

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Cabinet Highways Committee

Report of:	Executive Director, Place	
Date:	8 November 2012	
Subject:	Objections to a proposed Traffic Regulation Order associated with the East Bank Road Zebra Crossing Scheme for the East Community Assembly	
Author of Report:	James Haigh	
Summary:	To report to the Cabinet Highways Committee on Objections to a proposed Traffic Regulation Order associated with the East Bank Road Zebra Crossing Scheme for the East Community Assembly	

Reasons for Recommendations:

There have been four injury accidents in the last five years in this location all involving school age pedestrians. Therefore, the road safety advantages of installing these measures outweigh the concerns of local residents.

The Traffic Regulation Order for this scheme to provide waiting restrictions is considered a necessary part of the scheme. The East Community Assembly have considered the objections to the waiting restrictions and have decided that the advantages of the scheme outweigh any possible disadvantages to the objectors.

Recommendations:

- Overrule the objections to the waiting restrictions on East Bank Road/Hurlfield Road in the interest of road safety, and the Traffic Regulation Orders be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- Approve and construct the scheme shown in Appendix C
- Inform the objectors accordingly.

Background Papers: None

Category of Report: OPEN

Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

YES Cleared by: Matthew Bullock Legal Implications YES/NO Cleared by: Nadine Wynter Equality of Opportunity Implications YES Cleared by: lan Oldershaw Tackling Health Inequalities Implications YES/NO Human rights Implications YES/NO: Environmental and Sustainability implications YES/NO Economic impact YES/NO Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader	Financial Implications				
YES/NO Cleared by: Nadine Wynter Equality of Opportunity Implications YES Cleared by: Ian Oldershaw Tackling Health Inequalities Implications YES/NO Human rights Implications YES/NO: Environmental and Sustainability implications YES/NO Economic impact YES/NO Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader	YES Cleared by: Matthew Bullock				
Equality of Opportunity Implications YES Cleared by: Ian Oldershaw Tackling Health Inequalities Implications YES/NO Human rights Implications YES/NO: Environmental and Sustainability implications YES/NO Economic impact YES/NO Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader	Legal Implications				
Tackling Health Inequalities Implications YES/NO Human rights Implications YES/NO: Environmental and Sustainability implications YES/NO Economic impact YES/NO Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader	YES/NO Cleared by: Nadine Wynter				
Tackling Health Inequalities Implications YES/NO Human rights Implications YES/NO: Environmental and Sustainability implications YES/NO Economic impact YES/NO Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader	Equality of Opportunity Implications				
Human rights Implications YES/NO: Environmental and Sustainability implications YES/NO Economic impact YES/NO Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader	YES Cleared by: Ian Oldershaw				
Human rights Implications YES/NO: Environmental and Sustainability implications YES/NO Economic impact YES/NO Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader	Tackling Health Inequalities Implications				
YES/NO: Environmental and Sustainability implications YES/NO Economic impact YES/NO Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	YES/NO				
Environmental and Sustainability implications YES/NO Economic impact YES/NO Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	Human rights Implications				
Feconomic impact YES/NO Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	YES/NO:				
Economic impact YES/NO Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	Environmental and Sustainability implications				
Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	YES/NO				
Community safety implications YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	Economic impact				
YES/NO Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	YES/NO				
Human resources implications YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	Community safety implications				
YES/NO Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	YES/NO				
Property implications YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	Human resources implications				
YES/NO Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	YES/NO				
Area(s) affected Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	Property implications				
Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	YES/NO				
Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in	Area(s) affected				
Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in					
	Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Leader				
	Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in				
le the item a matter subject is used for any good by the Oite Ooms 110					
Is the item a matter which is reserved for approval by the City Council?					
YES/NO					
Press release					
YES/NO					

OBJECTIONS TO A PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER ASSOCIATED WITH A SCHEME FOR THE EAST COMMUNITY ASSEMBLY

1.0 SUMMARY

1.1 To report to the Cabinet Highways Committee on Objections to a proposed Traffic Regulation Order associated with the East Bank Road Zebra Crossing Scheme for the East Community Assembly

2.0 WHAT DOES THIS MEAN FOR SHEFFIELD PEOPLE

2.1 The scheme outlined in this report contributes to the delivery of the 'Standing up for Sheffield' Corporate Plan, supporting and protecting communities by responding to customer requests for safer walking routes to schools and various local amenities.

