

MEETING OF THE CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

held 10 November 2011

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

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1	<u>Apology</u>	<u>Substitute</u>
	Councillor Helen Mirfin-Boukouris	None

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 13 October 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 (i) containing 44 signatures requesting objecting to the Upperthorpe Permit Parking Scheme and requested clarification on whether this petition had been withdrawn by the petitioner and (ii) containing 14 signatures concerning the poor state of repair of Head Lane, Bolserstone and that this was the subject of a report to the Committee at this meeting.

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.

6.2.1 The Head of Transport and Highways reported that the Chair of the Northern Community Assembly had requested that the Highways

Committee note that reports in relation to item 1 (Requesting the retention of the heave on Nether Ley Avenue between nos. 33 to 35 and 36 to 38 in the interests of road safety) and item 9 (Requesting a pelican crossing on Wordsworth Avenue as a safe crossing for children going to Montenev Primary School) would be submitted to the public meeting of the Assembly in November and not in October as stated in the petitions list.

7. CULTURAL INDUSTRIES QUARTER PUBLIC REALM REGENERATION PROJECT

7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out proposals to improve the environment of parts of the Cultural Industries Quarter (CIQ) , and outlined comments received following public consultation on the proposals. The report also sought endorsement of the scheme and approval to progress to detailed design, tender and traffic regulation order processes.

7.2 Marie May and David Holland, representing Sheffield Hallam University, attended the meeting and reported that the University were proposing to provide 21 additional car parking spaces in the 4 small university car parks in the Arundel Street area. These would be free to the general public after 6.30 p.m. on weekdays and Saturdays and free all day Sundays.

7.3 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:-

- (a) welcomes the proactive manner in which the Sheffield Hallam University had worked with the City Council and confirms its support for continued collaborative working between the two organisations;
- (b) endorses the proposal, as detailed in Appendix B to the report, and requests the progression of the detailed design and traffic regulation order processes;
- (c) gives delegated authority to the Director of Housing, Enterprise and Regeneration to accept a tender for these works as long as the tender sum can be contained within the budget; and
- (d) requests that officers maintain the dialogue with local businesses to ensure that they were kept well informed, particularly in relation to parking.

7.4 Reasons For The Decision

7.4.1 A financial opportunity had arisen with Sheffield Hallam University's Capital Programme to carry out this work in conjunction with Sheffield City Council. The Council needed to approve the scheme in order for the work to progress.

7.4.2 Local businesses had been contacted directly and asked about their access needs. The majority of businesses had responded and personal contact

had already been made with some, to discuss and resolve their issues. Subsequent to the meeting of the Cabinet Highways Committee held on 13 October 2011, owners had met with the owner of The Rutland Arms to ensure that he fully understood the scheme and his specific needs were met.

7.5 Alternative Options Considered And Rejected

7.5.1 An option considered was whether to ban vehicles from the area. The area in question had a large number of residents and businesses which needed to carry out their operations. There were also several car parks, and on street parking bays which were there to cater for the parking needs of visitors to the City. Banning vehicles completely was not a viable option.

7.5.2 It was hoped to remove larger service vehicles from the area, but due to the adverse responses received from businesses and the Police, this element was dropped from the scheme.

8. REPORT ON THE 12 MONTH EXPERIMENTAL STREET LIGHT SWITCH OFF ON BASLOW ROAD BUS TERMINUS AND THE 40MPH SPEED LIMIT

8.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out the results of the consultation following the completion of the 12 month experimental street light switch off and 40mph speed limit on Baslow Road.

8.2 Councillor Colin Ross attended the meeting and commented that he supported the recommendations, as did local residents. In his view the 40mph speed limit was sensible. He further requested that the street lamps be removed as soon as possible.

8.2. **RESOLVED:** That the Committee requests:-

- (a) that the 40mph speed limit on Baslow Road be retained;
- (b) that the experimental street lighting switch off be made permanent; and
- (c) that the street lighting columns be removed as part of the PFI contract.

8.3. Reasons for the Decision

8.3.1 There had been a consultation exercise with interested parties and a near unanimous response was to make the experimental street lighting switch off permanent. No comments were received regarding the speed limit. The reportable accident statistics indicated that there had been no accidents at this location during the experimental period.

