

## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL



## Cabinet Highways Report

---

**Report of:** Executive Director, Place

---

**Date:** 28 July 2015

---

**Subject:** University of Sheffield Campus Masterplan  
Report of the Result of Consultation

---

**Author of Report:** Simon Botterill

---

**Key Decision:** YES

---

**Reason Key Decision:** Expenditure/savings over £500,000

---

**Summary:**

Sheffield University, in partnership with Sheffield City Council, are proposing to make changes to a number of roads in the City Centre which support the University's Masterplan.

The project also seeks to extend the Council's existing pedestrian Gold Route, enhance cycle provision in the area and significantly improve the pedestrian crossing facilities on Western Bank and the Inner Ring Road.

This report describes the proposals, the Traffic Orders advertised, together with the responses received. A number of amendments are proposed to mitigate many of the objections.

This report seeks approval to the project and to the promoted Traffic Orders. It is acknowledged that some details will need to be agreed with interest parties and that a further Traffic Order will need to be promoted to deliver some of the mitigations suggested.

---

**Reasons for Recommendations:**

These changes are proposed to improve the public realm and enhance the environment. In addition to this, the proposals will also enable the area to become safer for the increased number of students as a result of the New Engineering Building known as the Diamond Building. The proposals will also

improve existing pedestrian facilities along Western Bank, by relocating one pedestrian crossing point and providing a new crossing point and Upper Hanover Street by relocating and improving crossing points. In addition to the above, a number of roads in the area of the campus are proposed to be restricted to vehicular traffic either permanently or with only access for part of the day or with one way movement only. The closure of Leavygreave Road East, in particular, to vehicular traffic will result in the diversion of two bus services (52/95).

---

**Recommendations:**

- Note the comments and objections to the schemes and advertised TRO's
  - Confirm that the scheme (as amended) will be of benefit to the public
  - Approve the amended scheme for design and implementation , subject to further officer approval of details
  - Approve the TRO's, as amended by the proposals shown in **Appendix D**, in accordance with Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996
  - Approve the promotion of a new Traffic Order to facilitate delivery of the amended proposals
  - Thank all those who made contact and inform them of the decisions
- 

**Background Papers:**

- Appendix A - Consultation letters
  - Appendix B – Consultation plans
  - Appendix C – Summary of consultation responses
  - Appendix D – Amended Scheme Plans
- 

**Category of Report:        OPEN**

---

## Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

<b>Financial Implications</b>
YES Cleared by: Paul Schofield
<b>Legal Implications</b>
YES Cleared by: Nadine Wynter
<b>Equality of Opportunity Implications</b>
YES/ Cleared by: Annemarie Johnston
<b>Tackling Health Inequalities Implications</b>
YES/NO Cleared by:
<b>Human Rights Implications</b>
NO
<b>Environmental and Sustainability implications</b>
NO
<b>Economic Impact</b>
NO
<b>Community Safety Implications</b>
NO
<b>Human Resources Implications</b>
NO
<b>Property Implications</b>
NO
<b>Area(s) Affected</b>
Central, Broomhill and Walkley
<b>Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Lead</b>
Cllr Terry Fox
<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>
NO
<b>Press Release</b>
YES

