

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session

### Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 12 September 2013

**PRESENT:** Councillor Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development)

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs (Cabinet Adviser), John Bann (Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services), Stan Collier (Senior Technician), James Burdett (Highway Engineer), Cate Jockel (Senior Transport Planner) and Andrew Marwood (Highway Engineer)

.....

#### **1. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

1.1 No items were identified where it was proposed to exclude the public and press.

#### **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

#### **3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS SESSION**

3.1 The minutes of the Session held on 11 July 2013 were approved as a correct record.

#### **4. PETITIONS**

##### 4.1 Public Question in Respect of Double Yellow Lines on King Street, Chapeltown

Mr Neville Winder attended the meeting to request that the Cabinet Member give consideration to the installation of double yellow lines at junctions on King Street, Westbrook Road and Loundside. Parking on King Street made it difficult to access Lound Side and this often resulted in a safety risk.

In response John Bann, Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services commented that funding was not currently available for the installation of double yellow lines on King Street. There may be a possibility of the works being undertaken at the same time as the Streets Ahead Project but he could not confirm a date for this at this stage. He would check and write to Mr Winder.

##### 4.2 Petitions

###### New Petitions

There were no new petitions to report.

###### 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.

**5. RESPONSES TO A PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER ASSOCIATED WITH THE FORMER CENTRAL COMMUNITY ASSEMBLY SMALL HIGHWAY SCHEMES**

- 5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out the proposed response to objections received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce parking restrictions at three locations for small highway schemes being promoted by the former Central Community Assembly.
- 5.2 Mr Fraser Hartley, a resident of Chesterwood Drive, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He commented that a number of residents had originally requested the installation of double yellow lines on Chesterwood Drive as the pavement was unusable. This situation had now improved, however, and double yellow lines were no longer needed. The issue was commuters using Chesterwood Drive to park all day. Consideration should be given to introducing a permit parking scheme for residents.
- 5.3 Ash Connolly, a resident of Fulwood Park Mansions, commented that he believed the proposals would cause more problems in the longer term. There was already limited parking on Chesterwood Drive and could lead to the blocking of residents garages amongst other things. The residents were not the problem and this would punish them further. A more effective solution would be a residents parking scheme and a 30 minute short stay parking around the school.
- 5.4 In response, Stan Collier, Senior Technician, commented that the scheme took into consideration residents objections. It was believed that there was a need to protect part of Chesterwood Drive with restrictions. The area adjacent to the entrance to Nos.1-6 Fulwood Park Mansions would be kept clear for parking.
- 5.5 John Bann, Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services, added that there was only a small budget for Permit Parking Schemes but consideration could be given to including Chesterwood Drive in the Broomhill Permit Parking Zone.
- 5.6 Mr Hayden Fields attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member in relation to the Orchard Road proposals. He commented that the majority of residents were elderly and with mobility issues and often had district nurses visiting so it was important that they had places to park. A Residents Parking Scheme was more appropriate and this view was supported by a local Ward Councillor.
- 5.7 Kirsty May, a resident of Walkley Road, commented that she did not believe parking was a major issue and the proposals would create parking problems as many residents would have no alternative but to park on

Walkley Road.

