

APPENDIX C

1. **Reference Q1 (proposed widening of Holme Lane at its junction with Ball Road):-**

“Not sure how this will be achieved, but is a good idea. Concerned that there will still be a lane from Malin Bridge to Hillsborough corner from Wood Lane area” (1 respondent); “The main restriction to traffic flow is the traffic signals affording priority to Supertram” (1 respondent); “Traffic through Hillsborough/Malin Bridge is a big problem and any proposals to aid traffic flow can only be an improvement” (2 respondents); “Proposed two lane arrangement on Holme Lane would help traffic flow” (1 respondent); “Proposal for 2 lanes will encourage more traffic, instead of encouraging people to walk, cycle and use public transport” (1 respondent); “Widening to 2 lanes may mean that traffic will travel more quickly to the detriment of pedestrians” (1 respondent); “People already park on the pavements - where will they park when the existing spaces are removed?” (1 respondent); “Where is the available extra space to widen the road?” (1 respondent); “Increasing Holme Lane to 2 lanes seems sensible” (1 respondent);

Officer response: The lane arrangement to Hillsborough corner will remain unaltered. Signal timings are set to minimise delays to Supertram to ensure service times are maintained whilst obtaining an appropriate throughput of general traffic. The timings are closely monitored to achieve an optimum balance. It is not anticipated that the proposed 2 lane arrangement will encourage additional traffic, rather the intention is to reduce congestion by maximising throughput of traffic at this location. It is considered that the proposed improvements to facilities in Malin Bridge will encourage an increase in walking and cycling. The new arrangement is not expected to increase traffic speeds, but will help to deal more effectively with the volume of traffic. The additional carriageway width required to accommodate 2 lanes will be addressed by narrowing the footway, which currently accommodates parking in front of property nos. 185 to 195 Holme Lane. It is acknowledged that loss of this facility will be a significant disbenefit to those residents. However, it is intended to minimise the loss of parking as much as possible and introduce waiting restrictions which will enable parking to take place on the carriageway during the least traffic-sensitive periods of the day, and certainly overnight. These issues will be addressed following detailed discussion and consultation with the residents affected.

2. **Reference Q2 (shared footway for pedestrians and cyclists):-** “Will be too dangerous, footways are for pedestrians, not cyclists” (9 respondents); “widening footways will reduce traffic speeds, thus causing more congestion” (3 respondents); “There are few cyclists, area is too hilly” (1 respondent).

Officer response: It is anticipated that the proposed widening of the footways will be adequate to accommodate the dual use by pedestrians and cyclists without introducing any significant element of conflict. Widening of the footways is promoted only where the width of carriageway is not reduced to an unacceptable extent. It is not anticipated that the widened footways will have an impact on the level of congestion. It is wholly appropriate to introduce facilities and measures wherever possible to encourage an increase in cycling, particularly in respect of the journey to school. Such provision is also fully supported by the School Travel Plan.

3. **Reference Q3 (Parking bays on Holme Lane):-** “Will restrict flow of traffic on Holme Lane, therefore no point in developing 2 lanes of traffic” (1 respondent); “Fully agree, but only if parking will be available during peak hours, otherwise there will be no improvement” (1 respondent).

Officer response: The restriction to traffic flow on Holme Lane referred to is assumed to be the short section of single lane in the vicinity of the proposed parking bays, opposite the junction with Rivelin Valley Road. It is not anticipated this will restrict traffic flow as the lane arrangement on the approach to this “narrowing” provides a dedicated left turn lane for vehicles turning into Rivelin Valley Road, with the ahead movement remaining in the off-side lane. Once through the narrowed section, two lanes are again formed with the nearside lane accommodating traffic turning left to Stannington Road and the other lane proceeding around the gyratory towards Loxley Road/Loxley New Road. The parking bays will ensure that parked vehicles do not impede these movements; The parking bays will be available at all times, with no peak hour restrictions, although it is proposed to introduce time-limited waiting to maximise parking turnover.

4. **Reference Q4 (Crossing Points):-** “Fully support the proposed crossing points” (8 respondents); “The proposed uncontrolled crossing points at the Holme Lane/Rivelin Valley Road junction would be better if signal-controlled” (8 respondents); “The controlled crossing on Rivelin Valley Road located between Holme Lane and Watersmeet Road is too far up Rivelin Valley Road/too close to the Watersmeet Road junction” (3 respondents); “Relocate the Rivelin Valley road crossing to the south of the Watersmeet Road junction” (2 respondents); “Signal-controlled crossings should be provided at the Stannington Road/Holme Lane Junction” (2 respondents); “The crossing facilities will lead to traffic tail-backs, increasing congestion” (5 respondents); “The proposed change of priority at Loxley Road/Loxley New Road (in association with the controlled crossing) will increase congestion” (6 respondents).

Officer Response: Support for the proposed crossings is acknowledged. It is also noted that controlled crossings would be welcomed at all locations. However, it has been necessary to strike a balance between provision of controlled crossings and the need to minimise interventions which would have an unacceptably negative effect on traffic flows leading to unmanageable congestion. The junction of Holme Lane/Rivelin Valley Road is one of these locations and regrettably, it is not considered appropriate to introduce controlled crossing points. The location of the crossing on Rivelin Valley Road is dictated by the pedestrian desire line and the need to provide a length of carriageway to accommodate vehicular queues without compromising traffic flows on Holme Lane to an unacceptable extent. The distance from the Watersmeet Road junction is completely acceptable in design terms and fully complies with National Department for Transport advice. Potential blocking of the junction by north-bound traffic on Rivelin Valley Road will be addressed by appropriate markings at the junction (ie. a yellow box or ‘keep clear’ markings). Relocation of this crossing to the south of the junction would not address the primary pedestrian desire line thus reducing the benefits provided by the facility. It is acknowledged that provision of controlled crossings at the Holme Lane/Stannington Road junction is desirable. However, as outlined above for the Holme Lane/Rivelin Valley Road junction, such facilities at this location would have an unacceptably negative impact on traffic flows. Provision of the controlled crossings will

undoubtedly result in queuing traffic, but careful management of the facilities in conjunction with queue detection equipment will ensure such tailbacks do not create an unacceptable level of congestion. The suggested change of priority at the Loxley Road/Loxley New Road junction has been reviewed and the crossing arrangement will now be revised to enable the existing priority arrangement to be retained.

5. **Reference Q5 (Proposed changes to parking restrictions will aid traffic flows):-** “Parking restrictions will displace parking to other locations to the disbenefit of residents” (4 respondents); “Any loss of parking raises serious concerns, especially for Traders” (5 respondents); “More parking restrictions are needed to help to keep the traffic flowing” (2 respondents).

Officer response: The level of parking restrictions has been kept to a minimum whilst ensuring that the proposed mitigation measures are not compromised to an unacceptable degree. It is not considered that the loss of parking will necessarily have an impact in areas where residential parking is at a premium, particularly as every opportunity has been taken to provide facilities to maximise a reasonable parking turnover (for example in the proposed parking bays). It is anticipated that the available short-stay parking to be created in the proposed bays will largely address the needs of customers to premises in the general vicinity. As can be seen from the two responses requesting more parking restrictions, it has been necessary to strike a balance between all the conflicting views and requirements. It is considered that the restrictions and parking provision proposed achieves the best possible arrangement.

6. **Reference Q6 (The proposed traffic calming will reduce traffic speed and improve safety on Taplin Road/Harrison Road):-** “Traffic calming is not required on these roads as speeds are already low due to parked vehicles and poor quality surface” (9 respondents); “The traffic calming is welcomed, the existing 20 mph zone should be extended for the extent of the proposed calming” (7 respondents).

Officer response: As can be seen, there is a relatively even split against and in support of the calming proposals. Similarly, many of the respondents (both for and against) are residents of the roads in question. Members will recall that traffic calming measures were implemented to enable the introduction of a 20 mph zone on Taplin Road (between its junctions with Middlewood road and Oakland road), Hillsborough Road and Hillsborough Place. These works were completed in Autumn 2009. Authorisation for the works was granted by the West and North Planning and Highways Area Board on 9th September 2008 following submission of a report outlining the outcome of the public consultation exercise undertaken for the scheme. Two further reports relating to Taplin Road were submitted to the Board on 9th December 2008 and 28th July 2009. The first of these dealt with a request to extend the proposed traffic calming on Taplin Road to its junction with Ball Road. It was resolved that the previously approved scheme be constructed as there were no recorded injury accidents at the Ball Road junction during the 5 year period commencing 1/7/2003 and the cost of additional calming measures could not be justified. The second report outlined objections to the intention to make a Traffic Regulation Order which had been advertised for a period of 3 weeks commencing on 16/1/2009. The Board resolved that the objections be over-ruled and the Order be made. The additional calming works now proposed on the remainder of Taplin Road and Harrison Road are likely to satisfy the requests from residents to extend the original scheme on Taplin Road. Given that a total of 14 respondents

commented they were in full support of all the proposals, it is considered the calming measures are appropriate, particularly as Taplin Road/Harrison Road is to be promoted as a safer pedestrian/cycle route running parallel with and as an alternative to Holme Lane. The suggestion to extend the 20 mph zone is considered to have merit and should be adopted.

7. **Reference Q7 (upgrading footpath between Watersmeet Road and Thoresby Road will encourage more cycling/walking):-** Each of the following comments were raised by one respondent:- “Excellent idea”; “Proposals will increase usage of Watersmeet Road resulting in anti-social behaviour”; “Proposals acceptable provided there is no loss of trees resulting in changes to the semi-rural nature of the area”; “Street lighting needs improving on the footpath as it is currently unwelcoming”; “Provision of any cycleways and widened footpaths will improve access and safety”; “Concerned about the steepness and dangers associated with railings”; “Concerned about the effect on parking on Watersmeet Road”; “Not sure about the viability, perhaps children should be discouraged from cycling in the Malin Bridge area”.

Officer response: The assessment and design of measures to improve the footpath will address the concerns of those residents raising safety concern, eg. the standard of lighting, condition of railings etc. There are no obvious reasons why higher usage may lead to anti-social behaviour – indeed the opposite could be argued. It is unlikely that any trees would be affected by the proposals and the parking situation on Watersmeet Road will not be significantly affected. The Council continually seeks to provide and improve facilities to encourage cycling and walking and the safety aspects of such facilities is given every consideration.

8. A number of respondents raised issues not specifically related to the questions on the response form. These are listed below:-
- Request for traffic calming on Loxley Road (1 respondent)
 - Request for traffic calming on Watersmeet Road (1 respondent)
 - Request for calming measures on Holme Lane to address the speed of traffic turning into Rivelin Valley Road and Stannington Road (3 respondents)
 - Request for calming measures on Ball Road (2 respondents)
 - Suggestion to make Ball Road a one-way street due to double parking (2 respondents)
 - Severe concerns expressed about provision of the suggested drop-off point on Loxley New Road (8 respondents)
 - Request to remove the existing bus-stop near no. 94 Loxley New Road (3 respondents)
 - “Relocation of bus stop on Rivelin Valley Road to South of the Watersmeet Road junction will compromise visibility for drivers emerging from the junction” (1 respondent)
 - Measures needed to address problems on Holme Lane when large vehicles deliver to Burgon & Ball (1 respondent).
 - Request for more measures on Holme Lane for pedestrians and cyclists, including crossings and widened footways (5 respondents)
 - “Funding should be spent on repairing roads in the area rather than the measures proposed” (6 respondents)
 - Concerns that the parking bays located between Stannington Road and Loxley New Road will cause further congestion (3 respondents)

- Request for the pedestrian hand rail on Dykes Lane be retained, due to steep gradient (1 respondent)
- Request for double-yellow lines or other appropriate measures be introduced at the Bankfield Road/Dykes Lane junction to improve safety for motorists emerging from Bankfield Road (4 respondents).

Officer response:

- The measures proposed were identified in the Transport Assessments submitted with the planning application for Forge Valley Community School and conditioned on the consent. The calming measures requested by respondents on various streets were not included in the TAs and accordingly do not fall within the current remit.
- The suggested one-way arrangement on Ball Road was again not identified in the TAs. Additionally, such an arrangement is likely to have a negative impact on accessibility to/from the primary highway network.
- The drop-off point on Loxley Road received strong opposition from respondents who commented on this particular proposal. It is considered that the minimal benefits to be gained are significantly out-weighed by the disadvantages and therefore this element should be omitted from the proposals.
- In view of the comments received, it is proposed to discuss removal of the bus-stop with SYPTE and Operators, although it should be noted that this is an existing stop and not a proposed measure.
- Location of bus-stops close to junctions is not uncommon. In this case, the service in question is relatively infrequent (hourly) and it is unlikely a bus would dwell at the stop for any significant time. Rivelin Valley Road is relatively wide beyond the junction and accordingly, it is not considered that visibility will be unacceptably compromised.
- Discussions have commenced with Burgon and Ball to identify an appropriate way forward to address the issue raised.
- The measures currently proposed on Holme Lane address the areas of work conditioned in the planning consent. Provision of additional controlled crossings on Holme Lane have not been specified and would have a negative impact on traffic movement on the gyratory. Similarly, widening the footways on Holme Lane would narrow the carriageway to an unacceptable degree resulting in a reduction to single lane traffic leading to a significant level of congestion.
- Repairs to the fabric of the existing infrastructure do not fall within the remit of the planning conditions.
- It has been identified that the proposed parking bays at this location can be accommodated together with two lanes of traffic. Accordingly, the arrangement is unlikely to result in any additional congestion.
- The hand rail on Dykes Lane will be retained.

- The concerns of the respondents are fully acknowledged and the request for waiting restrictions to help address the problem is not unreasonable. Accordingly, suitable lengths of double yellow lines will be included in the Traffic Regulation Order to be advertised.