## REPORT TO CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

### UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD CAMPUS MASTERPLAN REPORT OF THE RESULT OF CONSULTATION

<b>1.0</b>	<b>SUMMARY</b>
1.1	Sheffield University, in partnership with Sheffield City Council, are proposing to make changes to a number of roads in the City Centre which support the University's Masterplan
1.2	The project also seeks to extend the Council's existing pedestrian Gold Route, enhance cycle provision in the area and significantly improve the pedestrian crossing facilities on Western Bank and the Inner Ring Road.
1.3	This report describes the proposals, the Traffic Orders advertised, together with the responses received. A number of amendments are proposed to mitigate many of the objections.
1.4	This report seeks approval to the project, and to the promoted Traffic Orders. It is acknowledged that some details will need to be agreed with interested parties and that a further Traffic Order will need to be promoted to deliver some of the mitigations suggested.
<b>2.0</b>	<b>WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR SHEFFIELD PEOPLE</b>
2.1	Sheffield City Council in partnership with the University of Sheffield are proposing to make a number of changes to the roads around the University campus.
2.2	These proposed changes are intended to provide benefit for the whole community in this area of Sheffield. The changes will improve safety and connectivity around the University and City Centre with new and improved pedestrian crossings on Western Bank and Upper Hanover Street. Certain roads will be either completely closed or time restricted to vehicular traffic, allowing for a more pleasant and safer environment for more vulnerable road users. Public realm will also be greatly improved, with better connectivity for pedestrians, cyclists and public transport users and an appropriate quality setting for the University's major investment in the new Engineering School on Leavygreave Road East and proposed new Science Schools on Leavygreave Rd West both of which will attract several thousand additional students and teaching jobs.
2.3	In light of the above, the proposals contribute to three of the 5 priorities set out in Sheffield's Corporate Plan 2015 – 2018, these being Strong Economy, Thriving neighbourhoods and communities and better health and wellbeing.

<b>3.0</b>	<b>OUTCOME AND SUSTAINABILITY</b>
3.1	<p>The introduction of the proposals described in this report will contribute to the delivery of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policy H of Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2011-2026 (<i>To develop high quality public places</i>);</li> <li>• Policy S of Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2011-2026 (<i>To encourage active travel and develop high quality cycling and walking networks</i>); and</li> <li>• Policy W of Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2011-2026 (<i>To encourage safer road use and reduce casualties on our roads</i>);</li> </ul>
3.2	In addition, the improvements to both pedestrian and cycle facilities will encourage people to choose these modes for their journeys rather than using car or public transport and could contribute to healthier lifestyles.
<b>4.0</b>	<b>MAIN BODY OF THE REPORT</b>
	<b>The Proposal</b>
4.1	The University Masterplan has been formulated to ensure that the campus continues to thrive and can expand in the future. The campus surrounds a number of key city roads and council officers have worked with the University to help shape the proposals. The Masterplan was approved, in principle, by Cabinet at its meeting on 18 March 2015. A Section 278 agreement will be entered into to ensure delivery public realm aspects of the Masterplan.
4.2	The University's proposed route improvements run throughout the area from Weston Park, in front of the Arts Tower, crossing Western Bank, onto Hounsfield Road into Leavygreave Road West, crossing Upper Hanover Street to Leavygreave Road East to join Sheffield City Council's Gold Route Extension proposals which then continue along Regent Street towards Division Street. All the proposals are detailed in the plans in Appendix B.
4.3	A new pedestrian and cycle crossing would be placed on Western Bank linking the Arts Tower forecourt to Houndsfield Road. The existing crossing, lower down will be relocated away from the junction. Both crossing will be crossed in a single movement as it is not possible to provide adequate waiting areas in the central reserve.
4.4	On Upper Hanover Way, the crossing by the tram stop would be amended to be in line from one side to the other. The pedestrian crossing close to Brookhill roundabout will be moved nearer to the Supertram tunnel and will be converted to a segregated pedestrian and cycle crossings.