3.0 OUTCOME AND SUSTAINABILITY

- 3.1 These proposals provide road safety benefits for customers, thereby contributing to 'A great place to live' by encouraging a thriving neighbourhood and helping to create a 'safe and secure community'.
- 3.2 If the scheme, and associated restrictions, is provided at this location then there will be road safety benefits for pedestrians, in particular children and the elderly.
- 3.3 Improving the pedestrian routes could encourage more people to walk or use public transport, thus helping to reduce the city's carbon footprint.

4.0 REPORT

- 4.1 Scheme information, The purpose of the scheme is to assist pedestrians particularly school children in crossing East Bank Road and comes in response to a series of accidents involving young pedestrians at this location. In order to achieve the visibility and correct speed it is also proposed to install waiting restrictions and speed cushions/hump. The Traffic Regulation Order required for the scheme was advertised between 6th and 27th July 2012.
- 4.2 Consultation results, Approximately 75 residents were included in the consultation area, receiving a letter, plan and questionnaire along with a pre-paid envelope. The consultation process generated a total of 39 responses giving a return rate of 52%. The results were as follows:

Fully	Partly	Don't	Not Sure
Support	Support	Support	
24	5	8	2
62%	13%	20%	5%

The Police, Ambulance Service, South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue and SYPTE were sent scheme proposals on 7th April 2012. No objections were received.

- 4.3 The objections and comments of support together with officer responses are detailed in the table included in Appendix A. The main objections were to the waiting restrictions and the removal of some off carriageway parking.
- 4.4 The waiting restrictions and removal of some off carriageway parking is essential to provide adequate visibility for pedestrians using the zebra crossing. Officers are mindful and sympathetic to the needs of residents and following the first consultation reduced the extent of the waiting restrictions in several areas, which resulted in several objections being withdrawn. The proposed restrictions now shown in Appendix C are considered to be the minimum requirement to achieve road safety and pedestrian/vehicle intervisibility over the extent of the scheme. Overall 8 off carriageway parking spaces will be lost (compared with 14 in the original proposal).
- 4.5 The Zebra crossing is located in the best position within the scheme limits for both the safety and desire line of the pedestrians wishing to cross. Officer observations on several occasions have noted that the majority of pedestrians crossing here do so using the island. There have been suggestions by residents to move that crossing to between Hurlfield Road and Dagnam Road however; concerns were raised by officers regarding the safety of the potential left turn from either road.
- 4.6 The changes are summarised on the plan included in Appendix C
- 4.7 The relevant Ward Members of the East Community Assembly were contacted regarding the objections. Ward Members have confirmed their support for implementing the scheme as advertised and on balance have concluded the objections to be over-ruled.

IMPLICATIONS

- 4.8 The budget estimate for the scheme is £108,400 with an additional £20,000 for the commuted sum element to cover future maintenance. This will be funded from the East Community Assembly 2012/13 large schemes budget. It has also been confirmed that any potential cost increase could be covered using the Road Safety Accidents Savings Budget.
- 4.9 An Equality Impact Assessment has been conducted and concludes that

the proposals are of universal positive benefit to all local people regardless of age, sex, race, faith, disability, sexuality, etc. Because the proposals relate to increased road and pedestrian safety they should be of particular positive benefit to the more vulnerable members of society, including the young, the elderly and disabled people. No negative equality impacts have been identified.

4.10 The Council, as the Highways Authority for Sheffield, has the powers under Part V of the Highways Act 1980 to implement the improvements requested in this report. The Council also has a statutory duty to promote road safety and to ensure that any measures it approves are reasonably safe for all users. Therefore in making decisions of this nature the Council must be satisfied that the measures are necessary to avoid danger to pedestrians and other road users or for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs.

5.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- Moving the Zebra Crossing was considered following comment from residents but there were safety concerns raised about drivers turning left from Hurlfield Road to East Bank Road who would be too close to the crossing to achieve adequate forward visibility which may result in a collision with a pedestrian on the crossing.
- 5.2 Reducing the length of waiting restrictions and allowing further (off carriageway) parking than that shown in Appendix C was considered following residents comments. However this would reduce visibility to below an acceptable level for that of a Zebra Crossing.

6.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 There have been four injury accidents in the last five years in this location all involving school age pedestrians. Therefore, the road safety advantages of installing these measures outweigh the concerns of local residents.

The Traffic Regulation Order for this scheme to provide waiting restrictions is considered a necessary part of the scheme. The East Community Assembly have considered the objections to the waiting restrictions and have decided that the advantages of the scheme outweigh any possible disadvantages to the objectors.

7.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 Overrule the objections to the waiting restrictions in the interests of road safety, and the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- 7.2 Approve and construct the scheme shown in Appendix C
- 7.3 Inform the objectors accordingly.

Simon Green Executive Director, Place

1 November 2012