- 5.8 John Bann reported that the request for double yellow lines had been received from a local Ward Councillor who had informed officers that there was a problem in the area.
- 5.9 Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, commented that he could see that parking was a problem in the area but believed that, taking residents comments into account, a compromise solution could be agreed where only part of the Order would be implemented.
- 5.10 In respect of the Fern Road/Welbeck Road, Walkley scheme, Alec Gibbons attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He stated that there had been no road traffic collisions in the area in the last 8 years so safety concerns were not an issue. If the restrictions were agreed residents would have to park in other areas and this would create problems in those areas. There had been no complaints from the emergency services or Veolia that their vehicles had not been able to get down the road.
- 5.11 Mr Gibbons further commented that the parked vehicles actually helped to improve safety as they slowed cars down who used the road. He believed that the issues stated in the report did not exist and a petition, signed by 71 people, against the proposed parking restrictions showed that residents did not back the proposals.
- 5.12 Mrs Gleadall, a local resident, commented that she believed that there was a problem in the area. There had been a lot of damage caused to parked cars because of the narrowness of the road. 62 people had signed a petition stating that some restrictions were needed and the reduction in the restrictions from that originally proposed was the best compromise for all.
- 5.13 Alex Thompson, a resident of Fern Road, stated that the proposals would lead to extra parking problems in the area. He said that one of the signatories to the petition had removed their name as they had originally believed that the proposals involved some physical measures. He considered that the proposals were not needed and the Cabinet Member should not approve them.
- 5.14 In response John Bann commented that the majority of those who had signed the petition against the proposals were not residents of Fern Road or Welbeck Road. He accepted the point that the parked vehicles helped to slow traffic down but some parking would still be allowed.
- 5.15 Councillor Bramall commented that he believed there was a need for some of the restrictions proposed and resolved that the order be approved but that it should be implemented on a staged basis to assess the impact in the area.

5.16 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the objections to the proposed traffic regulation for Chesterwood Drive, Broomhill, be upheld, in part and the revised proposals as shown in the plan included in appendix E-1, introduced;
- (b) consideration be given to extending the Broomhill Permit Parking Zone to include Chesterwood Drive;
- (c) discussions be held with Ashdell School in respect of implementing a Travel Plan to improve parking in the area;
- (d) the objections to the proposed traffic regulation for Orchard Road, Walkley be upheld, in part and the revised proposals as shown in the plan included in appendix E-2, introduced, subject to removing the proposal for the double yellow lines on the north east side of the road next to 90 Orchard Road;
- (e) the objections to the proposed traffic regulation for Fern Road/Welbeck Road, Walkley be upheld, in part and the revised proposals as shown in the plan included in appendix E-3, introduced on a stage by stage basis beginning with the double yellow lines on the corner of the junction of Fern Road/Welbeck Road, Walkley;
- (f) the Traffic Regulation Order, as amended, be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; and
- (g) all the respondents be informed accordingly.

5.17 **Reasons for Decision**

- 5.17. 1 The Traffic Regulation Order for the schemes included in this report was considered necessary to introduce parking restrictions at each of the locations with a view to resolving problems which had been brought to the attention of the City Council.
- 5.17. 2 Local Ward Councillors and officers had given due consideration to the views of all the respondents in an attempt to find acceptable solutions. The recommendations were considered to be a balanced attempt to address residents' concerns and aspirations.
- 5.17. 3 It was agreed to remove the proposal for double yellow lines on the north east side of the road next to 90 Orchard Road as it was believed that this would lead to increased parking problems in the area and was not necessary.
- 5.17. 4 It was agreed to introduce the double yellow lines on Fern Road/Welbeck Road, Walkley on a staged basis as it was felt that the impact of each stage should be assessed before deciding whether the next stage was necessary as a number of residents perceived the full restrictions

unnecessary and would create additional parking and safety problems in the area. Consultation would take place with local Ward Councillors at each stage to decide if further restrictions should be implemented, with the decision delegated to the Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development.

**5.18 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

5.18. These schemes had been designed to meet local needs/priorities as  
1 identified by former Community Assembly members. The proposals put forward were considered to deliver the required outcomes to resolve the problems which had been brought to the attention of the former Assembly.

5.18. These schemes had since been amended, where necessary, to try to  
2 address the concerns raised by residents/businesses.

**6. MOSBOROUGH KEY BUS ROUTE: BIRLEY SPA LANE/SPRINGWATER AVENUE AND MANSFIELD ROAD**

6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining the responses received to the advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders for two proposed schemes on the Mosborough Key Bus Route at Mansfield Road and Birley Spa Lane.

6.2 Ian King, a resident of Birley Spa Lane, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He stated that he was representing a number of local residents who had signed a petition opposing the Birley Spa Lane proposals. The proposals would mean the bus stop would move to the end of his drive which would create a number of problems. The current location of the bus stop was more appropriate for safety reasons as the proposed location would mean that buses could not be seen until the last moment whereas currently they could be seen from much further down the road.