4.5	To accommodate the large numbers of pedestrians near the Information Commons and Jessop West buildings, it is proposed to close Leavygreave Road to all motor vehicle traffic.
4.6	The closure of Leavygreave Road east of the ring road requires the relocation of the 52 and 95 bus routes. The new proposed route for the frequent 51 and 52 services on Western Bank is by amending the junction with Clarkson Street to allow buses to turn right. They would then turn into Durham Road and then join Glossop Road to re-join their regular route.
4.7	In addition, it is proposed to close the slip lane from Glossop Road to Upper Hanover Street. This will give buses priority on Glossop Road and as a result inbound journey times are slightly quicker. The slip lane is also noted to cause minor congestion when vehicles leaving the City Centre on Glossop Road use it to turn right.
4.8	As buses would no longer use the bottom section of Western Bank, the inbound bus lane and pre-signals would be removed. This would provide additional capacity for general traffic. Outbound bus routing remains the same, but the bus stop moves out of the layby to generate space for the crossing.
4.9	During the building works to the Children's Hospital and on Durham Road, all inbound buses will route via Mappin Street. The 95 route will remain here when the 51 and 52 route to Clarkson Street. It is proposed to make the section of Mappin Street from Pitt Street to West Street one way to ease the flow of buses.
4.10	To further improve pedestrian and cycle facility around the Campus, it is proposed to make the following sections of road one way, with access restricted between 09.30 and 18.30 Monday to Friday: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Leavygreave Road from Regent Terrace to Gell Street</li> <li>• Gell Street from Leavygreave Road to Glossop Road</li> <li>• Victoria Street from Leavygreave Road to Glossop Road.</li> </ul>
	<b>Consultation</b>
4.11	The public consultation period ran from 13 <sup>th</sup> March to 3 <sup>rd</sup> April 2015. Letters were hand delivered to houses and businesses and street notices were posted. In addition, the proposal was put on the Council website. The usual statutory consultations took place.
4.14	<b>Appendix A</b> shows the consultation letters which were issued and <b>Appendix B</b> , the plans which were attached. <b>Appendix C</b> contains the responses received and officers' comments.
4.15	In total 35 responses were received during the consultation period, of which 29 of the responses were objections to some part of the scheme. Four were in favour of the scheme and the remaining 2 responses

	required further information. The above includes communication with the Fire Service, the Police and the Passenger Transport Executive (PTE).
4.16	Of the rest, four others are worthy of note within the body of this report; these being from the Sheffield Royal Society for the Blind (SRSB), the Somme Barracks, Killi Cleaners and Sheffield City Centre Resident Action Group (SCCRAG) being those directly affected in some way.
4.17	A number of recurring themes featured within those responses that were against the proposals, they were; <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access Issues</li> <li>• Parking Issues</li> <li>• Pedestrian Crossing</li> <li>• Congestion</li> </ul>
4.18	Everyone who raised concern were responded to, either by email or letter, addressing any concerns that were raised. The Fire Service issue will be resolved within the detailed design of the proposal and it is expected that agreement with both the Police and PTE will be forthcoming after detailed discussions. It is not expected that resolution of the issues will affect the principle design elements of the project, nor the advertised Traffic Order.
	<b>Objections, Responses and Amendments Proposed</b>
4.19	Four meetings were arranged with three organisations and the Chair of Sheffield City Centre Resident Group to discuss their objections and to determine whether their concerns could be mitigated.
4.20	On Friday 27th March 2015 a meeting was held at the premises of Sheffield Royal Society for the Blind located on Mappin Street with the General Manager for SRSB. The issues raised included: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Pedestrian access including safe delivery of visitors to the centre, especially partially sighted where implementation of the one way operation along Mappin Street would necessitate the passenger door of vehicles opening into the middle of the road when vehicles parked outside the door to the Royal Society for the Blind;</li> <li>• Cycle route affecting turning movements on Mappin Street where the traffic island which identifies the start of the contra flow cycle route along Mappin Street located to the north of the junction with Pitt Street is problematic for any vehicles attempting to turn into Pitt Street;</li> <li>• Access and deliveries to property.</li> </ul>
4.21	To address these concerns, it is now proposed to extend the existing bay on Pitt Street to accommodate both loading and unloading of passengers and also provide space for blue badge holders to park. (See Appendix D). The general manager has indicated his agreement to this. The island is to

