

**SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL**

**Cabinet Highways Committee**

**Meeting held 14 March 2013**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Leigh Bramall (Chair), Bryan Lodge and Isobel Bowler  
(Substitute Member)

.....

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Harpham and Councillor Isobel Bowler attended the meeting as the duly appointed substitute. An apology for absence was received from Councillor Jack Scott but no substitute was appointed.

**2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

**4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 February 2013 were approved as a correct record.

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

5.1 Dawn Vernezze and Councillor Alan Hooper, Ecclesfield Parish Council, attended the meeting to request a footway be erected leading to the crematorium on Skewer Lane as it was currently dangerous for visitors. There were no warning signs to inform cars that pedestrians would be in the vicinity and Dawn believed that this was an accident waiting to happen. She also asked if there had been any plans developed for a footpath when the crematorium was built.

5.2 In response, John Bann, Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services reported that there had been a potential scheme investigated a number of years ago following requests from pedestrians. However, this had been dropped as it had been found that there wasn't great demand and it would be prohibitively expensive. The crematorium team had also not requested a footpath of this nature.

5.3 Councillor Leigh Bramall commented that he appreciated the cost implications but requested that another cost assessment be undertaken so that the questioner could be informed of the cost of the scheme and whether this could be progressed.

- 5.4 **RESOLVED:** That the Director of Development Services be requested to undertake a cost assessment into the erection of a footpath leading to the crematorium on Skew Hill Lane

**6. ITEMS CALLED IN FOR SCRUTINY/REFERRED TO CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE**

- 6.1 There were no items called-in for Scrutiny or referred to the Cabinet Highways Committee.

**7. PETITIONS**

New Petitions

The Committee noted for information the receipt of petitions (a) containing 172 signatures requesting a pedestrian crossing on Hutcliffe Wood Road and (b) containing 16 signatures requesting additional parking spaces on Bellhouse Road and that both petitions would be investigated as part of the Streets Ahead project.

Outstanding Petitions List

The Committee received and noted a report of the Executive Director, Place setting out the position on outstanding petitions that were being investigated.

**8. PROPOSED PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES CROOKES ROAD/NILE STREET/FULWOOD ROAD/WHITHAM ROAD, BROOMHILL**

- 12.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking approval to a design option for completion of detailed design and preparation for the construction for the Crookes Road/Nile Street/Fulwood Road/Whitham Road pedestrian facilities.
- 12.2 Matt Turner attended the meeting to make representations to the Committee. He commented that Broomhill was already a heavily congested and polluted area which exceeded government targets on air pollution. He therefore asked if the proposals would reduce levels of pollution in the area? Mr Turner further asked whether the needs of cyclists had been taken into account when the scheme had been devised?
- 12.3 In response, Dick Proctor, Transport Vision and Strategy Manager, acknowledged that Broomhill was a heavily congested area. This was why local residents had been seeking an improvement to pedestrian facilities. The proposals would not result in traffic gridlock and a queue modelling exercise had demonstrated this. The Community Assembly supported the scheme. Officers were now confident that the scheme was affordable and, should approval be given by the Committee, detailed design of the scheme would be undertaken and the needs of cyclists would be a key part of this.

12.4 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee :-

- (a) acknowledge the outcome of the 2011 consultation and the reasons for the delay in progress since then;
- (b) approves Option 2 (slip road) for the Crookes Road/Nile Street/Fulwood Road/Whitham Road junction; and
- (c) approves the preliminary design of the Option 2 scheme and completion of the detailed design and construction in conjunction with the Streets Ahead programme.

12.5 **Reasons for Decision**

12.5.1 The scheme consultation clearly indicated that local people wanted to see improved pedestrian facilities at the Crookes Road/Fulwood Road crossroads. However, people did not wish to see any existing turning movements banned, but did accept a degree of additional delay to traffic created by these improvements. Option 2 was also predicted to have the least impact on existing traffic flows. This was generally why Option 2 was preferred. This option was therefore (and still is) considered to provide the best compromise.

12.5.2 The consultation captured a number of views and thoughts on what should happen with the car park and shopping parade along Fulwood Road. Although not part of the pedestrian improvement scheme, these would be retained for future use.

