



**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 March 2017*

**Subject:** *Cadman Street and Blast Lane:  
Objections 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? 1171		
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:-		
<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"The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)."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>		

**Purpose of Report:**

This report describes 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 sets out officers' responses to objections, including a petition 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 revised 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 objectors accordingly.

**Background Papers:**

Traffic Regulation Order consultation letter, original proposals plan and revised 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	<b>EMT member who approved submission:</b> Simon Green
3	<b>Cabinet Member consulted:</b> Councillor 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.
	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> John Priestley
	<b>Job Title:</b> Senior Transport Planner
<b>Date:</b> 16/12/16	

## 1. PROPOSAL

- 1.1 In April 2014 Transport Planning were contacted by a Mr Tom West who requested the introduction of parking restrictions on Blast Lane, between its junction with Cadman Street and the road closure beneath a railway bridge. Mr West requested double yellow lines at the road closure in order to provide a turning area for vehicles and to prevent the pedal cycle route, through the closure, being blocked by parked cars. He also requested the introduction of time limited waiting in order to prevent all day commuter parking and provide parking for local businesses, in particular, the Emmaus charity shop that provides accommodation, employment and a way back into society for homeless people.
- 1.2 In June 2014 Transport Planning were contacted by Ms Hilary Bradley, Section Administrator, Network Rail. Ms Bradley requested the introduction of double yellow line parking restrictions on Blast Lane, Cadman Street and Sussex Street to prevent parking that blocks sight lines at junctions and obstructs the traffic flow. Ms Bradley's concern was that, if an incident occurred on the railway, Network Rail might be unable to deploy personnel from their depot on Blast Lane to deal with it.
- 1.3 In July 2015 and June 2016 the City Council were contacted by Paul Blomfield MP (Sheffield Central) who requested the introduction of some form of dedicated parking provision for the Emmaus charity shop. This was due to the fact that due to commuter parking "The charity is losing out significantly on business and therefore this is undermining the work it does to rehabilitate homeless and vulnerable people." (Paul Blomfield MP, June 2016)
- 1.4 These requests were combined into a proposal to introduce double and single yellow line waiting restrictions as shown on plan one (attached).
- 1.5 In response to objections received as a result of the public consultation the proposals were revised, with the length of both the double and single yellow line restrictions being reduced, as shown on plan two (attached).
- 1.6 It was originally proposed to introduce 244 linear metres of double yellow line and 92 linear metres of single yellow line parking restrictions. Allowing for the fact that, under Rule 243 of the Highway Code, vehicles should not be parked within 10 metres of a junction, this equated to the loss of 56/57 parking spaces.
- 1.7 The revised proposals are for the introduction of 196 linear metres of double yellow line and 64 linear metres of single yellow line parking restrictions. Allowing, once again, for the fact that vehicles should not be parked within 10 metres of a junction, this equates to the loss of 44 parking spaces.
- 1.8 The revised proposals, therefore, serve to reduce the total loss of parking provision by 12/13 spaces.

## **2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?**

- 2.1 The proposed waiting restrictions should improve safety at the junctions of Sussex Street / Sussex Road and Sussex Street / Cadman Street through the removal of parking that blocks sight lines both for pedestrians and vehicles and also obstructs traffic trying to negotiate these junctions. There is no impact on climate change and there is no economic impact. Those motorists who previously parked at these junctions, illegally and with no consideration for other road users, 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 these junctions. On balance this proposal is considered to have a neutral effect on 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 (copy attached) and plan of the proposals was delivered to 12 frontagers in the area and to Capita, Hartshead House, 2 Cutlers Gate and 10 notices were put up on-street. An advertisement was also placed in the press.
- 3.2 The proposals received three objection letters from local businesses, 10 from Capita employees and a petition with 204 signatures signed by employees of Capita. No expressions of support were received. A full summary of the objections received and officer responses is given in the table at Appendix A below.
- 3.3 Prior to occupation of their current site, Capita were required to develop and implement a travel plan. An interim travel plan was approved in 2009, but they failed to submit a full travel plan. Details of the interim plan are attached at Appendix B below.

## **4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION**

### **4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications**

- 4.1.1 It is acknowledged that Capita employees and other commuters who park in this area will be inconvenienced. However, by removing unsafe, illegal and obstructive parking and providing parking for a charity facility that assists homeless persons the proposed measures are considered to have a positive impact overall.

### **4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications**

- 4.2.1 The total cost of implementing this scheme, including the commuted sum payment for ongoing maintenance costs, 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 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. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

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

## **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 revised 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 objectors accordingly;
- 7.4 That Capita be advised to re-visit their travel plan;
- 7.5 That 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/>

## APPENDIX A

### Objections Received and Officer Response

Objection	Number received	Officer Response
<p><i>Capita employees.</i> Staff at the Capita office have decided to submit a petition to voice their objections as there a number that use this area to park for work. Please note below reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Lack of available parking in the work car-park</li> <li>* Limited availability of alternative off road parking in the vicinity</li> <li>* Lack of space in the two NCP car-parks that are close by, Victoria Quays and Blonk Street, these are usually full by 9am</li> <li>* No public transport that runs close by to work</li> </ul>	<p>204 (petition)</p>	<p>In recognition of the objections raised by the petitioners, the parking restrictions originally proposed have been reduced in length.</p> <p>The petitioners must recognise, however, that parking around junctions and on footways restricts visibility, obstructs pedestrians and other road users and is a potential hazard. It is a contravention of Rules 243 and 244 of the Highway Code.</p> <p><i>Rule 243: DO NOT stop or park opposite or within 10 metres (32 feet) of a junction except in an authorised parking space.</i></p> <p><i>Rule 244: You MUST NOT park partially or wholly on the pavement in London, and should not do so elsewhere unless signs permit it. Parking on the footway can obstruct and seriously inconvenience pedestrians, people in wheelchairs or with visual impairment and people with prams and pushchairs.</i></p> <p>The proposed waiting restrictions will prevent contravention of the Highway Code in this manner.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that public transport provision to this area is not good, but it is available. See below.</p>
<p><i>Capita employees.</i> I would like to object on these grounds: This is a valuable parking place for Capita employees; our building doesn't have capacity for us all to park in our staff car park. Enforcing this order would not be fair to people that park their car there every day and don't cause any obstruction. I feel that with enforcing this order people will have to pay to use public car park at a fee which some of us simply cannot afford.</p>	<p>8</p>	<p>The restrictions will not prevent Capita employees from parking on-street. They are only intended to prevent parking in locations that are illegal, hazardous to other highway users and that do, in fact, obstruct the passage of other vehicles.</p> <p>It is not the Council's responsibility to provide parking. That lies with the employer who may, or may not, choose to help.</p>

<p>I am writing to object to the proposals to change the parking restrictions around Blast Lane.</p> <p>I object to the introduction of a limited waiting area opposite the charity store on the south side of Blast Lane and believe the area of restricted parking directly in front of the charity shop should be reduced. I also object to any restrictions (other than the loading bay) to parking at the west side of Blast Lane and to the extent that has been proposed towards Cadman street immediately in front of the Sipelia Works.</p> <p>The current parking proposals for local businesses and the restrictions in other areas are excessive. Local businesses have implemented their own solutions by placing cones and barriers in front of key areas. If the restricted parking were to be aligned more to this it would strike a better balance. It is important that the concerns of local businesses are addressed. However, the use of these spaces by others must also be taken into consideration.</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The limited waiting area opposite the Emmaus store, on the south side of Blast Lane, has been reduced in size. It is necessary to provide an adequate supply of limited waiting parking to give potential customers a reasonable chance of being able to access a parking space.</p> <p>Parking restrictions are required at the extreme western end of Blast Lane in order to provide a turning area for vehicles and to prevent obstruction of the cycle route through the highway closure.</p> <p>The parking restrictions on Cadman Street, outside the Sipelia Works, are necessary in order to ensure access for Network Rail vehicles.</p> <p>The time limited waiting that is proposed outside the Emmaus store is only slightly greater in extent than Emmaus have, of necessity, been reserving for the use of their customers through the use of cones. Among other things Emmaus sell furniture so it is essential that they have sufficient space for the unloading and loading of large items.</p> <p>The Sipelia Works refused the introduction of double yellow lines outside their premises, in the area used for loading, on the grounds that they preferred to continue to use cones or barriers to reserve this area. Hence the 7 metre gap in the yellow lines on the north side of Cadman Street outside the Sipelia Works.</p>
<p>Oppose. A number of large businesses in the area. These roads are used by employees. I understand that there is a need to control some of the parking however the extent will cause significant shortage of parking in the area. I do not feel that there has been an assessment of alternative for people who currently park in this area to provide a suitable alternative for them to travel to work. The public transport options to this area are almost non-existent. The nearest tram stop is at least a15 min walk and the nearest bus stop is around a 10 min walk. To access the closest bus stop you have to walk through the Wicker which has seen three serious and one fatal assaults in</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The original proposals were not excessive in extent and the revised proposals are even less so. There is no requirement for staff that currently commute by car to find an alternative form of transport, only to avoid parking in locations that are illegal, unsafe, obstructive and which show a total lack of regard for other road users.</p> <p>The distance to the nearest tram stop is a 14 minute walk, which equates to 0.6 mile and is not considered to be an excessive distance. The Nunnery Square park and ride facility is only two stops away from this tram stop.</p>

<p>the past six months. This, along with previous reports of violence, has resulted in people using their cars to travel to and from work for safety reasons. The public car parks are usually at capacity by 9am which has also forced people to find alternative parking options. I am objecting to the introduction of parking restrictions until an evaluation of alternative modes of transport and affordability of those options for staff who work in the area has been completed.</p>		<p>The distance to bus stops on the Wicker is an 8 minute walk, which equates to 0.4 mile. The greater the number of law abiding pedestrians that use the Wicker, the safer the journey becomes.</p> <p>It is beyond the scope of the consultation required for a Traffic Regulation Order to undertake the evaluations proposed by the objector. That responsibility rests with the employer.</p>
<p><i>Local Business.</i> I object to the proposed plans. The proposal makes no provision for parking spaces for local businesses. This is the basis of my objection.</p> <p>I rent a studio at Vulcan Studios on the corner of Sussex Street / Sussex Road. Each morning there is competition for the parking spaces, most used by people walking into the city centre for work.</p> <p>The businesses on these roads suffer lack of parking as it is. There are no spaces reserved for the workers at local business and we struggle to load/unload in the hours we need this facility. Is it possible to have reserved parking for businesses by permit free of charge?</p> <p>I appreciate the need for ordered parking, not least as defective parking occasionally blocks full access to our front door. They fully mount the pavement.</p> <p>I don't want to be swept up in the proposed parking restrictions as my livelihood is based here. I need to load and unload my vehicle sometimes several times a day.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The Council does not allocate on-street parking provision for private individuals or businesses.</p> <p>The Council does not operate permit parking schemes free of charge and this request would not meet the criteria for a permit parking scheme.</p> <p>A business that requires a loading bay, for work purposes, can submit an application for same to the City Council. No businesses in this area have submitted such an application.</p> <p>This scheme proposes the introduction of double yellow line parking restrictions outside the objector's premises. This would prevent the "defective parking" referred to. Loading and unloading on double yellow lines, for business purposes, is permitted (Highway Code, Rule 221). Consequently, provision of the restrictions would also provide the facility to load and unload that the objector requires.</p>
<p><i>Capita employee.</i> We all have to make a living as well as the companies around Blast Lane and some people are on low income and the parking charges in car parks can take a big chunk out of people's wages. We are not all on mega bucks and some live out of the area and public transport is not an option. Whilst I can see the frustration from the companies I think they need to appreciate the frustration from drivers who pay their road tax. Why is there not small loading areas of no parking just near the firms affected rather than taking up all of Blast Lane.</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>The payment of road tax is a legal requirement imposed by Central Government and does not bestow any right to park on the public highway.</p> <p>The proposed restrictions do not remove all of the parking provision from Blast Lane. In addition the restrictions have, in response to the objections, been reduced to the minimum lengths necessary to achieve the scheme's objectives.</p> <p>As stated previously, no businesses in</p>

		this area have submitted an application for a loading bay.
<p>I am writing to formally oppose the proposed changes to parking on Blast Lane, Cadman Street and Sussex Street.</p> <p>Employees of the large businesses in the area around Blast Lane, Cadman Street and Sussex Street use these roads to park and access their workplace. The extent of the changes proposed will cause a significant shortage of parking in the area.</p> <p>Please can you advise if an assessment of alternatives for people who park in this area has been undertaken and if so what were the results as it incredibly important that there are enough suitable alternatives as the proposed changes will not reduce the amount of cars which will need to park in vicinity of Blast Lane, Cadman Street and Sussex Street and the proposal will only reduce the already limited car parking in the area. Along with the significant shortage of parking in the area, the public transport options to this area are almost non-existent.</p> <p>I am formally objecting to the introduction of parking restrictions on Blast Lane, Cadman Street and Sussex Street until a full evaluation of alternative modes of transport and affordability of those options for staff who work in the area has been completed.</p>	1	<p>As stated previously, it is beyond the scope of this project to undertake the assessments proposed by the objector. That responsibility is the employer's.</p> <p>It is acknowledged that public transport provision to this area is not good, but it is available.</p> <p>It is further acknowledged that some displacement of parking, on to other roads in the area, will probably occur. This is necessary, however, in order to achieve the scheme's objectives.</p>

## APPENDIX B

### Capita's Interim Travel Plan

Measure	Timescale
<p>Provision of travel information to be made available to all staff before relocation to site. This will include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Maps showing cycle routes in relation to the site</li> <li>• Maps showing public transport routes in relation to the site</li> <li>• Information on useful websites – such as Traveline, Sustrans, WhizzGo, <a href="http://WWW.walkit.com/sheffield">WWW.walkit.com/sheffield</a></li> </ul> <p>This data is to be updated on a regular basis and displayed at appropriate locations in the office</p>	One month before site occupation
<p>Promotion of car sharing via car share South Yorkshire: <a href="http://www.carsharesouthyorkshire.com">www.carsharesouthyorkshire.com</a></p>	One month before site occupation
On site minor maintenance / repair kit for cycles	Upon occupation of site
Guaranteed free taxi home in emergency for those using public transport, cycling, walking or car share to get to work	Upon occupation of site
Maintain up to date bus timetables in the main reception area	Upon occupation of site
Allocation of car park spaces to car sharers to encourage car sharing	Upon occupation of site
Set up a car share database for staff where employees can view offers and requests for lifts from colleagues	One month before site occupation
Car share posters to be put up on all notice boards and displays in main reception area	Upon occupation of site
Investigate provision of video conference facilities to reduce the need for business travel	Upon occupation of site
Ensure that all new staff are aware of the transport options available - include in formal induction procedures	Ongoing
Investigate providing discounted ticketing to encourage use of public transport	One month before site occupation
Introduce salary sacrifice to allow savings in purchase of cycles and / or public transport season tickets.	One month before site occupation
Promotion of urban cycle coaching	Upon occupation of site
Promotion of regular bike doctor scheme	Upon occupation of site

This page is intentionally left blank