

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 9 October 2014

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

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs (Cabinet Adviser)
Dick Proctor (Transport Planning Manager)
James Burdett (Highways Engineer)
Cate Jockel (Senior Transport Planner)

.....

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 There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS SESSION

3.1 The minutes of the previous Session, held on 11 September 2014, were approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

4.1 The Cabinet Member received petitions (a) containing 78 signatures requesting the resurfacing of, and weight limit on, Mill Lane, Ecclesfield and that the resurfacing would take place under the Streets Ahead Programme and (b) containing 33 signatures requesting the Council support World Car Free Day and that a letter of response had been sent to the lead petitioner.

5. OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED 7.5T WEIGHT RESTRICTION IN MAYFIELD VALLEY

5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the measures to restrict Heavy Goods Vehicles Traffic from travelling through the area known as Mayfield Valley and setting out officer responses to two objections.

5.2 Ros Hancock, representing the Friends of Porter Valley, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. She stated that the Friends were in favour of the restriction. Their main concern was the cross-valley routes as a number of the routes were in the Porter Valley not Mayfield Valley. The Friends of Porter Valley were in favour of the weight restriction as the routes were used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders and alternative routes were a long way round. The roads were inappropriate for HGVs as they were narrow, twisting and steep and people could not see round the corners easily. The final concern was that,

under the new winter maintenance programme, the roads concerned would not be gritted in the future and this meant the potential for large lorries to slip on the ice.

5.3 Charlie Denning, a local resident, also stated that he was in favour of the weight restriction. He regularly saw H.G.Vs using the roads and getting stuck on tight corners. He had safety concerns as it was a main route in the Peak District used by many walkers. Some of the speeds used by the vehicles were excessive and they didn't stop for pedestrians.

5.4 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) having considered the responses and objections to the proposed Traffic Regulations Order, the reasons set out in the report for making the Traffic Regulation Order outweigh any unresolved objections;
- (b) the Traffic Regulation Order described in the report be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (c) the Traffic Regulation Order and associated sighting be introduced as and when funding from the LTP is made available; and
- (d) the objectors be informed of the decision.

5.5 **Reasons for Decision**

5.5.1 The weight restriction will reduce average numbers of heavy vehicles in a predominantly rural area. Thereby improving road safety for residents and those that pursue recreational activity in the areas. It will also improve the environment and reduce the detrimental impact on highway infrastructure.

5.6 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

5.6.1 In Mayfield Valley a targeted approach was initially considered to look at strategic roads that could be restricted while having an overall desired reduction of through flow in HGV's. This was subsequently discounted as it would result in an extra restriction and warning signs that would have a substantial impact on the budgetary element of the scheme as a whole, would have a negative aesthetic impact with a significant number of additional signs being needed, this consequently would also have an impact on future maintenance costs and ongoing electricity supply costs being both budgetary and environmentally negative.

6. **BUS HOTSPOTS - BRIDGEHOUSES**

6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report summarising the results of a consultation undertaken in August/September 2014 in respect of proposals to improve traffic management in the vicinity of Bridgehouses on the Inner Relief Road (IRR). The report also set out objections and other comments on the proposals and officer responses to them.

- 6.2 Mick Knott and Graham Alsop, representing Cycle Sheffield, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. They commented that they had submitted their objections formally.
- 6.3 It was stated that Cycle Sheffield had not seen the exact figures for the bus delays but suggested they would be around four to six minutes and therefore did not justify spending £700k on the scheme. A much better solution would be the introduction of a Smart Card system which had been discussed but not implemented.
- 6.4 Cycle Sheffield did not believe there should be any parking in the area concerned. They were unclear on the design of the crossing at the bottom of Pitsmoor Road and asked if a snicket could be introduced there.
- 6.5 James Burdett, Highways Engineer, confirmed that the crossing would use dropped kerbs following the advice of the Cycle Audit. Mick Knott commented that he had not seen the Cycle Audit. Officers stated that the audit was the note of the meeting with the auditor, which he had seen.
- 6.6 Mick Knott added that he couldn't understand why a mandatory cycle lane was not introduced on Chatham Street and this should be 1.5m wide. The bend on Chatham Street used to have a hatching to guide drivers away from cutting the corner and the introduction of a solid white line might be appropriate here.
- 6.7 The entry and exit points for the car wash on Chatham Street should be reversed. In conclusion, Mick Knott stated that he believed the proposals were advantageous for buses and would disadvantage cyclists and pedestrians. After 6 hours of surveys Cycle Sheffield's advice to cyclists would be to deal with Bridgehouses as they saw fit.
- 6.8 In response, Cate Jockel, Senior Transport Planner, commented that a number of changes had been made to the proposals following discussions at the Cycle Forum. The additional Traffic Regulation Order which was recommended would propose removing the existing parking on Pitsmoor Road and banning the left turn from Chatham Street into Pitsmoor Road
- 6.9 Councillor Leigh Bramall stated that he had been involved in discussions as to whether Chatham Street could be made two way for cyclists and this was something which should be looked at.
- 6.10 Cate Jockel added that she accepted the proposals would disadvantage cyclists inbound on Pitsmoor Road but the proposals on Chatham Street would make things better for them. Officers would look at the detailed design in respect of the entry and exit points to the car wash and the road markings from Mowbray Street to Nursery Street. As a parallel project, officers would look into the possibility of making Chatham Street two-way for cyclists.
- 6.11 Councillor Leigh Bramall commented that he was aware that bus companies were looking into the implementation of a Smart Card System.

6.12 In conclusion, Dick Proctor, Transport Planning Manager, commented that the scheme was justified as the engineering changes proposed would make significant journey time improvements in the area.

6.13 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) having considered the objections and the officer view that the reasons set out in the report for making the TRO outweigh the objections, the TRO be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, with the proposed loading bay to be re-located and without the revocation of no waiting/loading on Chatham Street (i.e. without additional parking provision);
- (b) the scheme be progressed to detailed design and subsequent implementation;
- (c) a TRO be advertised for the removal of parking on Pitsmoor Road to the north of Swinton Street to improve its two-way operation; the removal of the left-turn from Chatham Street to Pitsmoor Road; and altering some of the advisory cycle lanes to mandatory, as appropriate;
- (d) progress feasibility work into a two-way cycle route along Chatham Street
- (e) the respondents be informed accordingly.

6.14 **Reasons for Decision**

6.14.1 The scheme is part of the “bus hotspots” element of the Better Buses programme, linked to the Sheffield Bus Partnership of which the Council is a member. It contributes to the City Council’s objectives of improving socially-inclusive access to jobs; improving access to mainstream public transport in order to increase its usage. It aims to make bus journeys quicker and more reliable through infrastructure improvements and improving network management and enforceability at critical locations. This scheme should improve journey time and reliability without any detriment to other users.

6.14.2 All objectors and respondents have been written to providing feedback on the issues they raised. There is one outstanding objection. All respondents have been informed of the report and been invited to the meeting.

6.15 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

6.15.1 The proposal has developed iteratively, altering as the design progressed following comments from the Road Safety Auditor, the Cycle Auditor and respondents to the consultation. This has led to the development of the final proposed scheme.

6.15.2 The alternative option would be the ‘do nothing’ option. This would not achieve benefits for bus users or general traffic.

This page is intentionally left blank