



**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** Simon Nelson

**Tel:** 0114 2736208

**Report of:** Executive Director, Place  
**Report to:** Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport  
**Date of Decision:** TBC  
**Subject:** Proposed removal of the A61 London Road - Queens Road tidal system

Is this a Key Decision? If Yes, reason Key Decision:-	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
- Expenditure and/or savings over £500,000	<input type="checkbox"/>	
- Affects 2 or more Wards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to? Environment and Transport		
Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee		
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? 448		
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:		

**Purpose of Report:**

To seek endorsement for the removal the A61 London Road - Queens Road tidal system through the Streets Ahead highway maintenance contract and to describe the replacement measures identified by Amey to manage the passage of traffic.

**Recommendations:**

The Cabinet Member is asked to:

1. endorse the revocation of the London Road and Queens Road tidal working Traffic Regulation Order and the removal of the associated infrastructure; and
2. approve the principle of the replacement traffic management arrangements including the revisions to Traffic Regulation Orders described in this report and, if necessary, the making of additional orders.

**Background Papers:** N/A

<b>Lead Officer to complete:-</b>		
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: N/A
		Legal: Bob Power/Richard Cannon
		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>	Edward Highfield
3	<b>Cabinet Member consulted:</b>	Councillor Lewis Dagnall
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> Tom Finnegan-Smith	<b>Job Title:</b> Head of Strategic Transport and Infrastructure
	<b>Date:</b>	

## 1.0 PROPOSAL

### Background

- 1.1 A signal controlled 'tidal' traffic management system has been in operation on the A61 London Road-Queens Road since 1981, varying the number of in- and out-bound lanes according to the time of day. It originally covered the length between Thirlwell Road and St Wilfrid's Road but this was later reduced due to safety concerns and rising maintenance costs. It now covers Broadfield Road to St Wilfrid's Road in City and Nether Edge and Sharrow wards. Three defunct overhead gantries remain in place. A location plan is appended (Appendix A).
- 1.2 The infrastructure is now life expired. The gantry mounted lane usage signs require significant amendment, the method of operation doesn't meet current standards, the system is a considerable maintenance liability and periodic malfunctions have a hugely detrimental impact on the highway network. On average, the tidal flow system is out of action (i.e. a lane is closed to all traffic) once a month due to either critical lamp failures or communications problems. This doesn't include any downtime due to non-critical lamp failures, the replacement of which also requires the closure of lanes.
- 1.3 Any like-for-like replacement tidal system is unlikely to be feasible in this location. It would have to comply with current regulations requiring significant additional investment in terms of both infrastructure and the cost of ongoing maintenance.

### Removal of the tidal flow system

- 1.4 Amey, through the Streets Ahead highway maintenance contract, plan to remove the tidal flow system altogether. The associated works will include the removal of all nine overhead gantries, the reassignment of traffic lanes, alterations to the timing of traffic signals and alterations to the junction of London Road and Queens Road with Wolseley Road (see Appendix B, Indicative Layout). The scheme will establish two full-time inbound and two full-time outbound lanes on Queens Road. All works are contained within the existing carriageway.
- 1.5 Amey has stated that the proposed layout will result in a net saving of approximately £250k over the lifetime of the Streets Ahead Maintenance Contract.

### Discussion

- 1.6 Modelling of the proposal indicates that the combination of improvements to the Wolseley Road junction and the introduction of adaptive traffic control systems will ensure the capacity of the network is maintained. The outbound evening peak queue on Queens Road between Charlotte Road and Alderson Road will be longer than at present, however overall journey times will be unaffected. Journey times will be more reliable as

the removal of the tidal system will eradicate the increasingly frequent faults that trigger the closure of the tidal lane.

- 1.7 This revision to the operation and layout of the highway will complement the recently completed widening of Chesterfield Road between Heeley Retail Park and Saxon Road and the proposed widening of London Road between Gleadless Road and Wolseley Road to establish two continuous inbound lanes between Woodseats and Granville Square. It will enhance the potential for further development of the business and retail area off Guernsey Road, which has been hindered by access restrictions imposed by the tidal flow arrangement. Future maintenance will be far easier and less disruptive, and officers feel that the layout will be clearer to drivers unfamiliar with the area.
- 1.8 Officers have no objection to the proposal described in this report and will arrange for the London Road-Queens Road tidal Traffic Regulation Order to be revoked.

#### Timescale

- 1.9 Amey are currently proposing that the works be conducted in two stages:
- i) the tidal flow system be discontinued and replaced with traffic signs reflecting the future arrangement during the 2019 spring bank holiday. This will give road users a chance to become accustomed to the new layout prior to full implementation; and
  - ii) the gantries be removed, the junction with Wolseley Road be altered and the carriageways and footways be resurfaced during the 2019 school summer holidays.

#### Traffic Regulation Order

- 1.10 The alterations to the junction of London Road, Queens Road and Wolseley Road will require the introduction of a 'No loading at any time' restriction to prevent vehicles blocking the southwest bound approach to the junction (see Appendix B). This Order must be secured to ensure that traffic can pass unhindered at all times and replaces existing loading restrictions.

Officers will contact the occupiers of the commercial properties most directly affected to better understand their businesses requirements and weigh up whether any mitigating measures are justified and feasible. The Order will be advertised by the Council on behalf of Amey once this has taken place.

#### 2.0 HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?

- 2.1 The Streets Ahead maintenance programme of which this scheme is a part ensures that the benefits of the core investment period are enjoyed into the future. (pp. 99, Sheffield Transport Strategy)

2.2 Although Amey has not developed the scheme in order to satisfy the Council's Corporate objectives there are some associations:

Corporate objective	Corporate key aims	How achieved
Strong economy	Achieve economic potential and be well connected; Support businesses to start and grow; Attract more visitors to Sheffield	Improved access and journey reliability along the corridor; reduced disruption due to maintenance

### 3.0 PUBLICITY AND CONSULTATION

3.1 Amey and the Council intend to publicise these works jointly.

### 4.0 RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

#### Equality of Opportunity Implications

4.1 An Equality Impact Assessment has been conducted and concluded that there are no significant equality impact, positive or negative, arising from these changes. Overall, the works will benefit everyone using this corridor through improvements to journey reliability and a reduction in disruption caused by the unreliability of the current traffic management system.

#### Financial and Commercial Implications

4.2 All tasks described in this report are to be funded by Amey through the Streets Ahead maintenance contract. There are therefore no financial implications arising from the recommendations of this report.

#### Legal Implications

4.3 The Transport Act 2000 (amended) places a duty on the City Council to develop policies for the promotion of safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport to, from and within its area, and carry out its functions so as to implement those policies.

The Council has powers under Part V of the Highways Act 1980 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ('the 1984 Act') to implement the proposals described in this report, including the provision of pedestrian crossings and waiting restrictions. The said works do not require planning permission where they are being carried out for the maintenance or improvement of the roads concerned, so long as they do not have a significant effect on the environment, as they may be considered to be permitted development under class A within Part 9 of Schedule 2 to the Town and Country Planning (General Permitted Development) (England)

Order 2015.

In exercising the powers under the 1984 Act, the Council is required to secure (a) the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrians) and (b) the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway, and so far as practicable having regard to the matters listed below.

The matters to be considered before reaching any decision are:

- i) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;
- ii) the effect on the amenities of a locality and (including) the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles;
- iii) the national air quality strategy prepared under Section 80 of the Environment Act 1995;
- iv) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of passengers/potential passengers; and
- v) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

In accordance with the procedure set out in the Road Traffic (Temporary Restrictions) Procedure Regulations 1992, the Council needs to consider whether any objections received to its proposals to revise an existing TRO outweigh the benefits of implementing the proposal. Any objections that need to be considered in accordance with this procedure will be the subject of a separate report and decision.

Other Implications

#### 4.4 Programming and co-ordination of works

The intention has been to co-ordinate the removal of the tidal system with works to widen the A61 London Road between Gleadless Road and Wolseley Road. Unfortunately, the construction of the widening scheme has been delayed by the constraints of an associated land acquisition process. Consequently, Amey may not be able to programme the works to run concurrently. A communications strategy needs to be put in place to ensure that any separation of construction periods is publicised and the reasons made clear.

#### 4.5 Management of the changeover period

The management of the transition away from tidal working will require careful consideration as drivers have come to expect certain lanes to be available at certain times. Officers feel that this can be achieved through a combination of publicity and temporary traffic management during the changeover period.

#### 5.0 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

##### 5.1 A simple renewal of the existing gantry system has been ruled out as

explained in paragraph 1.3 above.

5.2 The scheme described within this report has been proposed and developed by Amey as part of their responsibility to fulfil the terms of the Streets Ahead maintenance contract. There is no funding to incorporate further major improvements.

## 6.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 As essentially a maintenance scheme, the works described above do not require a specific Cabinet Member approval. However, officers feel political endorsement would be advantageous given the need to publicise what will be a major change to the operation of an extremely important strategic route.