

Agenda Item 5



Author/Lead Officer of Report: Gay Horsfield,
Transport Planner

Tel: 2735828

Report of: Executive Director Place
Report to: Individual Cabinet Member Decision
Date of Decision: 13 April 2017
Subject: Coisley Hill / Sheffield Road Zebra

Is this a Key Decision? If Yes, reason Key Decision:-	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
- Expenditure and/or savings over £500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Affects 2 or more Wards	<input type="checkbox"/>	
Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to? Place Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? Thriving Neighbourhood and Communities		
Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? 919		
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:- <i>"The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)."</i>		

Purpose of Report:

The report outlines the objection received to proposals for a zebra crossing on Coisley Hill / Sheffield Road, Woodhouse. The report seeks a decision on how the scheme should be progressed in light of this objection.

Recommendations:

- The zebra is built at the location planned having considered the issues that were raised in the objection.
- The waiting restrictions around the corners of Ashwell Road are implemented.
- The objector is informed of the decision taken.

Background Papers:

(Insert details of any background papers used in the compilation of the report.)

Appendix A - Coisley Hill / Sheffield Road Survey Results

Appendix B – Scheme drawing

Appendix C – Letter of objection and officers' responses

Appendix D – Road Safety Audit 1

Lead Officer to complete:-	
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.
	Finance: Julie Currey 15/02/2017
	Legal: Nadine Wynter 22/02/2017
	Equalities: Annemarie Johnston 23/02/2017
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>	
2	EMT member who approved submission: Simon Green
3	Cabinet Member consulted: Cllr Mazher Iqbal
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Decision Maker by the EMT member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.
	Lead Officer Name: Gay Horsfield
	Job Title: Senior Transport Planner
Date: 13 April 2017	

1. PROPOSAL

- 1.1 Sheffield Road near Woodhouse West School has a long standing request for a pedestrian crossing.
- 1.2 The site was previously identified as an Accident Saving scheme by the Council's Transport Planning team. 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.
- 1.3 There have been no recorded injury accidents in the last 5 years, from 1 January 2011 to 31 December 2015. Hence the traffic calming measures originally proposed have been removed. Speeds indicate that no physical traffic calming measures are required.
- 1.4 The previous scheme was a joint project. The traffic calming was funded from the Accident Savings Scheme allocation and the zebra was funded from the Streets Ahead Enhancement budget.
- 1.5 The previous scheme received seven responses. These were:
- Two supporting the proposals;
 - Four objecting to the proposed waiting restrictions, including one with attached petition with 171 signatures; and,
 - Three 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)
- 1.6 In view of the previous objections a survey was done in July 2016, see **Appendix A** for survey results summary. The main crossing point is where the School Crossing Patrol warden operates in Zone B. However several pedestrians were counted crossing nearer to Coisley Road, Zone A. Moving the crossing further away from Coisley Road and nearer to Ashwell Road could result in more pedestrians not walking up and using the zebra crossing. There are low numbers of pedestrians crossing in Zone C and Zone E. Zone D, between Ashwell Road and Wolverley Road, had the highest number of pedestrians on the Saturday. However there is not enough physical space to build the crossing here. Also pedestrians from the Coisley Road direction will probably not walk up to the zebra on school days.
- 1.7 The new scheme has removed all elements of the traffic calming but has kept the zebra crossing at the same location. The survey confirmed that this was the most appropriate location to serve the most significant pedestrian desire line. **Appendix B** – Scheme Drawing
- 1.8 There are two small sections of new waiting restrictions around both corners of Ashwell Road to ensure that pedestrians, especially people with limited mobility or with pushchairs, can use the dropped kerbs.

2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE ?

- 2.1 The pedestrian crossing will improve accessibility and safety for a high

number of pedestrians, many of whom are children that walk to and from school. It contributes to the creation of a safer residential environment and making the City a *Great Place to Live*.

2.2 Protecting the dropped crossings will also help a variety of pedestrians.

3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

3.1 Notices detailing the new proposals were erected on-street and posted through local frontages on 2 December 2016. The notices invited people wishing to object to or otherwise comment on the proposals to submit their comments by 23 December 2016.

3.2 One letter of objection was received, see **Appendix C**. The main concern was the safety of access in and out of their drive at school time. They also felt that the crossing should be located between the shop and the Westend Club as it would serve the community better. Whilst pedestrian numbers were highest at this location on a Saturday, overall they were still much lower than numbers near the school on a weekday.

3.3 The Road Safety Audit 1 did not identify the drive access as a problem. See **Appendix D**. The auditor was consulted again after a meeting with the objector. They felt that the resident should be able to enter/leave their drive safely provided that they drive sensibly and in accordance with the Highway Code.

3.4 Therefore the crossing in its proposed location ensures the greatest pedestrians benefit and protects this desire line relative to other, lesser desire lines.

4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications

4.1.1 Overall there are no significant differential, positive or negative, equality impacts from implementing these individual scheme works as part of the wider Streets Ahead Enhancement project. The work should be positive for everyone by improving access to both around local neighbourhoods and also to the bus and tram infrastructure. It should be particularly positive for the elderly, young and mobility impaired.

4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

4.2.1 £60,000 has been allowed to implement the zebra crossing from the 2017/18 LTP programme. This element of LTP funding is part of the Streets Ahead Enhancement programme (BU93053), which has £400,000 in total approved by the Integrated Transport Authority (ITA). The Sheffield City Council Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities Board and Capital Programme Group have approved a £400,000 total budget for 17/18 but a Final Business Case with details of the works and costs to be carried out will be subject to the Capital Gateway Approval process.

4.2.2 The commuted sum to cover future maintenance is estimated at £5K. It is claimed from the LTP and then held in the revenue contribution

account BU22183. It is paid to Amey at the end of the financial year to cover related maintenance expenditure over the next 25 years. However should any other implications arise, appropriate consultation and advice will be sought on the issues as required. The commuted sum for this scheme will be ~£12k which is less than the £50k commuted sums approved for Streets Ahead Enhancement programme for 17/18.

4.3 Legal Implications

4.3.1 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.

4.3.2 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.

4.3.3 The Council received one objection to the proposal in response to the consultation. The Council therefore needs to consider whether this objection outweighs the benefits of implementing the proposal. If the Council is satisfied that the benefits of implementing the proposal outweigh the objections, it will be acting lawfully and within its powers should it decide to implement the proposal.

4.4 Other Implications

4.4.1 N/A

5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

5.1 Doing nothing has been considered, that is not implementing the proposed zebra crossing. This would mean that conditions for pedestrians crossing Sheffield Road would remain unimproved. Also recruitment and retention of School Crossing Wardens is difficult. If the current warden left and the position was not filled then the main pedestrian desire line would be left unprotected.

5.2 Relocating the crossing 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, no other suitable safe location has been identified. Moving the crossing slightly nearer the shop would mean removing all the parking outside the shop. There is not enough physical room to put it between Wolverley Road and Ashwell Road and would mean that at least one bus stop would need to be moved. Moving the crossing near to the Social Club would mean substantial loss of residential parking and again moving at least one bus stop. It would leave the stronger desire line by the school, albeit one only used for relatively short periods of the day, unprotected, perhaps increasing risk to people crossing at this point including the school crossing patrol.

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The new survey confirms that the zebra in the proposed location best serves the main pedestrian desire line for the majority of the time.