

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 12 June 2014

**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  
Paul Fell, Business Manager, Transport, Traffic and Parking Services  
Nat Porter, Highways Officer  
Ian Taylor, Senior Project Manager, Highways

.....

**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 10 April 2014 were approved as a correct record.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

4.1 New Petitions

There were no new petitions

4.2 Outstanding Petitions List

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

**5. PARKING PERMIT PRICES**

5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report providing a response to two petitions which had been received requesting:

1) That parking permit prices be returned to pre-2011 levels, which were £10 for a first residents permit, compared to the current £36.

2) That permit prices be reduced for people on low incomes.

- 5.2 Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. She had submitted one of the petitions prior to becoming a Councillor and was therefore able to make representations. She commented that she had been promised by officers the figures for each area but had not yet received them and therefore asked if these could be sent to her.
- 5.3 Ms. Smalley further stated that more income was being received from permits than was being spent within the area she lived in and asked why this was the case as the income should not be spent elsewhere.
- 5.4 In response, Paul Fell, Business Manager, Transport, Traffic and Parking Services, acknowledged that income from parking permits was running at a surplus. However, it was Council policy that income received was spent across the City and not just in the areas from which it was received.
- 5.5 Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development added that income from parking permits was £500k and the cost of enforcement was greater than that. It was only right that residents should pay a proportion of the cost. He acknowledged that the cost of permits had risen in recent times but highlighted that the present cost was only £1 more than when they were introduced in 2004 and compared favourably with other local authorities across the country.
- 5.6 **RESOLVED:** That:-
- (a) the requests contained in the two petitions be noted;
  - (b) the permit prices already agreed for 2014/15 be endorsed without further charge; and
  - (c) officers be instructed to advise the petitioners of the decision.
- 5.7 **Reasons for Decision**
- 5.7.1 The parking permit prices be used in the 2014/15 financial year have already been set and endorsed by the Cabinet Member in April 2014.
- 5.7.2 Service budgets for the 2014/15 financial year have already been set in anticipation of Parking Services achieving income targets, which include around £423,000 from income from parking permits in parking zones. Any reductions in the permit prices would be a pressure on the Parking Services budget.
- 5.7.3 The cost of a permit is demonstrably modest and confers a significant degree of benefit to the permit holder. Therefore, no justification is found for the contention that fees are unfair or excessive.
- 5.7.4 Offering a further discount to people on low wages would add complexity and costs to the permits administration process and would provide limited relief when compared with the cost of running a car.

5.8 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

5.8.1 The costs and impacts of reducing permit prices have been considered.

6. **PETITION IN RESPECT OF BANNER CROSS/ECCLESALL ROAD PROPOSED PARKING METER SCHEME**

6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining the receipt of a petition concerning the proposed pay and display parking scheme on Ecclesall Road at Banner Cross district centre. The petition requested that additional public consultation was conducted before the proposed experimental introduction of the scheme. The report set out the background to the petition and made recommendations accordingly.

6.2 Saskia Palmer, a resident of Banner Cross, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. She commented that the issue had only been raised as a result of the concerns of a handful of traders in the area rather than the majority of businesses. She believed the consultation to be inadequate as it had been targeted at traders on a small section of Ecclesall Road and traders she had spoken to had commented that they were not presented with alternative options to the scheme proposed.

6.3 Ms. Palmer further commented that traffic surveys had been undertaken prior to the opening of the Sainsbury's superstore in the area which had had an impact on traffic numbers. She therefore did not believe that this was a realistic survey of Banner Cross and further surveys should be undertaken. She had undertaken a survey in the area to which 200 people had responded. 83% of respondents believed that nothing should be done and only 1 person voted in favour of the proposals.

6.4 In response, John Bann, Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services informed the Cabinet Member that this had been a scheme developed as a result of a local Ward Member request to look at possible solutions to the problem. It was clear that traders and residents were concerned about the future of their local shops. It appeared that many residents were against the proposals and that there was limited off street parking in the area.

6.5 Nat Porter, Highways Officer, commented that the surveys had been undertaken in October 2013 and he considered them representative of the situation in the area. The pay and display would accommodate short stay parking.

6.6 Councillor Leigh Bramall stated that he did not believe he had enough information to proceed at this stage. He requested that the decision be deferred and a survey of businesses be undertaken in the area and clarification be sought of the current view of the local Ward Member who had previously contacted officers. A further report should then be submitted to a future Session and officers should liaise with the petitioners and local community organisations.

