

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Thursday 14 February 2013 by the Cabinet Highways Committee.

Date notified to all members:

The end of the call-in period is 4:00 pm on

The decision can be implemented from

Item No

8. RESPONSES TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER TO INTRODUCE PARKING RESTRICTIONS ON CLIFFEFIELD ROAD AND MEERSBROOK AVENUE

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out the public response to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) to introduce parking restrictions on the junction of Cliffeield Road and Meersbrook Avenue to prevent vehicles parking in areas that restrict visibility for motorists and other road users.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:-

- (a) overrules the objection to the proposed traffic regulations on Cliffeield Road and Meersbrook Avenue and introduce the restrictions as shown in the plan in Appendix A to the report;
- (b) resolves that the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; and
- (c) requests that all respondents be informed of the Committee's decision.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

9.3.1 The Traffic Regulation Order for this scheme was necessary to introduce the proposed parking restrictions with a view to resolving problems which have been raised by a local people and Members.

9.3.2 Community Assembly Members and officers had given due consideration to the views of the respondents in an attempt to find an acceptable solution. The recommendation was considered to be a balanced attempt to address residents concerns and aspirations.

9.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

9.4.1 This scheme had been designed to meet local needs/priorities as identified by South Community Assembly Members. The proposals put forward were considered to deliver the required outcomes to resolve the problems which have been brought to the attention of the Assembly.

9.4.2 A reduction in the length of the proposed restriction to 5 metres on each length of the junction was an option which could be considered. This course of action had been adopted previously by Members in similar circumstances. However, it was not something which it was felt could be justified on this occasion because of the narrow road widths and tightness of the corners.

9.4.3 A further option would be to do nothing at all but this would result in a potentially dangerous situation remaining unresolved.

9.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

1.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

1.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

1.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

9. OBJECTIONS TO SOUTH LANE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER

10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the proposed camera enforcement scheme at South Lane and also reported on the feedback from two rounds of public consultation, including an objection to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order.

1.2 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) overrules the objection to the Traffic Regulation Order and requests that the objector be advised accordingly;
- (b) requests that the detailed design and implementation of the proposals be completed as illustrated in Appendix D to the report; and
- (c) requests that the relevant Traffic Regulation Orders be advertised to allow additional evening parking spaces on South Lane and short

stay parking on Cumberland Street and they be implemented should there be no objections.

10.3 Reasons for Decision

10.3. Council Officers have worked with the market developers, South Yorkshire
1 Passenger Transport Executive, local bus operators and local businesses to ensure that the proposed scheme meets the objectives of 'A Vision for Excellent Transport', 'Standing up for Sheffield', and 'Better Buses' while trying to improve pick up/drop off arrangements and on street parking issues in the area too.

10.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

10.4. *Do Nothing:* Should nothing happen, the existing level of abuse will
1 continue and additional traffic associated with the markets development may also take the opportunity to use South Lane and Cumberland Street to access or leave the City Centre. This option would not meet the planning condition for the markets development and would worsen the existing situation for public transport users so this was not seen as feasible.

10.4. *Enforce at the existing bus gate:* Before a bus gate was enforced, the
2 Council needed to make sure that drivers had a well signed "escape' route", thus enabling people who enter an area by mistake to exit without fear of being penalised. It was not possible to provide such a route on Cumberland Street so drivers were more likely to inadvertently receive a Penalty Charge Notice, so this option was not seen as feasible.

10.4. *Implement the new bus gate, but don't enforce it:* Implementing the new
3 bus gate but not enforcing it was feasible. However, this option would not meet the planning condition for the markets development and could worsen the existing situation for public transport users so it was not proposed to progress with this option. In addition, previous market research had established that there was public support for proper enforcement of bus and tram gates and lanes in Sheffield.

10.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

10.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

10.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

10.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

10. HILLSBOROUGH PERMIT PARKING REVIEW

11.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report informing Members of the comments received following the public consultation on the review of the Hillsborough Permit Parking Scheme, together with recommendations for further work and possible changes to existing parking restrictions.

11.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:-

(a) approves the removal of the following streets from further consultation and survey work adjacent to the current scheme boundary and requests that those people who responded to the consultation be informed:-

- Burnaby Street
- Dixon Road
- Dykes Hall Road
- Findon Street
- Garry Road
- Hammerton Road
- Hawthorn Road
- Holme Close
- Keyworth Road
- Kirkstone Road
- Langsett Road
- Manvers Road
- Middlewood Road
- Morley Street
- Oakland Road
- Portsea Road
- Singleton Road, Crescent and Grove
- Upwood Road
- Victor Street
- Walkley Lane
- Warner Road
- Wynard Road;

(b) approves further investigation of small changes to the existing scheme as well as roads adjacent to the current boundary as identified in Appendix E to the report and any subsequent Traffic Regulation Orders be advertised; and

(c) approves further survey work on Beechwood Road, Clarence Road, May Road, Leader Road including East View Terrace and Leader Court, Hunter Road, Minto Road, Taplin Road and Thoresby Road and any subsequent Traffic Regulation Orders be advertised to

enable these streets to be included in the permit parking scheme.

11.3 Reasons for Decision

11.3. Based on the responses received from the recent consultation and by
1 comparing results obtained from three previous comprehensive consultations it was recommended to agree the list of recommendations set out in paragraph 7.0 which outlined the next steps of the review process. Any subsequent Traffic Regulation Orders considered necessary by the Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services would allow further feedback from both residents and businesses on any planned changes.

11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

11.4. Officers had considered the content of each individual comment received.
1 Where comments had been made requesting small adjustments it was intended that these would be fully investigated.

11.4. One alternative option would be to advertise much larger scale changes
2 based on comments made by some people in the consultation. However, as the general response rates were fairly low on a number of streets this would have resulted in promoting scheme changes which were supported only by a minority and not entirely focused on the majority of customer requirements.

11.4. An alternative option for further work would be to include both Keyworth
3 Road and Dixon Road in further surveys or possible legal adverts. The decision not to include both these streets was based not only on results obtained from this consultation but also previous survey and on consultation work. Where there was definitely support for parking restrictions on these streets this was in contrast to much of the surrounding area. It was felt that these streets could not be added to the scheme in isolation as a migration of parking problems was likely to occur. Any promotion of restrictions for the whole area was likely to be unpopular with the majority of residents.

11.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

11.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

11.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

11.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing