



Author/Lead Officer of Report: *John Priestley,
Senior Transport Planner*

Tel: 2734479

Report of: *Mr Tom Finnegan-Smith*

Report to: *Councillor Mazher Iqbal*

Date of Decision: *9 February 2017*

Subject: *Goddard Hall Road and Crabtree Close:
Objection to proposed waiting restrictions*

Is this a Key Decision? If Yes, reason Key Decision:-	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
- Expenditure and/or savings over £500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>
- Affects 2 or more Wards	<input type="checkbox"/>
Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to? <i>Infrastructure and Transport</i>	
Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? <i>Culture, Economy and Sustainability</i>	
Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? 1126	
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-	
<p><i>“The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).”</i></p>	

Purpose of Report:

This report describes the measures to restrict parking on Goddard Hall Road and Crabtree Close through the introduction of double yellow line waiting restrictions.

It sets out officers’ responses to one objection and seeks a decision from the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport.

Recommendations:

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 waiting restrictions be implemented and the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

Introduce associated traffic signing;

Inform the objector accordingly.

Background Papers:

Traffic Regulation Order proposals plan

Lead Officer to complete:-	
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.
	Finance: Julie Currey
	Legal: Paul Bellingham
	Equalities: Annemarie Johnston
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>	
2	EMT member who approved submission: Simon Green
3	Cabinet Member consulted: Mazher Iqbal
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Decision Maker by the EMT member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.
	Lead Officer Name: John Priestley
	Job Title: Senior Transport Planner
Date: 01/12/16	

1. PROPOSAL

- 1.1 In December 2014 the Council received a letter from Mr Shoukat Ali, 14 Goddard Hall Road, Sheffield, S5 7AP. Mr Ali has four severely disabled children. He needs to maintain access to his property for between two and three mini-buses, twice a day during the week, that take his children to and from school and for ambulances that take them to and from hospital for treatment. Mr Ali has a thermoplastic 'H' marking on the carriageway at his drive but claims that, in spite of this, his drive is constantly blocked, either partly or fully, by parked vehicles. He therefore requested its replacement with double yellow lines.
- 1.2 Transport Planning are also in receipt of a request for the provision of double yellow lines at the junction of Crabtree Close and Goddard Hall Road. This is to prevent parking at the junction that blocks sight lines and obstructs the traffic flow, particularly large vehicles such as those that collect refuse.
- 1.3 These two requests were, therefore, combined into a proposal to introduce 55 linear metres of double yellow line waiting restrictions at this junction (see attached plan).
- 1.4 This is not something that the Council is legally required to do but it does come within the Council's duty of care.

2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE ?

- 2.1 The proposed waiting restrictions should improve safety at a junction through the removal of parking that blocks sight lines both for pedestrians and vehicles and also obstructs traffic trying to pass through the junction. There is no impact on climate change and there is no economic impact. Those motorists who previously parked, illegally, at this junction will clearly not agree with the introduction of parking restrictions. The situation will, however, be improved for all the pedestrians and motorists seeking to pass through the junction. On balance, therefore, this proposal is considered to improve the customer experience.

3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

- 3.1 The Traffic Regulations Section has conducted the standard consultation that is legally required for a Traffic Regulation Order. A letter and plan of the proposals was delivered to 10 properties on Crabtree Close and Goddard Hall Road in the vicinity of the proposals and three notices were put up on-street. An advertisement was also placed in the local press.
- 3.2 There were two written responses to the consultation, a letter of support from Mr Ali (the requestor) and a letter of objection from a resident of

Goddard Hall Road, who objected on the following grounds:

- 3.3 *Objection:* he (i.e. the objector) sometimes hires a car.
Response: no parking restrictions are proposed outside the objector's property so he is not directly affected.
- 3.4 *Objection:* he works from home and has never seen Mr Ali's drive blocked.
Response: this would be disputed by Mr Ali.
- 3.5 *Objection:* the roads are clear at the weekends, so the restrictions are unnecessary.
Response: in addition to the mini-buses for school, Mr Ali claims that he needs to have access available "24 hours a day and for 7 days a week for ambulance and doctors services as and when required."
- 3.6 *Objection:* no-one else has requested any parking restrictions.
Response: on 1 June 2015 former Councillor Mr Ibrar Hussain submitted a request, *on behalf of local residents*, for double yellow line parking restrictions at a number of locations in this area, including the junction of Crabtree Close and Goddard Hall Road.
- 3.7 *Objection:* the measures are not justified; they will reduce the existing parking provision.
Response: as can be seen from the attached plan, the total length of the proposed restrictions is 55m. Rule 217 of the Highway Code states that motorists should not park "opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction". Consequently 40m of the proposed restrictions are serving to formalise a rule that motorists should already be observing. Mr Ali has a 6.5m 'H' bar marking at his drive that motorists should be observing. The total nett loss of available parking space is, therefore, only 8.5m which provides sufficient space for school mini-buses and ambulances to be able to park parallel to the kerb.
- 3.8 Mr Ali claimed that parking at the junction sometimes prevents Veolia refuse vehicles from being able to access Goddard Hall Road. Transport Planning therefore wrote to Mr Steven Taylor, Contract Supervisor, Veolia ES Sheffield Limited, in order to verify this information. In his reply, Mr Taylor stated that "We encounter difficulties there [i.e. the junction of Crabtree Close and Goddard Hall Road] most collection days."

4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications

- 4.1.1 Overall the proposed measures will have a positive impact. By addressing inconsiderate parking practices they will assist in the delivery of education and health services to four disabled children.

4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

- 4.2.1 The total cost of the road markings is estimated to be £220. This includes the commuted sum payment for ongoing maintenance costs. It is to be funded from the allocated capital budget for 'loading and waiting schemes' within the Local Transport Plan. In line with the Council's capital approval process the initial business case was approved by the Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities Board on 13th July 2016 and the CAF for the capital budget was endorsed by the Capital Programme Group (CPG) on 25th July 2016. The final business case, which had no changes to the costs was then approved by the Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities Board in September 2016. The contract award is expected to go to CPG in January 2017.

4.3 Legal Implications

- 4.3.1 The Council has the power under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) where it appears to the Council that it would be expedient to make it for, inter alia, avoiding danger to pedestrians and other road users or for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs. Before the Council can make a TRO, it must consult with relevant bodies in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. It must also publish notice of its intention in a local newspaper. Where objections are received Regulation 13 places a duty on the Council to ensure that these objections are duly considered. These requirements have been complied with. In making its decision the Council must also be satisfied that the approved scheme will secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians). Provided the Council is so satisfied it is acting lawfully and within its powers.

Other Implications

- 4.3.2 The measures will be delivered using existing staff resources. There are no other implications.

5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 5.1 The only alternative, as proposed by the objector, 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.

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The proposed measures will address inconsiderate parking practices,

thereby assisting in the delivery of health and education services to four disabled children. They will also improve safety and accessibility at a junction by removing parking that blocks sight lines and obstructs turning manoeuvres.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

- 7.1 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 waiting restrictions be implemented and the Traffic Regulation Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- 7.2 Introduce associated traffic signing;
- 7.3 Inform the objector accordingly.