

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Thursday 10 October 2013 by the Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session.

Date notified to all members: 14 October 2013

The end of the call-in period is 4:00 pm on 18 October 2013

The decision can be implemented from 19 October 2013

### Item No

#### **5. ECCLESALL ROAD SMART ROUTE - OBJECTIONS TO A TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER RELATING TO CHANGE TO LENGTHS OF BUS LANE**

5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining the receipt of objections to a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to a) remove the length of out-bound bus lane on Ecclesall Road between Hunters Bar and Rustlings Road and b) shorten the out-bound bus lane by 36 metres on the approach to the Psalter Lane junction and setting out the Council's response. The report also outlined the reasons to discontinue progressing proposals to provide a suggested shared pedestrian/cyclist facility on the footway adjacent to the length of bus lane proposed to be removed, but recommending interim arrangements to address some of the concerns expressed by objectors.

#### 5.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the reasons set out in the report for making the TRO outweighed any unresolved objections and the TRO be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) the TRO be made in respect of the bus lane on the approach to the Psalter Lane junction and an advisory cycle lane be introduced to provide an alternative for cyclists to off-set the loss of the bus lane;
- (c) the removal of the bus lane between Hunters Bar and Rustlings Road be deferred pending the provision of a suitable alternative route for cyclists. Following such provision, the bus lane be removed to be replaced by an advisory cycle lane;
- (d) the objectors be informed accordingly.

#### 5.3 **Reasons for Decision**

5.3.1 The Council had previously undertaken extensive survey work and two comprehensive public consultation exercises with regard to the Ecclesall

Road Smart Route. The outcomes of the first and second stages of consultation were reported to the Cabinet Highways Committee in February and December 2011 respectively. The latter report detailed the public responses to the various interventions proposed along the route. It also set out a table summarising the consultation results and suggesting a proposed way forward with regard to each intervention. Intervention 9a related to removal of the bus lanes at Hunters Bar and proposed that the inbound bus lane should remain but that the outbound bus lane should be removed as analysis showed that Hunters Bar could work more efficiently if both approach lanes to the junction (from City) were used more equally.

5.3.2 Therefore, despite the objections received to this TRO, the recommendation to implement the changes to the outbound bus lane, as set out in the report to the Cabinet Highways Committee in December 2011, should be endorsed and the objections over-ruled.

5.3.3 In view of the concerns expressed by the cyclists, it was considered that mitigating arrangements should be introduced to temporarily address the situation until an alternative route was provided. This was proposed to be achieved by means of an advisory cycle lane on the approach to the Psalter Lane junction and retention of the lower length of bus lane until the alternative route was available.

#### 5.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

5.4.1 The proposal to which the objections relate was one intervention of many along the length of the Ecclesall Road Smart Route. A number of interventions were outlined during the consultation period and the responses analysed to inform which proposals should be progressed, revised or dropped. For example, the option to slightly re-shape Hunters Bar roundabout to enable a better traffic lane arrangement received a strongly negative response from respondents. The traffic modelling and analysis of the interventions to be promoted and developed demonstrated that the proposals to remove sections of the bus lane at this location added to the overall benefits identified.

5.4.2 The strength of objections expressed by cyclists indicated the need to provide suitable replacement facilities over the two bus sections of bus lane proposed to be removed. Accordingly, it was incumbent on the Council to identify suitable measures to minimise the impact of and address the situation in the short term.

5.4.3 The suggested provision of pedestrian/cyclist shared use of the footway attracted strong opposition from objectors and was consequently not recommended. Other options considered included:-

(i) Retain the bus lanes – this was not a satisfactory permanent solution as the time-saving benefits outlined in paragraph 4.6 of the report would be significantly compromised.

(ii) Remove the bus lanes and provide replacement advisory cycle lanes – this option was felt to provide a reasonable solution on the approach to the Psalter Lane junction but was less satisfactory over the lower length. Less confident cyclists would still feel vulnerable during the evening peak in particular as the two adjacent traffic lanes would be fully utilised following removal of the bus lane and the overall width of available carriageway was not generous.

(iii) As (ii) above but with the lower bus lane temporarily retained – the bus lane would be removed and replaced by an advisory cycle lane only when the alternative cycle route was completed. The potential drawbacks relating to provision of the cycle lane would still be present, but its use would probably be limited to confident, utility cyclists with others choosing to use the Endcliffe Park/Ranby Road route.

5.4.4 Of the various considered measures to address the safety concerns expressed by the objectors, the proposal outlined in paragraph 5.3 (iii) of the report was felt to be the most appropriate in the circumstances.

5.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

5.6 **Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

None

5.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

5.8 **Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In**

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing