

**Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session**

**Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 13 November 2014**

**PRESENT:** Councillor Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development)

**ALSO IN ATTENDANCE:** Dick Proctor (Transport Planning Manager)  
Moaz Khan (Interim Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services)  
Nat Porter (Highways Officer)  
Simon Nelson (Traffic Management Engineer)  
Mark Simons (Highways Officer)

.....

**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 9 October 2014 were approved as a correct record.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

4.1 New Petitions

There were no new petitions to report.

4.2 Public Question in respect of the Wadsley Bridge Supermarket Highway Works

Matt Turner commented that, on 9 May 2013, this Session was told that the zebra crossings would not be removed as part of the Wadsley Bridge Supermarket, as recorded in the minutes at paragraph 3.7, in response to his concern about them being removed. They had now been removed and the replacement crossings were not functioning. There were now no crossings across these roads (Penistone Road and Leppings Lane). He therefore asked why had these been removed, and why were they removed before the replacement crossings were finished?

Mark Simons, Highways Officer, commented that he shared Mr Turner's frustrations. He had not been in attendance at the Session on 9 May 2013 so couldn't comment on what had been said but it was always the intention to remove the crossing. The current situation was, however, unacceptable.

The highway scheme for Sainsbury's had proved problematic as he believed

Sainsburys had not done enough work to establish the locations of the Statutory Undertakers equipment. This has resulted in some necessary changes to the design as the scheme was being constructed (and as a result some delay had occurred). Slightly further along the A61 was the Council's Pinchpoint scheme. The work here was being undertaken by Amey and managed by the Council. The Pinchpoint Scheme was planned well in advance and the Statutory Undertakers work programmed accordingly.

Mark Simons managed what were known as Section 278 schemes where developers were allowed to appoint their own contactors to undertake works on the public highway. Whilst the Council could no longer insist on undertaking highway works for private developers it still had a responsibility to ensure that works were undertaken in the right way.

The Sainsbury's scheme had had design changes and issues with the statutory undertakers works causing delay and this has resulted in the scheme evolving whilst on site. As a result of the issues arising from this, Mr Simons had suggested that the Council reviewed how all Section 278 legal agreements were managed in the future. At the zebra crossing referred to by Mr Turner, Mr Simons had been promised that alternative arrangements would be operational within two days which had not been the case.

There had been issues with the road surface where the zebra crossing was and as a result this had to be resurfaced. A Road Safety Audit had been undertaken which accepted that for a short period of time, pedestrians could be signed to cross in the location of the old zebra crossing, but to take care.

The Council had not received a satisfactory response from Siemens, who were responsible for providing the permanent alternative crossing facilities, despite numerous requests.

**RESOLVED:** That the Director of Regeneration and Development Services be requested to liaise with Sainsbury's and inform them of the City Council's request that, should a permanent crossing not be installed to replace the zebra crossing which had been removed as part of the works associated with the Wadsley Bridge Supermarket, a temporary crossing be installed as soon as possible in the interests of road safety.

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

- 4.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report providing an update on investigations subsequent to the decision of 12<sup>th</sup> June 2014 regarding a petition received considering the proposed pay and display parking scheme on Ecclesall Road at Banner Cross district centre, and seeking a decision on the petition and the scheme.
- 4.2 Viv Lockwood, Secretary of the Banner Cross Neighbourhood Group, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He commented that the Group had taken a neutral position on the proposals from the beginning as they

- were aware that they were contentious.
- 4.3 At the last Session a local resident had stated that the majority of traders were not in favour of the proposals. This was not true and the Group had sought comment from both traders and local residents.
- 4.4 The economy of Banner Cross was fragile and a number of shops had recently closed or were in danger of having to close. The area had seen a drift of customer footfall down the hill from up the hill. Mr Lockwood had visited local traders to ask if they were in favour of the proposals. A number had commented that they were overwhelmingly in favour. This was because they had been losing trade as a result of vehicle movements. After 9:30 a.m. when waiting restrictions had finished a number of people were bringing their cars down and parking in front of the shops resulting in a loss of trade as potential customers often went elsewhere if they saw that they couldn't park near the shop.
- 4.5 Some of the comments from traders was that they hoped that the bus lane restrictions could operate in a different way. However, they hoped that something could be done to resolve the problem. Those traders who had supported the proposals often had their own car parks so the issues were not as apparent.
- 4.6 Mr Lockwood was concerned by the steady decline in the economy of Banner Cross and he was frightened that the area would be left with a dead economy. It would only take another three or four shops to close down for it to be the final straw.
- 4.7 In respect of the residents' petition, the Banner Cross Neighbourhood Group had 270 members and it was not Mr Lockwood's experience that there was a large body of resident opinion against the proposals. He believed the scheme addressed many of their concerns. When a number of residents had been told of the possibility of installing a parking meter in the area their instinctive reaction was to oppose it. However, when the reasons for its introduction were clearly explained to them they often changed their view.
- 4.8 In conclusion, Mr Lockwood commented that he hoped the Cabinet Member could support the original proposal and requested that this be approved on an experimental basis to assess its impact.
- 4.9 Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, commented that this was a very difficult issue. He understood the views of residents that they wanted to park near their homes but also that a thriving district centre was vital and this presented a conflict which was difficult to resolve.
- 4.10 Councillor Bramall commented that he believed more work should be done on this. There was currently an issue of funding. He was minded to request more work be undertaken on investigating journey patterns and the turn over of traders. He requested that this be undertaken and a further report be submitted to this Session in the new financial year.
- 4.11 **RESOLVED:** That a decision on the scheme be deferred pending further work

investigating journey patterns in the area and the impact on local trade and a further report be submitted to a future Session in the new financial year.

**4.12 Reasons for Decision**

4.12. There was a difficult balance in the area of the needs of traders for customers to  
1 park outside their shops and local residents who wished to park their cars outside their house. Further work needed to be undertaken to assess both sides needs and the impact on local trade and parking in the area before a decision could be taken.

**4.13 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

4.13. To approve the recommendation not to implement a scheme in the area. Local  
1 traders had emphasised the importance of a scheme being introduced to ensure a vibrant, thriving shopping area in Banner Cross. Further work needed to be undertaken to assess their needs as well as the wish of local residents to park their cars near their houses.

**6. PENISTONE ROAD PROPOSED PROHIBITION OF LEFT TURN INTO HERRIES ROAD SOUTH**

5.2 **RESOLVED:** That the item be withdrawn from consideration at the meeting pending further discussions with cycle interest groups.

**7. OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMIT IN DARNALL AND SHIRECLIFFE**

6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the response from residents to the proposal to introduce a 20mph speed limit in Darnall and Shirecliffe, reports the receipt of objections and set out the Council's response.

6.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the Darnall and Shirecliffe 20mph Speed Limit Orders be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) the objectors be informed accordingly; and
- (c) the proposed 20mph speed limits be introduced.

**6.3 Reasons for Decision**

6.3.1 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.

6.3.2 Having considered the objections to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Darnall and Shirecliffe 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 the area would be in-keeping with the City's approved 20mph Speed Limit Strategy.

6.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

6.4.1 Consideration has been given to omitting Wilfrid Road from the Darnall 20mph limit area. There are relatively few residential properties fronting Wilfrid Road, however it bounds one side of Darnall Community Park and play area. Following the receipt of these comments the local Ward Members were asked for their opinion on the inclusion of Wilfrid Road, either in total or in part. Two of the three Ward Councillors responded and both specifically asked for the speed limit on Wilfrid Road to be reduced to 20mph as originally planned.

6.4.2 The 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 paragraph 4.13 of the report.

This page is intentionally left blank