

MEETING OF THE CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE**held 20th May, 2010**

PRESENT: Councillors Ian Auckland (Chair), David Baker, Penny Baker and Shaffaq Mohammed.

.....

1. WELCOME AND HOUSEKEEPING ARRANGEMENTS

The Chair welcomed members of the public to the meeting and outlined basic housekeeping and fire safety arrangements.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 11th March, 2010, were approved as a correct record and, arising therefrom, Members requested that a response provided by the Director of Legal Services in relation to the Committee's request that consideration be given, as part of the review of the Constitution, to (i) amending the current Council policy on highway trees to give more power to take decisions and (ii) giving delegated authority to Community Assemblies to take decisions on highways matters within the budget allocated to them, as currently any decision was a recommendation to the Head of Transport and Highways to approve, be re-circulated to all Members of the Committee .

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

There were no public questions or petitions.

6. ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY/REFERRED TO CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

There were no items referred to the Committee from Scrutiny.

7. PETITIONS**New Petitions**

The Board noted the receipt of petitions (i) containing 42 signatures requesting the implementation of a permit parking scheme to Hillsborough Road/Place in advance of measures from the wider area and that a report in relation to this was on the agenda for this meeting of the Committee, (ii) containing 21 signatures regarding traffic calming measures for speeding cars on Kingfield Road and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of the South Community Assembly, (iii) containing 106 signatures requesting a pedestrian crossing on Hutcliffe Wood Road and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of the South Community Assembly, (iv)

containing 200 signatures requesting a safe pedestrian crossing at the junction of Gleadless Road & Blackstock Road and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of the South Community Assembly, (v) containing 31 signatures regarding parking problems on Hayfield Crescent, Hayfield Place and Hayfield Drive and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of the South Community Assembly, (vi) containing 44 signatures calling for better signage and physical changes to stop rat running through the Ward's Brewery Flats, Ecclesall Road and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of the Central Community Assembly, (vii) containing 834 signatures requesting a Child Safety Zone through Main Street and designated areas of Hackenthorpe, incorporating Birley Spa Lane, Springwater, Cotleigh and Delves area, Beighton Road, Sheffield Road and Church Lane and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of the South East Community Assembly, (viii) containing 18 signatures asking that the Council retain permit holder parking below 221 Cemetery Road and not return it to unrestricted parking and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of this Highways Committee, (ix) containing 220 signatures requesting the Council to address access and mobility issues in the South area of Walkley and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of the South East Community Assembly and (x) received following circulation of the agenda containing 23 signatures in support of the '15mins free' parking arrangement for the Sharrow Vale local shopping centre as being better than nothing but requesting reusable clock discs instead of pay & display meters and that this would be considered as part of the review of the permit parking scheme in the Sharrow area, (xi) received following circulation of the agenda containing 61 signatures objecting to the Northern General Hospital Permit Parking Scheme on Fairbank Road and Endors Road and that a report would be submitted to the July meeting of this Committee.

Petition – Permit Parking, Lancing Road

The Board noted the receipt of a petition containing 17 signatures requesting permit parking on Lancing Road and heard representations from members of the public in support of the petition who requested that permit parking needed to be introduced on Lancing Road/Lancing Street and Edmund Road as a matter of urgency in view of parking problems in the area.

The Head of Transport and Highways reported that a wider review of the permit parking scheme in the local area was currently taking place and residents should make their views known during this review.

The Chair requested that, in light of the representations heard at the meeting, if these were also highlighted during the review then any measures which could alleviate parking problems in the area be prepared so that they could be introduced as a matter of urgency.

Outstanding Petitions List

The Board received and noted a report of the Executive Director, Place setting out the position on outstanding petitions that were being investigated.

8. **PROPOSED ZEBRA CROSSING ON RINGINGLOW ROAD: REPORT OF REPRESENTATIONS**

The Head of Transport and Highways submitted a report of the

Executive Director, Place informing Members of representations received about the proposed zebra crossing on Ringinglow Road adjacent to Ecclesall Church of England Junior School, outlining officer responses to them and making recommendations on the way forward.

The report stated that the Council received a petition containing 273 signatures requesting provision of a pedestrian crossing facility to alleviate difficulties experienced by pedestrians when crossing Ringinglow Road in the vicinity of Ecclesall Church of England Junior School. The petition was reported to the City Centre, South and East Planning and Highways Area Board on 30th June, 2008 where the Board requested that officers investigate the matter. Accordingly, a scheme was developed to address these aspirations, the details of which were attached as Appendix A to the report.

A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was required to enable the introduction of double yellow lines (prohibition of waiting at any time) at the junction of Ringinglow Road/Edale Road and waiting restrictions in association with the 'School Keep Clear' marking on Ringinglow Road.

It was reported that these restrictions would keep the junction and school entrance clear from parked vehicles and improve visibility between pedestrians and motorists. This would enable pedestrians to cross more safely. Problems occurred largely (although not exclusively) at school drop-off and pick up times when vehicles were parked close to and around the junction in question, compromising visibility both for pedestrians crossing the side road and for motorists emerging from the junction.

The TRO was advertised in the usual way for a period of 4 weeks commencing 18th December, 2009 including notices displayed on-street and by public notice in the Sheffield Star newspaper. Consideration had been given to the time of year and the consultation period was extended from 3 to 4 weeks.

A total of nine representations relating to the TRO advertisement had been received, five of which set out concerns about the possible displacement of vehicles from Ringinglow Road onto Marsh House Road. Two of these five representations were specific to the TRO. Two other objections were received relating to the bus stop clearway markings. A further 15 comments/suggestions were raised through the Ecclesall Smartroute which were outlined in the report.

In response to the representations, the Head of Transport and Highways reported that it was hoped that measures introduced along with the school travel plan would help to alleviate the problem of displacement parking on Marsh House Road and that the bus stop clearway met the minimum distance required of 27 metres.

A member of the public attended the Committee to make representations in relation to the scheme. He commented that he believed the proposed measures could lead to increase in speeding vehicles on Ringinglow Road. He also believed the cost of the scheme had increased from what was first proposed. Problems of displacement parking on Marsh House Road were not just a problem on the school run but throughout the day as teachers from the school often parked their vehicles on the road throughout the day. He requested that a review of the scheme be undertaken after its operation and requested that the highways officer involved attend a future meeting of the Ecclesall Community Forum.

In response, the Head of Transport and Highways reported that proposed costs outlined at the start of a scheme frequently changed due to a

number of factors. In terms of teachers parking on Marsh House Road, he would liaise with the School Travel Plan Advisor to ask them to emphasise to staff the virtues of car sharing and request that they find alternative places to park. He further commented that it was important to inform local residents that measures were planned in the wider area which may impact on Ringinglow Road.

Members requested that all measures proposed in the area be included on a single plan and be displayed on the internet and in local schools as part of the consultation.

RESOLVED: That (a) objections to the Traffic Regulation Order be overruled and the Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

(b) the scheme, as shown on drawing no. TM-BN562-P1 in the report, be approved and issued to Street Force for construction;

(c) the objectors, lead petitioner and other respondents to the consultation be informed accordingly; and

(d) the Head of Transport and Highways be requested to develop a plan of all the traffic measures connected to the development of Silverdale and High Storrs Schools for display on the internet and local schools during the consultation period.

9. REPORT ON A PETITION REGARDING BUSINESS PARKING PERMITS IN BROOMHILL

The Head of Transport and Highways submitted a report of the Executive Director, Place outlining his response to a petition regarding business parking permits in Broomhill. It was stated that business permit holders in the Broomhill Permit Parking Scheme were concerned that the revisions to the scheme brought about by the review consultation would impact on their ability to park close to their premises.

In the original scheme, business permit holders were not allowed to park in the one hour maximum stay bays. In the revised scheme, these bays changed to two hour maximum stay. Business users continued not to be allowed to use them.

The report stated that the Broomhill Permit Parking Scheme was introduced in September 2006. The review of the scheme started in April 2007 and consultation with residents and businesses led to changes to the traffic regulation order which were made and sealed in June 2009. The changes had been implemented in phases from April 2009 onwards by updating the signs and road markings.

The original scheme allowed business permit holders to park in 'permit holder' and 'shared use' bays but not in the one hour maximum stay bays in the streets and car parks included in Table 1 in the report. These bays were primarily meant for shoppers because they were conveniently close to the shops, within easy walking distance. Members of the Planning and Highways Area Board had previously agreed that this was important for the viability of the shopping centre.

The review consultation identified a need to change the maximum stay allowed in some of the bays outlined in Table 1 from one hour to two hours to give more shoppers more time to comfortably visit a number of shops and businesses in one trip. Therefore, in the revised scheme, one hour maximum

stay parking bays in the locations outlined in Table 1 had been changed to two hour maximum stay bays.

The original terms and conditions allowed business permit holders to park in all two hour maximum stay bays. To avoid confusion, therefore, the revised scheme's terms and conditions made it clear that the locations outlined in Table 1 were not available for business parking, even though they were now two hour maximum stay bays.

A petition was received by the Council at its meeting held on 7th October, 2009 and reported to the City Centre, South and East Planning and Highways Area Board on 2nd November, 2009 from the lead petitioner representing a business on Glossop Road. The petition from 110 signatories considered that the roads which business permit holders were allowed to use in Broomhill were too far away from their business premises. The petitioners wished to be able to park as close as possible to their businesses for reasons of security and trade. They considered that the Council should be doing all it could to make it easier for businesses to conduct trade quickly and efficiently and considered that the higher price paid for the business permit should enable them to park at a reasonable distance from their businesses.

The Head of Transport and Highways reported that the petition had originated from the mistaken belief that the review of the Broomhill Permit Parking Scheme had newly denied business permit holders from parking on certain streets around Broomhill centre. He commented that, in fact, the ban on business permit holders parking in the bays outlined in Table 1 had not changed. It may be that the original ban had not been enforced sufficiently rigorously and hence business permit holders now viewed the revised terms and conditions as a worsening of the situation.

The parking bays which were the subject of the petition were close to shops and were intended to provide a relatively quick turnover of short stay spaces for shoppers and hence maintain healthy trading conditions.

The Head of Transport and Highways commented that he did not believe there was a need to limit businesses to one permit only, as petitioned for. Currently, the Council allowed up to two permits per business. More could be considered depending on the nature and size of the business. Any restriction would limit the operation of business in the area.

The lead petitioner, owner of a local business in the area, attended the meeting to make representations in support of the petition. She commented that the length of time allowed for parking did not serve the needs of local businesses and four hour maximum stay would be more appropriate. She further requested that loading and unloading be allowed on double yellow lines outside the shops. She also suggested that allowing parking for free outside the local Post Office for 15 minutes may help the situation.

In response, the Head of Transport and Highways reported that it was difficult to achieve a consensus amongst businesses in the area. There were some four hour maximum stay bays in the area. Loading and unloading on double yellow lines was allowed, outside of peak hours.

Members commented that it was difficult to achieve a consensus view amongst businesses in the area as some preferred the four hour maximum stay and some preferred two hours as they believed that this encouraged more shoppers. They supported the principle of the 15 minute free parking outside the Post Office and requested the Head of Transport and Highways to

investigate the possibility of introducing this.

RESOLVED: That (a) the petition and the concerns of local businesses be noted;

(b) business permit holders be not allowed to park in the two hour bays and car parks as listed in Table 1 of the report;

(c) the lead petitioner be advised accordingly; and

(d) the Head of Transport and Highways be requested to investigate the possibility of the introduction of 15 minute free parking outside the local Post Office.

10. REPORT ON A PETITION REQUESTING THE EARLY IMPLEMENTATION OF A PERMIT PARKING SCHEME ON HILLSBOROUGH ROAD AND HILLSBOROUGH PLACE

The Head of Transport and Highways submitted a report of the Executive Director, Place outlining his response to a petition requesting the early implementation of a permit parking scheme on Hillsborough Road and Hillsborough Place.

The report stated that Hillsborough Road and Hillsborough Place were covered by one hour limited waiting restrictions during the day. During the course of the consultation period for the proposed Hillsborough Permit Parking Scheme, residents of Hillsborough Road and Hillsborough Place had received parking tickets. A petition from residents of these streets had requested that the proposed permit parking scheme be introduced early to prevent more parking tickets being issued. It was recommended that, given sufficient support at detailed consultation stage, an experimental traffic regulation order be implemented to allow the introduction of the permit parking scheme approximately six months in advance of the full scheme, should it go ahead.

A member of the public attended the meeting to make representations, on behalf of local residents and businesses of Hillsborough Place, in support of the petition. She commented that the current restrictions were introduced in the 1970's when there was a Bank and Post Office on the road which was no longer the case. She commented that local residents had frequently been unable to park on their own road and requested that the permit parking scheme be introduced as a matter of urgency.

Members commented that they supported the proposals. These roads were a special case because of where they were situated and would not set a precedent or be prejudicial to other schemes in the wider Hillsborough Permit Parking Scheme consultation.

RESOLVED: That (a) following consideration of the consultation results from Hillsborough Road, Hillsborough Place and Taplin Road (between Middlewood Road and Hawthorn Road), the Head of Transport and Highways be requested to use his delegated authority to advertise the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order to introduce permit parking for residents, if there was over 50% of residents in favour of the proposal;

(b) the restrictions be monitored and any necessary changes be ultimately incorporated into the Traffic Regulation Order for the full scheme, should it go ahead; and

(c) if the full scheme does not go ahead, a permanent Traffic Regulation Order covering the streets in question be consulted on before the 18 month period of the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order was over.

11. REPORT ON A PETITION REGARDING THE COST OF PARKING PERMITS IN THE CITY CENTRE

The Head of Transport and Highways submitted a report of the Executive Director, Place outlining his response to a petition regarding the cost of parking permits in the City Centre.

In September 2009, parking permit charges in areas outside the City Centre were reduced in line with other local authorities. Resident permit charges in the City Centre remained unchanged. Permit charges in the City Centre were more expensive than outside in order to act as a deterrent to private car use and a policy tool to control congestion and air pollution. A petition from 41 signatories was received on 7th October, 2009 requesting a reduction in City Centre permit prices in line with the rest of the City. The report recommended that the petition was not supported on the basis of its potential to damage the effectiveness of this policy tool to manage private car use and to damage the City Centre's ability to trade.

RESOLVED: That (a) the request to reduce the general cost of City Centre Resident Parking Permits be refused;

(b) the charge for Resident Parking Permits for low emission vehicles in the Central Parking Zone be reduced to £50 per year for the Inner Zone and £25 per year for the outer zone; and

(c) the lead petitioner be advised accordingly.

12. REPORT ON THE OUTCOME OF THE CONSULTATION EXERCISE TO REVIEW THE EXPERIMENTAL ONE-WAY SCHEME ON MITCHELL ROAD

The Head of Transport and Highways submitted a report of the Executive Director, Place setting out the outcome of the consultation exercise carried out with residents into the six month experimental one-way scheme on Mitchell Road.

The report stated that the City Centre, South and East Planning and Highways Area Board gave authority in June 2008 for an experimental one-way plug to be provided at the junction of Abbey Lane/Mitchell Road on a six month trial basis.

At the end of the six month experimental trial period a consultation exercise was carried out with residents of Mitchell Road and the surrounding area and a number of options were put forward for consideration.

The overall majority of the respondents supported the experimental closure being made permanent. Although the majority of residents of Camping Lane had requested the layout returned to the original layout due to an increase in traffic.

The increase in traffic on Camping Lane appeared to be vehicles using the road to bypass the traffic signals on Abbey Lane/Chesterfield Road, now that Mitchell Road was no longer available to use.

Whilst there had been an increase in vehicles on Camping Lane, there had not been reported a particular problem with speeding traffic. Whilst this scheme had reduced the problem of through traffic on Mitchell Road, it had created less of a problem on Camping Lane. This would continue to be monitored and, if the problem worsened, the possibility of further measures would be investigated. As a result of the responses received, therefore, it was recommended that the experimental one-way measure was made permanent

and the local residents be informed.

RESOLVED: That (a) the experimental one-way scheme on Mitchell Road be made permanent;

(b) the residents be informed accordingly; and

(c) the traffic situation on Camping Lane continue to be monitored and further measures be considered if the problem of increased traffic levels worsened.