

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

EXECUTIVE FUNCTIONS DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Thursday 10 April 2014 by the Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session.

Date notified to all members: Wednesday 30 April 2014

The end of the call-in period is 4:00 pm on Wednesday 7 May 2014

The decision can be implemented from Thursday 8 May 2014

Item No

5. PENISTONE ROAD PINCH POINT AND BETTER BUSES SCHEME

5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report presenting the objections received following the advertisement of five Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) in relation to the Penistone Road 'Pinchpoint' and Better Buses scheme and the officer response to the objections.

5.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) with the exception of the TRO to prohibit the left turn into Herries Road South, the objections be overruled to the TRO's related to the Penistone Road 'Pinchpoint' and 'Better Buses' scheme and the orders be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and the Orders be introduced;
- (b) a decision be deferred regarding the TRO to prohibit the left turn into Herries Road South, pending further investigation;
- (c) the decision to increase the speed limit to 40mph between Infirmary Road and Capel Street be approved in principle but further discussions be held as to its operation; and
- (c) those who made representations be informed accordingly.

5.3 Reasons for Decision

5.3.1 The TRO to prohibit the right turn out of Hillsborough Barracks would mean that more green signal time could be given to traffic turning in and out of the junction, thereby reducing queuing traffic on Penistone Road and more efficiently releasing the vehicles exiting the Barracks.

5.3.2 The TRO to prohibit the left turn into Herries Road South would allow a signalised toucan crossing to be implemented across this junction, to aid pedestrian and cycling movements, without adding another stage to the junction's traffic signals. However, there have been objections, to this particular proposal, that officers had

not had time to fully consider before needing to report back to the Cabinet Member.

5.3.3 The TRO to add further loading restrictions to part of Bradfield Road would maintain the free flow of traffic from Penistone Road.

5.3.4 The TRO for the designated outbound bus lane would increase the attractiveness of Penistone Road as a public transport corridor. It would also allow the bus lane to be camera enforced should the need arise.

5.3.5 The TRO to allow the speed limit change would satisfy the recommendation set out in the speed limit assessment of the City's 'A' roads, following the Department for Transport's national guidelines on setting speed limits. The increase in limit would allow speeds to be consistent and appropriate for the surrounding environment and would provide an opportunity to highlight the change in character of the road where the limit becomes 30mph.

5.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

5.4.1 Although the 'Pinchpoint' and 'Better Buses' schemes both look specifically to tackle issues relating to 'motorised' forms of transport on the Penistone Road corridor, officers have built on the preliminary Smartroute proposals to achieve much improved access for pedestrians and provide facilities both on street and off for cyclists. These provisions have been at the forefront of the design process.

5.4.2 An alternative to the scheme put forward would be to further increase provision for one particular user group, i.e providing an additional lane for general traffic/providing further bus lanes or more crossing points etc, however officers consider that this would affect the balance of the proposals and due to private land constraints would be at the expense of another user group.

5.4.3 Officers could have advertised the 40mph speed limit for a much longer section (Herries Road South to Shalesmoor) as recommended following the speed limit review of all 'A' class roads in the City in 2010. However, following a more recent review (breaking the route into two sections) and considering the proposals to be implemented as part of the 'Pinchpoint' scheme, officers consider a new limit of 40mph only to be appropriate between Infirmary Road and Capel Street.

5.5 **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

5.6 **Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration**

None

5.7 **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

5.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

6. CITY CENTRE TO MOSBOROUGH KEY BUS ROUTE - CITY ROAD BUS LANE

6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out proposals for a new outbound bus lane, to operate in the evening peak, on City Road as it approaches the junction with Park Grange Road (also known as the Spring Lane junction). The report summarised the results of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) advertisement in autumn 2013. It set out objections and other responses to the TRO and officer responses to them.

6.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

(a) the objections be overruled, the City Road Bus Lane Traffic Regulation Order be made and the scheme be implemented; and

(b) the objectors and respondents be informed accordingly.