6.3 Mr King further commented that youths may congregate at the bus stop and, as this was at the end of his drive, may create privacy issues. The location would also make it difficult to get on and off his drive and create safety problems. Mr King had no problems with the other measures proposed and believed that they were needed.

6.4 James Burdett, Traffic Engineer, reported that the location of the bus stop had been the preferred option of Members of the local Community Assembly when both options had been put to them. The access to Mr King's driveway would be maintained if the proposals were agreed.

6.5 John Bann added that most bus operators preferred bus stops on the road and not on a layby as at the current location; however the other works could still be completed if the bus stop remained where it was.

6.6 Councillor Bramall commented that on balance he did not see a persuasive reason for moving the bus stop and, although Community Assembly Members had voted for the move, there was not a strong wish to do so.

6.7 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the Mansfield Road Bus Lane Traffic Regulation Order be made and the scheme be implemented. In response to the objection, the Double Yellow Lines on the western side of Newlands Road at its junction with Mansfield Road be reduced by 5m;
- (b) the Birley Spa Lane/Spring Water Avenue Traffic Regulation Order be made and the scheme be implemented, subject to the bus stop remaining at its current location;
- (c) the lead petitioner and the objector be informed accordingly; and
- (d) officers be requested to investigate work on an extra area of verge treatment to enable parking on the left hand side of the junction of Birley Spa Lane.

6.8 **Reasons for Decision**

6.8.1 Both proposed schemes were part of the Mosborough Key Bus Route – the 120 bus route – which was one of the best-used high frequency public transport services in the City. The key route contributed to the City Council’s objectives of improving socially-inclusive access to jobs; improving access to mainstream public transport for all; and improving public transport in order to increase its usage. It aimed to make bus journeys on this main route quicker and more reliable through infrastructure improvements and improving network management and enforceability at critical locations.

6.8.2 Having considered the objections in the TRO consultations, it was considered that the reasons set out in the report for making the Traffic Regulation Orders outweighed the unresolved objections.

6.8.3 It was considered unnecessary to move the bus stop as outlined in the proposals as keeping the bus stop in its current location would not prevent the introduction of the crossing points and a number of residents had objected to the move of the location of the bus stop.

6.9 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

6.9.1 There were no alternative options for the relocation of the Mansfield Road bus lane. The alternative options for the Birley Spa Lane/Spring Water Avenue bus stop were set out in paragraphs 4.8 to 4.13 of the report.

**7. NORTHERN GENERAL HOSPITAL AREA - PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining the receipt of representations made by residents/businesses in response to the introduction of parking restrictions in streets adjacent to the Northern General Hospital as advertised in two Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's). The report also set out the Council's response and recommendations.

7.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) those who made representations be informed accordingly; and
- (c) the proposed parking restrictions be introduced.

**7.3 Reasons for Decision**

7.3.1 The introduction of localised parking restrictions in streets adjacent to the Northern General Hospital will help minimise the impact of long stay parking in the area, providing further opportunities to park for local residents and businesses.

7.3.2 Following the decision at the July 2010 meeting of the Cabinet Highways Committee not to progress permit type restrictions, after significant objections were received, the scheme which has now been developed was considered important to be able to manage parking practices in the area.

7.3.3 Officers had worked with residents/businesses of the area through two TRO consultations in 2013 and an open day event held at the local community centre to develop the final scheme proposals.

7.3.4 Having considered the initial objections in the first TRO consultation and made adjustments in line with residents suggestions, it was considered that the reasons set out in the report for making the Traffic Regulation Order outweighed any unresolved objections.

**7.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

7.4.1 Officers had adjusted the proposals in response to suggestions from residents and businesses. Alternatives had therefore been discussed and investigated through two consultations.

7.4.2 Many residents had indicated that they would support the introduction of a 'Permit Parking Scheme, however a decision was made at the July 2010 meeting of the Cabinet Highways Committee not to progress permit type restrictions after significant objections were received.

**8. DATE OF NEXT SESSION**

8.1 It was noted that the next Session would be held on 10 October 2013.