

## CYCLE TRACKS ACT 1984 CONVERSION OF PARTS OF A PUBLIC FOOTPATH TO SHARED FOOTPATH/CYCLE TRACK AT HALFWAY, SHEFFIELD.

OBJECTOR	VIEWS EXPRESSED	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p>Resident A of Middle Ox Gardens</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="562 305 1260 678">1. <i>“Re. the section marked A-B that runs from Rotherham Road for 17.5 metres. To achieve a width of 3 metre, a number of trees will need to be cut down. Some of these are well established and some are younger. I’m sure you are aware of the environmental and health benefits of trees. These trees also currently create a pleasant canopy for the existing footpath which enhances my local neighbourhood. This would, in my opinion, be needlessly removed if the proposal is passed.”</i></li> <li data-bbox="562 716 1260 992">2. <i>“In the section marked A-B, where the existing footpath runs parallel to housing, there is a fairly narrow section of grass with trees on it. This grass backs right onto the current housing. If the path is widened to three metres, which green space will be reduced by just under 50% which would have a significant negative impact on the green space.”</i></li> <li data-bbox="562 1057 1260 1300">3. <i>“Throughout the entire planned Cycle Path route, lamp posts would need to be relocated and in places, other (all mature) trees would need to be destroyed. When there are potential routes that could allow the green space to remain, un-impacted, I believe that those routes should take precedent.”</i></li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li data-bbox="1285 305 1984 678">1. There is no plan to remove any trees as a result of providing this facility. However, it will be necessary to trim the bough of one tree at a point shown as ‘B’ on the Order and Plan included as Appendix A. The width at two points, where widening would compromise trees, will remain at 2 metres. Given the expected level of usage and open nature of this route it is considered acceptable to have these short pinch-point sections. A plan showing the scheme proposals is included as Appendix C.</li> <li data-bbox="1285 716 1984 1024">2. The ‘green’ area between the points shown on the Order plan as A to B covers an area of approximately 786 square meters. Widening the current footpath, between these points, by 1 metre will reduce this area by approximately 100 square metres. Overall the green space in the vicinity of the path is approximately 20,000 square metres. The widening of the footpath will reduce this space by around 500 square metres.</li> <li data-bbox="1285 1057 1984 1195">3. Just one lamppost will require repositioning; this is situated near point ‘B’ on the Order Plan. As previously stated, there is no plan to remove any trees a result of providing this facility.</li> </ol>

APPENDIX B

OBJECTOR	VIEWS EXPRESSED	OFFICER RESPONSE
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 112</p>	<p>4. <i>“The removal of trees, shrubbery and grass seems to be in contradiction to Sheffield City Council’s Five Year Policy to persevering and developing green spaces in the City (announced in November 2018.”</i></p> <p>5. There has been no community consultation that I am aware of regarding this proposed cycle path. There are only five notices of the proposed work been put up on the entirety of the route. Even the maps have been stuck on the lampposts sideways which makes them impossible to understand without taking a photograph and rotating it. There is no way, mentioned on the notices, for people to make contact online to voice any concerns (or support) of the proposal, thereby making it more difficult and unlikely that residents can object. As it states in the notice, “If no objections are duly made...Sheffield City Council may itself confirm the Order as unopposed.” This gives the impression that the Council have done the least amount necessary hoping to get the Cycle Path constructed without any objections.</p>	<p>4. As previously mentioned no trees are planned to be removed as a result of these works. Additionally there are no plans to remove any shrubs. Promoting and encouraging cycling, and improving cycle facilities, is entirely consistent with the Council’s “Transport Vision” (December 2017), so there is a need to balance both policies.</p> <p>5. On the 27th November 2018 the proposed route was discussed and given approval at the Planning and Highways Committee Meeting. The agenda for these meetings is published in advance and the public may attend should they wish. Subsequently the Order was drafted and the public consultation period commenced. Notices were placed at either end of the route, but also at suitable intervening periods along it, to ensure that those accessing the path at other points would be made aware of the proposal. The Order Plans onsite were re-orientated as soon as we were made aware that there was an issue. For anyone requiring further information or to object to the proposal a telephone number and address were included on the notice.</p> <p>Unfortunately, due to an administrative error the Order was not made or advertised in the press. Consequently the Order was made on the 28th February 2019 and advertised in line with Statutory requirements.</p>