6.3 Reasons for Decision

6.3.1 The scheme is part of the Mosborough Key Bus Route (the 120 bus route), one of the best-used high frequency public transport services in the City. The Key Route contributes to the City Council's objectives of improving socially-inclusive access to jobs; improving access to mainstream public transport for all; and improving public transport in order to increase its usage. It aimed to make bus journeys on this main route quicker and more reliable through infrastructure improvements and improving network management and enforceability at critical locations. This scheme should improve journey time and reliability without any detriment.

6.3.2 All objectors and respondents have been written to providing feedback on the issues they raised and also making them aware of the revision to the parking proposals. They have not formally withdrawn their objections; however, they were asked to advise if they wished to pursue them and none of the residents have done this, although one Ward Councillor has responded to say that he stands by his comments.

6.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

6.4.1 The initial option considered was a similar scheme but within the existing carriageway. The option did not get through the standard road safety audit process, as described in paragraph 4.5 of the report.

6.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

6.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

6.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

6.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

7. PETITION REQUESTING REVIEW OF PERMIT PARKING ON FALDING STREET, CHAPELTOWN

7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report on the findings of initial investigations into possible alterations to the existing permit parking scheme at Falding Street, Chapelton, following a petition received from local residents. The report set out the likely implications of making the suggested changes and gives the recommendations accordingly.

7.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the Falding Street permit parking scheme remain in place as existing for the time being; and
- (b) the lead petitioner be informed of the findings of the initial investigations.

7.3 Reasons for Decision

7.3.1 No funding is available to cover the costs of design, consultation, legal procedure, or of amending or removing signs and road markings associated with the request.

7.3.2 Currently, the Council's priority for the investigation of new or revised permit parking schemes is the area adjacent to the City Centre. Changes at Falding Street would not contribute to this priority.

7.3.3 Due to excessive residential parking demand, alterations to the hours of operation of the scheme are unlikely to bring about an improvement in the availability of kerbside parking space. Whilst removal of the scheme would alleviate residents of the need to buy exemption permits, it may result in deterioration in parking conditions on Falding Street, although parking surveys conducted elsewhere in the town suggest any influx of non-residents is unlikely to be significant.

7.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

7.4.1 The potential removal of the then temporary scheme was consulted upon with local residents in 2010. The majority view at that time was to make the scheme permanent.

7.4.2 Introducing rationing of permits has been considered, so as to improve the parking situation by addressing the identified excess residential demand. Of the 20 valid

issued permits, 3 are for the second vehicles. No permits have been issued to a household's third vehicle. Limiting permits to one per household would, at the present levels, reduce parking demand from 105% of capacity to 89% of capacity.

- 7.4.3 This approach would, at present demand, manage numbers of residents' vehicles that could be accommodated on street, although space would still be at a premium. Residents would still need to be careful to park in a space-efficient manner, without leaving excessive gaps, to ensure all resident's vehicles can be accommodated.
- 7.4.4 It is worth noting that 20 permits currently issued represents an increase of 33% from the peak permit holders' parking demand observed during on-street parking surveys conducted in October and November 2009. Whilst this apparent increase in residents' car ownership may not predict future trends, there may be merit in limiting the issue of permits to the available capacity (i.e. 19) to prevent over-subscription arising as a problem in the future. Once 19 permits are issued, further applicants for permits would be placed on a waiting list, with new permits issued on a first-come first-served basis only when existing permits are surrendered, withdrawn, or expired and not renewed.
- 7.4.5 Permit rationing has not, however, been recommended as it differs considerably from suggestions made by the petitioners. Such a proposal would also appear unlikely to be supported by those households who wish to park multiple vehicles on street. It also does not take into account the use of visitor permits.
- 7.4.6 Removal of the permit parking restriction has been considered as an option. Although this would be beneficial to residents in so far as they would no longer need to purchase exemption permits, it has not been recommended on the grounds that no funding has been allocated to cover the costs of removing the scheme, and that such changes would not contribute to the Council's priorities with respect to the investigation of permit parking schemes.
- 7.4.7 If there is external demand for parking in the vicinity, removal of the existing permit scheme may result in worsened conditions for parking on Falding Street as anyone would be able to park there. Further investigations would be required to assess how far this might be an issue.
- 7.4.8 Extending the hours of operation of the scheme has been considered. This would require a change to the traffic order, for which no funding is presently available. Given that the numbers of permits in issue exceeds the kerbside parking capacity, extending the operating hours of the scheme may not materially improve the parking situation on the street.
- 7.4.9 Reducing the cost of permits has been considered. In the interests of equality, the changes for permits are fixed throughout the City (outside of the City Centre). Reducing the standard permit charge would have a considerable financial implication; the financial viability of permit parking schemes is dependent on income received from the sale of permits, which presently cover approximately one third of the operational and enforcement cost of permit parking schemes throughout the City.

