



**EAST
LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE
MEETING – 30TH JUNE 2022
WRITTEN ANSWERS PROVIDED TO
PUBLIC QUESTIONS**



1.	Public question from Rosalie Hill
	<p>Question:</p> <p>Could consideration be given to a restriction on parking outside Park Hill Community Building before 9.30am?</p> <p>(Note: this was a correction of the wording from the question at the meeting of 23 March, 2022: “In relation to the Park Hill Parking Scheme, it was mentioned that the proposal reduced the number of available spaces outside (park hill community group building?). There was also none no waiting restrictions or provision for disabled parking. It was suggested that a parking charge be implemented”)</p>
	<p>Response:</p> <p>The parking scheme operating times was proposed to be 8am so any restrictions outside the community building would come into operation at 8am. The current bay types for outside this building are a mix of ‘pay and display’ and ‘residents only’ parking. However, short stay parking was being considered, which would generate a turnover of spaces and may be more helpful to the users of the library/community spaces.</p> <p>There were no specific disabled parking bays proposed, however, all ‘pay and display’ and ‘residents bays’ could be parked in free or charge and without a permit. Disabled badge holders could also park on yellow lines for up to 3 hours as long as there was no loading ban.</p>
2.	Public question from NJ Hill
	<p>Question:</p> <p>Were there any proposals for dealing with the turn restrictions and limitation of speed?</p> <p>(Note: this was a correction of the wording from the question at the meeting of 23 March, 2022: “In relation to the Park Hill Parking Scheme, it was asked if the speed cameras on Donnington Road were linked to the Traffic Regulation Order”)</p>
	<p>Response:</p> <p>The proposals aimed to physically reduce the speed of traffic by possibly installing cushions. The abuse of the current banned right turn and speed limits could only</p>

	<p>be enforced by the police. Additional signing could be considered to help adherence to the banned right turn restriction, but this could not be confirmed this until the scheme was approved to move forward into design.</p>
3.	Public question from public questioner 3
	<p>Question:</p> <p>At the last LAC meeting, and as other Councillors have said, we were told the Park Hill Parking Scheme would not go ahead if the majority of residents did not want it.</p> <p>Out of the 1066 responses only 46 were in favour of the scheme (4.3%). So 95.7% were against it.</p> <p>Will this parking scheme now be abandoned as this clearly shows the scheme does not have community support and the majority of residents do not want it? Plus a councillor has said the Parking Hill scheme has overwhelmingly been rejected.</p>
	<p>Response:</p> <p>There was a due process to follow with the proposed scheme. Where circumstances had changed since the proposal was first made, an updated report would be presented to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee who would make appropriate recommendations. Ward Councillors were unable to make such decisions.</p> <p>The aim was to take the report with all objections to the November meeting of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Change Policy Committee for members to decide how/if to proceed with the scheme.</p>
4.	Public question from Stephen Burgin
	<p>Question:</p> <p>Given the initial business case is written predominantly to give equal support to businesses and residents and that the population of Norfolk Park/Park Hill is >90% residential and the research that underpins the vast majority of the rationale is from 2005-2015 and is from overseas research is there really any point in continuing with this costly scheme?</p>
	<p>Response:</p> <p>Individual Councillors were unable to make decisions on such schemes, and the decision would be made in due course by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.</p>

	The aim was to take the report with all objections to the November meeting of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Change Policy Committee for members to decide how/if to proceed with the scheme.
5.	Public question from Rosalie Hill, Chair, Park Community Action
	<p>Question:</p> <p>Regarding the proposed Park Hill parking scheme, were there any alternatives to parking permits and meters considered as a means of addressing extraneous parking in the area: for example, no parking before 9.30am as currently prevails on parts of Duke Street/City Road? Were such alternatives costed and compared in terms of ease of enforcement?</p>
	<p>Response:</p> <p>In the initial business case, alternative options of managing the parking were briefly explored. Installing more restrictions similar to the one on Duke Street would also apply to residents and they would have to move their cars to outside of the immediate area until 9.30am. This would also mean that residents cannot park in the area between 4.30 and 6.30pm.</p> <p>This restriction would also allow commuters to park on residential streets all day (9.30am-4.30pm) for free meaning residents would be less likely to find parking near their homes.</p>
6.	Public question from Rosalie Hill, Chair, Park Community Action
	<p>Question:</p> <p>Were the parking needs for access to community buildings such as the Park Centre/library considered before drawing up the scheme? Was the Council aware of the importance of activities in Park Centre to community cohesion, the improvement of health and the reduction of social isolation?</p>
	<p>Response:</p> <p>There may be scope to offer more flexibility outside the library such as short stay parking which creates more turnover of spaces, leaving more opportunity to park for visitors of these facilities. In some previous schemes, shorter stay parking bays were installed in order to create a good turnover of parking for people to use facilities such as libraries. Unfortunately, the 2018 parking strategy means that all bays need to be a mixture of pay and display/permit bays only. However, these bays would offer 20 mins free parking and due to the proposed new restrictions, there should be more free spaces available for residents to enjoy the community facilities.</p>
7.	Public question from Graham Wroe
	Question:

