

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 14 November 2013

PRESENT: Councillor Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs (Cabinet Adviser)

.....

1. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

1.1 No items were identified where it was proposed to exclude the public and press.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1 Councillor Leigh Bramall declared a personal interest in agenda item 7 'Hillsborough Permit Parking Review' as he owned a property on Lennox Road adjacent to Dixon Road referred to in the report.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS SESSION

3.1 The minutes of the previous Session held on 10 October 2013 were approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

4.1 New Petitions

John Bann, Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services, reported that a petition, containing 45 signatures, had been submitted to the meeting of Full Council, held on 6 November 2013, requesting a change to the pedestrian crossing at Chancet Wood Drive and Greenhill Avenue. This would be included on the Outstanding Petitions List for future Sessions.

Outstanding Petitions

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

5. MOSBOROUGH KEY BUS ROUTE: SIGNALISING THE JUNCTION OF BIRLEY MOOR ROAD AND OCCUPATION LANE

5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking Cabinet Member approval to implement the scheme to signalise the junction of Birley Moor Road and Occupation Lane as part of the Mosborough Key Bus Route works.

5.2 **RESOLVED:** That the design be approved and the scheme be implemented in 2013/14 including the placement of traffic signs using the Department for Transport's Better Bus Area Fund Provision.

5.3 Reasons for Decision

- 5.3.1 The scheme is part of the Mosborough Key Bus Route – the 120 bus route – which is one of the best-used high frequency public transport services in the City. The Key Route contributes to the City Council's objectives of improving socially-inclusive access to jobs; improving access to mainstream public transport service for all; and improving public transport in order to increase its usage. It aims to make bus journeys on this main route quicker and more reliable through infrastructure improvements and improving network management and enforceability at critical locations. At this location, it was felt that the significant benefits to bus journey times and reliability on this high frequency service make it worth doing and that there is adequate mitigation.

5.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 5.4.1 Two other options were considered. One was to signalise the existing junction, incorporating the existing pedestrian crossing, without any mitigation for main road traffic other than signal technology (MOVA). This was cheaper than the budget estimate for the preferred option. However, it exacerbated existing delays and causes additional queues all round. (Cost estimate £164k, excluding Commuted Sum).
- 5.4.2 The other option considered was to signalise the existing junction, incorporating the existing pedestrian crossing, and provide a near-side passing space (i.e widen the carriageway) so that straight-ahead traffic inbound on Birley Moor Road could pass right-turning traffic. (Cost estimate £199k, excluding Commuted Sum). This option was only developed because the preferred option initially affected more SU equipment and was more costly. However, the preferred scheme cost has been reduced through amending the design but retaining the right-turn pocket.
- 5.4.3 The three options have been modelled by AMEY in respect of the impact on delay, queue length and reserve capacity at morning peak, evening peak and pedestrian crossing time (after school). It is considered that the preferred option is the best all-round option for signalling the junction, having the least impact on main road traffic.
- 5.4.4 The other alternative option would be to do nothing. However, it is felt that the significant benefits to bus journey times and reliability on this high frequency service make it worth doing and that there is adequate mitigation.

5.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

5.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

5.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

5.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

6. BUS HOTSPOTS PROGRAMME: PROPOSALS FOR BOCKING LANE, RENNEY ROAD AND RENNEY AVENUE AT GREENHILL

6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking approval to implement proposals as part of the Sheffield Bus Hotspots programme.

6.2 Mrs Riggott, a resident of Renney Avenue, commented that she acknowledged that double yellow lines were needed in the area to allow for the free running of bus services. However, the proposals did not go far enough to resolve the problem of insufficient parking spaces in the local area, particularly with a school, doctors and church nearby. The addition of double yellow lines on Renney Avenue would lead to additional parking problems on the road. There was a grassed area outside numbers 23 and 48 and a grassed verge opposite numbers 11-25 which could be used to create parking spaces.

6.3 Steve Jackson, a resident of Allenby Close, commented that he did not believe the proposals would resolve problems as the major problem was cars parking illegally and inconsiderately and this would not change. The reduction in visibility pulling out of Allenby Close as a result of the proposals would be an accident waiting to happen. He also believed that there were too many bus stops on Bocking Lane which added to the problem.

6.4 In response, Cate Jockel, Senior Transport Planner, reported that objections had been received from residents of Renney Avenue and the plans had been amended as a result. No objections to the proposals had been received from the school or the church. She acknowledged that there was a problem in the area as it was on a very frequent bus route. Additional parking bays had been introduced on Renney Road, although it was accepted that there would be less parking overall in the area.

6.5 James Burdett, Highways Engineer, commented that he was aware of the issues raised in relation to Allenby Close. He would speak to enforcement officers in respect of illegal parking in the area. There was a minimum of 2 metres from the wall to the kerbline so he believed the visibility when pulling out would not be a problem. The introduction of the bus stop clearway should keep the location free from parked cars.

6.6 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) unresolved objections to the Traffic Regulation Order be overruled and the revised scheme be implemented;
- (b) any remaining objectors and other respondents be written to to inform them of this decision;
- (c) the Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services be requested to liaise with the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) as to the possibility of reducing the number of bus stops on Bocking Lane; and
- (d) the Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services be requested to investigate the possibility of the creation of additional parking on Reaney Avenue, particularly whether the Council land opposite the church hall could be used for parking.

