Council has decided not to modify the proposals.

The Council has received two Objections. Before the Order can be made it will need to be publicised in accordance with the requirements of Regulation 7 of the 1996 Regulations. This includes publication of a notice of the proposals in a newspaper circulating in the locality of the area where the road which is the subject of the Order is located. This must be done within two years of the date the order is first publicised in a newspaper circulating in the locality of the area where the land to which the Order relates is located. Within 14 days of the order being made it is necessary in accordance with Regulation 17 of the 1996 Regulations to publish a notice of making in a newspaper circulating in the area in which any road or place to which the Order relates is situated.

	<p>Once an Order is made by the Council it will need to be publicised in accordance with the requirements of Part 3 of the 1996 Regulations. The Order cannot come into force before the order has been publicised in accordance with these requirements. The time period for challenge is three months from the date of the making of the Order.</p> <p>Risk management</p> <p>The Local Transport Plan sets out to reduce the number and severity of casualties on the highway network in Herefordshire and provide a highway network that is safe and efficient. A Key Performance Indicator is contained in this Local Transport Plan and details a locally set target for a reduction in fatal or serious injuries on the highway network. The adoption of the recommendations in this report would contribute to these objectives in the Local Transport Plan.</p> <p>It is important for safety, and its effectiveness that the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles (Except for Access) restriction is imposed appropriately having regard to the type of factors considered in this report. This is the case at Pilley Road, Clifton Road & Carless Close.</p> <p>There is a risk that vehicles may not comply with the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles (Except for Access) restriction. However, the TRO establishes the legal framework necessary for enforcement by the police and makes it unlawful for drivers with no legitimate access requirement to use the route as a “rat-run”. Even without active enforcement measures, the presence of the restriction itself is likely to deter some drivers, resulting in a reduction in through-traffic. Additionally, the TRO will already be in place, should the council decide to implement camera enforcement in the future, enabling a swift deployment of such measures.</p>
Details of any alternative options considered and rejected:	<p>Not to make any changes to the access arrangements – This is not recommended as it would fail to achieve the primary goal of the proposal: to prevent “rat-running” on Pilley Road & Clifton Road between Folly Lane & Ledbury Road to avoid the traffic signal junction. This change aims to improve road safety and the quality of life for residents and recreational users within the area. The proposals align with Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Additionally, not implementing the Prohibition of Motor Vehicles (Except for Access) restriction would contradict the wishes of the Ward Councillor and the majority of local residents.</p>
Details of any declarations of interest made:	None

Signed..... Date: 03/11/2025

Please ensure that signatures are redacted before publishing.

Appendix A: Scheme Layout

