

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Thursday 9 March 2017 by the Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session.

Date notified to all members: Thursday 9 March 2017

The end of the call-in period is 4:00 pm on Wednesday 15 March 2017

The decision can be implemented from Thursday 16 March 2017

Item No

4. CADMAN STREET AND BLAST LANE: OBJECTION TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

4.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the measures to restrict parking on Cadman Street, Blast Lane and Sussex Street through the introduction of double yellow line and time limited waiting single yellow line waiting restrictions. It also set out officers' responses to objections, including a petition and seeks a decision from the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport.

4.2 RESOLVED: That:-

- (a) having considered the responses to the consultation, it is recommended that the reasons set out in the report outweigh any unresolved objections and that the revised waiting restrictions be implemented and the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) associated traffic signing be introduced;
- (c) the objectors be informed accordingly;
- (d) Capita be advised to re-visit their travel plan; and
- (e) Capita be advised that their employees can use the following link to contact Inmotion, who should be able to provide information on journey planning, ticketing etc <http://www.inmotion.co.uk/help-and-contacts/>

4.3 Reasons for Decision

4.3.1 The proposed measures will address inconsiderate and illegal parking practices which will:

- Improve safety at junctions
- Improve accessibility for Network Rail and local businesses

4.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

4.4.1 The alternatives, as proposed by the various objectors, are to either reduce the restrictions to the point where they would not achieve their objectives, or to not introduce any parking restrictions at all. Neither of these are considered to be acceptable options. No other alternatives to parking restrictions have been considered.

4.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

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

None

4.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Laraine Manley, Executive Director, Place

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

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

5. **WESTWICK CRESCENT AND WESTWICK ROAD: OBJECTION TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS**

5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing measures to restrict parking at the junction of Westwick Crescent and Westwick Road, through the introduction of double yellow line parking restrictions. The introduction of time-limited waiting elsewhere on Westwick Crescent will reduce the impact of the restrictions by increasing the turnover of parking spaces. The report also set out officers' responses to objections received and sought a decision from the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport.

5.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) having considered the responses to the consultation it is recommended that the reasons set out in this report outweigh any unresolved objections and that the revised waiting restrictions be implemented and the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) introduce associated traffic signing; and
- (c) the objectors be informed accordingly.

5.3 **Reasons for Decision**

5.3.1 The proposed measures will address inconsiderate and illegal parking practices which will improve safety at a junction for pedestrians and motorists by removing

parking that blocks sight lines. They will also improve the overall parking experience at this location by replacing single yellow lines, which get ignored, with double yellow lines and by introducing time limited waiting to optimise the availability of parking spaces.

5.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

5.4.1 The only alternative, as proposed by the objectors, is not to introduce any parking restrictions at this location. This is not considered to be an acceptable option. No other alternatives to parking restrictions have been considered.

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

Laraine Manley, Executive Director, Place

5.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

6. ACCEPTANCE OF SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL TRANSITION YEAR GRANT

1.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report to approve acceptance of Sheffield City Region's Sustainable Travel Transition Year (STTY) revenue grant for the year 2016/ 2017. There has been a delay in bringing the report due to clarification of the Sheffield City Region (SCR) governance processes and the preparation of the grant agreement. The grant in the sum of £826,000 will come from the Department for Transport to the Sheffield City Region (SCR) which will in turn be passed on to the Council via a further grant agreement from SCR. The Council will provide match funding in the sum of £176,600. The Council will also be the accountable body for the grant. Therefore the Council will be responsible for the obligations and liabilities of the grant agreement placed on the Sheffield City Region, which have been passed on from SCR to the Council.

6.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport:-

- (a) notes the acceptance of Sheffield City Region's Sustainable Travel Transition Year (STTY) revenue grant of up to £826,000 and match funding of £176,600, as detailed in Appendix A of the report (STTY Revenue Programme Summary);
- (b) approves the Council entering into and signing the grant agreement with the Sheffield City Region, to accept the STTY revenue grant and the terms of

the grant, as detailed at Appendix B of the report;

- (c) notes that the Council will act as a delivery partner for projects totalling £1,002,600 (SCR grant of £826,000+ £176,600 of match funding) and act as the accountable body for the grant allocated to the Council; and
- (d) delegates' authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance to take such steps as they deem appropriate to achieve the outcomes set out in this report.

6.3 Reasons for Decision

- 6.3.1 Acceptance of the grant would enable the continuation of complimentary revenue measures (such as cycle training and events, independent travel training and road safety education and training) to capital investment in improving road safety, including facilities for walkers and cyclists that will help achieve the Transport outcome of having better connected transport to increase travel choices.

6.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 6.4.1 An alternative option would be to reject the Sustainable Travel Transition Year grant, which would have a detrimental effect on the overall funding for Transport, Traffic and Parking Services and consequently Sheffield City Council.

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

Laraine Manley, Executive Director, Place

6.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

7. CHANGES TO PRICES FOR PAPERLESS VISITOR PARKING VOUCHERS

- 7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking approval to offer electronic paperless visitor parking vouchers at a lower rate than the current paper visitor parking vouchers.

7.2 RESOLVED: That:-

- (a) paperless parking visitor vouchers be introduced at £10 per batch of 25, 25% less than the current cost of paper booklets; and

- (b) a contingency of paper parking visitor booklets be maintained to support customers with additional needs.

7.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 7.3.1 As part of the Customer Experience programme, introducing paperless permits improves customer ability to access vouchers quickly rather than be reliant on manual processing of an online request, which is subject to loss or delay in the post.
- 7.3.2 Paperless visitor vouchers will offset future costs increases for staff required for manual processing.
- 7.3.3 Allowing paperless vouchers to be issued in half day segments reduces risk of customers being adversely disadvantaged from the current transferable paper method.
- 7.3.4 Reducing costs of paperless virtual visitor vouchers means that the risk of customers being adversely affected if they do need to purchase more vouchers is reduced.
- 7.3.5 The maximum potential loss by introducing paperless permits at less than the current costs is £13,140. The actual loss is likely to be less than this as some customers may have to purchase more books than they currently do.
- 7.3.6 Support for people with additional needs or lack of internet access is still available via customer services, and a contingency of maintaining paper permits can be considered.
- 7.3.7 The council will gain a better understanding of visitor vouchers use, which can support any future review of parking permit policy.

7.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 7.4.1 **Do nothing** – continue to implement paperless permits, but leave visitor vouchers as paper books.

Implications of this are increased cost to Parking Services and Sheffield City Council of continuing to have a paper system. This is an indicative cost of £10k per year based on needing additional staff to process paper permit application checks.

7.4.2 **Change to paperless visitor vouchers but maintain current cost**

Implications – Paperless permits require the vehicle registration to be entered into the database. This will mean that vouchers cannot be transferred between vehicles in the way they currently can be. Introducing a half day voucher at half the cost, for example 5hrs parking for £0.25 would provide greater flexibility for shorter stay visitors and reduce the risk of it costing the resident more than it

currently does. However there is some risk of dissatisfaction at the perceived “extra cost” if customers currently transfer the voucher more than once.

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

Laraine Manley, Executive Director, Place

7.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing