

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 12 December 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  
Simon Botterill, Team Manager, Traffic Management  
Stan Collier, Senior Technician  
Nel Corker, Highways  
Andrew Marwood, Highways 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 previous Session, held on 14 November 2013 were approved as a correct record.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

4.1 The Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services reported that petitions had been received (i) containing 197 signatures requesting traffic calming measures on Harborough Avenue, Manor Park, (ii) containing 45 signatures requesting a change to the pedestrian crossing at the junction of Chancet Wood Drive and Greenhill Avenue and (iii) containing 168 signatures in relation to problems caused by Stagecoach bus drivers parking their cars on Green Lane and The Common, Ecclesfield. Petitions (i) and (ii) would be referred to the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development. Petition (iii) had been referred to the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive for a response to the lead petitioner.

**5. INVESTING IN SHEFFIELD'S LOCAL TRANSPORT SYSTEM: 2013/14 UPDATE AND 2014/15 PROPOSALS**

5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining progress in delivering the Council's overall transport capital programme in 2013/14; and seeking outline approval for the draft programme for 2014/15

5.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Cabinet Member:-

- (a) endorses the updated current 2013/14 Local Transport Plan programme;
- (b) approves the proposed allocations for the draft 2014/15 Local Transport Plan programme, as indicative priorities for consideration within the Council's overall budget setting process, due to be received by Cabinet early in the New Year;
- (c) endorses the continued 2013/14 and 2014/15 programmes for Local Sustainable Transport Funds, the Better Buses Area Fund (BBAF) and the Better Bus Area (BB2) as approved by the Department for Transport;
- (d) notes the differing levels of flexibility available for the various funding streams; and
- (e) instructs officers to seek appropriate financial approval for each project through the Council's formal Cabinet approval process.

### **5.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 5.3.1 Council Officers have worked with South Yorkshire partners, SYITA Members and the relevant Cabinet Lead Members to ensure that the proposed LTP Capital Programmes for 2013/14 and 2014/15 and the current LSTF and BBAF programmes meet the objectives of 'A Vision for Excellent Transport', 'Standing up for Sheffield', and the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy.

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

- 5.4.1 The splits in funding of each block could be spent in any number of ways. However, the current proposal is based on the City Council working with South Yorkshire partners and Cabinet Lead Members on Transport, Highways and Environmental matters to ensure that the proposed LTP Capital Programmes for 2013/14 and 2014/15 meet the objectives of 'A Vision for Excellent Transport', 'Standing up for Sheffield, and the South Yorkshire LTP whilst maximising the opportunities presented through the 'Streets Ahead' Programme.
- 5.4.2 For LSTF, Better Buses and Pinch Point Funding, alternative options are limited as the bids were based on delivering specific types of outputs and outcomes. However, within that scope, there is some flexibility to change the specific locations of interventions.

## **6. REQUEST FOR PEDESTRIAN CROSSING ON HUTCLIFFE WOOD ROAD**

- 6.1 It was reported that this item had been withdrawn from the agenda.

## **7. MALIN BRIDGE JOBCONNECTOR**

- 7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking Cabinet Member approval to implement the scheme to improve the bus/tram interchange at Malin

Bridge by providing a permanent stop and terminus point for the Supertram Link bus service adjacent to the Malin Bridge tram stop and terminus.

7.2 **RESOLVED:** That the scheme be implemented to improve interchange between bus and tram at Malin Bridge by providing a permanent stop and terminus point for the Supertram Link bus service adjacent to the Malin Bridge tram stop and terminus.

### 7.3 **Reasons for Decision**

7.3.1 The proposal is the best location for interchange between bus and tram at Malin Bridge. It will provide convenient, accessible and safe interchange between the Supertram Link bus service and the tram, as well as with the other bus services that use this bus stop. The impact on traffic of the existing temporary bus stop will be removed. The new location will be monitored and reviewed to see what, if any, impact the new provision has on local traffic management.

### 7.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

7.4.1 Several different locations for a permanent solution have been investigated since 2010. These have included the service road and the Park and Rode, as well as various locations around the gyratory, including the extension of the existing bus layby adjacent to the tram stop to allow the bus to stop within it and wait time. There are pros and cons to all of these locations and these were discussed between officers and Local Members. Following that, it was agreed to progress to public consultation on extending the existing bus layby adjacent to the tram stop. The other alternative option would be to do nothing and leave the existing bus stop in the existing 'temporary' location but this does impact on traffic management and congestion around this gyratory, as well as local residents.

