



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Highways Cabinet Member Decision

Report of: Executive Director, Place

Date: 14 July 2016

Subject: Tinsley Meadows Academy:
Objections to proposed waiting restrictions on roads around the new
Tinsley Meadows Academy

Author of Report: David Ramsden

Summary:

This report describes the measures to restrict parking at pedestrian access points to the new Tinsley Meadows Academy to complement the school travel plan.

It sets officers responses to objections, the petitions and questionnaires from the drop-in session carried out as part of the Traffic Regulation Order process.

Reasons for Recommendations:

To provide safe routes to the new Tinsley Meadows Academy for pedestrians, in particular children, by providing waiting restrictions at the principal access points and crossing points on the roads surrounding the academy.

These parking restrictions and other measures will help to safeguard pedestrians whilst minimising the loss of parking for local residents.

Recommendations:

- Implement the revised proposals and make the amended Traffic regulation Order in accordance with the Road Traffic regulation Act 1984;
 - Introduce associated traffic signing;
 - Widen a short section of Norborough Road by approximately 1m near its junction with Bawtry Road;
 - Monitor the situation once the Academy opens to see if additional measures are needed such as a school crossing patrol and report back with recommendations on further action;
 - Inform the objectors accordingly.
-

Background Papers:

Appendix A Original Traffic Regulation Order proposals plan

Appendix B Revised Traffic Regulation Order proposals plan
Appendix C School Travel Plan Summary
Appendix D Drop in session questionnaire analysis
Appendix E Petition extracts

Category of Report: OPEN

Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

Financial Implications
Cleared by: Julie Currey 30/6/16
Legal Implications
Cleared by: Paul Bellingham 05/07/16
Equality of Opportunity Implications
Cleared by: Annmarie Johnston 28/6/16
Tackling Health Inequalities Implications
NO
Human rights Implications
NO
Environmental and Sustainability implications
NO
Economic impact
NO
Community safety implications
NO
Human resources implications
NO
Property implications
NO
Area(s) affected
Darnall Ward & Tinsley
Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader
Councillor Mazher Iqbal
Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in
Culture, Economy and Sustainability
Is the item a matter which is reserved for approval by the City Council?
NO
Press release
YES

TINSLEY MEADOWS ACADEMY:
OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS ON SURROUNDING
ROADS

1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 This report describes the response from residents to the proposed introduction of waiting restrictions on roads around the new Tinsley Meadows Academy, reports the receipt of objections, petitions and outcome of a drop-in session and sets out the Council's response.

2.0 WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR SHEFFIELD PEOPLE?

2.1 Restricting parking at junctions and key locations on the roads around the new Tinsley Meadows Academy will improve road safety for parents and children walking, cycling and scooting to and from the new academy.

2.2 Parking around junctions restricts visibility and increases the risk that pedestrians could be struck by passing vehicles. There is little or no off street parking in the area. With properties often having more than one car the pressure on parking in the street is high. This has led to vehicles being parked in and around the junctions on the roads around the site of the new academy. Parking also takes place on footways and within 10 metres of junctions which is in contravention of Rule 243 and 244 of the Highway Code:

Rule 243

DO NOT stop or park:

- Opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction, except in an authorised parking space

Rule 244

You MUST NOT park partially or wholly on the pavement in London, and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it.

Parking on the footway can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairments and people with prams or pushchairs.

3.0 OUTCOME AND SUSTAINABILITY

3.1 As part of the construction of the new Tinsley Meadows Academy, parking restrictions are planned around junctions and at strategic points on the roads around the new academy.

3.2 Restrictions on parking will have a positive impact on the safety of pedestrians and children travelling to and from the academy and help encourage more parents to walk their children to it and not to take the car.

4.0 REPORT

Introduction

4.1 Tinsley Meadows Academy is being constructed as a replacement for two existing schools; Tinsley infants and Tinsley Juniors.

- 4.2 The school travel plan, see Appendix C, is intended to encourage more children to walk, cycle and scoot to academy. In order for this to be achieved in a safe manner the parking on the roads around the new academy needs to be managed.
- 4.3 The original proposal introduced no parking at any time at strategic junctions and locations around the academy, see plan in Appendix A.