	be removed and this will also facilitate general deliveries
4.22	<p>A meeting was held on Monday 30th March 2015 at Mr Killi's Store on Glossop Road, with Mr Killi. The issues raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access and deliveries to property, Mr Killi has a number of deliveries throughout the day, many of which are either bulky or heavy and therefore considers that he requires deliveries areas directly outside his premises;</li> <li>• Customer parking is required for the deliveries as described previously;</li> <li>• Existing TRO;</li> <li>• Impact of one-way system on business;</li> <li>• Relocation of the bus stop.</li> </ul>
4.23	<p>As a result of this meeting, the proposal for Victoria Road has been amended to leave the southern section of Victoria Road two way and leave three parking spaces in place. This section of Victoria Road would be accessible at all times. Mr Killi has confirmed that this revision would not be acceptable. The plans have again been revised and the two way section extended to leave 6 spaces available for customers. Mr Killi has now withdrawn his objection</p>
	•
4.24	<p>On Monday 30<sup>th</sup> March 2015 a meeting with representatives of the Somme Barracks was held. Issues raised included:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Access and deliveries to property which is required 24 hours a day, seven days each week by large, sometimes articulated vehicles often carrying live ammunition;</li> <li>• Access is required for external services, 3<sup>rd</sup> party deliveries, contractors and building maintenance;</li> <li>• The resident caretaker within the barracks requires access 24 hours per day, every day, as does her family who also live on site;</li> <li>• Transportation requirements for Reserve Forces and Officer Training Corps require access to the building for buses, coaches and large army personnel carriers. .</li> </ul>
4.25	<p>As a result, the proposals have been amended to leave the lower section of Gell Street two way which would allow access for vehicles under 7.5 tonnes to access at all times. In addition, the access time restriction for Leavygreave Road and Gell Street will be relaxed to exempt large service vehicles to the barracks. Due to the infrequent nature of these large vehicles, this is considered a reasonable compromise which will not jeopardise the main objectives of the project. The Barracks have agreed these changes.</p>



4.26	<p>Two meetings have been held with SCCRAG, the first on was held on Monday 30th March and the second on 6<sup>th</sup> May 2015 at the University Library on Mappin Street. A number of issues were raised but at the second meeting this was reduced to four main items.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Residents seeking access to the area from West Street must divert to avoid the first tram gate. This is an unnecessary diversion as they are not intending to go through the second gate.</li> <li>• There is likely to be additional traffic on Gell Street trying to access the City Centre as a result of the closure of Leavygreave Road. This traffic may well be travelling at excessive speed.</li> <li>• That access to the north of the city would be made more difficult and lengthy if the slip lane at Glossop Road is closed</li> <li>• That removal of parking space on the north side on Glossop Road will make it more difficult for residents to find parking space in the area. Parking in the Gell Street area has become more difficult over recent years.</li> </ul>
4.27	<p>Residents of the Gell Street area have had to make a diversion to avoid the first bus/tram gate for a number of years. The changes proposed would necessitate these people using Regent Street and Regent Terrace to bypass the gate. This is essentially the same route and is no longer than their accustomed route using Gell Street. It is not proposed to amend the scheme to formally allow these residents through the gate. It is pertinent to note that the gate only operates for 2.5 hours each afternoon, Monday to Friday and a short diversion via Regent Street/Regent Terrace will continue to provide an alternative access of no greater distance than that via Gell Street.</p> <p>Once Mappin Street has been resurfaced and made fully one way, this route is expected to be the favoured route into the City Centre. However, it is accepted that some local area access might relocate to using Broomspring Lane and Gell Street, south of Glossop Road. The project is prepared to consider implementing both a 20mph limit for these streets and traffic calming. These only being progressed should before and after surveys demonstrate both significant increase in speed and volume.</p> <p>The proposal to close the slip road results from traffic modelling which identified that general traffic on Glossop Road needed to be reduced to deliver bus journey times on the new routing similar to existing. Closing the slip road is expected to deliver that reduction in traffic flow. But if the changes to Western Bank improve access to the ring road, then it may not be necessary to close this slip. Rather than close the road from the start, it is proposed to monitor the level of use of Glossop Road and bus journey times and close the road only if traffic using it is proven to be causing delay.</p> <p>It is already proposed to amend the proposals to retain 9 parking spaces on Gell Street and Victoria Street, immediately north of Glossop Road. Although the project removes parking spaces most are remote from the southern section of Gell Street and it is considered that the project will</p>

	<p>have limited effect on the demand on Gell Street. But it is also recognised that overall parking demand in this area might well have increased over time. Officers have undertaken to see if any changes to the parking regime in this area could be made to ease the situation.</p>
4.28	<p>The Fire Service have objected to one specific area of the project, that being the provision of coach parking on Favell Road will prevent the free passage for fire appliances.</p>
4.29	<p>Coach parking for the University has recently been relocated from Durham Road to Favell Road. At this time, parking on the opposite side of the road was banned to ensure large vehicles could pass stationary coaches. Therefore officers are convinced that the Fire Service objection is unfounded. However, there will be further dialogue with the Fire Service to ensure that their needs are accommodated throughout the project.</p>
4.30	<p>The Police have submitted a number of strong concerns. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Layout and operation of the Western Bank / Clarkson Street junction.</li> <li>• Closure of the slip road at Houndsfield Road in terms of increased congestion</li> <li>• One way streets causing additional congestion and additional enforcement.</li> <li>• Proximity of the two crossings on Western Bank leading to driver frustration and abuse of traffic signals. Also removal of guardrail and central reserve.</li> <li>• Removal of the staggers at both of the Upper Hanover Street crossings leading to reduced safety.</li> </ul> <p>The Police have requested a meeting to discuss their concerns.</p>
4.31	<p>One meeting has taken place with the Police, and another is scheduled for the 23 July. The requested Road Safety audits have been carried out for each element of the project and it is considered that once signed off that the Police concerns will be addressed. However, the following officer observations are as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Clarkson Street junction layout has been designed to accommodate all regular vehicle sizes and the operation of the signals will prevent buses from blocking the pedestrian crossing on Western Bank.</li> <li>• Traffic modelling predicts that the additional capacity on Western Bank offsets the loss caused by the closure of the Houndsfield slip road closure and that rat running through Houndsfield Road and Favell Road is unlikely,</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The paving of the one way streets will produce an environment which is expected to be self-enforcing. However, it is recognised that additional measures may be required to control use of these roads. These roads are already lightly used and any redistribution of traffic is not expected to cause congestion.</li> <li>• The number of pedestrians crossing Western Bank is huge and at peak times the existing crossing cannot cope. Pedestrians are often seen standing on the road as they cannot fit on the central island. The proposed crossings will enable pedestrians to cross from one side to the other in a single movement. The road has been narrowed to minimise the crossing distance and hence the delay to traffic. Short signal cycle times will also make the crossings attractive. It is considered that the safety gains by these crossings outweigh the potential for crossing away from the formal crossing locations.</li> <li>• The staggers on the Upper Hanover St crossing would be removed to increase the capacity of the crossings. This form of crossing is becoming standard practice for new crossings, using near sided pedestrian signals. It is pertinent to note that Supertram and the PTE also initially expressed similar concerns about the proposed amendments to the crossing close to the tram stop but have since indicated that the arrangement could be an improvement particularly if a separate new dedicated cycle crossing is provided as proposed. The PTE are in the process of commissioning a safety independent audit of both proposals, but careful signalling of control of approaching trams should minimise risk to an acceptable level.</li> </ul>
4.32	<p>The PTE had initially submitted a number of comments on the proposals, on behalf of the bus operators and Supertram. The PTE have been involved throughout the development of the project.</p> <p>Officers have responded positively to these and the PTE now formally given their support the scheme with the exception of the pedestrian crossing of Upper Hanover Street.</p> <p>Supertram have since carried out their own assessment of the crossing layout and are now comfortable with the proposal, subject to satisfactory details being submitted for their approval.</p>
<b>5.0</b>	<b>FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
5.1	<p>The financial implications of the Phase 1 Campus works was reported to Cabinet on the 18<sup>th</sup> March. Cabinet has approved a sum of £6,776k to</p>