7.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

7.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

7.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

7.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee if Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

8. INVESTING IN SHEFFIELD'S LOCAL TRANSPORT SYSTEM: THE 2014/15 CAPITAL PROGRAMME

8.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report confirming the previously reported overall transport Capital Programme for the Council in 2014/15.

8.2 RESOLVED: That:-

- (a) the previously outlined draft 2014/15 Local Transport Plan programme be confirmed subsequent to the Council's overall budget setting process; and
- (b) officers be instructed to seek appropriate financial approval for each project through the Council's formal Capital approval process.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 Council officers have worked with South Yorkshire partners and the relevant Cabinet Lead Member to ensure that the proposed LTP Capital Programme for 2014/15 and the LSTF and "Better Buses" programmes meet the objectives of 'A Vision for Excellent Transport', 'Standing up for Sheffield' and the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

8.4.1 The alternative options for prioritising the allocations of transport funding were also discussed and endorsed in December 2013.

8.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

8.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

8.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

8.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing

9. PARKING SERVICES INCOME

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out how the Council uses income from parking in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. The report also set out the parking prices and tariffs which it is proposed will be applicable in the City during the 2014/15 financial year and sought approval to progress a range of improvements to parking delivery.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development:-

- (a) formally endorses the Council using income from parking in accordance with Section 55 (4) of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 on the type of scheme highlighted in paragraph 4.7 of the report
- (b) approves the continued use of the tariffs outlined in paragraph 4.3 of the report and Appendices A1 and A2 and endorses the proposal not to raise tariffs in 2014/15;
- (c) approves the continued use of the costs of residents and business permits, as set out in paragraph 4.5 of the report;
- (d) approves the rollout of the RingGo phone payment system Citywide and the ceasing of the transaction fee, as set out in paragraph 4.8 of the report; and
- (e) approves the further investigation of parking improvements, set out in paragraph 4.10 of the report.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

9.3.1 Although the Council are already following the legislation in terms of using parking income, recent high profile cases nationally underline the need to have the decisions and actions taken by the Council formally recorded as having political support.

9.3.2 It is proposed to develop an initiative for Smart Parking and to revise the RingGo payment system to improve convenience for motorists seeking to park in Sheffield. The Cabinet Member agreed with the principle behind the scheme but wished to defer the approval of the terms and conditions of the system pending further discussions.

9.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 9.4.1 Alternative options do not exist for utilisation of parking income, as the use of this income is specified by legislation.
- 9.4.2 The Council could maintain its current parking operation but this would not take advantage of developing technology to offer more customer focussed parking facilities in the City.
- 9.4.3 The Cabinet Member could have approved the change in terms and conditions in relation to pay and machine breakdown but requested that this be deferred until an evaluation of the outcome of the Citywide roll out of the RingGo payment system was provided.

9.5 Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted

None

9.6 Reason for Exemption if Public/Press Excluded During Consideration

None

9.7 Respective Director Responsible for Implementation

Simon Green, Executive Director, Place

9.8 Relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee If Decision Called In

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing