

**Cabinet Highways Committee**

**Meeting held 28 July 2015**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Terry Fox (Chair), Leigh Bramall and Isobel Bowler

.....

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Ben Curran.

**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 MEETINGS**

4.1 The minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 29 August 2014 and 20 May 2015 were approved as correct records.

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

5.1 There were no public questions or petitions received.

**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. UNIVERSITY OF SHEFFIELD CAMPUS MASTERPLAN - RESULT OF CONSULTATION**

7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the proposals, the traffic orders advertised, together with the responses received to the consultation in relation to the University of Sheffield Campus Masterplan. The report sought approval to the project and the promoted Traffic Orders.

7.2 Cabinet, in confirming its in principle support for the University of Sheffield Campus Phase 1 Scheme at its meeting held on 18 March 2015, had delegated authority to the Cabinet Highways Committee to consider the results of the public consultation exercise, and having done so, if the Committee were of the view that the Scheme would be of benefit to the public and that it had been possible to overcome any valid objections, to confirm the Council's final approval for the Scheme to be implemented.

- 7.3 Nigel Cussen, representing the Pegasus Group on behalf of the Reserved Forces, attended the meeting to make representations to the Committee. He commented that he had objected to the original Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) due to the requirement for the ongoing use of the barracks for large Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs).
- 7.4 Following the consultation an amendment to the scheme had been proposed which Mr Cussen was happy with. However, Appendix D of the report did not reflect the amendment which Mr Cussen believed had been agreed as only one turning head was shown. The Barracks were keen to work closely with the University and the Council to achieve the ideal solution and he was confident that this had been agreed with the University.
- 7.5 In response Simon Botterill, Team Manager, Traffic Management, replied that the additional turning head had been omitted from Appendix D in error. He further commented that under the TRO the Council was proposing an amendment to allow HGVs through the proposed pedestrianised zone in certain hours. A one way system on Gell Street was also proposed. The proposal from the Barracks to set the gates back and move the wall was not on the highway so could not be approved by officers but was one that the Council would support.
- 7.6 Thomas Green, representing Sainsbury's, also attended the meeting to make representations to the Committee. He commented that the proposals would remove the opportunity for HGVs to deliver to the store and no alternative solution had been proposed. He was therefore seeking clarity on where delivery vehicles could unload at the store.
- 7.7 Simon Botterill responded that the store had planning permission to unload on Hounslow Road which was not planned to be pedestrianised. Other stores across the City unloaded on roads with similar gradients to Hounslow Road. He expressed regret that the Council had not had the opportunity to consult with Sainsbury's but a letter had been sent to the store informing them of the proposals and inviting comment. In response to a question from Members, Mr Botterill confirmed that, should the proposals be agreed, the Council would liaise with Sainsburys to find the best solution.
- 7.8 Steve Hambleton, representing Royal Society for the Blind, commented that he had concerns over the proposal to make Mappin Street one way. At present if their members came off West Street they would be able to be dropped off outside the Society's building and the proposals would mean that this would not be possible.
- 7.9 Members of the Society tended to be elderly and blind and as a result needed to be dropped off close to the building. Mr Hambleton believed that a solution had been found to extend the drop off on Pitt Street and was seeking clarification on loading and unloading parking solutions.
- 7.10 Simon Botterill confirmed that he would visit the Society prior to advertising the TRO to ensure that they were happy with the proposals. The proposal was to

extend the lay-by and create a lay-by for loading and unloading on Pitt Street. The remainder would be double yellow lines and blue badge holders would be entitled to park there.

- 7.11 Steve Hambleton sought further clarification in relation to traffic movements between Pitt Street and Charlotte Lane as there was confusion over whether Charlotte Lane was one way. Although it was confirmed by Simon Botterill that it was not one way, Mr Hambleton reported that there were no entry signs at the top of Charlotte Lane. Mr Botterill agreed to investigate this.
- 7.12 Responding to further questions from Mr Hambleton regarding problems with delivery vehicles from the Cavendish Public House reversing down Broad Street, Mr Botterill confirmed that he would investigate this following the meeting.
- 7.13 John Petty attended the meeting to make representations to the Committee on behalf of Sheffield Children's Hospital. He commented that the Hospital was broadly supportive of the changes and he understood the long term ambition was to make Clarkson Street one way. His only remaining concern was in relation to the multi storey car park which the University had agreed could be used by the Hospital. When people came out of Carlton Street they were faced with two crossings. He wanted assistance to marshal people across so they did not take short cuts and end up at the entrance to the car park.
- 7.14 Simon Botterill commented that this was a difficult problem to solve as it was outside the scope of the Masterplan. The multi storey car park had planning permission but there was no condition to require a crossing to be built on Clarkson Street.
- 7.15 Members agreed that this was an issue outside of the TRO. They queried whether a sign could be erected to encourage people to cross at the crossings. It was agreed that officers would discuss the most appropriate solution with the Hospital.
- 7.16 Simon Botterill then outlined the proposals in more detail. He reported that the University was expanding and changes were needed to accommodate this and any future expansion. There was a need to improve crossings in the area. No tram stops would be changed should the proposals be agreed.
- 7.17 Part of Leavygreave Road was to be made one way to provide access to Gell Street and Victoria Way. As the area was on a high frequency bus route, officers had looked at the possibility of directing buses down Mappin Street. Bus operators had complained that this wasn't logical and officers had agreed with that. The new proposal was for buses to turn right onto Clarkson Street. This change had been modelled and it was believed that these changes could be accommodated without any serious impact on traffic flow in the area.
- 7.18 A comprehensive consultation had been undertaken on the proposals. 35 responses had been received, 29 of which were objecting either fully or in part. The objection from Killi's store had been resolved by leaving a section of Victoria Road two way and this objection had been withdrawn. The City Centre Residents Action Group had submitted 4 objections much of which were not to do with the

