

MEETING OF THE CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

held 8 September 2011

PRESENT: Councillors Leigh Bramall (Chair), Harry Harpham, Bryan Lodge
and Mary Lea.

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- | | | |
|-----|---|--|
| 1.1 | <u>Apology</u>
Councillor Helen Mirfin-Boukouris | <u>Substitute</u>
Councillor Mary Lea |
|-----|---|--|

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING

- 3.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 14 July 2011 were approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

- 4.1 There were no public questions or petitions.

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

- 5.1 There were no items called in for Scrutiny or referred to this Committee.

6. PETITIONS

New Petitions

- 6.1 The Committee noted for information the receipt of petitions (a) containing 63 signatures objecting to proposed double yellow lines on Loxley Road and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of this Highways Committee, (b) containing 50 signatures requesting traffic calming on Tadcaster Road and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of the South Community Assembly and (c) containing 105 signatures requesting that the Council reduce the speed limit on Clough Grove, Oughtibridge and that a report would be submitted to a future meeting of the Northern Community Assembly.

Outstanding Petitions List

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

- 6.3 It was reported that the petitions submitted to the last meeting of the Committee in July opposing the Ecclesall Road Smart Route proposals and objecting to heavy goods vehicles using the lanes in the Mayfield Valley and requesting an all-vehicle speed limit there had not been included on the list and would be included on the list to be submitted to the next meeting of the Committee.

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISIONS RECORD

7. 20MPH SPEED LIMITS: REPORT ON THE CONSULTATIONS WITH COMMUNITY ASSEMBLIES AND CONSIDERATION OF THE WAY FORWARD

- 7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report on the progress that had been made with 20mph speed limit areas in Sheffield so far, including an update on consultations with the Community Assemblies. The report also considered the future delivery of this initiative.
- 7.2 Members heard representations from three members of the public broadly in support of the proposals and requested that the policy commence across all residential areas and not just areas surrounding schools.

7.3 Decision Taken

7.3.1 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) approves a strategy to be developed for City-wide 20mph speed limits, starting with areas surrounding schools and following with other suitable residential areas;
- (b) requests that the strategy development involves meaningful discussions with local communities and interest groups; and
- (c) requests that the feasibility of delivering City-wide 20mph speed limits in coordination with the 'Streets Ahead' Highways Maintenance Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract be investigated.

7.4 Reasons For The Decision

- 7.4.1 Average reductions in driver speeds have the potential for delivering significant benefits across the road safety, transportation, environmental and health agendas.
- 7.4.2 The potential benefits of 20mph speed limits in residential areas include a reduction in road traffic collisions and casualties. There were also quality of life and community benefits, and encouragement of healthier and more sustainable transport modes such as walking and cycling.

7.4.3 The forthcoming 'Streets Ahead' Highways Maintenance Private Finance Initiative (PFI) contract may provide an opportunity for 20mph speed limits to be delivered across the City in a cost effective way.

7.5 **Alternative Options Considered And Rejected**

7.5.1 To continue with the current policy of 20mph speed limits being introduced in partnership with the Community Assemblies funded from their own Highway budgets. However, this funding was limited and there was not a consistent approach across the City. The views of the Community Assemblies will be important in developing the 20mph strategy and ultimately in gaining community support delivering the strategy.

7.5.2 That speed limits across the City remain the same. However, this would lead to the same level of road accidents and vehicle speeds.

7.9 **Any Interest Declared Or Dispensation Granted**

7.9.1 None.

7.10 **Reason For Exemption If Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

7.10.1 Not applicable.

7.11 **Respective Director Responsible For Implementation**

7.11.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

8. **PROPOSED JUNCTION CHANGES AT ST. GEORGE'S TERRACE/BROOK HILL**

8.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report providing information on how the 'exit' route of Regent Street had coped with the anticipated additional traffic since the Glossop Road bus and tram gate had been enforced to determine whether a signal controlled crossing of St. Georges Terrace should be progressed to make the junction fully signalised.

8.2 Members heard representations from a resident of St. George's Court. He commented that the majority of residents were in favour of the proposals and welcomed the report.

