

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 9 March 2017

PRESENT: Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Chair) (Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Simon Botterill, Team Manager, Traffic Management
John Priestley, Senior Transport Planner
Nigel Robson, Principal Transport Planner
Ben Brailsford, Parking Services Manager

.....

1. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS SESSION

3.1 The minutes of the previous Session, held on 9 February 2017, were approved as a correct record.

4. WESTWICK CRESCENT AND WESTWICK ROAD: OBJECTION TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

4.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing measures to restrict parking at the junction of Westwick Crescent and Westwick Road, through the introduction of double yellow line parking restrictions. The introduction of time-limited waiting elsewhere on Westwick Crescent will reduce the impact of the restrictions by increasing the turnover of parking spaces. The report also set out officers' responses to objections received and sought a decision from the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport.

4.2 Roger Stevenson, a local resident, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He commented that the current situation at the location concerned was an accident waiting to happen due to the parking situation leading to poor visibility for pedestrians and road users alike.

4.3 Double yellow lines should be introduced as single yellow lines were consistently ignored. He did not believe that businesses would be affected as there was adequate parking available nearby. This had been a long standing issue and the community had been waiting a long time for promises to be fulfilled.

4.4 Councillor Richard Shaw, a local Ward Councillor, also attended the Session in

support of Mr Stevenson and local residents. He commented that the strength of public feeling could be seen by the petition submitted and the number of signatures that it had collected. The junction was a heavily used junction and was notorious in the area for its safety concerns. Councillor Shaw therefore supported the petition and the recommendations in the report.

4.5 In welcoming the recommendations, Councillor Mazher Iqbal, requested that officers contact Mr Stevenson and Mick Thomas, another interested party, with a definitive date for the scheme to be introduced once this was known.

4.6 **RESOLVED:** That:-

(a) having considered the responses to the consultation it is recommended that the reasons set out in this report outweigh any unresolved objections and that the revised waiting restrictions be implemented and the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

(b) introduce associated traffic signing; and

(c) the objectors be informed accordingly.

4.7 **Reasons for Decision**

4.7.1 The proposed measures will address inconsiderate and illegal parking practices which will improve safety at a junction for pedestrians and motorists by removing parking that blocks sight lines. They will also improve the overall parking experience at this location by replacing single yellow lines, which get ignored, with double yellow lines and by introducing time limited waiting to optimise the availability of parking spaces.

4.8 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

4.8.1 The only alternative, as proposed by the objectors, is not to introduce any parking restrictions at this location. This is not considered to be an acceptable option. No other alternatives to parking restrictions have been considered.

5. CADMAN STREET AND BLAST LANE: OBJECTION TO PROPOSED WAITING RESTRICTIONS

5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the measures to restrict parking on Cadman Street, Blast Lane and Sussex Street through the introduction of double yellow line and time limited waiting single yellow line waiting restrictions. It also set out officers' responses to objections, including a petition and seeks a decision from the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport.

5.2 An employee of Capita, a business nearby to the proposed scheme, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He believed the revised proposals were a lot better in striking a balance for all interested parties.

5.3 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) having considered the responses to the consultation, it is recommended that the reasons set out in the report outweigh any unresolved objections and that the revised waiting restrictions be implemented and the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) associated traffic signing be introduced;
- (c) the objectors be informed accordingly;
- (d) Capita be advised to re-visit their travel plan; and
- (e) Capita be advised that their employees can use the following link to contact Inmotion, who should be able to provide information on journey planning, ticketing etc <http://www.inmotion.co.uk/help-and-contacts/>

5.4 **Reasons for Decision**

- 5.4.1 The proposed measures will address inconsiderate and illegal parking practices which will:
- Improve safety at junctions
 - Improve accessibility for Network Rail and local businesses

5.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 5.5.1 The alternatives, as proposed by the various objectors, are to either reduce the restrictions to the point where they would not achieve their objectives, or to not introduce any parking restrictions at all. Neither of these are considered to be acceptable options. No other alternatives to parking restrictions have been considered.

