

MEETING OF THE CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

held 9 June 2011

PRESENT: Councillors Leigh Bramall (Chair), Julie Dore, Bryan Lodge and Mick Rooney

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- | | | |
|-----|-----------------------------------|------------------------|
| 1.1 | <u>Apologies</u> | <u>Substitute</u> |
| | Councillor Harry Harpham | Councillor Julie Dore |
| | Councillor Helen Mirfin-Boukouris | Councillor Mick Rooney |

2. APPOINTMENT OF DEPUTY CHAIR

- 2.1 RESOLVED: That Councillor Bryan Lodge be appointed Deputy Chair of the Committee for the 2011/12 municipal year.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 3.1 Councillor Leigh Bramall declared a prejudicial interest in item 9 (Chaucer Asda Pedestrian Crossing) as he had liaised with the objectors in relation to the proposal. Councillor Bramall left the room during consideration of the report and took no part in the discussion or vote. Councillor Bryan Lodge took the Chair during consideration of the report.

4. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

- 4.1 The Committee received and noted the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 April 2011 and approved the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 18 May 2011.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

- 5.1 Councillor Robert Murphy submitted a question on behalf of local residents asking whether the new administration would be freezing the implementation of new weight restriction TRO's until the outcome of the review into HGV Routes across the City.
- 5.2 In response, Councillor Bramall commented that it was important to look at the situation City-wide and not look at an area in isolation. This was being undertaken at the present time and the outcome would be reported at a future date.

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

6.1 There were no items called in for Scrutiny or referred to the Cabinet Highways Committee.

7. **PETITIONS**

7.1 *New Petitions*

The Committee noted for information the receipt of petitions (a) containing 18 signatures requesting traffic calming measures outside the Eva Ratcliffe Care Home on Yew Lane along with representations received by Councillor Dunworth and that this would be referred to a future meeting of the Northern Community Assembly, (b) containing 1513 signatures requesting a pelican crossing on Wordsworth Avenue and that, following clarification with the petitioners of the exact location that they wish the crossing to be located, this be referred to a future meeting of the appropriate Community Assembly, (c) containing 412 signatures requesting the installation of a 20mph speed limit in Broomhall and Sharrow and that this would be referred to a future meeting of the Central Community Assembly, (d) containing 6 signatures requesting the removal of the extension of a single yellow line opposite 40-42A and 38 Grange Crescent and that this would be referred to a future meeting of this Highways Committee and (e) containing 9 signatures requesting a pelican crossing at the Psalter Lane/ Ecclesall Road junction and that this would be referred to future meetings of the South and South West Community Assemblies.

7.2 *Petition Requesting a Ban of HGV's on Abbey Lane*

Angela Greenwood, a local resident of Abbey Lane, attended the meeting to make representations in support of the e-petition, containing 33 signatures, requesting a ban on HGV's on Abbey Lane. She commented that action was needed urgently as the ban on HGV's on Bocking Lane would shortly be implemented and this would result in traffic problems and congestion on Abbey Lane as a result of HGV's using that road instead.

In response the Head of Transport and Highways reported that the ban on HGV's on Bocking Lane had been approved by the Cabinet Highways Committee following a recommendation from the South Community Assembly. They had also called for a City-wide review of HGV routes across the City in the light of concerns expressed by residents at the Assembly.

Members commented that it was difficult to understand the decision to ban HGV's on Bocking Lane in isolation as this would inevitably re-route HGV's onto Abbey Lane and other surrounding roads. What was needed was a City-wide review which, as stated earlier in the meeting, was being undertaken at the present time.

RESOLVED: That the petition be referred to the South Community Assembly and they be informed of the concerns of this Committee as to the decision taken.

7.3 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: CHAUCER ASDA PEDESTRIAN CROSSING**

7.1.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report informing Members of the need to re-consult the residents of Chaucer Road regarding the location of a proposed signal controlled pedestrian crossing, reporting the results of that consultation and recommending a location for the crossing.

7.1.2 Nicola Taylor, a resident of 33 Chaucer Road, attended the meeting to make representations to the Committee. She commented that should the pedestrian crossing be installed at the location proposed, outside her property, this would directly impact on her amenity in a negative way and affect her sleep patterns which were important as she worked shifts. She also believed that the communication from officers had been poor throughout the process.

7.1.3 **DECISION TAKEN**

RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

(a) approves the location of the crossing outside number 33 and instructs officers to make reasonable adjustments to the crossing location and design such that its impact is minimised;

(b) requests officers liaise with Asda, and their contractors, to ensure that the verge and footway are suitably amended to provide additional parking opportunities; and

(c) requests that officers inform the Chaucer Road residents of the Members' decision.

7.1.4 **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

7.1.4.1 The provision of a signal controlled pedestrian crossing is in compliance with the granted planning permission and will provide a safe crossing point for people travelling by foot to and from the District Centre.

7.1.4.2 The location recommended, outside number 33, impacted least on the street as a whole and mitigation measures can be taken to minimise the

effects on that resident.

7.1.5 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

7.1.5.1 The obvious and possibly the best option for most of the residents of Chaucer Road would be the removal of the crossing as a requirement of the planning permission. However, as previously stated, the Planning Committee had made a judgement that a crossing on Chaucer Road would meet the future needs of the area by providing a safe crossing point for people travelling to the Chaucer District Centre and the new retail store. The October consultation indicated strong support for the crossing. For this reason, this option has not been pursued

7.1.5.2 One resident had suggested locating the crossing at the roundabout with Deerlands Avenue. The highway changes here amended the roundabout to include a new pedestrian island. Consideration had already been given, at the planning stage, to this matter. This location had been discounted by Council officers and Asda's consulting engineers. Crossings on the exit from a roundabout always had safety issues, relying on drivers seeing a red light and being able to stop. It was normal practice to locate the exit crossing some distance from the exit. Limitations on land availability would mean that the crossing would be very close to the roundabout exit and so would not be safe. Additionally, there was concern that such a crossing would generate queues going back into the roundabout, resulting in congestion.

7.1.5.3 Consideration was given to locating the crossing between Chaucer Close and Halifax Road. This option was discounted for two reasons. Firstly, a crossing located on this section of Chaucer Road would be unattractive to anyone coming out of Chaucer Close. Secondly, a crossing here would suffer from the same concerns raised at the other locations, but would offer no particular advantage.

7.1.5.4 Finally, consideration was given to alternative measures to assist pedestrians cross Chaucer Road. A zebra crossing had essentially the same impact on parking as a controlled crossing. Indeed, the need for intervisibility between a driver and someone waiting at the crossing was paramount for safety and consideration could not be given to reducing the zig-zag marking or providing hard standing closer to the crossing. A central pedestrian island would provide less benefit and safety, but would still attract parking restrictions to ensure that traffic could safely pass the island. Additionally, there would be extensive statutory undertakers diversions needed to accommodate the necessary road widening.

7.1.5.5 On balance, it was considered that pursuing one of the two crossing locations presented the best benefit for pedestrians for journeys to and from the District Centre.

7.1.9 ANY INTEREST DECLARED OR DISPENSATION GRANTED

7.1.9.1 Councillor Leigh Bramall declared a prejudicial interest as he had been involved in discussions with interested parties in relation to the scheme. Councillor Bramall left the room prior to consideration of the report and took no part in the discussion or vote.

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

7.1.10.1 Not applicable

7.1.11 **RESPECTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

7.1.11.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

7.2 **AGENDA ITEM 10: OUTCOME OF PERMIT TO WORK ON THE HIGHWAY CONSULTATION**

7.2.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining the results of a public consultation on a draft of Sheffield's 'Permit to Work on the Highway' scheme and seeking approval to apply to the Secretary of State for Transport to operate a Permit to work on the Highway scheme in Sheffield.

7.2.2 **DECISION TAKEN**

| |
|--|
| RESOLVED: That the Committee approves that a submission to the Secretary of State for Transport be made to allow the "Yorkshire Common Permit Scheme" to be operated in Sheffield. |
|--|

7.2.3 **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

7.2.3.1 The Yorkshire Common Permit scheme will help to reduce disruption caused by road and street works. It will provide an important tool to officers managing the Highways PFI build programme and as more Local Authorities adopt the scheme efficiencies of scale will become available.