12.6 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

12.6.1 Officers developed two other options at the initial design stage. These were as follows:-

- An all red pedestrian phase, providing new controlled crossings on all four arms of the junction. This would be the most effective method of providing improved pedestrian crossing facilities. All traffic would need to be stopped as part of an 'all red' phase in the traffic signals to allow pedestrians to cross. This would result in significant additional delays to traffic, with queues extending over a wide area and affecting the main highway network. Pedestrians wishing to cross more than one arm of the junction would also be subject to delays, as they would have to wait a full cycle of the traffic lights to be able to cross the next road. For these reasons, the Community Assembly did not wish to progress this option.
- A two-stage controlled pedestrian crossing on Crookes Road. This would involve a widened central pedestrian island, resulting in the Crookes Road approach being reduced to one lane. Pedestrians would cross in two stages. However, modelling suggested the

delays to traffic would be significant and on balance this option was rejected.

**9. OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS (TROS) ASSOCIATED WITH SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR MARKINGS AND WAITING RESTRICTIONS OUTSIDE CARFIELD, MEERSBROOK BANK AND HUNTERS BAR SCHOOLS**

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining objections received to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders (TROS) associated with school keep clear markings and waiting restrictions outside Carfield, Meersbrook Bank and Hunters Bar Schools.

9.2 Kristina Irwin attended the meeting to make representations on behalf of 12 residents of Argyle Road. She commented that many residents had children who attended Carfield School and the road safety problems in the area were readily apparent. The school had over 550 pupils and the entrance was on Argyle Close. There was a traffic warden on Argyle Road but no supervision on Argyle Close. There was a clear danger to pedestrians and children when people tried to drive up Argyle Close which would then mean they had to make a dangerous manoeuvre to come back out of Argyle Close. Residents believed that the measures proposed ignored the main priority which was to stop people driving up Argyle Close to drop their children off. Residents didn't believe parking bays on Argyle Road were the solution as they believed people would still attempt to drive up Argyle Road. They would also actually help to increase the problems as other car users may not park further away and walk to the school if they believed a parking bay may be free on Argyle Road. She submitted a 55 signature petition calling on the Council to resolve traffic problems in the area and requested that everyone work together to resolve the problems.

9.3 Ward Councillor Cate McDonald commented that she shared many of the views of local residents and agreed that one of the biggest problems was people using Argyle Close to drop their children off. She had worked with the school and the Police to try and resolve the problems. She suggested that, although she supported the recommendations at this stage, the possibility of extending the double yellow lines on Argyle Close should be investigated to tie in to future Traffic Regulation Orders.

9.4 John Bann commented that the comments made highlighted the problem officers had in that people had different views in respect of a solution to the problems. There had been a proposal to extend the double yellow lines on Argyle Close but this had been rejected by a number of residents although this could be included in a future Traffic Regulation Order should the proposal now be supported.

9.5 Members commented that they supported the recommendations at this time but requested a review of the operation of the scheme be undertaken in 3 months time at the end of the academic year.

9.6 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:-

- (a) resolves that the TRO for Binfield Road be implemented with the amended times;
- (b) resolves that the TRO for limited waiting on Argyle Road be implemented with the amended times be made but not all bays marked out and the proposal for extending the double yellow lines on Argyle Road be dropped; and a review of the scheme be undertaken in three months time at the end of the academic year;
- (c) resolves that the TRO at Cowlshaw Road be implemented as advertised; and
- (d) requests that the objectors be informed accordingly.

9.7 **Reasons for Decision**

9.7.1 A resident had made comment about the advertised time when School Keep Clear markings would operate outside Meersbrook School on Binfield Road. Reference was made to loss of parking for residents if the marking operated at all times. Officers therefore recommended that the times of the no parking restrictions be reduced to Monday to Friday 8.00am to 9.30am and 2.30pm to 4.00pm, so that outside those hours, parking would be available for residents.

9.7.2 Several residents of Argyle Road raised objections to the proposal to introduce limited waiting opposite their homes. A meeting was held with residents on site on 27 February. Following this and discussion with ward members officers proposed that the times be reduced to Monday to Friday between 8.30am and 9.30am and 2.45pm and 3.45pm with a maximum stay of 15 minutes, so that outside those times, parking would be available for residents. In addition, the length of the proposed limited waiting be reduced so that there was more unrestricted parking available for residents.

