

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Cabinet Highways Committee

Meeting held 14 February 2013

PRESENT: Councillors Leigh Bramall (Chair), Harry Harpham, Bryan Lodge and Jack Scott

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 10 January 2013 were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 Cycle Safety Audits

Matt Turner asked the following question in relation to Cycle Safety Audits:-

‘Sheffield City Council has had a policy of undertaking cycle safety audits for all transport schemes over £50,000 since 2006. This commitment was made in a Council motion passed in 2007 as well as the Sheffield Cycle Action Plan of April 2006 and the South Yorkshire Cycle Action Plan of April 2011. I’ve seen no evidence that this policy has ever been implemented and believe that the lack of cycle audits has contributed to the dangerous conditions cyclists experience on the roads of Sheffield. Why has this policy never been implemented and what work is being done to ensure it will be implemented swiftly?’

In response, the Chair, Councillor Leigh Bramall commented that he had only been made aware of the issue recently. He thanked the questioner and other cyclists for raising the issue and reported that the issue would be discussed at the next meeting of the Cycle Forum in March.

5.2 Ecclesall Road Smart Route

Mrs Platts raised a number of questions, on behalf of local residents, in relation to

the Ecclesall Road Smart Route. The Chair agreed to take the questions away and respond to the questioner and local residents directly.

6. ITEMS CALLED IN FOR SCRUTINY/REFERRED TO CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

- 6.1. There were no items called-in for Scrutiny or referred to the Cabinet Highways Committee.

7. PETITIONS

7.1 New Petitions

The Committee noted for information the receipt of a petition containing 9 signatures objecting to speeding vehicles on Walkley Bank Road and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of this Highways Committee

7.2 Outstanding Petitions List

The Committee received and noted a report of the Executive Director, Place setting out the position on outstanding petitions that were being investigated. Members requested that the description of petition number 5 be amended to outline the reasons for the petition.

The Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services reported that he had liaised with members of the South West Community Assembly in relation to the request for improved parking facilities for customers using Millhouses Shopping Centre. The use of the Abbeydale Grange School site had been ruled out for safety reasons. Millhouses Pub had offered the use of their car park. There was, however, no immediate solution and local businesses were not supportive of any parking restrictions in the area.

8. RESPONSES TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER TO INTRODUCE PARKING RESTRICTIONS ON CLIFFEFIELD ROAD AND MEERSBROOK AVENUE

- 9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out the public response to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce parking restrictions on the junction of Cliffefield Road and Meersbrook Avenue to prevent vehicles parking and improve visibility for motorists and other road users.

- 9.2 Mr Mason, a local resident, attended the meeting to make representations in support of the proposals. He commented that he welcomed the proposals as parking on Meersbrook Avenue had made the area dangerous as it was often difficult to see past the parked cars when pulling

out of his driveway. He also reported that cars had been blocking his driveway on occasions and damage had been caused to his car.

9.3 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) overrules the objection to the proposed traffic regulations on Cliffeield Road and Meersbrook Avenue and introduce the restrictions as shown in the plan in Appendix A to the report;
- (b) resolves that the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; and
- (c) requests that all respondents be informed of the Committee's decision.

9.4 Reasons for Decision

9.4.1 The Traffic Regulation Order for this scheme was necessary to introduce the proposed parking restrictions with a view to resolving problems which have been raised by a local resident.

9.4.2 Community Assembly Members and officers had given due consideration to the views of the respondents in an attempt to find an acceptable solution. The recommendation was considered to be a balanced attempt to address residents concerns and aspirations.

9.5 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

9.5.1 This scheme had been designed to meet local needs/priorities as identified by South Community Assembly Members. The proposals put forward were considered to deliver the required outcomes to resolve the problems which have been brought to the attention of the Assembly.

9.5.2 A reduction in the length of the proposed restriction to 5 metres on each length of the junction was an option which could be considered. This course of action had been adopted previously by Members in similar circumstances. However, it was not something which it was felt could be justified on this occasion because of the narrow road widths and tightness of the corners.

9.5.3 A further option would be to do nothing at all but this would result in a potentially dangerous situation remaining unresolved.

9. OBJECTIONS TO SOUTH LANE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the proposed camera enforcement scheme at South Lane and also reported on the feedback from two rounds of public consultation, including an objection to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order.

10.2 Nathan Broadhead, representing the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYLTE), attended the meeting to make representations in support of the proposals. He reported that the SYLTE had been working closely with the Council on the scheme. They had agreed to amend the hours of operation to 0700 hours to 1900 hours, Monday to Saturday, in response to representations received and requested that Members approve the proposals.

10.3 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:-

- (a) overrules the objection to the Traffic Regulation Order and requests that the objector be advised accordingly;
- (b) requests that the detailed design and implementation of the proposals be completed as illustrated in Appendix D to the report; and
- (c) requests that the relevant Traffic Regulation Orders be advertised to allow additional evening parking spaces on South Lane and short stay parking on Cumberland Street and they be implemented should there be no objections.

10.4 **Reasons for Decision**

10.4. Council Officers have worked with the market developers, South Yorkshire
1 Passenger Transport Executive, local bus operators and local businesses to ensure that the proposed scheme meets the objectives of 'A Vision for Excellent Transport', 'Standing up for Sheffield', and 'Better Buses' while trying to improve pick up/drop off arrangements and on street parking issues in the area too.

10.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.5. *Do Nothing:* Should nothing happen, the existing level of abuse will
1 continue and additional traffic associated with the markets development may also take the opportunity to use South Lane and Cumberland Street to access or leave the City Centre. This option would not meet the planning condition for the markets development and would worsen the existing situation for public transport users so this was not seen as feasible.

10.5. *Enforce at the existing bus gate:* Before a bus gate was enforced, the
2 Council needed to make sure that drivers had a well signed "escape" route", thus enabling people who enter an area by mistake to exit without fear of being penalised. It was not possible to provide such a route on Cumberland Street so drivers were more likely to inadvertently receive a Penalty Charge Notice, so this option was not seen as feasible.

10.5. *Implement the new bus gate, but don't enforce it:* Implementing the new
3 bus gate but not enforcing it was feasible. However, this option would not

meet the planning condition for the markets development and could worsen the existing situation for public transport users so it was not proposed to progress with this option. In addition, previous market research had established that there was public support for proper enforcement of bus and tram gates and lanes in Sheffield.

10. HILLSBOROUGH PERMIT PARKING REVIEW

11.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report informing Members of the comments received following the public consultation on the review of the Hillsborough Permit Parking Scheme, together with recommendations for further work and possible changes to existing parking restrictions.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:-

(a) approves the removal of the following streets from further consultation and survey work adjacent to the current scheme boundary and requests that those people who responded to the consultation be informed:-

- Burnaby Street
- Dixon Road
- Dykes Hall Road
- Findon Street
- Garry Road
- Hammerton Road
- Hawthorn Road
- Holme Close
- Keyworth Road
- Kirkstone Road
- Langsett Road
- Manvers Road
- Middlewood Road
- Morley Street
- Oakland Road
- Portsea Road
- Singleton Road, Crescent and Grove
- Upwood Road
- Victor Street
- Walkley Lane
- Warner Road
- Wynard Road;

(b) approves further investigation of small changes to the existing scheme as well as roads adjacent to the current boundary as identified in Appendix E to the report and any subsequent Traffic Regulation Orders be advertised; and

- (c) approves further survey work on Beechwood Road, Clarence Road, May Road, Leader Road including East View Terrace and Leader Court, Hunter Road, Minto Road, Taplin Road and Thoresby Road and any subsequent Traffic Regulation Orders be advertised to enable these streets to be included in the permit parking scheme.

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 11.3. 1 Based on the responses received from the recent consultation and by comparing results obtained from three previous comprehensive consultations it was recommended to agree the list of recommendations set out in paragraph 7.0 which outlined the next steps of the review process. Any subsequent Traffic Regulation Orders considered necessary by the Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services would allow further feedback from both residents and businesses on any planned changes.

11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 11.4. 1 Officers had considered the content of each individual comment received. Where comments had been made requesting small adjustments it was intended that these would be fully investigated.
- 11.4. 2 One alternative option would be to advertise much larger scale changes based on comments made by some people in the consultation. However, as the general response rates were fairly low on a number of streets this would have resulted in promoting scheme changes which were supported only by a minority and not entirely focused on the majority of customer requirements.
- 11.4. 3 An alternative option for further would be to include both Keyworth Road and Dixon Road in further surveys or possible legal adverts. The decision not to include both these streets was based not only on results obtained from this consultation but also previous survey and on consultation work. Where there was definitely support for parking restrictions on these streets this was in contrast to much of the surrounding area. It was felt that these streets could not be added to the scheme in isolation as a migration of parking problems was likely to occur. Any promotion of restrictions for the whole area was likely to be unpopular with the majority of residents.