



## Individual Cabinet Member Report\*

---

<b>Report of:</b>	Executive Director, Place
<b>Report to:</b>	Cabinet Member for Business, Skills & Development
<b>Date:</b>	9 <sup>th</sup> October 2014
<b>Subject:</b>	Objections to Proposed 7.5T except for access Weight restriction in Mayfield Valley
<b>Author of Report:</b>	David Ramsden ext 36178
<b>Key Decision:</b>	YES
<b>Reason Key Decision:</b>	Weight restriction affects 3 wards

---

**Summary:** This report describes the measures to restrict Heavy Goods Traffic from travelling through the area known as Mayfield Valley.

It sets officers responses to two objections.

---

### Reasons for Recommendations:

Drivers of large vehicles currently use roads throughout Mayfield Valley to travel between the A57 Manchester Road and the A625 Hathersage Road. These roads are in most cases narrow, footways are intermittent and often none existent in the rural areas. The majority of these roads are unsuitable for the through flow of large vehicles. Use by such vehicles unnecessarily increases the road safety hazards to other users and has a detrimental impact on the efficient movement of traffic in the area and the highway infrastructure.

---

**Recommendations:**

Having considered the responses and objections to the proposed Traffic Regulations Order, it is recommended that the reasons set out in this report for making the Traffic Regulation Order outweigh any unresolved objections

Make the Traffic regulation Order described in this report in accordance with the Road Traffic regulation Act 1984

Introduce the Traffic Regulation Order and associated traffic signing as and when funding from the LTP is made available

Officers to be instructed to inform the objectors of the decision.

---

**Background Papers:**

Appendix A Traffic regulation Order location plan

Appendix B Councillor Questions and responses

---

**Category of Report:**      OPEN

---

## Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

<b>Financial Implications</b>
YES Cleared by: Damian Watkinson
<b>Legal Implications</b>
YES Cleared by: Nadine Wynter
<b>Equality of Opportunity Implications</b>
YES Cleared by: Ian Oldershaw
<b>Tackling Health Inequalities Implications</b>
NO
<b>Human Rights Implications</b>
NO
<b>Environmental and Sustainability implications</b>
YES
<b>Economic Impact</b>
YES
<b>Community Safety Implications</b>
YES
<b>Human Resources Implications</b>
NO
<b>Property Implications</b>
NO
<b>Area(s) Affected</b>
Mayfield Valley Wards: Fulwood, Ecclesall, Dore & totley
<b>Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Lead</b>
Leigh Bramall
<b>Relevant Scrutiny Committee</b>
Economic and Environmental Wellbeing
<b>Is the item a matter which is reserved for approval by the City Council?</b>
YES
<b>Press Release</b>
NO

## **Report to the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills & Development**

### **Objections to Proposed 7.5T except for access Weight restriction in Mayfield Valley**

#### **1.0 SUMMARY**

- 1.1 This report describes the measures to restrict Heavy Goods Traffic from travelling through the area known as Mayfield Valley.
- 1.2 It sets officers responses to two objections to the proposed 7.5 tonne except for access weight restriction in Mayfield Valley.

#### **2.0 WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR SHEFFIELD PEOPLE**

- 2.1 Encouraging HGVs onto suitable routes will help manage community concerns regarding HGVs. It will also enable HGVs to use the road network more effectively. Restricting HGV's from using Mayfield Valley as a short cut will improve the environment and road safety for local people and those who use the area for recreation. It will also reduce the physical impact on the highway infrastructure in the area.

#### **3.0 OUTCOME AND SUSTAINABILITY**

- 3.1 As part of an overall review of Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) routes throughout Sheffield. This will be part of a wider strategy to keep HGV's on roads that are more suitable for that type of vehicle.
- 3.2 Better management of the HGV route network will have a positive impact on general road safety in rural and semi-rural areas as well as having a positive impact on reducing damage to highway infrastructure.

#### **4.0 INTRODUCTION**

- 4.1 A report was submitted to Cabinet Highways in December 2012 which presented a review of Heavy Goods Vehicle Routes through Sheffield and into the city. The report sought approval for a HGV Route network, a process and criteria for assessing HGV problems and a hierarchy of measures to deal with them.
- 4.2 In addition the report also sought to develop proposals for dealing with some HGV hot spots.
- 4.3 This report was subsequently approved by members.
- 4.4 Mayfield Valley was identified as an HGV hot spot requiring action to address residents' concerns.
- 4.5 The measures described in this report represent works to be constructed during the financial years 2015/2016.

