

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## Cabinet Highways Committee

### Meeting held 8 October 2015

**PRESENT:** Councillors Terry Fox (Chair), Leigh Bramall and Sioned-Mair Richards  
(Substitute Member)

.....

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Isobel Bowler and Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards attended the meeting as the duly appointed substitute. An apology for absence was also received from Councillor Ben Curran but no substitute was appointed.

#### **2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

- 2.1 No items were identified where it was proposed 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 28 July 2015 were approved as a correct record.

#### **5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

- 5.1 There were no public questions or petitions.

#### **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. STREETS AHEAD - WINTER MAINTENANCE REVIEW**

- 7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking approval to implement the recommendations set out in section 14 of the report following a review of the Council's winter maintenance service 2014/15. The review assessed the outcome of the decision by the Cabinet Highways Committee on 29 August 2014 to approve changes to the winter maintenance service. The report also detailed the options considered by Members and officers prior to reinstating previously removed Priority 2 precautionary gritting routes in December 2014 during a period of adverse weather in response to a small number of reported driving incidents in parts of the city.

7.2 The minutes of the meeting of the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, held on 30 September 2015, were circulated. The Committee had considered a presentation in respect of the Winter Maintenance Review and requested that their comments be circulated to Members of the Cabinet Highways Committee.

7.3 Steve Robinson, Head of Highway Maintenance, presented the report. He reported that, earlier in the year he had started to establish a city wide Multi-Agency Stakeholder Winter Planning Group. The aim was for this Group to identify any gaps in services and to identify something or someone to fill those gaps. The group met in May but other priorities meant that the Group was unable to meet again. There was a commitment to re-establish this Group by May 2016.

7.4 In response to Members' questions, Mr Robinson welcomed any feedback from Members about the distribution of Snow Wardens across the City. When asked about the security of salt stored, Mr Robinson said that the Salt Barns were manned during the winter months for 24 hours a day so he believed they were as secure as they could be. In respect of people taking grit from grit bins, Mr Robinson considered the important thing was for people to report when the bins were nearly empty so that grit could be replaced. Mr Robinson also reported that he was working with his team and Amey to introduce further new winter services during this season.

7.5 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the relocation of 158 grit bins from reinstated Priority 2 precautionary gritting routes to ungritted routes in accordance with the grit bin criteria is implemented;
- (b) further snow shovels are made available to the public upon request, and the public shall be informed of the collection process through the winter maintenance service information portal on the Council's website;
- (c) the Priority 2 precautionary gritting routes reinstated in December 2014 continue to form part of the winter maintenance precautionary gritting service with any additional requests for precautionary gritting assessed against the precautionary gritting route criteria approved by Cabinet Highways Committee on 29 August 2014; and
- (d) the financial implications are noted and the expenditure is approved.

7.6 **Reasons for Decision**

7.6.1 The safety of residents within the city is of great importance to the Council. Reports in December 2014 showed that the public were either not aware of the changes to the gritting network, or not driving in accordance with the prevailing conditions on those roads which were previously gritted. Whilst the Council understands that there remains a risk of accidents on those roads that have been gritted, there is an increased risk on roads which have not received any gritting

treatment.

- 7.6.2 The recommendations proposed meet the expectations of stakeholders for an extensive city wide winter maintenance service.

## 7.7 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 7.7.1 There were no alternative options presented in the report.

## 8. **PETITION - REQUEST FOR FURTHER CONSULTATION WITH RESPECT TO A PROPOSED PAY AND DISPLAY PARKING SCHEME ON ECCLESALL ROAD AT BANNER CROSS**