9.7.3 A resident at Cowlshaw Road objected to the introduction of waiting restrictions on Cowlshaw Road at Hunters Bar School, as it would cause acute parking problems. Cowlshaw Road currently formed part of the Sharrowvale Residents Parking Scheme and as such, was already subject to parking restrictions along most of its length. This current scheme aimed to introduce a TRO at an existing keep clear marking. It would also change existing markings at the junction with Kirkstall Road, where the combined keep clear and double yellow lines would be replaced with double yellow lines with a loading ban. Both of these proposals would make the markings more enforceable and help to reduce congestion and increase visibility at the busy T junction.

9.7.4 Having considered the objections to the introduction of TROs at the three

schools in the South Community Assembly area officers considered that the reasons set out in the report outweighed the objections but accepted that the hours of operation should be reduced for Meersbrook School and Carfield School.

#### 9.8 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.8.1 In this circumstance, the proposed TRO was the best solution to congestion and parking problems which had existed for a number of years. Until the TRO was in place, the markings could not easily be enforced by Parking Services officers. No alternatives had therefore been considered.

#### 10. **OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMIT IN THE PARSON CROSS AND UPPERTHORPE AREAS**

10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining objections received to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in the Parson Cross and Uppertorpe areas and setting out the Council's response.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:-

- (a) having considered the objections to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Parson Cross, west of Lindsay Avenue, resolves that the reasons set out in the report for making the Speed Limit Order outweigh the objections and that the Speed Limit Order should be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) having considered the objections to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Uppertorpe, resolves that the reasons set out in the report for making the Speed Limit Order outweighed the objections and that the Speed Limit Order should be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (c) requests that the objectors be informed accordingly; and
- (d) resolves that the proposed 20mph speed limit be introduced.

#### 10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 Reducing the speed of traffic in residential areas will, in the long term, reduce the number and severity of accidents, reduce the fear of accidents, encourage sustainable modes of travel and contribute towards the creation of a more pleasant, cohesive environment.

10.3.2 The introduction of a 20mph speed limit in these areas forms part of the City's approved 20mph Speed Limit Strategy.

#### 10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4. The objections relate to the principle of introducing sign-only 20mph speed

1 limits into residential areas, and therefore the recently approved Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. As such, no alternative options had been considered.

## **11. OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMITS IN HIGH GREEN, NORTH OF WORTLEY ROAD**

11.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining objections received to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in the High Green area, north of Wortley Road and setting out the Council's response.

11.2 John Bann reported that, following consultation, he was recommending that a decision on the scheme be deferred pending consultation on extending the scheme to part of Wortley Road.

11.3 Councillor Trevor Bagshaw attended the meeting to make representations on behalf of Councillor Alan Hooper, Ecclesfield Parish Council and in his own capacity as a local Ward Councillor and governor at High Green School. He asked that, although he was very much in favour of the proposals, could the line for the start of the scheme be extended past the roundabout to the end of Mortemley Lane to include part of Pack Horse Lane. He also considered that there were a number of problems at the junction of Wortley Road and the A61 and asked whether the scheme could begin from that junction.

11.4 In response, John Bann commented that he would investigate the Mortemley Lane location as suggested but was more concerned about the suggestion of Wortley Road and the A61 but this could be investigated further.

11.5 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee defers a decision on the scheme pending the outcome of advertising an extension to the scheme to include part of Wortley Road.

### **11.6 Reasons for Decision**

11.6. 1 Reducing the speed of traffic in residential areas will, in the long term, reduce the number and severity of accidents, reduce the fear of accidents, encourage sustainable modes of travel and contribute towards the creation of a more pleasant, cohesive environment.

11.6. 2 The introduction of a 20mph speed limit in this area would be in-keeping with the City's approved 20mph Speed Limit Strategy.

11.6. 3 To investigate and advertise an extension to the scheme to part of Wortley Road and top of Mortomley Lane.

### **11.7 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 11.7. The objections related to the principle of introducing sign-only 20mph  
1 speed limits into residential areas, and therefore the recently approved  
Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. As such, no alternative options had  
been considered.