6.7 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) a decision on the scheme be deferred pending further investigation and discussions, the outcomes of which are to be reported back to a subsequent meeting prior to any scheme being progressed; and
- (b) the lead petitioner and affected parties are informed of the outcome of the meeting and the decision.

## 6.8 **Reasons for Decision**

- 6.8.1 The petitioners request can be accommodated as part of the development process for the scheme at only minor cost, and can allow for changes to the scheme to be considered to mitigate for any local concerns.

## 6.9 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 6.9.1 Declining the petitioners' request for additional consultation was considered. Petitioners would still have opportunity to comment on the scheme as part of the statutory process laid out by the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. In this particular instance, this would be for a six month period, during which the scheme would be introduced experimentally when comments can be made and considered in light of practical experience of the operation of the scheme.
- 6.9.2 Approve the recommendations as outlined in the report.

## 7. **BUS RAPID TRANSIT (BRT) NORTH TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS - CONSULTATION RESULTS**

- 7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report presenting the objections received to the advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) to complement the Bus Rapid Transit North project along with the officer response to the objections.

### 7.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) having considered the responses to the Traffic Regulations Orders related to the Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) North Scheme consultation, it is agreed that the reasons set out in the report for making the TROs outweigh any unresolved objections;
- (b) the orders be made, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, and introduced; and
- (c) those who made representations be informed accordingly.

## 7.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 7.3.1 The TRO to prohibit the right turn into the north-eastern access to number

438 Sheffield Road would formalise the traffic movements intended for the designed road layout and reduce the likelihood of vehicular conflict at the junction with the access to the proposed development on the opposite side of the road. The right turn into the south western access to number 438 would still be possible as would the left turn out of both accesses.

- 7.3.2 The TRO to prohibit the right turn from Sheffield Road through the gap in the central reserve opposite St Lawrence Road would formalise the traffic movements intended for the designed road layout and reduce the likelihood of vehicular conflict caused by vehicles slowing significantly, to make the right turn, being struck by following vehicles travelling ahead on Sheffield Road.
- 7.3.3 The TROs to introduce the two 'one-way' and two 'ahead only' restrictions at the Sheffield Road/Blackburn Road Meadows Way junction would formalise the traffic movements intended for the designed road layout, deterring injudicious manoeuvres.
- 7.3.4 The TRO to prohibit U-turns at the Sheffield Road/Blackburn Meadows Way junction would reduce the likelihood of drivers making injudicious manoeuvres to access Sheffield Road (south west section towards the M1 Junction 34) and Ferrars Road.
- 7.3.5 The TRO to introduce a 24 hour clearway on Blackburn Meadows Way and part of Sheffield Road would complement the existing 24 hour clearway for Meadowhall Way and would reduce the amount of signing and lining required to convey and enforce the Order to prohibit stopping.
- 7.3.6 The TROs for the ahead-only restrictions on Attercliffe Common, at its junction with Carbrook Street, would reduce the likelihood of drivers making injudicious turning manoeuvres through the gap in the central reserve of the dual carriageway.

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

- 7.4.1 Alternative routeing was considered using an appraisal carried out in 2013 by consultants Arup, comprehensive local knowledge and the desired locations for the BRT bus stops. The three option variations were:

- 1) Carbrook Street/Dunlop Street/Weedon Street/Meadowhall Drive/Meadowhall Way
- 2) Attercliffe Common/Weedon Street; and
- 3) A6178/Sheffield Road/Vulcan Road

- 7.4.2 The view formed was that routeing along Carbrook Street, Dunlop Street, Weedon Street, Meadowhall Drive and Meadowhall Way to reach the new Blackburn Meadows Way would improve journey time reliability and reduce journey times. This is because of outbound congestion, from the M1 Junction 34 Tinsley back to Arena Square, caused by capacity issues at the M1 Junction 34 junction (something that is largely outside the control of

Sheffield City Council). Similarly inbound congestion, from Arena Square back to Weedon Street, results from flows from the M1 to the Outer Ring Road (A6102 Broughton Lane) converging to cause the junction to be at capacity. Neither of these issues can be resolved by traffic signal timing improvements and both can only be addressed by major highway schemes.

- 7.4.3 In addition to the above-mentioned regular congestion there are frequent major events at the Sheffield Motorpoint Arena that can exacerbate commuter congestion and/or lead to significant delays at off peak times. In order to maintain journey time reliability it would be prudent for the BRT buses to avoid such congestion.
- 7.4.4 As well as giving the best journey times the preferred route is the most appropriate for the proposed bus stop locations especially the major development set to take place on or around Meadowhall Drive.