

**MEETING OF THE CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE**

**held 13 January, 2011**

PRESENT: Councillors Ian Auckland (Chair), Steve Ayriss, David Baker and Colin Ross.

.....

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Penny Baker and Shaffaq Mohammed. Councillors Steve Ayriss and Colin Ross attended the meeting as the duly appointed substitutes.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest.

**3. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**

The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 9 December 2010 were approved as a correct record.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

There were no public questions or petitions submitted to the Committee.

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

There were no items referred to the Committee from Scrutiny.

**6. PETITIONS**

New Petitions

The Committee noted the receipt of petitions (a) containing 49 signatures objecting to proposed parking restrictions on Clarence Road, Dykes Hall Road and other roads included in the area proposed and that this would be submitted to a future meeting of this Highways Committee; and (b) containing 5 signatures asking for a smaller tree to replace the overgrown one outside 7 Thorpe House Avenue and that this would be submitted to a future meeting of the South Community Assembly.

Outstanding Petitions List

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

**7. EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISION RECORDS**

The following decision(s) were taken by the Cabinet

**7.1 AGENDA ITEM 9: SHIREGREEN: STREETSCENE PHASE 3C**

**7.1.1 DECISION TAKEN**

RESOLVED: That the Committee approves Quadrant 3c proposals of the Improvement Project.

**7.1.2 REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

7.1.2.1 To continue the roll out of the improvements in roads, footpaths and public areas across the Shiregreen Estate.

**7.1.3 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

7.1.3.1 Not to proceed with the scheme.

**7.1.4 ANY INTEREST DECLARED OR DISPENSATION GRANTED**

None.

**7.1.5 REASON FOR EXEMPTION IF PUBLIC/PRESS EXCLUDED DURING CONSIDERATION**

Not applicable.

**7.1.6 RESPECTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

**7.2 AGENDA ITEM 10: STATION FOOTBRIDGE RIGHT OF WAY UPDATE**

**7.2.1 DECISION TAKEN**

RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

(a) approves that the introduction of a voluntary Walkway Agreement through Sheffield Station continues to be pursued in the short term following positive progress, whilst lobbying for this to be included in future franchise or operational agreements for Sheffield Station from April 2015 is pursued in the longer term;

(b) requests that the creation of a Public Right of Way is further progressed in parallel with this with a report to the City Centre, South and East Planning and Highways Committee starting the formal process; and;

(c) requests that the Council identifies sufficient budget to resource these plans;

**7.2.2 REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

- 7.2.2.1 The Council is determined to ensure that free public access is maintained and protected through the station for the benefit of local residents, communities and the economy of Sheffield.
- 7.2.2.2 If it is possible to come to an agreement with the Department for Transport, East Midlands Trains and Network Rail the introduction of a Walkway Agreement would formalise access for the public across Sheffield Station.
- 7.2.2.3 In the longer term continued lobbying of the Department for Transport has the potential to result in the inclusion of the agreement within franchise or operational agreements at the station from April 2015.
- 7.2.2.4 The introduction of a legal Public Right of Way through Sheffield Station could result in significant costs to the Council associated with legal processes, any associated works/costs and maintenance responsibilities. In addition, the outcome of a Creation Order if objected to would not be within the direct control of the Council. However, this may be the only way forward if a Walkway Agreement is not reached.
- 7.2.2.5 Further work was being progressed to refine and determine the likely costs associated with creating a Public Right of Way at Sheffield Station. This will feed into the report to the City Centre, South and East Planning and Highways Committee starting the formal process.

