

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 8 January 2015

PRESENT: Councillors Leigh Bramall(Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development) and Jayne Dunn (Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs (Cabinet Adviser)
Moaz Khan (Interim Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services)
Simon Botterill (Team Manager, Traffic Management)
Dick Proctor (Transport Planning Manager)
Nat Porter (Highways Officer)
Susie Pryor (Senior Transport Planner)
James Haigh (Highways Technician)
Dave Aspinall (Woodland Manager)

.....

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 previous Session held on 13 November 2014 were approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

4.1 New Petitions

The Cabinet Members received and noted petitions (a) containing 40 signatures requesting the removal of the central grass verge on Butchill Avenue and (b) containing 12 signatures requesting improved road safety measures on Sharrow Vale Road.

4.2 Outstanding Petitions List

The Cabinet Members received and noted a report of The Executive Director, Place setting out the position on outstanding petitions that were being investigated.

5. DEEP LANE CYCLE CROSSING CONSULTATION

5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the proposed changes

to improve the perception of safety for users of the Blackburn Valley Cycle Route when crossing Deep Lane. It also set out a response to an objection to the scheme.

5.2 Neil Stadden and Louise Marley, two local residents, attended the meeting to make representations to the Cabinet Member. Mr Stadden commented that they had recently purchased Station House and planned to run a motor trade business from the property.

5.3 Ms. Marley added that the yard at the property would be used as a car sales area and access was required. In the future there were plans to open an ice cream/café cart next to the property which they hoped would enhance the cycle route and encourage people to come to the area and this would require access. She also had concerns about drainage in the area and the effect of the proposals in a flood risk area.

5.4 Simon Botterill, Team Manager, Traffic Management, commented that the scheme had been developed prior to Mr Stadden and Ms. Marley purchasing the property referred to. He acknowledged the need for customer parking but added that businesses should not rely on the use of on street parking and provide customer parking. However, there would be two spaces available outside Station House for parking.

5.5 Mr Botterill further commented that there would be more than adequate room for a vehicle with a trailer to access the site. Officers did not want to encourage vehicles to park in the area on a large scale as this could present problems for pedestrians and other road users.

5.6 Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, commented that he supported the idea of an ice cream/café cart in the area. He supported the scheme but requested that drainage was looked at as part of the detailed design.

5.7 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the scheme, as described in the report, be approved;
- (b) works to improve drainage in the area be undertaken by Amey as part of the detailed design process; and
- (b) the objectors be informed accordingly.

5.8 **Reasons for Decision**

5.8.1 Officers believe the objections have been addressed and the reasons for the recommendations outweigh the objections received. The works described in the report will contribute to an improvement in safety on Deep Lane.

5.9 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 5.9.1 A signing only scheme was considered but it was decided that it would not have sufficient effect on driver speed and would not have any effect on visibility.

6. COISLEY HILL - OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING

- 6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining objections received to proposals for the introduction of traffic calming and a pedestrian crossing, along with associated waiting restrictions, on Coisley Hill and Sheffield Road, Woodhouse. The report sought a decision on how the scheme should be progressed in light of these objections.
- 6.2 Nat Porter, Highways Officer, informed the Cabinet Member that he had received representations from a local resident who had not been able to attend the Session but wished to inform them that he fully supported the measures proposed.
- 6.3 Debbie Naughton, a local resident attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. She commented that she believed local residents were being punished as a result of the actions of parents and children of the nearby school. They had ignored the current restrictions which were in place so she had no confidence that they would comply with the restrictions proposed.
- 6.4 Ms. Naughton believed the proposed crossing was in the wrong location and should be sited closer to Wolverley Road which would be the more appropriate location for pedestrians to cross. She added that coaches used by the school regularly parked on double yellow and zig zag lines. If the proposals were agreed other vehicles would have to overtake the coaches which would create a potential danger.
- 6.5 Ms. Naughton stated that the drive at 167 Coisley Hill required access as two disabled users lived there. She had discussed this with Mr Porter and disagreed with him on the distances. Work undertaken for the scheme would be 11ft from number 167 and the beacon would glare into the house. If this was sited slightly closer to the school the beacon would be between two houses.
- 6.6 There was an 11ft clearance from the drive of number 167 to the proposed crossing. This would make seeing pedestrians from the drive very difficult and create a danger as cars would have to reverse out from number 167.
- 6.7 Janet Barry, a resident of Ashpool Close, also attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. She stated that she was not in principal opposed to a crossing in the area. However, she was disabled and had responsibility for transporting a disabled person at number 167 Coisley Hill. She currently had to reverse from the drive of number 167 and she had concerns that if a crossing was put in the location proposed many children would not realise that there was a drive at number 167.
- 6.8 She believed that the observations in the area referred to in the report must have been done during school times and they needed to also be done at other times to assess the general use in the area. If the crossing was moved closer to Wolverley Road it would be used at all times of the day and not just during school hours.