6.7 **Reasons for Decision**

- 6.7.1 There is significant benefit to be gained from the scheme, which strikes a good balance between the various demands on the local highway from high frequency bus services and passengers; local traffic; parking demand and pedestrian accessibility. It fits with the aim of the Hotspots programme to make bus journeys quicker and more reliable through infrastructure and other improvements at key locations.

6.8 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 6.8.1 Other options considered included (1) the originally advertised proposal of more waiting restrictions on Reney Avenue – which would have further improved traffic flow; and (2) not providing parking areas on Reney Road – which would have reduced scheme costs; as well as (3) the ‘do nothing’ alternative.

7. HILLSBOROUGH PERMIT PARKING REVIEW

- 7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining representations received following the advertisement of a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) proposing waiting restriction adjustments for streets inside and outside the Hillsborough Permit Parking Scheme. The report set out the Council’s responses and recommendations.
- 7.2 Ashley Field, a resident of Winster Road, commented that he welcomed the report. However, he had concerns over the consultation process. He did not believe that 2-3 surveys in February/March was sufficient and should be split between the summer and the winter. He was aware that in London there was a system of permit parking for one hour and he believed that that system could operate in Hillsborough. He also questioned the rise

in the price of permits which were above the rate of inflation.

- 7.3 Kathleen and David Crapper, residents of Clarence Road, stated that local residents did not wish to see a permit parking scheme on Clarence Road. A petition had been collated, containing 22 signatures in opposition to permit parking on Clarence Road. Residents were also concerned about the price of permits which they did not believe represented best value.
- 7.4 Mr Mayor and Alan Young, owners of a business on Winster Road welcomed the report as local residents and businesses did not wish to see a permit parking scheme on the road.
- 7.5 John Bann, Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services responded that there was real demand for a permit parking scheme in the Hillsborough area. Where a scheme was introduced, people then often found other roads to park on which often caused problems for other residents and led to further demands for a permit parking scheme. In relation to surveys, there was a cost implication for undertaking more of them. The suggestion of a single hour permit parking scheme was sound when the problems were caused by commuters but that was not always the case in the Hillsborough area. In respect of the costs of permits, £36 was the cost when schemes were first introduced and there was a need to restore them to that price because of budget pressures. This cost did not cover the cost of enforcing the schemes.
- 7.6 Councillor Leigh Bramall added that there were no plans to increase the cost of permits further. It was a difficult balancing act to meet the needs of all residents when deciding whether to introduce a permit parking scheme.
- 7.7 Pam Cooper and Yvonne Glover, representing Lily's Sandwich Shop at the junction of Burrowlee Road and Penistone Road, then made representations to the Cabinet Member. They commented that staff at the shop had been experiencing unnecessary aggravation from customers frustrated at parking issues near the shop. Lily's had displayed notices to try and persuade people to park in the car park towards the back of the shop. The core hours for the shop were 9.00am to 2.00pm so they did not believe that customers impinged on residents' parking.
- 7.8 The shop had not taken any permits and had freed up 4 spaces for parking. They had requested that they be allowed to display an A Frame informing customers of the location of the car park but this had been refused by the Council. The sign at the rear of the shop alerting customers to the car park had been obscured by trees. They believed that allowing parking for 2 hours would encourage those attending the football matches to park there and half an hour was a suitable compromise.
- 7.9 In response, Andrew Marwood, Highways Engineer, reported that local residents had requested more limited waiting spaces in the area and that changing the parking bay was a step to far.

7.10 Councillor Leigh Bramall commented that he accepted the argument that half an hour parking would be more appropriate than 2 hours. He requested that officers look at trialling half an hour parking and investigate what else could be done to better sign the car park.

7.11 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 for the small scale changes inside and outside the scheme with the exception of Burrowlee Road;
- (b) the Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services be requested to investigate the introduction of limited waiting restrictions on Burrowlee Road in the first two parking bays adjacent to Penistone Road for half an hour or an hour with an exemption for permit holders through consultation with local residents and businesses;
- (c) any proposed extensions to the existing permit scheme not be progressed;
- (d) those who made representations be informed accordingly; and
- (e) the proposed parking restrictions be introduced.

7.12 **Reasons for Decision**

7.12.1 The recommendations reflect the views of local people on changes inside and outside the Permit Parking Scheme, as requested by residents. They are an attempt to provide a suitable balance of parking restrictions in the Hillsborough area. The changes would conclude the review process.

7.12.2 Officers have worked with residents/businesses of the area through two consultations to develop the final scheme proposals.

7.12.3 Having considered the comments made through the review and TRO consultation and made adjustments in line with resident suggestions it was considered that the reasons set out in the report for making parts of the TRO outweigh any unresolved objections.

7.13 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

7.13.1 Officers have considered the content of each individual comment received. Requests to alter the proposals have been investigated and where feasible adjustments have been made. In particular some sections of double yellow lines have been reduced so that a balance between road safety benefits and parking demands can be achieved.

7.13.2 From the survey data provided in February and March it is clear that some of the streets adjacent to the existing scheme still suffer from long stay parking problems with few spaces turning over to assist residents and local

businesses. Based on these results and comments received during the review officers could have implemented an extension to the permit scheme. It has however always been the intention of the Council to implement a permit parking scheme in Hillsborough where a majority of residents responding to the consultation have been in favour of such measures. On that basis it is considered that implementing the measures would go against the wishes of many residents who expressed their opposition to the changes.