7.2.4 **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

7.2.4.1 Do nothing and continue with the existing system for managing roadwork's. This is a possibility but will not give that additional level of control of control that the introduction of a Permit scheme would. This would have a major, negative impact on the Highways PFI works and the movement of traffic in Sheffield.

7.2.4.2 Operate a "joint" Permit scheme that was administered by one Highway Authority on behalf of a number of Authorities, for example the four South Yorkshire Authorities. This is a possibility, and may be the direction that Sheffield wishes to take in the longer term.

7.2.5 **ANY INTEREST DECLARED OR DISPENSATION GRANTED**

7.2.5.1 None.

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

7.2.6.1 Not applicable

7.2.7 **RESPECTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION**

7.2.6.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place.

7.3 **AGENDA ITEM 11: BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE: ALL SAINTS SCHOOL – RESULTS OF PUBLIC AND TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATION**

7.3.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report informing Members of comments received following public consultation on proposed highway works on Norfolk Park Road and Granville Road relating to the redevelopment of All Saints/Seven Hills Schools. The report included a response to the comments received and recommended that an amended scheme be approved.

7.3.2 Frank Abel and Mr Hill, two local residents in the vicinity of the proposals, attended the meeting to make representations to the Committee. They commented that they believed the consultation had been inadequate and Mr Abel submitted counter proposals for the scheme which he asked the Committee to consider.

7.3.3 Simon Botterill, Traffic Management, reported that both the consultation and the counter proposals had been shared with local ward Members. The Members believed the consultation was adequate and requested that officers progress the initial proposals rather than the counter proposals submitted.

7.3.4 **DECISION TAKEN**

RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

(a) with the exception of the proposed one-way restriction on Norfolk Park Road, overrules the objections to the Traffic Regulation Orders as discussed in the report and in the appendices in the interests of road safety, and resolves that the Orders be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

(b) requests that, subject to officers finding an appropriate safe design on Norfolk Park Road, the One-Way Order be relaxed to allow pedal cycles to travel in a south-westerly direction and that objections to the Order be overruled and the revised Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

(c) requests that, if a safe design cannot be achieved, objections to the One-Way Order on Norfolk Park Road be overruled and the Order be

made as advertised;

(d) approves and constructs the scheme designs as shown in Appendix D;

(e) requests that officers review the impacts of making Norfolk Park Road one-way, particularly in respect of Granville Road, within one year of the new arrangements commencing; and

(f) requests that the respondents be informed of the decisions made.

7.3.5 REASONS FOR THE DECISION

7.3.5.1 The Transport Assessment submitted with the planning application was instrumental in defining the highway-related conditions on the planning consent. The measures developed to address the relevant planning conditions had been further consulted upon throughout the immediate area on several occasions, with significant changes made. The recommendation relating to progression of the measures followed an indication of support from a majority of respondents.

7.3.6 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

7.3.6.1 The Transport Assessments identified the mitigation measures which subsequently formed the basis of the relevant conditions to the planning consent granted for the All Saints/ Seven Hills School development.

7.3.6.2 As discussed within the report, the mitigation measures had been revised in response to comments received during the public consultations, in effect resulting in the development of several alternative options.

7.3.7 ANY INTEREST DECLARED OR DISPENSATION GRANTED

7.3.7.1 None.

7.3.8 REASON FOR EXEMPTION IF PUBLIC/PRESS EXCLUDED DURING CONSIDERATION

7.3.8.1 Not applicable.

7.3.9 RESPECTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

7.3.8.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

7.4 AGENDA ITEM 12: BUILDING SCHOOLS FOR THE FUTURE: STOCKSBRIDGE SCHOOL – RESULTS OF PUBLIC AND TRAFFIC ORDER CONSULTATION

7.4.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report informing Members of representations received following public consultation on proposed

highway works in the Stocksbridge area related to the refurbished Stocksbridge School, together with Council officer responses and recommendations about the proposals.

7.4.2 Members considered representations circulated at the meeting from residents of Pot House Lane and Shay House Lane.

7.4.3 **DECISION TAKEN**

RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

(a) approves the removal of the proposed one-way on Pot House Lane from the scheme as a result of public consultation;

(b) approves the amended scheme, as outlined in Appendix D to the report, for detailed design and construction following changes to meet the needs of residents;

(c) overrules the objections to the Traffic Regulation Orders as discussed within the report and in Appendix C of the report where appropriate in the interests of road safety, and the Orders be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

(d) requests that officers inform Members of the Northern Community Assembly of the concerns expressed by residents about the wider effects of traffic on neighbouring roads, which also have schools on them; and

(e) the respondents be informed of all the decisions made.