- 8.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report providing an update subsequent to the decisions of the Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session on 12th June and 13th November 2014 regarding a petition received concerning the proposed pay & display parking scheme on Ecclesall Road at Banner Cross district centre, and seeks a decision on the petition and the scheme.
- 8.2 Fenella Tratt, a local resident and business owner, attended the meeting to make representations to the Committee. She had been involved in collecting signatures for the petition submitted objecting to the proposal for pay and display parking at a previous meeting of the Committee. She commented that people had not been intimidated into signing the petition, as had been claimed at the previous meeting, and had signed because they objected to the proposal.
- 8.3 Ms. Tratt added that a number of people did not believe pay and display was the right solution for parking problems in the area. The parking demand survey which had been undertaken prior to the last meeting was flawed as it had been undertaken before the Sainsbury's supermarket had opened and this had caused a shift in the balance of parking in the local area.
- 8.4 Ms. Tratt further commented that pay and display parking may deter people from using the local shops in the area. 15 minutes free parking was not the answer as this often did not give people to the opportunity to do all the shopping they wanted.
- 8.5 The current proposals presented more pressure on parking for local residents who lived in family houses nearby. Ms. Tratt believed a more appropriate solution was to allow people to park for an hour. This allowed people to park for free for an hour and meant a greater turnover of cars. When this had been suggested to officers, officers had said that these restrictions could not be enforced but she stated there were examples across the City which showed that this could be enforced.
- 8.6 If the proposals were introduced on an experimental basis, it was important to know how it would be evaluated and how people would know if it had been a success.

- 8.7 Viv Lockwood, Secretary of the Banner Cross Neighbourhood Action Group (BCNAG), also attended the meeting to make representations to the Committee. He commented that when the proposals were first suggested the Group took a neutral position, although they were aware that the traders had been asking for a solution to the parking problems in the area for a long time.
- 8.8 He circulated a recent survey of local traders which showed that they were overwhelmingly in favour of the proposals. The trading environment was very fragile and many were having to cope with high rents. Since Sainsbury's had opened and the local pharmacy moved, there had been a shift in footfall towards these shops resulting in a slow but significant seepage away from the area of small independent shops.
- 8.9 Mr Lockwood stated that traders were seeing motorists use the outside of the shops like a park and ride, parking their cars up outside the shops once the restrictions ended and travelling to work on public transport, leaving little room for potential shoppers. 9 people had said they were against the scheme. 2 of those parked their vehicles outside their shop and another had a parking area around the back of their shop.
- 8.10 From their original neutral position, the Neighbourhood Action Group now recognised the severe problems in the area. Following the last meeting of the Committee the Group had met with local residents who had opposed the proposals and had reached a compromise position. Following discussions with Nat Porter, Senior Transport Planner, this position had been slightly amended and the Group was now largely supportive of the proposals submitted to the Committee at this meeting.
- 8.11 Nat Porter reported that at the meeting held on 13 November 2014 it had been agreed to go out to further consultation on the proposals in an attempt to try and reach a compromise position. Following the submission of the Neighbourhood Action Group's proposal, this had been amended slightly following discussions with the Group, resulting in the proposals now submitted in the report.
- 8.12 The report recommended that a permanent scheme be advertised, not the experimental order recommended at the last meeting, as a result of budget pressures and any objections would be reported back to the Committee.
- 8.13 Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, commented that this was now the third time that he had been involved with considering the proposals. It was difficult to please everyone but the fact that the Neighbourhood Action Group had met with some of the objectors from the last meeting and had agreed on a compromise showed that the latest proposals now represented the most acceptable solution that could be achieved.
- 8.14 **RESOLVED:** That:-
- (a) the proposal to introduce a 29-space 2 hour pay & display scheme on an experimental basis (including two spaces in the lay-by outside Sainsbury's

on Eccelsall Road at Banner Cross) be brought forward through the capital approval process for consideration;

- (b) a peak hour loading only restriction be introduced in the lay-by at Sainsbury's as part of the scheme;
- (c) any objections or comments received in response to the advertisement of the Traffic Regulation Order be brought to a subsequent Highway Cabinet Member decision session meeting; and,
- (d) the petitioners and affected frontagers be informed accordingly.

## **8.15 Reasons for Decision**

- 8.15.1 A 29 space 2 hour pay & display scheme would appear, based on feedback to from the Banner Cross Neighbourhood Group, to offer the best balance between competing local interests, whilst providing adequate capacity having regard for the purposes it is permitted to introduce parking place schemes.
- 8.15.2 Because loading and waiting is permitted outside of peak hours, it is considered that providing pay-and-display parking in the lay-by outside Sainsbury is acceptable between the peak hours, as vehicles stopped to service the new development can do so from the kerbside legally and without unacceptable consequence. However, in the interests of maintaining the flow of traffic during peak hours, it is necessary to reserve the lay-by so it is available for servicing at these times.
- 8.15.3 Advertising a proposed scheme offers an opportunity to comment on and/or object to the proposals, prior to a final decision being taken as to whether or not to progress the scheme at a subsequent Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session.

## **8.16 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 8.16.1 Leaving waiting and parking restrictions as existing was considered. This would not address the original concerns regarding availability of parking for visitors of local shops.
- 8.16.2 Progressing BCNG's suggestion of introducing a 20- or 22-space scheme initially, and extending the scheme if necessary thereafter was considered, but was ruled out as a second Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) would be required in the event the additional parking was desired. An experimental TRO allows the Council to reduce the extents of restrictions during or after the experiment without a new TRO; this means it is more cost-effective to introduce a greater length of restriction with a view to contraction if necessary.
- 8.16.3 Similarly, if it were to prove possible and necessary, it would be more cost effective to relax the experimental order to provide areas of 4 hour parking than it would to introduce a new Order to reduce a time limit.

- 8.16.4 In making parking place Orders, the Council must exercise its powers to provide suitable and adequate parking facilities. The observed demand suggests a scheme of reduced capacity or with areas of 4 hour parking provided could be expected to be full to capacity throughout weekdays. If the Council were to propose a scheme which did not offer adequate capacity and was not effective in improving the availability of kerbside parking, it may be open to the accusation it has used its powers to provide parking places with charges improperly.

## **9. NORTH SHEFFIELD BETTER BUSES - ST MICHAEL'S ROAD**

- 9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report on the results of public consultation and responses to a Traffic Regulation Order in relation to the element of the North Sheffield Better Buses Scheme, relating to St Michael's Road, Ecclesfield.

### **1.2 RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the revised scheme, on St. Michael's Road, Ecclesfield as shown in Appendix B of the report, be approved and implemented, subject to any required re-confirmation of costs after detailed design (including any commuted sums);
- (b) the Traffic Regulation Order relating to the revised waiting restrictions be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; and
- (c) the respondents to the consultation of the scheme be informed accordingly.

### **9.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 9.3.1 The revised scheme described in the report will contribute to improving journey times and reliability for bus services along this route. At the same time, it addresses the concerns of respondents to the original proposal.
- 9.3.2 The scheme is being designed in detail with funding available to allow the scheme to be built in 2015/16.

### **9.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 9.4.1 The alternative options, including an alternative design, were discussed in the report. Doing nothing would not address the issues that regularly occur at the location. The design as amended is, therefore, the preferred option.

## **10. NORTH SHEFFIELD BETTER BUSES - HUCKLOW ROAD**

- 10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report on the results of public consultation and responses to a Traffic Regulation Order in relation to the element of the North Sheffield Better Buses Scheme relating to Hucklow Road.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the revised scheme on Hucklow Road, as shown in Appendix B of the report, be approved and implemented, subject to any required re-confirmation of costs after detailed design (including any commuted sums);
- (b) the Traffic Regulation Order relating to the proposed waiting restrictions be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; and
- (c) the respondents to the consultation on the scheme be informed accordingly.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 The revised scheme described in the report will contribute to improving journey times and reliability for bus services along this route. At the same time, it addresses the concerns of respondents to the original proposal.

10.3.2 The scheme is being designed in detail with funding available to allow the scheme to be built in 2015/16.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 The alternative options, including an alternative design, were discussed in the report. Doing nothing would not address the issues that regularly occur at the location. The design as amended is, therefore, the preferred option.