OBJECTOR	VIEWS EXPRESSED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Page 113	<p>6. If the community had been consulted, you'd find that local people would prefer money to be spent on the area around the park being better lit and more litter bins put in place.</p> <p>7. In 2016-2017 this estate was left a rubbish tip by Amey who, in October 2016 began fitting new lampposts. Despite being told the work would only take 3 months, it took over five months a huge campaign by residents and involvement of local Councillors and MPs to get to job completed and tidied up. My house, on Middle Ox Gardens was left without any street lighting at all for 3 months. The thought of those same lampposts being dug up and work being started again fills not just me, but many local residents with dread. It is difficult to articulate the amount of disruption that was caused. Nobody wants that again.</p> <p>8. <i>"I am informed that this scheme is being paid for by Taylor Wimpey and that it is a requirement that a number of Cycle Paths are constructed allowing vehicle free access to the new estate. If this is the case, I would suggest that it makes more sense to provide a continuation of the existing Cycle Lane on Rotherham Road and go down Deepwell Avenue. This would be more centrally accessible to both sides of the Deepwell Estate. It would also join up with the existing Cycle Paths and would not require any</i></p>	<p>6. The planning application which this proposal is in connection with was open to public comment and objection in the same way that all planning applications are. In line with Council Transport and Planning policies, Officers have sought to use planning gain to improve cycle connectivity to and from the development.</p> <p>7. It is unfortunate that residents suffered such issues during the street lighting renewal works. As stated previously only one lighting column is planned to be repositioned (at point B) as a result of providing this facility. Work on the new areas of highway will be inspected at relevant points during the construction by an Officer of the City Council.</p> <p>8. An opportunity to provide a dedicated cycle route, from Rotherham Road to the new development off Deepwell Avenue, was proposed and included as a condition in the outline planning permission (13/01674/OUT) granted on 26th June 2015. At this time a specific route was not identified. Subsequently officers identified a suitable off road route that would suit both experienced and novice cyclists (particularly children utilising the nearby park). The carriageway along Deepwell Avenue is on</p>

APPENDIX B

OBJECTOR	VIEWS EXPRESSED	OFFICER RESPONSE
	<p><i>removal of trees or green spaces. It would also stop the dangerous parking adjacent to the park on Deepwell Avenue which I know a number of residents have raised concerns about.</i></p>	<p>average 7 metres in width. Providing a cycle route along Deepwell Avenue would require provision of dedicated lanes on either side of the carriageway of at least 1.5 metres wide and given the reduction in carriageway width it would not be practical.</p>

## APPENDIX B

CYCLE TRACKS ACT 1984 CONVERSION OF PARTS OF A PUBLIC FOOTPATH TO SHARED FOOTPATH/CYCLE TRACK AT HALFWAY, SHEFFIELD.

Page 115

OBJECTOR	VIEWS EXPRESSED	OFFICER RESPONSE
Resident B of Middle Ox Gardens	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. My main objection is with regard to the A-B section which runs past my back garden fence. Having put up with considerable noise and inconvenience from the recent footpath/lighting upgrades, I now find you're proposing to repeat the experience by changing it again. Are these decisions made on a whim or do some receive forward planning?</li>   <li>2. The current footpath is only a couple of yards from my back fence and I have been unable to ascertain whether the proposed widening would bring the path even closer. This suggests privacy issues as, whereas the current path would not allow an average height person to peer over the fence, the same person on a bicycle could easily do so.</li>   <li>3. In addition, pinch-points along the whole route necessary to avoid felling trees mean that the route becomes more hazardous for pedestrians.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. An opportunity to provide a dedicated cycle route, from Rotherham Road to the new development off Deepwell Avenue, was proposed and included as a condition in the outline planning permission (13/01674/OUT) granted on 26th June 2015. At this time a specific route was not identified. Unfortunately the chosen route and design was not determined until early 2018, sometime after the highway improvement works at the Deepwell Avenue estate had commenced/completed.</li>   <li>2. The widening, along the section running at the rear of your property on Middle Ox Gardens, will take place on the northern side of the footpath (this can be seen on the drawing attached as Appendix C) and users will be no closer to these properties than they already are. It is conceivable that a person riding a bicycle would (if standing) be of a slightly greater height than if they were walking. It is however noted that the fences along the rear of these properties are of a palisade type and that where they are not masked by highway trees/shrubs it is entirely possible to see through them without the need to peer over.</li>   <li>3. Noted. The width at two individual points, where widening would compromise trees, will remain at 2 metres. Given the open nature of this route and the expected level of usage, it is considered acceptable to have these short pinch-point sections.</li> </ol>

OBJECTOR	VIEWS EXPRESSED	OFFICER RESPONSE
	<p>4. I have my doubts whether this route would be a great favourite for the cycling community either. From the Morrison's roundabout, cycling downhill to the new estate would present an easier option than continuing further uphill along a much busier road to reach the new path.</p> <p>5. I realise that adding a few more yards of cycle route to the city map would tick a box on the council to-do list, but genuinely useful paths which link to the existing system would be a better use of scarce council-tax payer's money, so recently used to update the paths/lighting that you're proposing to rip up.</p>	<p>4. Though a relatively short section of new cycle track, it will provide a link to the park, the general highway network and in time, where development opportunities arise, may connect to other shared routes e.g. the Trans Pennine Trail and routes west of Hollow Lane. Whilst some more experienced cyclists might choose to utilise the road network, other users, particularly children, will find these off road paths safer.</p> <p>5. The developer will be responsible for all costs associated with this scheme, including construction and commuted sums for the future maintenance.</p>