



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Individual Cabinet Member Decision

Report of: Executive Director, Place

Report to: Cabinet Member for Business, Skills & Development

Date: 8th January, 2015

Subject: Objections to proposed traffic calming, Coisley Hill, Woodhouse, Accident Saving Scheme.

Author of Report: Nat Porter (ext 35031)

Key Decision: NO

Summary: The report outlines objections received to proposals for the introduction of traffic calming and a pedestrian crossing, along with associated waiting restrictions, on Coisley Hill and Sheffield Road, Woodhouse. The report seeks a decision on how the scheme should be progressed in light of these objections.

Reasons for Recommendations:

The proposed waiting restrictions are necessary to enable buses to traverse the proposed traffic calming features, which are proposed in response to recorded road traffic collisions. Failure to provide these restrictions would impede the flow of service buses and emergency services, and may result in additional noise nuisance for residents.

The proposed waiting restrictions outside Nos 155-159 Sheffield Road are proposed to ensure adequate visibility for the safety and comfort of pedestrians using the proposed crossing. The Council's Road Safety Audit Co-ordinator has indicated that retaining parking would likely be raised as an issue at the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit.

The crossing is proposed to serve the main observed pedestrian desire lines. Notwithstanding the existence of other desire lines for crossing, it is felt to be important that these are given lesser priority.

Recommendations:

- That, notwithstanding objections received, the advantages outweigh the objections and the Order be made as advertised;
 - That the proposed traffic calming, pedestrian crossing and associated works be introduced as proposed; and,
 - That those who have provided comments in response to the letter and public notice be informed of the decision accordingly.
-

Background Papers: Appendix A – Drawing of proposed scheme
Appendix B – Correspondence received and officer's comments

Category of Report: OPEN

Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

Financial Implications
YES Cleared by: D. Watkinson (11 th Dec '14)
Legal Implications
YES Cleared by: N. Wynter (1 st Dec '14)
Equality of Opportunity Implications
NO Cleared by: I. Oldershaw (28 th Nov '14)
Tackling Health Inequalities Implications
NO
Human Rights Implications
NO
Environmental and Sustainability implications
NO
Economic Impact
NO
Community Safety Implications
YES
Human Resources Implications
NO
Property Implications
NO
Area(s) Affected
Woodhouse ward
Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Lead
Cllr. Leigh Bramall
Relevant Scrutiny Committee
Economic and Environmental Wellbeing
Is the item a matter which is reserved for approval by the City Council?
NO
Press Release
NO

REPORT TO THE CABINET MEMBER FOR BUSINESS, SKILLS & DEVELOPMENT

OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC CALMING, COISLEY HILL, WOODHOUSE ACCIDENT SAVINGS SCHEME

1.0 SUMMARY

- 1.1 The report outlines objections received to proposals for the introduction of traffic calming and a pedestrian crossing, along with associated waiting restrictions, on Coisley Hill and Sheffield Road, Woodhouse.
- 1.2 The report seeks a decision on how the scheme should be progressed in light of these objections.

2.0 WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR SHEFFIELD PEOPLE

- 2.1 Reducing the likelihood and impact of road traffic collisions contributes to '*Safe & Secure Communities*'.
- 2.2 Ensuring pedestrians can use the highway network safely and conveniently contributes to '*A Great Place to Live*'.

3.0 OUTCOME AND SUSTAINABILITY

- Reducing the incidence of collisions resulting in injury on the highway network;
- Improving the safety and convenience of pedestrians using the highway network;
- Policy W of the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2011-2026 (*To encourage safer road use and reduce casualties on our roads*); and,
- the Council's Vision For Excellent Transport In Sheffield (*a better environment; a healthier population; a safer Sheffield*);

4.0 REPORT

Background

- 4.1 Coisley Hill, Woodhouse has been identified by the Council's Transport Planning team as a site requiring remedial measures in response to recorded road traffic collisions.
- 4.2 There were 9 accidents along this route in the period 2008-2012. Two were serious. There were 4 child pedestrian casualties; these have all occurred in the evenings and not on the school journey. Out of the nine accidents, 5 occurred in the dark.

- 4.3 In response to the collision record, a scheme of road humps has been developed to moderate vehicle speeds. Additional 24 hour waiting restrictions (proposed double yellow lines) are proposed, to facilitate the movement of buses and emergency vehicles where part-width cushions are proposed.
- 4.4 The proposed traffic calming is intended to reduce the incidence of road traffic collisions, by giving drivers and others greater time to react to conflicts before they result in collision. The measures are estimated to reduce the incidence of collisions by around 25-35%.
- 4.5 The proposed scheme also includes a pedestrian crossing, to ease crossing the road for pedestrians. The crossing has been located to serve the most significant pedestrian desire line observed on site. Further waiting restrictions are proposed to maintain sightlines to the crossing.
- 4.6 24 hour no stopping restrictions are also proposed at bus stops and at the entrance to Woodhouse West Primary School. A drawing illustrating the proposals is included as Appendix A.

