

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 9 April 2015

PRESENT: Councillors Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development) and Jayne Dunn (Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs (Cabinet Adviser)
Moaz Khan (Interim Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services)
Simon Botterill (Team Manager, Traffic Management)
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 16 March 2015, were approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

4.1 Public Question in respect of Street Lighting in the Sharrow Vale Area

Shelley Cockayne, Chair of the Sharrow Vale Community Association, attended the Session to ask the Cabinet Members about imminent planned work by AMEY to change the street lighting in the Sharrow Vale area. Ms Cochayne requested the postponement of the permanent removal of the cast iron lamp posts. She had written to Steve Robinson, Head of Highway Maintenance, ten days ago requesting the postponement and had not yet received a response. Previous attempts to raise the issue had been ignored.

Although the lampposts were not Victorian, they were important to the heritage of the community and archive had dated them back to 1933. Officers had commented that the lampposts could not be put on the boundary but they had been placed there in other areas.

Ms. Cockayne believed local residents should have been consulted before the design of the new lampposts had been agreed. AMEY had stated that it was a decision of the Council to remove the lampposts. Although it was acknowledged that it was not a conservation area, maintaining the heritage was important to local residents. There had been no consultation with the residents on the proposals. The residents had worked hard to preserve the area and believed it was an area

of special character and the cast iron lampposts were an important part of this.

In conclusion, Ms. Cockayne requested the postponement of the removal of the lampposts subject to a feasibility study being carried out and consultation with local residents.

In response, Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene, commented that she became aware of the issue very recently when she was alerted to a petition on the matter. Councillor Nikki Bond, a local Ward Councillor, had also raised the issue with her. She was committed to the preservation of heritage. She would look into the issue raised but couldn't promise that work would be postponed.

If Ms. Cochayne left her email address Councillor Dunn would ensure that she received a response. She had been told that the lampposts could be preserved for the community but that they wouldn't be able to connect them and this would impact on the streetscene. She wanted to find a solution that would be suitable for everyone.

5. NORMANTON HILL CROSSING SCHEME

- 4.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the proposals for a signalised pedestrian crossing at the site of a tragic fatal collision in May 2014.
- 4.2 Sandra Bradley, a local resident, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. She commented that she found it appalling the number of drivers who had been caught speeding since the fatal accident in May 2014. She had spoken to schoolchildren and didn't believe they would use the proposed access road and did not believe this would be a problem for drivers for using the access road.
- 4.3 Ms. Bradley acknowledged that the relocation of the bus stop may cause a problem for some but the relocation would mean that the bus stop would have a 2.5m wide footpath which it hadn't had previously. She accepted that there would have to be a delay whilst the possibility of Great Crested Newts in the area was explored but hoped that the crossing could be installed as soon as possible.
- 4.4 Councillor Jayne Dunn commented that she was aware how hard local Ward Councillors had been working on the issue and it had been a good example of a community project with the Council and local residents working together. Speeding in the area was a difficult issue to manage and the Council would be monitoring this closely.
- 4.5 Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, stated that it was acknowledged by all that the installation of the crossing was the right thing to do. There was nowhere else that the bus stop could be relocated and as had been mentioned the relocation would mean that the bus stop would gain a good footway for users.
- 4.6 **RESOLVED:** That the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and

Streetscene:-

- (a) notes the comments made by respondents to the consultation; and
- (b) approves the scheme, as proposed, for design and implementation, subject to:-
 - (i) confirmation of sufficient funding within the Local Transport Plan allocation Road Safety block; and
 - (ii) approval of the scheme via the Capital Approval gateway process.

4.7 Reasons for Decision

- 4.7.1 The pedestrian crossing and associated works will contribute to an improvement in safety along Normanton Hill. The introduction of a pedestrian crossing should reduce the number and severity of collisions and reduce the fear of collisions.

4.8 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 4.8.1 This site is currently a location for a Speed Indication Device (smiley SID). It is Council policy to use these devices for a relatively short period of time and rotate them between other roads in the area, otherwise motorists become used to them and they do not have the desired effect. The speed data from the SIDs at this location shows the average vehicle speeds of 39mph in the downhill direction which suggests that at this location such a measure is ineffective.
- 4.8.2 A traffic calming scheme could be considered. However, given existing speeds a localised traffic calming scheme could lead to loss of control accidents. Therefore, it would probably be necessary to traffic calm the whole length of the road, linking the scheme with the existing measures located between Linley Lane and Coisley Hill. The cost of such a scheme along this length would be very expensive and it would be difficult to justify this, given the overall low collision rate along the length of Normanton Hill.

6. GREENHILL AVENUE/GREENHILL MAIN ROAD TRAFFIC SIGNALS

- 6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the further work carried out and sought approval for the revised scheme which retained the left turn from Greenhill Main Road into Greenhill Avenue. No objections have been received to the new proposals from those who objected previously.
- 6.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development:-
 - (a) approves the scheme and requests its implementation to introduce traffic signals at the junction of Greenhill Main Road/Greenhill Avenue and associated works in the vicinity, as shown on drawing no. 1513BB2-SD-LT107-TRO-C subject to the following conditions being met:

- (i) confirmation of accurate costs (including any commuted sums)
 - (ii) confirmation of sufficient funding for the project
 - (iii) approval of the scheme through the Capital Approval process.
- (b) resolves that the Traffic Regulation Order be made in respect of the proposed waiting restrictions only, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; and
- (c) requests that the objectors be informed accordingly.

6.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 6.3.1 The proposals described in the report will contribute to improving journey times, reducing congestion for all users and improving road safety, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 6.3.2 This alternative scheme fully addresses the objections received to the proposed scheme considered by the Cabinet Member in March 2014 whilst still achieving the benefits of the original scheme.
- 6.3.3 Funding is in place for 2015/16 to build the alternative scheme.

6.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 6.4.1 The alternative options were described in the March 2014 report and this is the actual alternative option.