	fund the highways works.
5.2	The scheme will remove approximately 90 on Street pay and display parking spaces (Favell Road, Hounsfield Road, Leavygreave Road and Victoria Street) which will result in a loss of £118,000 annual income to the Council by the end of 2016-17. This will be partially offset by additional income from coach parking on Favell Rd which will leave a net loss of £100,000 from 2017-18. This pressure will have to be mitigated by the Director of Regeneration and Development Services in order to remain within budget in subsequent years. A number of mitigations are being considered.
5.3	The Parking Services activity has a high element of fixed costs so the removal of these spaces is unlikely to result in any significant cost saving. It follows therefore that to remain within budget, the service may need to prioritise its expenditure and some transport activities may have to be revised.
5.4	Following consultation, the proposed amendments will have an impact on the costs of the scheme and the commuted sums payable. The scheme has a fixed budget to which all parties are committed and the financial impact of these changes will be managed through value engineering elsewhere in the scheme.
5.5	The introduction of the 20 m.p.h. zones is part of the approved Capital programme and the funding for this year's works has been allocated. In the event that the Broomspring Lane, Gell Street, Wilkinson Street and Wilkinson Lane area were to be treated, this would require additional funding to be found or the existing programme changed to substitute these roads.
<b>6.0</b>	<b>LEGAL IMPLICATIONS</b>
6.1	The Council has the power to make a Traffic Regulation Order under section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 for reasons that include the avoidance of danger to persons or other traffic using the road; to facilitate the passage on the road of traffic (including pedestrians); and to prevent the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which is unsuitable to the existing character of the road. However before the Council can make an Order it must consult the 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 been complied with.
6.2	Although there is no requirement for public consultation, extensive consultation has taken place and the Council has considered and responded to all public objections received.
6.3	In response to the consultation, the Council has received objections from individuals who were not supportive of the proposed scheme. Therefore

	the Council needs to give careful consideration to the results of the consultation and will need to decide whether the objections raised outweigh the benefit to the public of approving the scheme, as amended.
6.4	If the Council is satisfied that the scheme will be of benefit to the public and that the proposed amendments to the TRO's sufficiently address the issues raised in the objections, the Council will be acting lawfully and within its powers, should it decide to:- (a) approve the amendments to the TRO's; (b) make further Orders in accordance with the procedures set out in the above legislation and; (c) confirm the Council's final approval for the scheme to be implemented as amended.
6.5	The Council's final approval for the scheme to be implemented is subject to all necessary planning permissions, Traffic Management Orders and another regulatory approvals or consents being obtained by the University of Sheffield.
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Equal Opportunities</b>
7.1	Overall there are no significant differently equality implications identified in the Equality Impact Assessment (ref 544). The proposals will have a slight negative affect on the surrounding road network by slightly increasing the volumes of traffic on those roads, however these roads are designed to carry this traffic and any impact should be marginal. The proposals should be positive regardless of age, sex, race, faith, disability, etc for those living, working and studying in and around the University of Sheffield's Campus and also those that use the area and facilities for recreation.
<b>8.0</b>	<b>ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED</b>
8.1	The current volume of pedestrians crossing both Upper Hanover Road and Western Bank indicates that it is highly desirable that changes have to be made. Doing nothing is not considered an option.
8.2	The rerouting of buses to Clarkson Street is considered necessary by the bus operators. Rerouting all services permanently to Mappin Street was considered, but the geometry is not appropriate high frequency bus services and this moves stops further from the heart of the campus.
<b>9.0</b>	<b>REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
9.1	These changes are proposed to improve the public realm and enhance the environment. In addition to this, the proposals will also enable the area to become safer for the increased number of students as a result of the New Engineering Building known as the Diamond Building.
9.2	The proposals will also improve existing pedestrian facilities along Western Bank, by relocating one pedestrian crossing point and providing a new crossing point and Upper Hanover Street by relocating and

	improving crossing points. In addition to the above, a number of roads in the area of the campus are proposed to be restricted to vehicular traffic either permanently or with only access for part of the day or with one way movement only. The closure of Leavygreave Road East, in particular, to vehicular traffic will result in the diversion of two bus services (52/95).
<b>10.0</b>	<b>RECOMMENDATIONS</b>
10.1	Note the comments and objections to the proposals and advertised TRO's
10.2	Confirm that the scheme (as amended) will be of benefit to the public
10.3	Approve the amended scheme for design and implementation , subject to further officer approval of details
10.4	Approve the TRO's, as amended by the proposals shown in <b>Appendix D</b> , in accordance with Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996
10.5	Approve the promotion of a new Traffic Order to facilitate delivery of the amended proposals
10.6	Thank all those who made contact and inform them of the decisions

Simon Green  
Executive Director, Place

28 July 2015