	<p>Could the parking scheme consider:</p> <p>(a) provision of secure parking for bicycles.</p>
	<p>Response:</p> <p>The Council are just about to award a contract to install secure bike parking on the Active Travel neighbourhood. In addition to this, it was hoped to start a trial of residential cycle parking and locations such as Park Hill would be considered in this trial.</p>
8.	Public question from Graham Wroe
	<p>Question:</p> <p>Could the parking scheme consider:</p> <p>(b) provision of electric vehicle charging points.</p>
	<p>Response:</p> <p>On-street residential charging trials were being carried out nationally and the Council would review potential funding, options and issues, in order to inform the city's approach to providing an electric vehicle charging infrastructure. Key issues being considered included: what is the right solution, or solutions, for the city, given factors such as electricity supply and infrastructure, footway width/footway clutter, where cables go, and the wide variety of technologies coming forward. The Government had also just released their strategy for electric vehicle charging infrastructure which would feed into this.</p> <p>A number of rapid chargers had recently been installed for public use as well as for taxi and private hire drivers and it was hoped to expand this network, including the addition of fast chargers, in the future. More information, including a map of these chargers, could be found on the Council's website at www.sheffield.gov.uk/cleanair</p>
9.	Public question from Steve Cooper
	<p>Question:</p> <p>Crossing points for pedestrians at Parkway/Handsworth Road junction for Athelstan School pupils as the bus is invariably late and parking provision at school is difficult especially when the recreation department car park is not allowed to be used?</p>
	<p>Response:</p> <p>The Chair advised that this issue cut across various services within the Council, and that a full response would be provided to the questioner.</p>

	<p>Councillor Miskell echoed concerns around the quality of bus services and noted that one-third of bus services were expected to be cut in October 2022. He believed that public investment was needed and explained that the newly elected South Yorkshire Mayor, Oliver Coppard, had taken the decision to start a formal assessment into bus franchising with a view to planning and determining bus routes.</p> <p>Bus reliability should be taken up with the operator (Stagecoach or First).</p> <p>Officers could advise further on the car park referred to once its location was known. If it belonged to the school the Council would have no jurisdiction on how it was used.</p>
10.	Public question from David Cobley
	<p>Question:</p> <p>We have been trying for three years to get traffic calming measures on Donnington Road, Essex Road and Holdings Road. We were advised that a draft scheme was in force and that the Council had indicated it would use CIL money to fund such a scheme and that the money was available.</p> <p>Following on from a meeting of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, written confirmation had been received that officers had developed options which had then been submitted to the Local Area Committee for their consideration.</p> <p>Can you confirm that you have had these options and are positively considering them?</p> <p>A Freedom of Information request put to South Yorkshire Police regarding the number of fixed penalty notices issued for non-compliance with no left/right turns has not yet been answered. We have been advised that the Council has devolved powers to apply for enforcement powers to use enforcement cameras for such driving offences. Has the Council applied for those powers and, if so, when do they plan to commence?</p> <p>Nether Edge and other wards have set out a programme of signage on roads. Is there a similar programme for the East Local Area Committee area?</p>
	<p>Response:</p> <p>The Transport, Regeneration and Climate Change Policy Committee had approved funding allocation for a scheme to install 28 vehicle activated signs across the city, and each Local Area Committee had been asked to identify 6 hotspots which the vehicle activated signs would be rotated around throughout the year. A schedule would be provided to the questioner. Community Infrastructure Levy money was owned by the ward and that ward councillors made decisions on this spending.</p>

	<p>Active Neighbourhood schemes were being trialled in Nether Edge and Crookes, and that there was limited funding available.</p>
--	---

	<p>The price for installing a traffic calming scheme on Donnington Road is with the local members to decide whether it can be funded with Community Infrastructure Levy.</p>
--	--