Consultation

- 4.7 Notices detailing the proposals were erected on-street and published in local press on 24th October, 2014. The notices invited people wishing to object to or otherwise comment on the proposals to submit their comments by 14th November, 2014.
- 4.8 In addition to this, directly affected frontagers were written to with a plan of the proposals, to draw their attention to the scheme and to invite objections and or other comments.
- 4.9 Seven responses were received in response to the notice and/or letter. These comprise –
- Two responses supporting the proposals;
 - Four responses objecting to the proposed waiting restrictions, including one with attached petition with 171 signatures; and,
 - Three responses objecting to the location of the proposed pedestrian crossing.

No responses were received objecting to the proposed road humps.

(Note that some responses objected to more than one aspect of the scheme, hence the sum of responses listed above adding to more than seven)

- 4.10 Of the responses objecting to the proposed waiting restrictions –
- One related specifically to proposed restrictions on Ashpool Fold;
 - One (the one including the petition) related specifically to waiting restrictions on Sheffield Road outside Nos 155-159;
 - One objects on the basis that there may be displacement of parking demand into Ashpool Close;

- The remaining objector raises more general concerns about the proposed restrictions.
- 4.11 The proposed restrictions on Ashpool Fold affect only the first 6 metres of the street (i.e. one car length on each side). Drivers are already advised by the Highway Code not to park within 10 metres of a road junction (rule 243). There proposed restrictions should therefore have negligible impact on both the *de jure* and *de facto* parking capacity of Ashpool Fold.
- 4.12 The restrictions proposed outside Nos 155-159 are intended to protect sightlines between drivers and pedestrians using the crossing, so as to ensure that –
- Drivers can stop in good time for pedestrians waiting at or entering the crossing; and,
 - Pedestrians can see approaching traffic and be able to determine whether or not it is safe to cross.
- 4.13 The Council's Road Safety Auditor has indicated that retaining parking at this location would in all likelihood be raised as an issue at Road Safety Audit, and that an exception report would likely to be required. Retention of parking would then have to be considered by the Head of the Transport, Traffic and Parking Service or their nominee at the arbitration stage. There would remain a risk that, notwithstanding any resolution of this committee, arbitration would not permit the retention of this parking whilst providing the zebra crossing. In any event, the time require for arbitration would be expected to delay the scheme beyond the lifetime of the funding (see paragraph 4.18).
- 4.14 The proposed restrictions may result in displacement of parking demand into side streets, and this may cause some nuisance at busy periods (such as around school times). The restrictions are, however, necessary to enable service buses to traverse the proposed speed cushions, and to protect sightlines to the proposed pedestrian crossing.
- 4.15 The objections to the location of the proposed crossing were on the basis that locating the crossing nearer to the shop or working men's club would be better, in that this would be of use to people accessing these amenities. Whilst some pedestrians were observed to cross the road in this location, numbers were observed to be far fewer than those crossing at the school, even if that demand only exists for a relatively short period of the day.
- 4.16 It is therefore judged appropriate to provide the crossing in its proposed location to ensure the greatest number of pedestrians benefit, and to ensure this desire line was not 'underprotected' relative to other, lesser desire lines. This need not preclude the introduction of additional crossing(s) in future if budget were allocated for this.
- 4.17 One of the objections to the crossing gave further grounds for objection. This is included, along with all of the other representations received and

Officer's comments, in Appendix B.

Financial implications

- 4.18 The cost to implement the proposed traffic calming is estimated at £55,000, funded from the 2014/15 LTP programme. This element of LTP funding is part of an 'Accident Savings' programme which has been approved by the Integrated Transport Authority (ITA). The scheme costs will be charged to BU92769. The commuted sum for the scheme - covering future maintenance, has been estimated at £19,250. In order to fully fund this scheme, the current approvals for the Accident Scheme Saving Block, which encompasses several other schemes, will need to be varied through the ITA as the current approval is not sufficient fund all the schemes. This variation will be to increase the amount available to spend on Accident Savings Schemes in Sheffield by around £20,000. Should this additional allocation not be approved, the 2014/15 the funding for another of the schemes in the accident savings block will have to be reduced by the amount required. In addition any agreed funding increases which lead to an overall increase in capital expenditure on the Accident Savings Block will be brought forward for authorisation through the Capital Approvals Process.
- 4.19 £70,000 has been allowed to implement the zebra crossing, 2014/15 LTP programme. This element of LTP funding is part of a 'Street Ahead enhancements' programme funded in Sheffield which has been approved by the Integrated Transport Authority (ITA). The scheme costs will be charged to BU93052. The commuted sum for the scheme - covering future maintenance, has been estimated at £17,500.

