

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**Executive Decision Record**

Decision Maker:	Executive Member for Culture and Recreation
Date:	6 July 2012
Title:	Proposal to make a Traffic Regulation Order on Rushmoor Bridleway No.24 at Farnborough North Station
Reference:	4032
Report From:	Director of Culture, Communities & Business Services

Contact name: Vicky Bowskill

Tel: 01962 846891

Email: vicky.bowskill@hants.gov.uk

1. The decision:

- a) That Hampshire County Council should introduce a permanent Traffic Regulation Order under section 1a) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, to prohibit equestrians from proceeding along Rushmoor Bridleway No.24 at Farnborough North Station.
- b) That Network Rail be advised that whilst the County Council considers that a bridge would be preferable in this case, the County Council recognises that this is not a feasible option at the present time.

2. Reason for the decision:

- 2.1 This bridleway crosses the railway on the level and is the only access between platforms at Farnborough North Station. There are significant concerns about safety, particularly as the route is heavily used by students and pupils attending Farnborough College. To enable the crossing to be redesigned and thus improve safety it is necessary to exclude horses from using the crossing.
- 2.2 The prohibition on equine use would enable the lights to be re-phased to reduce the flashing period by half from 40 seconds to 20 seconds and an audible signal could be introduced. Improvements to the width of the crossing and waiting area could also be made, which would result in a significant improvement in safety for pedestrians and cyclists, who are the predominant users of this crossing.
- 2.3 No horse riders have come forward to say that they actually use - or wish to use - this route, and there is no record of any horse riders contacting the

signal box in order to use the crossing. The route does not connect with any known areas of equestrian demand for access, nor with the wider bridleway network.

3. Other options considered and rejected:

- 3.1 Provision of a bridge or underpass was rejected owing to the lack of space needed to construct such a structure.

4. Conflicts of interest:

- 4.1 Conflicts of interest declared by the decision-maker:

None.

- 4.2 Conflicts of interest declared by other Executive Members consulted:

None.

5. Dispensation granted by the Conduct Advisory Panel: none.

6. Reason(s) for the matter being dealt with if urgent: not applicable.

7. Statement from the Decision Maker:

Approved by:

Date:

6 July 2012

**Executive Member for Culture and Recreation
Councillor Keith Chapman**