8.3 **Decision Taken**

8.3.1 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:

- (a) approves the design and construction of the previously approved (and consulted upon) signal controlled crossing as originally intended at the Broad Lane end of St. George's Terrace as illustrated in Appendix C to the report; and

(b) requests that local Councillors and the Central Community Assembly be informed of this decision.

8.3.2 **Reasons for the Decision**

8.3.2.1 In purely traffic terms, the signals were not necessary on St. Georges Terrace and may cause extra delays at quiet times. The signals will have queue detection equipment on their approach, so that if queues form, the signals on Broad Lane will turn red, stopping traffic on Broad Lane and creating a gap for traffic to exit St. Georges Terrace. This will minimise longer delays.

8.3.2.2 However, the two traffic lanes on St. Georges Terrace had proved difficult to cross for pedestrians, especially elderly local residents wishing to catch a bus from the relocated stop on Broad Lane.

8.3.2.3 A lot of the required work for the signal junction/crossing had already been done at the site (the detail of the existing site was included in Photograph 1 in Appendix B to the report), therefore it was recommended to implement a signal controlled crossing across St. Georges Terrace and link it to the existing crossing of Broad Lane to provide full signalisation of this junction.

8.4 **Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

8.4.1 Officers had considered a variety of options including:

- doing nothing
- considering different types of crossings over St. George's Terrace moving the bus stop down Broad Lane.

8.4.2 Doing nothing was an option, but would lead to a continuation of the access issues to a bus stop, particularly for the elderly residents of St. Georges Court.

8.4.3 Different types of crossings over St. Georges Terrace had been considered:-

- Reducing the width of St. Georges Terrace to one lane to make the uncontrolled crossing distance shorter. This was an option, but it would cause some additional traffic queues on St. Georges Terrace and would be expensive as it involved changing the existing kerblines and using high quality materials. In addition, reducing the road width now could create capacity issues in the future as a result of other changes to the highway network proposed through the new retail quarter development.
- Zebra crossing in the location of the currently uncommissioned crossing. The current crossing point was too close to Broad Lane to turn it into a zebra crossing – the detail of the existing site was included in Photograph One in Appendix B included with the report. There should ideally be at least two car lengths after a zebra crossing before the 'Give Way' line in which to allow vehicles to wait without sitting on the crossing.

- Separate signal controlled crossing (not co-ordinated with the wider junction signals) in the location of the currently uncommissioned crossing. The current crossing point was too close to Broad Lane to turn it into a separate signal controlled crossing. There should ideally be at least two car lengths after the crossing before the 'Give Way' line in which to allow vehicles to wait without sitting on the crossing. The current layout would not allow this.
- Allowing for the fact that the existing location did not appear to be practical, then all the existing equipment would have to be removed and a new crossing facility constructed further down St. Georges Terrace. This would create the possibility that the new crossing point would be some distance from where people want it to be so it would just not get used. The costs of removing equipment, re-designing and providing facilities in an alternative location will be high.

8.4.4 Moving the bus stop was an option, but not without consequences. In order to improve access to the outbound (uphill) bus stop, it would need to be moved to a new location between St. Georges Terrace and Mappin Street. Although a new location for the bus stop has been found:

- The location would restrict the west bound (uphill) traffic lane on Broad Lane, particularly at peak times. Although there would be scope for smaller vehicles to overtake a stationary bus, road widths would be 'tight' and may create the possibility of a head on collision with vehicles travelling in opposite directions.
- Visibility of the nearside traffic signals at St. Georges Terrace could be masked by a stationary bus at the stop. However, there were secondary sets of signals on the central islands which would remain visible.
- The costs of removing equipment, re-designing and providing bus stop facilities in an alternative location will be reasonably high.
- This solution did not improve the wider issue of a lack of pedestrian crossing facilities across St. Georges Terrace.

8.5 **Any Interest Declared Or Dispensation Granted**

8.5.1 None.

8.6 **Reason For Exemption If Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

8.6.1 Not applicable.

8.7 **Respective Director Responsible For Implementation**

8.7.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place.

9. OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER ON DAWLANDS CLOSE

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report providing a response to a petition objecting to a Traffic Regulation Order on Dawlands Close.