Legal implications

- 4.20 The Council in exercising its functions under the Road Traffic Regulation Act (including provision of pedestrian crossings and waiting restriction) is required under the Section 122 of the Act to (a) secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrians) and (b) the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway, and so far as practicable having regard to the matters listed below.

The matters to be considered before reaching any decision are:

- i) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
 - ii) the effect on the amenities of a locality and (including) the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles;
 - iii) the national air quality strategy prepared under Section 80 of the Environment Act 1995;
 - iv) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of passengers/potential passengers; and
 - v) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.
- 4.21 In response to the consultation, the Council has received a number of objections from individuals who are not supportive of the approach the

Council is taking with regard to the proposed waiting restrictions and the location of the proposed pedestrian crossing. The Council therefore needs to consider whether these objections outweigh the benefits of implementing these proposals. If the Council is satisfied that the benefits of introducing the proposals outweigh the objections, it will be acting lawfully and within its powers should it decide to implement the proposals.

4.22 ***Equality implications***

No significant equalities implications have been identified in connection with either progressing the proposed scheme, or with retaining the status quo. Any pay & display scheme would include exemptions for disabled persons' blue badge holders, from both charges and time limits.

5.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

5.1 Doing minimum has been considered (i.e., not implementing the proposed traffic calming or zebra crossing). This would mean that the collision rate would be expected to continue at the observed rate, and that conditions for pedestrians crossing Coisley Hill would remain unimproved.

5.2 Reducing or removing the lengths of proposed yellow lines where the restrictions are proposed to facilitate the flow of buses over the proposed speed cushions has been considered. Failure to provide these restrictions may mean buses are unable to straddle cushions owing to parked vehicles. This would act as a hindrance to the running of service buses, and may increase the risk of incidents of passengers falling where buses are jolted by the humps. There may also be increased noises nuisance where vehicles are unable to straddle cushions.

5.3 Reducing or removing the lengths of proposed yellow lines in the vicinity of the shop at № 155 has been considered. If parking were permitted here, parked vehicles would interfere with sightlines between pedestrians approaching the crossing from the southern footway, and drivers approaching from the west. The remaining visibility would be less than that required for a motorist to come to a safe stop for a pedestrian entering the crossing at the design speed of the scheme (25mph, this being the design 'after' speed of the traffic calming); nor would it be sufficient for a pedestrian to determine that they have enough time to safely cross the road.

5.4 Replacing speed cushions with full-width road humps would allow for much of the proposed waiting restrictions to be removed, in so far as buses would be able to use the full width of the carriageway, rather than being constrained to straddling individual cushions. However, these would act as a hindrance to the running of service buses, and may increase the risk of incidents of passengers falling where buses are jolted by the humps. Full width humps could be expected to have greater implications for the emergency service than cushions. It would also not be possible to deliver a scheme with significantly revised traffic calming within the lifetime of the scheme budget.

- 5.5 Relocating the proposed pedestrian crossing to the vicinity of the Wolverley Road junction has been considered. This would address the concerns raised that the proposed crossing does not serve pedestrian movements to the shop, working men's club and bus stops. However, it would leave the stronger desire line by the school (albeit one only used for relatively short periods of the day) relatively 'underprotected', perhaps increasing risk to people crossing at this point (including the school crossing patrol). It would also not be possible to deliver a relocated crossing within the lifetime of the scheme budget.
- 5.6 Providing a crossing near to Wolverley Road in addition to the proposed crossing was considered. This would address the concerns raised that the proposed crossing does not serve pedestrian movements to the shop, working men's club and bus stops. However, the available scheme budget is not sufficient to cover the cost of two crossings.
- 5.7 Deferring the matter to allow for additional investigation and/or consultation has been considered. This would require additional time, during which the funding for the scheme would expire. This means that without a decision to build the scheme at this meeting, it would not be possible to progress a scheme.

6.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The proposed waiting restrictions are necessary to enable buses to traverse the proposed traffic calming features, which are proposed in response to recorded road traffic collisions. Failure to provide these restrictions would impede the flow of service buses and emergency services, and may result in additional noise nuisance for residents.
- 6.2 The proposed waiting restrictions outside Nos 155-159 Sheffield Road are proposed to ensure adequate visibility for the safety and comfort of pedestrians using the proposed crossing. The Council's Road Safety Audit Co-ordinator has indicated that retaining parking would likely be raised as an issue at the Stage 2 Road Safety Audit.
- 6.2 The crossing is proposed to serve the main observed pedestrian desire lines. Notwithstanding the existence of other desire lines for crossing, it is felt to be important that these are given lesser priority

8.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 8.1 That, notwithstanding objections received, the advantages outweigh the objections and the Order be made as advertised;
- 8.2 That the proposed traffic calming, pedestrian crossing and associated works be introduced as proposed; and,
- 8.3 That those who have provided comments in response to the letter and public notice be informed of the decision accordingly.

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place
12th December, 2014