7.4.4 **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

7.4.4.1 The Transport Assessment submitted with the planning application was instrumental in defining the highway-related conditions on the planning consent. The measures developed to address the relevant planning conditions have been further consulted upon throughout the immediate area on several occasions, with significant changes made to address the concerns of local people, where possible. The recommendation relating to progression of the measures followed an indication of support from a majority of residents.

7.4.5 **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED**

7.4.5.1 The Transport Assessments identified the mitigation measures which subsequently formed the basis of the relevant conditions to the planning consent granted for the Stocksbridge School development.

7.4.5.2 The mitigation measures have been revised in response to comments received during the public consultations, in effect resulting in a revised scheme.

7.4.6 **ANY INTEREST DECLARED OR DISPENSATION GRANTED**

7.4.6.1 None

7.4.7 REASON FOR EXEMPTION IF PUBLIC/PRESS EXCLUDED DURING CONSIDERATION

7.4.7.1 Not applicable

7.4.8 RESPECTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

7.4.8.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

7.5 AGENDA ITEM 13: OBJECTIONS TO A PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER DETAILING A ONE WAY TRAFFIC ARRANGEMENT ON HAYFIELD CRESCENT

7.5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining objections received to the Traffic Regulation Order associated with the proposal for a one way arrangement for Hayfield Crescent and making recommendations on a way forward.

7.5.2 DECISION TAKEN

RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

(a) agrees that, in light of the consultation, the proposal not be progressed; and

(b) requests that those in support of the proposal be informed accordingly.

7.5.3 REASONS FOR THE DECISION

7.5.3.1 The idea for a one way arrangement was originally included in a petition, tendered by local residents, to the South East Community Assembly. The proposal has no significant Road Safety or Traffic Management implications. Further consultation on this proposal indicated that, out of the numbers of residents expressing an opinion, most do not approve of such an arrangement. Very few residents had expressed approval of the proposal. Taking everything into account (including the opinion of local Ward Councillors and the Community Assembly) it was recommended that the proposal be abandoned.

7.5.4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

7.5.4.1 The eastern leg of Hayfield Crescent was considered as an entry point. This option was not pursued for the reasons given in the summary of the public consultation outlined in Appendix B to the report.

7.5.4.2 The residents' other requests, in relation to school parking issues (including a request for a residents' parking scheme), were covered in the report considered by the South East Community Assembly on 23 September 2010 and were not considered appropriate to progress.

7.5.5 ANY INTEREST DECLARED OR DISPENSATION GRANTED

7.5.5.1 None

7.5.6 REASON FOR EXEMPTION IF PUBLIC/PRESS EXCLUDED DURING CONSIDERATION

7.5.6.1 Not applicable

7.5.7 RESPECTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

7.5.8 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

7.6 AGENDA ITEM 14: WICKER PROGRESS REPORT

7.6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report informing Members of the current situation in the Wicker area following the report to the Cabinet Highways Committee on 17 June 2010.

7.6.2 DECISION TAKEN

| |
|---|
| RESOLVED: That a site visit be undertaken to assess the current situation at the site and a further report be submitted to the July meeting of the Committee. |
|---|

7.6.3 REASONS FOR THE DECISION

7.6.3.2 To allow new Cabinet Highways Committee Members to examine the bus gate and road network at first hand and talk to local businesses.

7.6.4 ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED AND REJECTED

7.6.4.1 No new alternatives had been considered for this report back. However, a number of alternatives were considered in the earlier reports.

7.6.5 ANY INTEREST DECLARED OR DISPENSATION GRANTED

7.6.5.1 None

7.6.6 REASON FOR EXEMPTION IF PUBLIC/PRESS EXCLUDED DURING CONSIDERATION

7.6.6.1 Not applicable

7.7 RESPECTIVE DIRECTOR RESPONSIBLE FOR IMPLEMENTATION

7.7,1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place