9.2 Decision Taken

RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) thanks the petitioners for bringing their concerns to the attention of the Council;
- (b) upholds the objections and the waiting restrictions on Dawlands Close not be implemented;
- (c) requests that a Traffic Regulation Order providing a single yellow line waiting restriction and a School Keep Clear zig-zag marking on Dawlands Drive (as shown in Appendix C to the report) be passed to the East Community Assembly for their consideration as a 2011/12 small scheme and, subject to the approval of the Assembly, for the Order to be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; and
- (d) requests that the petition organiser be advised of the decision of the Committee.

9.3 Reasons for the Decision

9.3.1 It was considered that Pennine Housing proposals in this area will address the congestion issues on Dawlands Close without the need for waiting restrictions. The residents' request was therefore considered reasonable by Officers.

9.4 Alternative Options Considered And Rejected

9.4.1 Retaining the waiting restrictions as originally advertised would not provide any benefit given that off-street parking facilities were proposed by Pennine Housing, which will considerably lessen the congestion issues on Dawlands Close. Retaining the existing situation would not address the congestion issues on Dawlands Drive and would not provide any road safety benefits for children walking to and from Sheffield Park Academy.

9.5 Any Interest Declared Or Dispensation Granted

9.5.1 None.

9.6 Reason For Exemption If Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

9.6.1 Not applicable.

9.7 **Respective Director Responsible For Implementation**

9.7.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place.

10. **CONNECT 2 HALFWAY – KILLAMARSH PHASE 1 DETAIL DESIGN**

10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting the detailed design proposals for the Connect2 Halfway – Killamarsh Phase 1 project situated in Holbrook, Sheffield and Killamarsh, North East Derybshire.

10.2 **Decision Taken**

10.2.1	RESOLVED: That the Committee approves the detailed design of the Connect2 Halfway – Killamarsh Phase1 project in accordance with the drawings supplied to the Committee and that the scheme progresses to construction.
--------	---

10.3 **Reasons For The Decision**

10.3.1 To allow the Phase 1 project to proceed to construction in accordance with the programme that the Council had issued to Jacksons Civil Engineering Limited. Should the Council delay the decision to proceed to construction, there were likely to be financial and timing repercussions on the Phase 1 project.

10.4 **Alternative Options Considered And Rejected**

10.4.1 Alternative arrangements for the multi-user path were examined, including within the bounds of the existing highway, but were rejected on the basis of land or space constraints, or being too remote – and hence not suitably overlooked – from the existing road route.

10.4.2 The vertical and horizontal alignment of the path had been determined to achieve the most manageable and consistent path gradients and best cope with the topography and requirements of landowners and Network Rail.

10.5 **Any Interest Declared Or Dispensation Granted**

10.5.1 None.

10.6 **Reason For Exemption If Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

10.6.1 Not applicable.

10.7 **Respective Director Responsible For Implementation**

10.7.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place.

11. **ADVISORY PARKING RESTRICTIONS: POLICY AND PROCESS REVIEW**

11.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report seeking Member endorsement of revisions to the policy and procedure governing the provision of advisory parking restrictions.

11.2 **Decision Taken**

RESOLVED: That the Committee approves the proposed eligibility criteria, charges and appeals procedure for the provision of advisory parking restrictions outlined in the report.

11.3 **Reasons For The Decision**

11.3.1 To clarify the eligibility criteria for advisory parking restrictions and reduce the financial burden on the Council for operating this important service.

11.4 **Alternative Options Considered And Rejected**

11.4.1 The Access Liaison Group considered that all Blue Badge Holders should qualify for a disabled person's parking bay. This would approximately double the number of bays installed each year. This approach has been rejected as on some roads, bays could come to dominate even though many badge holders do not themselves have need for a vehicle. For instance blind people who have no mobility problems would qualify. Many people have off-street parking or do not have a car at the address; providing a bay for the occasional use of visiting family and care workers would be left vacant for much of the time. There was a strong likelihood that this would result in abuse of the bay system in areas where parking was at premium.

11.4.2 Alternatively, the service could be stopped. Despite the provisions contained in the Equality Act, there was no duty for Councils to provide a service for disabled person's parking bays at residential properties. The service did not currently cover its costs and it is expected that it will continue to run at a loss even if the proposed £50 assessment fee was introduced. The time spent considering appeals was increasing, as is the number of bays being provided free of charge. Nevertheless, there remained a very real need for the disabled for the disabled person's parking bay service in particular and there was no doubt that those who received a bay found them invaluable. For this reason officers recommended that the service be maintained, with refined eligibility criteria and a small universal assessment fee.