- 6.9 Parking restrictions currently in place in the area were ignored especially during school times and Ms. Barry believed the proposals were punishing local residents when the problems had not been caused by them. Traffic using Sheffield Road was not aware of the drive at number 167 and were therefore not allowing room for the car to reverse out of the drive.
- 6.10 Ms. Barry did not believe the consultation process had been extensive. Her mother had not been notified by the Council and she lived at the location where the crossing was proposed. She had to phone the Council to find out about the proposals.
- 6.11 Celia Hurst, a local resident, stated that she lived at the property where the proposed crossing would be located. Work was being undertaken at the location at the present time prior to any decision being taken and was already causing problems for pedestrians who were having to walk out into the road.
- 6.12 Janet Barry asked where the footpath was proposed to be widened and how would this be done? She was worried about road safety and breaking the law as she would have to reverse out onto a pedestrian crossing. The crossing should be located further up near Wolverley Road where it would have more use as there were two housing estates, a shop, working man's club and a bus stop. If the crossing was for the benefit of the school could this not be located at the top of Coisley Hill where it would mean parents would only have to walk a little bit further? She further commented that the speed limit should be reduced around the school and there should be enforcement around the school during school hours
- 6.13 Councillor Ray Satur also attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He commented that he was speaking on behalf of the owner of a small independent retailer on Sheffield Road. She had requested two parking spaces outside her shop as she relied on passing trade and also had deliveries to the shop. She also had a severely disabled son who needed to be transported. Her request was supported by a 171 signature petition.
- 6.14 Nat Porter responded that, because the demand at school times was so great, it was not felt to not be appropriate to provide the crossing near Wolverley Road and leave the school crossing site unprotected. He did have sympathy with the residents' view that a crossing was needed near Wolverley Road but he felt this should be an additional crossing to the one proposed and not instead of the one proposed.
- 6.15 Mr Porter added that levels would be put on the beacons to minimise the light pollution. The detailed design had suggested moving the crossing further west and would now be erected on the boundary between numbers 165 and 167. The beacon would be bracketed off to allow flexibility in how it would be directed and it was hoped to place the beacon as close to the boundary as possible.
- 6.16 Moaz Khan, Interim Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services, commented that it was not uncommon to see the access for a drive near a pedestrian crossing and this actually improved safety rather than cause a danger as had been

suggested.

6.17 In response to questions from Cabinet Members, Nat Porter confirmed that more work was needed to assess whether people would migrate to an alternative crossing at Wolverley Road. Moving the crossing to that location would lead to similar concerns from residents about private access.

6.18 Following concerns raised by officers as to funding for the scheme, officers agreed to look again at funding for a scheme in the area. Cabinet Members further requested that discussions be held with the local school to obtain their views on the scheme.

6.2 **RESOLVED:** That a decision on the scheme be deferred to a future meeting pending further consideration of the location of the proposed zebra pedestrian crossing.

6.3 **Reasons for Decision**

6.3.1 To consider the objections received in greater detail.

6.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

6.4.1 Implementing the scheme as advertised was considered but rejected owing to objectors' concerns.

6.4.2 Abandoning the scheme was considered but rejected given apparent support for the scheme in principle.

7. **20MPH PROGRAMME FOR 2015/16 AND A REVIEW OF THE BOUNDARIES OF THE AREAS**

5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the proposed programme of 20mph areas for 2015/16 and changes to the boundaries of some of these areas. It also included recommendations for the prioritisation of 20mph schemes and the issue of whether to include classified roads.

5.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the 2015/16 programme of proposed 20mph areas described in paragraph 4.12 of the report be approved;
- (b) the introduction of future 20mph schemes be prioritised by both their road injury collision record and the potential to co-ordinate their introduction with the Streets Ahead maintenance programme;
- (c) each classified road within a proposed 20mph area be assessed for inclusion or exclusion on a case by case basis;
- (d) the boundary review be continued for all the remaining potential 20mph

areas in the City.

5.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 5.3.1 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
- 5.3.2 The introduction of a 20mph speed limit in these areas would be in-keeping with the City's approved 20mph Speed Limit Strategy.

5.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 5.4.1 That speed limits in residential areas across the City remain the same. However, this would lead to the same level of road accidents and vehicle speeds in residential areas.

8. **OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMIT IN HACKENTHORPE AND THE AREA AROUND LONDON ROAD**

- 7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the response from residents to the proposal to introduce a 20mph speed limit in Hackenthorpe and the area around London Road, reporting the receipt of objections and setting out the Council's response.

7.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the Hackenthorpe and London Road area 20mph Speed Limit Orders be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) the objectors be informed accordingly;
- (c) the proposed 20mph speed limits be introduced; and
- (d) an advisory part-time 20ph speed limit be introduced on parts of Beighton Road as shown in Appendix C to the report.

5.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 5.3.1 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.
- 5.3.2 Having considered the objections to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Hackenthorpe and the London Road area the officer view is that the reasons set out in the report for making the Speed Limit Order outweigh the objections. The introduction of a 20mph speed limit in these areas would be in-keeping with the

City's approved 20mph Speed Limit Strategy.

5.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 5.4.1 In the case of Sheffield Road and Beighton Road consideration had been given to two alternative options to that recommended in this report. The first, to introduce a 20mph limit along the full length of Sheffield Road and Beighton Road as advertised had been discussed in paragraph 4.13 to 4.16 of the report. The introduction of a mandatory part-time 20mph speed limit in the area around the Beighton Road entrance to Rainbow Forge school has also been explored and discounted to the disproportionately high cost involved in providing the correct variable message signing required to render the limit legally enforceable.
- 5.4.2 The other objections relate 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 have been considered. Speeds will be monitored and the addition of further measures will be considered, if appropriate, as outlined in paragraphs 4.12 and 4.21 of the report.

9. **CAT LANE/CARFIELD LANE - PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF DRIVING ORDER**

- 9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to a proposed prohibition of driving order at Cat Lane/Carfield Lane.
- 9.2 **RESOLVED:** That, having considered the objection(s) to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order, it is agreed that:-
- (a) the objection should be overruled;
 - (b) the Traffic Regulation Order should be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
 - (c) the objector be informed accordingly;
 - (d) the necessary work to implement the closure of Cat Lane be carried out; and
 - (e) authority be given for the gate to be locked shut to prevent the passage of vehicles.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 9.3.1 Fly tipping is a problem in this area and current measures are not sufficient for the local users of the area. This TRO and gate will remove the through route, which are known to be preferred by fly-tippers, therefore reducing the incidences of fly-tipping at this location and increasing the amenity of this area for the local users of the area.

9.3.2 Agreement from PROW, The Countryside and Environment team, Highways Maintenance including Amey, local members and The Friends of Cat Lane Woods that this is the best course of action.

9.3.3 Whilst the issues raised by the objector are noted it is felt that these issues have all been considered and addressed and that the benefits of proceeding with the TRO outweigh the outstanding objection

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 Apply for TRO and fit 2 gates to completely restrict vehicular access from the outset. It was preference of all in attendance at the meeting to have a TRO that allows for this, but to only put one physical gate in place in the first instance, to ease access to Rose Cottage, whilst restricting the through route that fly-tippers currently enjoy. This was discussed and agreed as the best course of action at the site visit in September 2013.

9.4.2 Monitor the area and continue to remove fly-tipping.

Fly-tipping is removed from the public right of way itself by Amey under the streets ahead contract.

Fly-tipping is removed from the adjacent lands by the Countryside and Environment team.

This is not sustainable for Countryside and Environment team in particular who struggle to keep on top of the issue in this area. The local public including The Friends of Cat Lane Woods are calling for more robust and sustained action by Sheffield City Council.