8.4 Alternative Options Considered and Rejected

8.4.1 There were no alternative options considered.

9. **REPORT ON A PETITION: HEADS LANE, BOLSERSTONE**

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to a 14 signature petition received on 3 October 2011 from residents of Heads Lane, Bolserstone requesting a long term solution to the poor road condition.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee approves the actions taken, as outlined in the report, which were in accordance with the Council's Street Maintenance Policy, Standards and Strategy document.

9.3 **Reasons for the Decision**

9.3.1 The recommendations were based on the Street Maintenance Policy, Standards and Strategy document approved by Cabinet in May 2008.

9.4 **Alternative Options Considered And Rejected**

9.4.1 No alternative proposals were considered as the proposals were in accordance with current City Council policy.

10. **OBJECTIONS TO EXTENSION OF A SINGLE YELLOW LINE ON GRANGE CRESCENT**

10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report responding to petitioners about their concerns relating to the extension of a single yellow line on Grange Crescent and the difficulties in parking. The report also responded to an additional request from the occupier of 44 Grange Crescent, referred to the Central Community Assembly, for the removal of the 'permit holders only' bay outside his driveway which prevented him from reversing in/out of his driveway.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:-

- (a) refuses the petitioners' request to remove the single yellow line;
- (b) requests that a Traffic Regulation Order be advertised to seek to convert the single yellow line to a double yellow line, depending on the availability of funding;
- (c) requests that officers discuss this proposal with the Central Community Assembly;
- (d) refuses the request to move a parking bay opposite the driveway to No. 44 Grange Crescent pending work to be carried out by the resident to the driveway and garage area;

- (e) requests that officers monitor the situation following the changes outlined above; and
- (f) requests that the lead petitioner and resident of No. 44 Grange Crescent be informed of the decision.

10.3 **Reasons for the Decision**

- 10.3.1 The single yellow line waiting restrictions on Grange Crescent were put in to ease an access problem. This had reduced available parking by 2 spaces. However, parking at this location could not occur without obstructing the footway or driveway of No. 44 Grange Crescent due to the narrow carriageway width and it should be proposed as a double yellow line, no waiting at any time. Observations suggested that there were generally other alternative parking spaces available in the area.
- 10.3.2 A request for the removal of the 'permit holders only' bay had also been received. Reversing a vehicle into the driveway of No. 44 Grange Crescent was difficult due to the parking bay opposite and options to resolve this matter needed to be considered.

10.4 **Alternative Options Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 No other alternatives were considered other than those detailed in the report.

11. **REMOVAL OF ILLEGALLY PARKED VEHICLES**

- 11.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report proposing the introduction proposing the introduction of the removal of some illegally parked vehicles on specific circumstances.
- 11.2 Members questioned how the policy would apply should vehicles have broken down. In response, the Head of Transport and Highways commented that discussions were being held in respect of this. Members requested that a policy be developed to resolve any discrepancies in relation to broken down vehicles.
- 11.3 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:-
 - (a) approves the removal of vehicles which were parked illegally and to which a Penalty Charge Notice had first been issued in the following sets of circumstances:-
 - (i) where a vehicle, if left in its current position, would impede the undertaking of highway works by the PFI Service Provider to which a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order applied;
 - (ii) where a vehicle was known to have five or more unpaid Penalty Charge Notices; and

(iii) where an illegally parked vehicle was causing or likely to cause significant congestion; and

- (b) requests the Executive Director, Place develops and agrees a policy in respect of the removal of parked vehicles which have broken down with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

11.4 Reasons For The Decision

11.4.1 The introduction of a vehicle removals service was recommended in the three sets of specific circumstances detailed in the report in order to:-

(i) minimise delays for the PFI Service Provider in carrying out necessary works for the highway;

(ii) to maintain traffic flow and reduce congestion on key routes in the City, particularly to avoid network blockages; and

(iii) to enable the Council to deal more successfully with vehicle owners who persistently attempt to evade payment of legitimately due penalty charges.

11.5 Alternative Options Considered And Rejected

11.5.1 Consideration was given to setting up an in-house removals service, but this would have been more expensive than procuring the service externally, as there will be savings in set up costs and also economies of scale from using a contractor who already had appropriate equipment and a storage pound.

Signed _____
(Chair)

Date _____