Public consultation

- 4.4 Notices were delivered to all properties surrounding the new Tinsley Meadows Academy informing of the intention to install parking restrictions.
- 4.5 There were 33 written (email and letter) responses to the consultation, a petition containing 750 signatures and an e-petition, containing 48 signatures objecting to the proposals. The principal reason given was that it would have a negative effect on parking availability, which is already at a premium in this area.
- 4.6 Following the public consultation local councillors asked for a drop-in session to be arranged at Tinsley Community Centre to allow local residents a chance to discuss the proposals with them and officers. There would also be an opportunity to fill in a questionnaire designed to find out what their concerns were and what alternative proposals they felt would help.
- 4.7 The session was held on Thursday 26 May and was well attended. Both councillors and officers felt it was worthwhile and would help them to draft a revised set of proposals.
- 4.8 There were 73 questionnaires completed and a detailed breakdown of the problems and alternatives is given in Appendix D.
- 4.9 The main problem identified in 50 of the questionnaires was the likelihood that the parking restrictions would remove valuable on street spaces with a consequence that neighbour tensions could also be generated as residents seek alternative locations to park.
- 4.10 In terms of alternative solutions,
- 28 of the questionnaires requested that there be less or no parking restrictions;
 - 14 requested the restrictions be reduced to operate with limited time restrictions during the academy week and not during academy holidays;
 - 10 specifically requested no restrictions on St Lawrence Road and
 - 7 questionnaires requested a school crossing patrol to improve safety, although the preferred location of the crossing patrol was not identified.

Officers response

- 4.11 The new Tinsley Meadows Academy will bring together up to 650 pupils under one roof. The majority of them live in the local area around the

Academy and a substantial percentage of these pupils will walk to the academy. The school travel plan will also encourage more pupils to use travel modes other than the car.

A transport assessment was produced by external consultants who recommended a number of locations, around the academy, that would need parking restrictions to improve road safety for parents and children walking to and from the academy.

Officers also undertook a further assessment and identified a small number of additional locations that would benefit from parking restrictions to further enhance the safe route to the academy for pedestrians.

The initial Traffic Regulation Order proposal was drawn up based on these assessments, broadly in line with the recommendations set out in the Highway Code, and with consideration to the existing limits on parking that are evident from site observations. The focus of the extents of the restrictions was firmly on pedestrian and child safety.

Following the initial public consultation, meeting with local councillors and the subsequent drop-in session. Officers have taken into consideration the concerns of residents and have drawn up a revised proposal which reduces the overall impact of the parking restrictions. The revised proposals are shown on the plan in Appendix B.

Officers feel that to reduce the proposals further would unduly compromise pedestrians and child safety. Officers also feel that there should be the opportunity to review the restrictions following the opening of the academy with scope to make changes should problems become evident.

Other Consultees

- 4.12 Local members and the emergency services were also consulted. No objections from these bodies have been received.

Summary

- 4.13 The key to improving road safety for pedestrians travelling to and from the new academy is to reduce conflict between pedestrians and vehicles. In order to achieve this, locations where pedestrians cross the road should be kept clear of parked vehicles that can mask pedestrians, particularly children, from approaching drivers.
- 4.14 It is recommended that the revised proposals set out in this report be approved in order to provide safe routes to and from the new academy when it opens in September 2016.

Relevant Implications

- 4.15 The total cost of the signs, road markings and the widening of Norborough Road is estimated to be around £19k. It is to be funded from the basic need fund for the school project, for which a CAF, business case and contract award have been approved and signed off by the Capital and Growth Board and subsequently by Capital Programme Group on 23rd March 2015 and 24th

August 2015 respectively.

The 25-year commuted sum for ongoing maintenance costs is estimated at about £3k. This indicative sum was calculated following an assessment of the preliminary design, and the actual sum will be calculated by the New Works team in the Highways Maintenance Division once the detailed design has been signed off by the City Council and the Bill of Quantities provided by Amey.

- 4.16 Traffic Regulation Order: The Council has the power under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make a traffic regulation order (TRO) where it appears to the Council that it would be expedient to make it for, inter alia, avoiding danger to pedestrians and other road users or for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs. 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. Where objections are received Regulation 13 places a duty on the Council to ensure that these objections are duly considered. These requirements have been complied with. In making its decision the Council must also be satisfied that the approved scheme will secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians). Provided the Council is so satisfied it is acting lawfully and within its powers.

Highways Improvements: The Council, as the Highway Authority for Sheffield, has powers under Part V of the Highways Act 1980 to implement the improvements outlined in this report.

- 4.17 An Equality Impact Assessment has been conducted and concluded that safer roads 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.

5.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 5.2 The objections relate to the principle of introducing parking restrictions. The alternative options considered were to reduce their extent and time they would be in force. No other alternatives to parking restrictions were considered.

6.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 To provide safe routes to the new Tinsley Meadows Academy for pedestrians, in particular children, by providing parking restrictions at the principal access points and crossing points on the roads surrounding the academy.

These parking restrictions and other measures will help to safeguard pedestrians whilst minimising the loss of parking for local residents.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Implement the revised proposals and make the amended Traffic regulation Order in accordance with the Road Traffic regulation Act 1984.
- 7.2 Introduce warning signs at the principal crossing points.
- 7.3 Widen a short section of Norborough Road by approximately 1m near its junction with Bawtry Road;
- 7.4 Monitor the situation once the Academy opens to see if additional measures are needed such as a school crossing patrol and report back with recommendations on further action.
- 7.5 Inform the objectors accordingly.

Simon Green
Executive Director, Place

14th July 2016

Appendix A



TTAPS - DESIGN AND ASSURANCE 5th FLOOR, HOWDEN HOUSE, 1, UNION STREET, SHEFFIELD, S1 2SH E-mail Scheme.Design@Sheffield.gov.uk Regeneration and Development Services Director: David Caulfield, RTP1 A Service Area of Place, Sheffield City Council	Client	SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL	
	Scheme	TINSLEY MEADOWS ACADEMY	
This drawing is based upon Ordnance Survey material with the permission of Ordnance Survey on behalf of the Controller of Her Majesty's Stationery Office. © Crown Copyright. Unauthorised reproduction infringes Crown copyright and may lead to prosecution or civil proceedings. 100018816. 2016 AUTHOR David Ramsden CHECKED Chris Galloway DATE _____ DATE _____	Drawing Title	PROPOSED ROAD MARKINGS AND SIGNS TROS & SITE CLEARANCE	
	Drawing No.	1929-P1-02	
	Scale:	1/2000	A3
	Date:	Feb 2016	

APPENDIX C

Travel Plan review

- No of Pupils 604

Mode	Usual	Preferred
Walk	242	116
Cycle	3	113
Car	135	75
Scoot / Skate	2	74

- Children would like secure bike sheds and somewhere to park scooters
- Everyone is local except 1 pupil

Staff Survey comments

- Prefer to drive
- Too polluted to walk
- Inconsistent cycle facilities in the area

Actions

- Cycling to be promoted
- Walk to school week – June 2017
- Aim to involve staff and pupils in walking zone around school to explore issues around:
 - Congestion, pollution, climate change, healthy living – June 2017
- Look to form scooter club to allow children to ride micro scooters to school – October 2016
- Road Safety talks – October 2016
- Annual Road Safety Week – October 2016

APPENDIX D

Drop in session analysis

Total Questionnaires filled in 73

Problems

Less parking available for residents	50
Tension between neighbours	10
Road safety, pollution	6
Congestion from extra traffic	5
Won't be policed, people will still park on the lines	1
Parking on footways causes accidents	1

Alternatives

Less / no parking restrictions	28
Single yellow lines with time restrictions / not at weekends / after school	14
No restrictions on St. Lawrence Road	10
Crossing places / Crossing Patrol	7
All the restrictions not needed, just entrances	7
No restrictions opposite junctions	2
Wait and see what happens when the school opens	2
Stop lorries coming down the roads	2
Double yellow lines needed on Bawtry Road near the new school and library	1
reduce speed limit	1
School car park drop off	1
No Parking on footways	1

APPENDIX E - Petitions

There have been two petitions against the proposals.

1. The first was received by the Council on 6th April, 2016 and contained 750 signatures. This was organised by two local residents, Zafar Khoukar and Robina Ifikhar.

As a result of the petition a drop in session was held in the Tinsley Community Centre so that we could listen to the views of local residents and work with them to develop revised parking restrictions which would minimise the loss of parking whilst safeguarding the routes to school.

Title: Tinsley Yellow Line Petition

Petition against yellow lines within Tinsley

“We the undersigned call upon Sheffield City Council to listen to local residents of Tinsley who have concerned about the proposals to install yellow lines around Tinsley Green Park. We oppose the current plans and call for the City Council to work with local residents to draw up alternatives options to deal with traffic generated by the new school within Tinsley Green Park”

2. The second was an e-petition containing 48 signatures and the lead petitioner was Adil Mohammed and closed on 23 May 2016.

Title: ‘Petition to stop the Council reducing your parking spaces in Tinsley’

We the undersigned petition the council to listen local residents of Tinsley who have concerned about the proposals to install yellow lines around Tinsley Green Park. We oppose the current plans and call for the City Council to work with local residents to draw up alternatives options to deal with traffic generated by the new school within Tinsley Green Park

We think your restrictions are unnecessary. As a result of the proposed restrictions a goodly percentage of residential spaces would not be available for parking. Parking restrictions would make a bad situation worse. People would end up parking away from their houses and causing abrasion with neighbours. Furthermore by making it practically illegal to park outside your own home, it could lead residents into breaking the law unnecessarily.

The council should review, look at other options and provide evidence of the necessity for these restrictions

[‘Petition to stop the Council reducing your parking spaces in Tinsley’](#). The lead petitioner was and it closed on 23 May

This page is intentionally left blank