University Masterplan. Mr Botterill believed their concerns related to a potential increase in traffic. A volume and speed test would be undertaken in the area and again once the scheme had been completed. If there was found to be a big increase officers would look into the possibility of a 20mph scheme or traffic calming measures.

- 7.19 There had been an objection to closing the slip road on Glossop Road. The alternative route was not longer but it was accepted that it was more congested. However, it was believed that on balance the gains for bus journey times, which officers believed would result, made it worth doing. However, officers wanted to see how the new system worked before closing the road off.
- 7.20 The Fire Service had submitted an objection to the provision of coach parking on Favell Road as they believed this would prevent the free passage for fire appliances. Officers would liaise with the Fire Service in respect of this. The Police had raised a number of concerns related to safety and their ability to enforce conditions. Road safety audits would be undertaken and if these were signed off it was hoped that this would satisfy the Police. It was hoped that the restrictions would be made as self-enforcing as possible.
- 7.21 The Passenger Transport Executive (PTE) was largely happy with the proposals apart from one crossing on Upper Hanover Street. Supertram had since carried out their own assessment of the crossing layout and were now comfortable with the proposal, subject to satisfactory details being submitted for their approval.
- 7.22 Councillor Isobel Bowler commented that she supported the closing of the slip road on Glossop Road and asked if, as part of the scheme, officers would be looking at the operation of the traffic signals there? Simon Botterill responded that the operation of these lights had been changed recently and this would improve the traffic flow. As long as the signals were carefully managed the impact of the closing of the slip road would be fairly neutral.
- 7.23 Councillor Leigh Bramall thanked all those involved in the scheme. He believed it was a difficult exercise to make changes of this nature. He was concerned that Radio Sheffield had focused on potential issues the changes would create rather than the opportunities it would create to make a world class university campus. Moving forward with this scheme was a positive move for the City.
- 7.24 In welcoming the scheme, the Chair (Councillor Terry Fox), noted the issues raised by the Barracks, Sainsbury's and the Children's Hospital and requested that officers work with them to identify the best solutions to any potential issues raised.
- 7.25 **RESOLVED:** That Cabinet Highways Committee:-
- (a) notes the comments and objections to the proposals and advertised Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs)
  - (b) confirms that the scheme (as amended) will be of benefit to the public;

- (c) approves the amended scheme for design and implementation, subject to further officer approval of details;
- (d) approves the TRO's, as amended by the proposals shown in Appendix D of the report, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Local Authorities Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996;
- (e) approves the promotion of a new Traffic Order to facilitate delivery of the amended proposals;
- (f) thanks all those who responded to the consultation, and requests officers to inform them of the decisions; and
- (g) instructs officers to work with the local community to resolve their issues.

## **7.26 Reasons for Decision**

7.26.1 These changes are proposed to improve the public realm and enhance the environment. In addition to this, the proposals will also enable the area to become safer for the increased number of students as a result of the New Engineering Building known as the Diamond Building.

7.26.2 The proposals will also improve existing pedestrian facilities along Western Bank, by relocating one pedestrian crossing point and providing a new crossing point, and on Upper Hanover Street by relocating and improving crossing points. In addition to the above, a number of roads in the area of the campus are proposed to be restricted to vehicular traffic either permanently or with only access for part of the day or with one way movement only. The closure of Leavygreave Road East, in particular, to vehicular traffic will result in the diversion of two bus services (52/95).

## **7.27 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

7.27.1 The current volume of pedestrians crossing both Upper Hanover Street and Western Bank indicates that it is highly desirable that changes have to be made. Doing nothing is not considered an option.

7.27.2 The rerouting of buses to Clarkson Street is considered necessary by the bus operators. Rerouting all services permanently to Mappin Street was considered, but the geometry is not appropriate for high frequency bus services and this moves stops further from the heart of the campus.

This page is intentionally left blank