#### SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

#### **EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISION RECORD**

The following decisions were taken on Thursday 11 September 2014 by the Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session.

Date notified to all members: Wednesday 24 September 2014

The end of the call-in period is 4:00 pm on Tuesday 30 September 2014

The decision can be implemented from Wednesday 1 October 2014

#### Item No

# 5. GLEADLESS KEY BUS ROUTE SCHEME UPDATE AND TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER CONSULTATION

5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the further measures to be introduced during 2014/15 along the Gleadless Key Bus Route corridor to accessibility and punctuality of services 20, 20A, 47, 48, 79 and 79A in the Gleadless area, building on the work which commenced in 2013. The report also set out officer's responses to objections received to Traffic Regulation Orders with regard to proposed parking restrictions and bus lanes and general comments received with regard to the proposals.

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

- (a) a further report be submitted to a future Highways Cabinet Member Decision Session on the scope and outcome of consultation on the junction arrangement at the location of Prospect Road and Myrtle Road;
- (b) in light of comments now made, ecological assessments and consultation be undertaken in respect of land adjacent to (i) Blackstock Road between Gleadless Road and Bankwood Road and (ii) Spencer Road and Prospect Road and that the findings be reported to a future Highways Cabinet Member Decision Session:
- (c) the Traffic Regulation Orders described in the report, , be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (d) detailed design be completed and the proposals described in the report be implemented subject to the Council's Capital Approval procedures and the satisfactory outcome of further consultation following completion of the work referred toin paragraphs (a) and (b) above, to the satisfaction of the Highways Cabinet Member;
- (e) it be noted that full funding for the scheme had not yet been secured; and
- (f) the objectors be informed accordingly.

#### 5.3 Reasons for Decision

- 5.3.1 The proposals described in the report, supported by the Traffic Regulation Orders, will contribute to improvements in the punctuality and reliability of bus services in the Gleadless area together with accessibility improvements to/from bus stops and for passengers boarding and alighting buses. Having considered the objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders it was recommended that the reasons set out in the report for making the Traffic Regulation Orders outweighed any unresolved objections.
- 5.3.2 The scoping and consultation on the proposed junction at Myrtle Road and Prospect Road is required to ascertain the best solution for the location which meets residents requirements
- 5.3.3 The ecological surveys and consultation are required in view of the loss of green space to accommodate the road widening.

### 5.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 5.4.1 Officers considered a number of options for each scheme. In the case of the Blackstock Road/Constable Road scheme, a zebra crossing was considered but was not progressed as the speed of traffic on Blackstock Road would have required the introduction of traffic calming on the approaches to the crossing and would have detrimentally affected the availability of on-street parking availability. The proposed central refuge was tested in various locations both in relation to the bus stops and with a view to minimising the negative impact on parking.
- 5.4.2 The Blackstock Road widening scheme was developed following a review of an earlier proposal to provide a minor bus-only facility at the junction of Gleadless Road. This was discounted as, without the additional length of bus lane now proposed, the limited time saving benefits for buses did not justify the scheme cost.
- 5.4.3 The Richards Road widening proposals were developed after consideration of a new parking lay-by on the opposite side of Richards Road to accommodate residents' on-street parking requirements. The widening scheme now proposed accommodated parking along the frontage of the properties rather than on the opposite side of the carriageway and provided a slight increase in parking availability over the existing arrangement. The previous lay-by option would have resulted in a net loss of parking spaces.
- 5.4.4 With regard to the Spencer Road/Prospect Road/Myrtle Road proposals, although the scope and extent of the proposed bus lane had been determined, a number of different junction layouts were currently under consideration. Computer traffic modelling was being utilised to assess the arrangements and compare the outcomes with a simple 'give-way' layout, as currently exists. This latter arrangement may offer the most flexibility for all traffic throughout the day, with little negative impact on the calculated bus time-savings. In view of the ongoing assessments and the necessity to undertake further, localised, consultation when

the optimum junction layout had been finalised, it was proposed to submit a further report on these proposals and the outcome of consultation in due course.

# 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** 

# 6. INVESTING IN SHEFFIELD'S LOCAL TRANSPORT SYSTEM: PROGRESS ON THE 2014/15 CAPITAL PROGRAMME AND THE DRAFT 2015/16 PROGRAMME

- 6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining progress on the Council's overall transport capital programme for 2014/15; and to provide early guidance on the 2015/16 Local Transport Plan programme.
- 6.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-
  - (a) current progress on the overall 2014/15 transport programme be noted;
  - (b) the draft outline 2015/16 LTP transport programme and Better Buses Programme be endorsed, subsequent to the Council's overall budget setting process; and
  - (c) officers be instructed to seek appropriate financial approval for each project through the Council's formal Capital Approval process.

#### 6.3 Reasons for Decision

6.3.1 Council officers have worked with South Yorkshire partners and the relevant Cabinet Lead Member to ensure that the draft proposals for inclusion in the 2015/16 transport capital programme meet the objectives of 'A Vision for Excellent Transport', 'Standing up for Sheffield' and the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy. They are also compatible with the Sheffield Bus Partnership Investment Plan and the Council's Public Health plan and the emerging Cycling Strategy and Green Commission.

#### 6.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 6.4.1 The alternative options for prioritising the allocations of transport funding were also discussed and endorsed in December 2013.
- 6.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

6.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

6.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

6.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

**Economic and Environmental Wellbeing** 

- 7. SHEFFIELD 20MPH SPEED LIMIT STRATEGY: CONSULTATION FEEDBACK TO THE INTRODUCTION OF A 20MPH SPEED LIMIT IN HEELEY AND MEERSBROOK; LONGLEY; SOUTHEY GREEN; AND THE WARREN LANE AREA OF CHAPELTOWN
- 7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the response from residents to the proposal to introduce a 20mph speed limit in Heeley and Meersbrook; Longley; Southey Green; and the Warren Lane area of Chapeltown, reporting the receipt of objections and setting out the Council's response.
- 7.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-
  - (a) the Heeley and Meersbrook; Longley; Southey Green and the Warren Lane area of Chapeltown 20mph Speed Limit Orders be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
  - (b) the objectors be informed accordingly; and
  - (c) the proposed 20mph speed limits be introduced.
- 7.3 **Reasons for Decision**
- 7.3.1 Reducing the speed of traffic in residential areas will, in the long term, reduce the number and severity of accidents, reduce the fear of accidents, encourage sustainable modes of travel and contribute towards the creation of a more pleasant, cohesive environment.
- 7.3.2 Having considered the objections to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Heeley/Meersbrook and Longley the officer view was that the reasons set out in the report for making the Speed Limit Order outweighed the objections. The introduction of a 20mph speed limit in this area would be in keeping with the City's

approved 20mph Speed Limit Strategy.

# 7.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

7.4.1 The objections related to the principle of introducing sign-only 20mph speed limits into residential areas, and therefore the approved Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. As such, no alternative options had been considered. Speeds will be monitored and the addition of further measures will be considered if appropriate, as outlined in section 4.12 of the report.

### 7.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

# 7.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

### 7.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

# 7.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

**Economic and Environmental Wellbeing**