## 8. **REPORT ON OBJECTIONS AND COMMENTS TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS (TROS) IN THE FORMER NORTHERN AND NORTH EAST COMMUNITY ASSEMBLY AREA**

8.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining the receipt of objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order associated with several waiting restrictions in the former Northern and North East Community Assembly areas and setting out the Council's response.

8.2 It was reported that written representations had been received from Mr Terry Mills, a local shop owner, who had requested that his representations be read out at the meeting. Mr Mills was in support of the original Traffic Regulation Order which had proposed 4 limited waiting parking days and did not support the revised proposal for 1 bay. He believed that spaces were at premium, with people, nearby residents and businesses not parking considerately and requested a minimum of 3 bays to allow more turnover of visitors to the shops.

8.3 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the Traffic Regulation Order for Ash View be made as advertised;
- (b) the Traffic Regulation Order for Hillcrest Road be made as advertised;
- (c) the Traffic Regulation Order for Langsett Road South be made as advertised with the reduced length of restriction;
- (d) the Traffic Regulation Order for Middlewood Drive be made with the reduced length of restriction;
- (e) the Traffic Regulation Order for Middlewood Drive East be made with the reduced length of restriction; and
- (f) all respondents be informed accordingly.

#### **8.4 Reasons for Decision**

- 8.4.1 The Traffic Regulation Order for the schemes included in the report is considered necessary to introduce parking restrictions at each of the locations with a view to resolving problems which have been brought to the attention of the City Council.
- 8.4.2 Officers have given due consideration to the views of all respondents in an attempt to find acceptable solutions. The recommendations are considered to be a balanced attempt to address residents' concerns and aspirations.
- 8.4.3 Officers consider that the reasons set out in the report outweigh the objections but accept that the length of the waiting restrictions should be reduced at Langsett Road South, Middlewood Drive and Middlewood Drive East. The new proposals are shown on plans located in Appendices E2, F2 and G2 of the report. Requests for further waiting restrictions should be assessed at Bevan Way, Hillcrest Road and Eastgate if necessary once the proposed restrictions have been implemented. Further requests in the areas collated from the responses are to be submitted as a small scheme request to be assessed.

#### **8.5 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 8.5.1 The proposed Traffic Regulation Order is the best solution to the parking problems that exist at these locations. The parking at these locations cannot be controlled by enforcement by Parking Services Officers until the Traffic Regulation Order is made. No alternatives have therefore been considered, but adjustments made where considered necessary in response to public comments.

### **9. OBJECTIONS TO A PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER TO INTRODUCE PARKING RESTRICTIONS AT VARIOUS JUNCTIONS WITH CROSS LANE (CROOKES) AND ON WOODHOLM ROAD (ECCLESALL) - REVISED VERSION TO BE CONSIDERED AT THE MEETING**

- 9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out the 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 South West Community Assembly.

- 9.2 Trevor Jones, a resident of St Thomas Road, attended the meeting to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He stated that he was satisfied with the revised proposal on Cross Lane. If the original proposals had been agreed he would have had difficulty loading and unloading shopping. He believed the main problem on Cross Lane to be speed levels and this had been a problem even before the resurfacing of the road. As such he would like to see a 20mph speed limit on Cross Lane.
- 9.3 Anne Walker, also a resident of St Thomas Road and Russell Ward, resident of Forres Avenue, commented that they would not like to have seen the original proposal agreed and Mrs Walker stated that she was satisfied with the reduction in length of restriction to 5 metres on St. Thomas Road.
- 9.4 In response, Simon Botterill, Team Manager, Traffic Management, commented that speed cameras were only introduced on roads with an accident record. However, he noted the concerns raised and would investigate whether a 'smiley' speed restriction sign could be introduced. Speeds had been monitored since the resurfacing of roads throughout the City and, although it did not look as though speeds had increased to a great extent, it was still too early to draw conclusions.
- 9.5 20mph limits were being rolled out across the City. These were tied to accident levels and the Streets Ahead project. The proposals for the proposed restrictions Cross Lane were in line with the Highway Code, but had been reduced on St Thomas Road in recognition of the parking difficulties experienced there.
- 9.6 In relation to Woodholm Road, Mr Eyre, a resident of 7 Woodholm Road, stated that he accepted that if you lived near a school there would be issues related to parking, however the school was now being used as a community facility 7 days a week. Parking was available on the site but this was not actively encouraged and Woodholm Road effectively became the car park. The current headteacher of the school had informed Mr Eyre that they did not believe the parking problems were the responsibility of the school. This created poor visibility and cars often had to drive to the middle of the road before they could see oncoming traffic.
- 9.7 Mr Eyre stated that he had previously requested a permit parking scheme on Woodholm Road but this had been dismissed. He hoped that the proposed Traffic Regulation Order would be enforced.
- 9.8 In response, Simon Botterill commented that he recognised that the situation was unfortunate. However, the school did have to find ways to generate revenue. Officers were in the process of making the zig zag lines legally enforceable and the intention was to more rigorously enforce against people parking on them.
- 9.9 Problems caused by parking by School coaches would be investigated with the Children, Young People and Families portfolio. The Council did not have funding to provide H markings, in isolation, although this marking would be provided on Cross Lane at the request of Ward Councillors.

9.9 Mr Cartwright, Facilities Manager for the School reported that he was now meeting regularly with Councillor Diana Stimely, Ward Councillor for the area, to discuss issues and potential solutions. The school sent an email every term reminding people to park considerately, however they could not enforce where there were problems. A School Travel Advisor had also been into the school to discuss ways to resolve the problem.

9.10 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the objections be upheld, in part, to the proposed traffic regulations on the junctions of Cross Lane with Forres Avenue, St Thomas Road and Truswell Road, Crookes and on Woodholm Road, Ecclesall and the revised proposals be introduced as shown in the plans included in Appendices C-1 and C-2 to this report;
- (b) the objections be overruled to the proposed traffic regulations on the junctions of Cross Lane with Arran Road and Forres Road and the restrictions be introduced as shown in the plan included in Appendix B-2 to the report;
- (c) the Traffic Regulation Order be made, as amended, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; and
- (d) all the respondents be informed accordingly.

9.11 **Reasons for Decision**

9.12 The Traffic Regulation Order for the schemes included in the report was necessary to introduce parking restrictions at each of the locations with a view to resolving problems which have been brought to the attention of the City Council.

9.13 Local Ward Councillors and officers have 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.

9.14 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

9.14.2 Two of the schemes have been amended to try and address the concerns raised by residents.

**10. OBJECTIONS TO A PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER TO INTRODUCE A ONE-WAY TRAFFIC SYSTEM ON ETWALL WAY**

10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out the objections received to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce a one-way traffic system on Etwall Way in respect of a small highway scheme being promoted by the former North East Community Assembly.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the objections be overruled to the proposed traffic regulations on Etwall Way and the one-way traffic system be introduced as shown in the plan included in Appendix A to the report;
- (b) the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act, 1984; and
- (c) the respondents be informed accordingly

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 The Traffic Regulation Order for the scheme included in the report is considered necessary to introduce the vehicle access and movement restrictions at the location with a view to resolving problems which have been brought to the attention of the City Council.

10.3.2 Local Ward Councillors and officers have given due consideration to the views of all the respondents and feel that the proposed scheme meets the aspirations of local residents.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 The scheme has been designed to meet local needs/priorities as identified by former Community Assembly members. The proposals put forward are considered to deliver the required outcomes to resolve the problems which have been brought to the attention of the former Assembly.

**11. LOWER DON VALLEY CYCLE ROUTE IMPROVEMENTS SHEFFIELD ROAD/RABY STREET - TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER CONSULTATION RESULTS**

11.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out responses by officers to objections received in relation to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for parking restrictions on Sheffield Road and Raby Street in Tinsley. It was anticipated that the proposed double yellow lines will address current parking problems and compliment the proposed shared cycle/footway in this location.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 for the proposed waiting restrictions proposed for Sheffield Road and Raby Street;

- (b) those who made representations be made accordingly; and
- (c) the waiting restrictions be introduced as part of the cycle improvement scheme.

### 11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 11.3.1 the Traffic Regulation Order will deter inconsiderate parking on the footway which is to become a shared footway for cyclists and pedestrians.
- 11.3.2 The Traffic Regulation Order will also prevent inconsiderate parking practices on Sheffield Road close to existing traffic islands.
- 11.3.3 The road safety audit undertaken for the proposed cycle improvement scheme recommended that inconsiderate parking practices were addressed before the scheme was implemented.

### 11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 11.4.1 Officers have considered the possible alternatives put forward by residents to address parking concerns. For the reasons outlined in paragraphs 4.8 to 4.13 of the report officers consider that these are unfeasible and do not address the current/future problems associated with parking on footways.