### 7.2.3 **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

- 7.2.3.1 If changes to the current franchise agreement covering the station were to be pursued this would be subject to renegotiation with the Department for Transport, through South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive and it would be expected to have cost implications. The Department for Transport had been contacted in regard to this option but no response had been received.
- 7.2.3.2 Extensive lobbying by residents, organisations, Councillors and MPs was carried out opposed to the previous proposed gating of the station. Lord Adonis, the then Secretary of State for Transport, on a visit to Sheffield in April 2010, announced that East Midlands Trains was to be released from its obligation to install barriers as part of its franchise agreement until an alternative bridge had been constructed.
- 7.2.3.3 On the basis that gating was introduced at the station the Department for Transport looked into alternative public access and, in January 2010, provided the Council and Passenger Transport Executive with a copy of a report looking into the feasibility of alternatives. The report considered several options including strengthening/refurbishing the existing southern footbridge and providing a new link. However, funding had not yet been secured. East Midlands Trains had also offered to investigate what would be involved in opening the station goods bridge as an alternative option.
- 7.2.3.4 All new build/refurbished bridge options were further from current desire

lines. In addition, in a motion taken to Full Council on 28 July 2010, it was moved that the Council believed that, as the existing bridge was built using taxpayers money rather than private investment, then local people should have a right to use the bridge without the need for more taxpayers money being used to construct a second bridge.

7.2.3.5 In parallel, additional access improvements linking Park Hill, an area of major redevelopment, Norfolk Park area to the City Centre would be expected to support the regeneration of the City.

**7.2.4 ANY INTEREST DECLARED OR DISPENSATION GRANTED**

7.2.4.1 None

**7.2.5 REASON FOR EXEMPTION IF PUBLIC/PRESS EXCLUDED DURING CONSIDERATION**

7.2.5.1 Not applicable.

**7.2.6 RESPECTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

7.2.6. Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

**7.3 AGENDA ITEM 11: SECTION 278 AGREEMENT A61 HALIFAX ROAD, ASDA, CHAUCER**

**7.3.1 DECISION TAKEN**

RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

(a) approves the series of measures shown on drawing numbers TM-BR242-TR01A, TM-BR242-TR02A and TM-BR242-TR03A (as set out in Appendixes C, D and E attached to the report) and construct the scheme;

(b) approves that the Traffic Regulation Order be made, as amended, and set out in drawing numbers TM-BR242-TR01A, TM-BR242-TR02A and TM-BR242-TR03A attached to the report, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; and

(c) requests that objectors to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (and lead petitioner from the Medical Centre) be informed accordingly.

**7.3.2 REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

7.3.2.1 This public consultation on the highway works required for the new ASDA Store at Chaucer has helped to develop the highways-related planning conditions attached to planning decision notice 09/03952/FUL (and has added to the statutory consultation undertaken within the planning process). The recommendations to progress the measures were based on the support from a majority of respondents. Additionally, revisions had been made to some of the proposals (where practicable) to address issues and concerns

raised by respondents.

7.3.2.2 In conjunction with some of the proposed measures shown in Appendixes C, D and E, the amended Traffic Regulation Order indicated on the respective drawings would be required to enable safe and efficient operation of the highway.

### 7.3.3 **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

7.3.3.1 The Transport Assessment undertaken by external Consultants had identified the mitigation measures which subsequently formed the basis of this public consultation. Modelling work was undertaken to ensure that development traffic can be comfortably managed on the local highway network.

7.3.3.2 Other alternative options considered included:-

- Replacing the two roundabouts with signalled controlled junctions. Operationally, this would have created queuing difficulties. There was also a desire to retain the mature trees and enhance the landscaping within the central islands.
- Consideration was given to having the customer car park entrance in different locations such as off Chaucer Road or Wordsworth Avenue. However, it was felt that taking access directly off the roundabout via a new fifth arm would create the least disruption for residents in terms of vehicle turning movements. A customer access opposite houses would have created a much greater amenity issue.
- As a consequence of feedback generated by the consultation, the pedestrian crossing on Chaucer Road was being repositioned closer to Chaucer Close. Verge hardening was now proposed along sections of Chaucer Road to accommodate parking. The amount of double yellow lines at the junction of Wilcox Road with Halifax Road had been reduced. Disabled badge holders were allowed to park on double yellow lines so long as they didn't compromise road safety. Some new vehicular crossings would also be constructed for properties on Chaucer Road, funded by Asda.

### 7.3.4 **ANY INTEREST DECLARED OR DISPENSATION GRANTED**

7.3.4.1 None.

### 7.3.5 **REASON FOR EXEMPTION IF PUBLIC/PRESS EXCLUDED DURING CONSIDERATION**

7.3.5.1 Not applicable.

### 7.3.6 **RESPECTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

7.3.6.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

**7.4 AGENDA ITEM 12: HILLSBOROUGH PERMIT PARKING SCHEME:  
OUTCOME OF THE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER CONSULTATION**

**7.4.1 DECISION TAKEN**

RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

(a) approves making the Order and permit parking zone and associated restrictions as shown on drawing number TM/BN549/01a set out in Appendix F (1A to 1F) attached to the report;

(b) requests that the completed detailed design of the scheme be completed and issued to Street Force for construction subject to the scheme receiving appropriate funding in the 2011/12 financial year;

(c) approves making the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order permanent on parts of Taplin Road, Hillsborough Road and Hillsborough Place;

(d) requests that the lead petitioner and residents of Clarence Road be informed that they will be excluded from the permit parking restrictions with the exception of waiting restrictions at junctions to assist road safety and 4 hour pay and display bays (with exemption for permit holders close to Dykes Hall Road) and that the street be monitored following the implementation of a permit scheme in the rest of Hillsborough; and

(e) the lead petitioner of the Hawksley Mews parking petition be informed of the recommendation outlined in paragraph 7.1 of the report which now included the Mews in the overall scheme.

**7.4.2 REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

7.4.2.1 Based on requests received over many years from residents and businesses of Hillsborough; survey work carried out by officers on parking demands; three comprehensive consultations; adjustments made where feasible at each stage; and the balance of representations made during the Traffic Regulation Order advert. It was recommended to implement a permit parking scheme in Hillsborough.

**7.4.3 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

7.4.3.1 Officers had considered the degree of support for the proposals and the content of each individual comment received. Where adjustments could have been made to the scheme they had been incorporated at various stages of the consultations and design process. Where a majority of respondents were not in favour of a scheme on a particular road then the boundary had been adjusted where feasible. In this round of consultation it was clear that the issues of Clarence Road could not be addressed. The street was near the boundary of the scheme and, therefore, changes were not likely to affect the overall proposals. The street would be monitored as

part of the review process. The alternative would have been to progress the scheme as planned, however this would have meant promoting a scheme which was not focused on customer requirements.

- 7.4.3.2 An alternative would have been to remove the streets from which the objections to the TRO were received; However, it was recommended that these streets were retained when reviewing the balance of support from those areas following previous consultations and the location of the streets in the zone. An isolated street in the middle of a controlled zone would suffer from displaced parking.
- 7.4.3.3 Based on the support received from residents and businesses of Taplin Road, Hillsborough Road and Hillsborough Place, it was recommended to make this order permanent with the rest of the scheme should funding be available during the 2011/2012 financial year. It allows residents to park closer to their properties during the day whilst parking spaces turn over quicker than before to assist local businesses. No objections had been received from this area. A permanent order provided a long term solution to the parking problems in this area.
- 7.4.3.4 Any scheme approved for implementation will require further amendments as parking patterns settled as a result of the new restrictions. It was proposed that the scheme would be reviewed once it had been fully operational for a period of six months, subject to available funding. This review would tend to involve minor changes to the scheme, and to address any issues outside the scheme boundary, if appropriate. A much further reaching scheme could have been promoted from the outset. However, it was considered that the scheme detailed in plan no. TM/BN549/01a incorporated streets in Hillsborough where a scheme was most needed (based on resident feedback and survey data) and satisfied the majority of residents and business owners.

**7.4.4 ANY INTEREST DECLARED OR DISPENSATION GRANTED**

7.4.4.1 None

**7.4.5 REASON FOR EXEMPTION IF PUBLIC/PRESS EXCLUDED DURING CONSIDERATION**

7.4.5.1 Not applicable

**7.4.6 RESPECTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

7.4.6.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

---

Councillor Ian Auckland  
Chair,  
Cabinet Highways Committee

13 January 2011