- 4.6 The proposed HGV restrictions are supported by local residents, the Mayfield Valley Women's Institute, South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive and South Yorkshire Police.

#### Public Consultation

- 4.7 During June 2014 officers consulted properties throughout Mayfield Valley and advertised the proposed Traffic Regulation Order.
- 4.8 Approximately 1000 letters were delivered to houses and businesses throughout Mayfield Valley. 25 responses to the consultation were received. 19 of these responses were in support of the proposal. 2 of these were received as objections on the following grounds:

#### Objection One

There isn't an HGV problem in Mayfield Valley. They had lived in Mayfield Valley for 30 years and have driven, walked and cycled on the roads in Mayfield Valley countless times and couldn't recall seeing an HGV. The cost of implementing the weight restriction is not therefore, a good use of council funds.

#### Officer Response

Previously requests have been received for restrictions to HGV's in Mayfield Valley from residents and the Mayfield Valley Women's Institute. Investigations identified that HGV's appear to be using the roads through Mayfield Valley as a route between the A625 and A57. A large proportion of Mayfield Valley is rural and the roads were not designed to carry large numbers of HGV's, as a result HGV's have become stuck and have had to be recovered which has a detrimental impact on the free flow of traffic through the area. Restricting HGV's to principal routes through Sheffield ensures they travel on roads that are designed to carry this type of vehicle and is therefore value for money.

#### Objection Two

The proposed 'blanket' restriction is not appropriate and a more targeted strategy would be more effective with additional warning of the proposed restrictions on roads that are not themselves restricted.

#### Officer Response

A strategic targeted approach was considered aimed at targeting specific roads in the area. However as the area is so large this strategy risks encouraging drivers to "chance" going through the restriction. It also would result in significant additional signing which would have a detrimental impact on the cost of the scheme, the aesthetics of the area and ongoing maintenance and service costs.

#### Other Consultations

- 4.9 Local members, the emergency services, Yorkshire Water, the Freight Transport Association and the Forestry Commission have been consulted on the proposed weight restriction. No objections from these bodies have been received. Councillor Woodcraft and Councillor Alston provided comments and officers responses to these are given in Appendix B.

## Relevant Implications

### Financial

- 4.10 The cost of the works described in this report is approximately £35,000. A decision by key stakeholders on when to fund this from LTP and implement the works has yet to be taken.

### Equality Impact Assessment

- 4.11 An Equality Impact Assessment has been conducted and concluded that safer roads and reduced numbers of HGV's would fundamentally be positive for all local people regardless of age, sex, race, faith, disability, sexuality, etc. However, the most vulnerable members of society (i.e. the young, elderly, disabled and carers) would particularly benefit from this initiative. No negative equality impacts were identified.

### legal Implications

- 4.11 The Council has the powers to make Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) under Section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 for reasons that include the avoidance of danger to people or traffic and for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians). Before the Council can make a TRO, it must consult with relevant bodies in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. It must also publish notice of its intention in a local newspaper. These requirements have all been complied with and whilst there is no requirement for public consultation this has been undertaken and the Council should consider and respond to any lawful public objections received as a result

## **5.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 5.1 In Mayfield Valley a targeted approach was initially considered to look at strategic roads that could be restricted while having an overall desired reduction in through flow of HGV's. This was subsequently discounted as it would result in significant extra restriction and warning signs that would have a substantial impact on the budgetary element of the scheme as a whole, would have a negative aesthetic impact with a significant number of additional signs being needed, this consequently would also have an impact on future maintenance costs and ongoing electrical supply costs being both budgetary and environmentally negative.

## **6.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1 This weight restriction will reduce average numbers of heavy vehicles in a predominantly rural area. Thereby improving road safety for residents and those that pursue recreational activities in the areas, it will also improve the environment and reduce the detrimental impact on highway infrastructure

**7.0 REASONS FOR EXEMPTION** (if a Closed report)

7.1 This section is not applicable

**8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 Having considered the responses and objections to the proposed Traffic Regulations Order, it is recommended that the reasons set out in this report for making the Traffic Regulation Order outweigh any unresolved objections

8.2 Make the Traffic regulation Order described in this report in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984

8.3 Introduce the Traffic Regulation Order and associated traffic signing as and when funding from the LTP is made available.

8.4 Officers to be instructed to inform the objectors of the decision.

Author David Ramsden  
Job Title Traffic Engineer  
Date 14<sup>th</sup> August 2014

This page is intentionally left blank