6. **ACCEPTANCE OF SUSTAINABLE TRAVEL TRANSITION YEAR GRANT**

- 6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report to approve acceptance of Sheffield City Region's Sustainable Travel Transition Year (STTY) revenue grant for the year 2016/ 2017. There has been a delay in bringing the report due to clarification of the Sheffield City Region (SCR) governance processes and the preparation of the grant agreement. The grant in the sum of £826,000 will come from the Department for Transport to the Sheffield City Region (SCR) which will in turn be passed on to the Council via a further grant agreement from SCR. The Council will provide match funding in the sum of £176,600. The Council will also be the accountable body for the grant. Therefore the Council will be responsible for the obligations and liabilities of the grant agreement placed on the Sheffield City Region, which have been passed on from SCR to the Council.

- 6.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport:-

- (a) notes the acceptance of Sheffield City Region's Sustainable Travel Transition Year (STTY) revenue grant of up to £826,000 and match funding of £176,600, as detailed in Appendix A of the report (STTY Revenue Programme Summary);
- (b) approves the Council entering into and signing the grant agreement with the Sheffield City Region, to accept the STTY revenue grant and the terms of the grant, as detailed at Appendix B of the report;
- (c) notes that the Council will act as a delivery partner for projects totalling £1,002,600 (SCR grant of £826,000+ £176,600 of match funding) and act as the accountable body for the grant allocated to the Council; and
- (d) delegates' authority to the Director of Finance and Commercial Services in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance to take such steps as they deem appropriate to achieve the outcomes set out in this report.

6.3 Reasons for Decision

- 6.3.1 Acceptance of the grant would enable the continuation of complimentary revenue measures (such as cycle training and events, independent travel training and road safety education and training) to capital investment in improving road safety, including facilities for walkers and cyclists that will help achieve the Transport outcome of having better connected transport to increase travel choices.

6.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 6.4.1 An alternative option would be to reject the Sustainable Travel Transition Year grant, which would have a detrimental effect on the overall funding for Transport, Traffic and Parking Services and consequently Sheffield City Council.

7. CHANGES TO PRICES FOR PAPERLESS VISITOR PARKING VOUCHERS

- 7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking approval to offer electronic paperless visitor parking vouchers at a lower rate than the current paper visitor parking vouchers.

7.2 RESOLVED: That:-

- (a) paperless parking visitor vouchers be introduced at £10 per batch of 25, 25% less than the current cost of paper booklets; and
- (b) a contingency of paper parking visitor booklets be maintained to support customers with additional needs.

7.3 Reasons for Decision

- 7.3.1 As part of the Customer Experience programme, introducing paperless permits

improves customer ability to access vouchers quickly rather than be reliant on manual processing of an online request, which is subject to loss or delay in the post.

- 7.3.2 Paperless visitor vouchers will offset future costs increases for staff required for manual processing.
- 7.3.3 Allowing paperless vouchers to be issued in half day segments reduces risk of customers being adversely disadvantaged from the current transferable paper method.
- 7.3.4 Reducing costs of paperless virtual visitor vouchers means that the risk of customers being adversely affected if they do need to purchase more vouchers is reduced.
- 7.3.5 The maximum potential loss by introducing paperless permits at less than the current costs is £13,140. The actual loss is likely to be less than this as some customers may have to purchase more books than they currently do.
- 7.3.6 Support for people with additional needs or lack of internet access is still available via customer services, and a contingency of maintaining paper permits can be considered.
- 7.3.7 The council will gain a better understanding of visitor vouchers use, which can support any future review of parking permit policy.

7.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 7.4.1 **Do nothing** – continue to implement paperless permits, but leave visitor vouchers as paper books.

Implications of this are increased cost to Parking Services and Sheffield City Council of continuing to have a paper system. This is an indicative cost of £10k per year based on needing additional staff to process paper permit application checks.

7.4.2 **Change to paperless visitor vouchers but maintain current cost**

Implications – Paperless permits require the vehicle registration to be entered into the database. This will mean that vouchers cannot be transferred between vehicles in the way they currently can be. Introducing a half day voucher at half the cost, for example 5hrs parking for £0.25 would provide greater flexibility for shorter stay visitors and reduce the risk of it costing the resident more than it currently does. However there is some risk of dissatisfaction at the perceived “extra cost” if customers currently transfer the voucher more than once.