11.5 **Any Interest Declared Or Dispensation Granted**

11.5.1 None.

11.6 **Reason For Exemption If Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

11.6.1 Not applicable.

11.7 **Respective Director Responsible For Implementation**

11.7.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

12. **OBJECTION TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER ASSOCIATED WITH VARIOUS SCHOOL KEEP CLEAR MARKINGS**

12.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report on objections received to proposed Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) associated with the School Keep Clear Lines outside Ballifield, Bankwood, Carfield, Greenhill, Handsworth Grange and Southey Green Schools.

12.2 **Decision Taken**

RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) approves the implementation of the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders related to Bankwood, Ballifield, Greenhill, Handsworth Grange and Southey Green schools as advertised;
- (b) approves the implementation of the Traffic Regulation Order for Argyle Close without provision of a single yellow line at the northern end of the close; and
- (c) requests that the objectors be informed accordingly.

12.3 **Reasons For The Decision**

12.3.1 The proposals related to Bankwood, Ballifield, Handsworth Grange and Southey Green schools should be implemented as advertised as these proposals had no significant effect for residential parking and no substantial objections were made.

12.3.2 A resident had commented about the advertised length of the school keep clear markings outside Greenhill School. However, recent provision of a Zebra Crossing, adjacent to the advertised school keep clear markings, meant that the length of parking restrictions, outside the school, had been maintained and, therefore the markings should be implemented as advertised.

12.3.3 Residents of Argyle Close (Carfield School) have expressed anticipated difficulties in respect of on street parking provision. Therefore, officers recommended omission of the single yellow line at the northern end of Argyle Close. Omission of this line did not jeopardize the objectives of the proposals.

12.4 **Alternative Options Considered And Rejected**

12.4.1 If implemented, the effects and merits of the Traffic Regulation Orders would be assessed. Ballifield School was the only location where there were direct implications for residents in terms of the availability of on street parking directly outside their homes. A few residents had commented in relation to proposals outside Carfield and Greenhill Schools and as a result officers were recommending amendments to the original proposals outside Carfield School.

12.5 **Any Interest Declared Or Dispensation Granted**

12.5.1 None.

12.6 **Reason For Exemption If Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

12.6.1 Not applicable.

12.7 **Respective Director Responsible For Implementation**

12.7.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place.

13. **OBJECTION TO A PROPOSED ROAD SAFETY SCHEME, CROOKES**

13.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report on an objection received to a road safety scheme on School Road, Crookes.

13.2 An additional representation received from an objector who owned a local business was circulated to Members and the Head of Transport and Highways responded to the comments raised by the objector.

13.3 **Decision Taken**

RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) overrules the objections to the zebra crossing scheme on School Road, Crookes in the interests of road safety, and the TROs be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) approves the construction of the scheme design as shown in Appendix B to the report; and
- (c) requests that the objector be informed of the decision of the Committee.

13.4 **Reasons for the Decision**

13.4.1 The scheme highlighted in the report had considerable local support, including from the majority of shopkeepers. Given the level of support and the road safety advantages of installing measures at this location it was considered that the benefits outweighed the disadvantages.

13.5 Alternative Options Considered And Rejected

13.5.1 It would be possible to remove the zebra crossing from the scheme. The build out would still improve visibility for pedestrians by allowing them to see past parked traffic and would lessen the width of road that people have to cross. Such a scheme could possibly remove the need to remove parking spaces, although as a consequence the intervisibility between drivers and pedestrians would be less. The disadvantage of this proposal was that the lack of a proper controlled crossing will mean that drivers are under no obligation to stop for pedestrians, which will make the road harder to cross than if a zebra were provided. In addition, given the number of requests for a controlled crossing that had previously been received at this location, any scheme implemented perceived to consist of "lesser" measures was likely to lead to some criticism from the school and people who cross here.

13.6 Any Interest Declared Or Dispensation Granted

13.6.1 None.

13.7 Reason For Exemption If Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

13.7.1 Not applicable.

13.8 Respective Director Responsible For Implementation

13.8.1 Simon Green, Executive Director, Place.

Signed _____
(Chair)

Date _____