

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 10 April 2014

PRESENT: Councillor Leigh Bramall (Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs (Cabinet Adviser)
John Bann, Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services
Andrew Marwood, Highways Engineer
Ian Taylor, Project Manager, Highways
Paul Fell, Business Manager, Highways

.....

1. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

1.1 No items were identified where it was proposed to exclude the public and press.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

2.1 Councillor Leigh Bramall declared a personal interest in agenda item 5 'Penistone Road Pinch Point and Better Buses Scheme' (see minute 5 below) as his father owned a business on Herries Road South.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS SESSION

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

4.1 Public Question in respect of Parking Income

Mr Nigel Slack referred to item 9 on the agenda for the Session 'Parking Services Income'. He commented that the report indicated that the additional roll out of the system would cost £10,000 and the transaction fee a further £15,000. The report suggested that these costs will be covered by improved income from the 'Pay and Display' system by changes to the 'terms and conditions' concerning machines that were out of order and by improved take up of the 'RingGo' system itself.

Mr Slack further commented that appendices to the report gave great detail on the current parking charges in force in the City that were the source of the income in the 'parking account'. Mr Slack believed that what was missing, however, was any overall information on the income and expenditure of this account that would enable the Council or the public to consider the efficacy of the system or the changes proposed.

Mr Slack therefore asked will the Council provide information on the total income for this account, from the three identified income streams, the details of expenditure of this account and the resulting surplus generated and the details of the way this surplus was delivered?

In response, Councillor Leigh Bramall commented that a written response would

be provided to Mr Slack. He believed that further work was needed on the terms and conditions of the RingGo system and he would comment further on that under that item.

4.2 New Petitions

John Bann, Head of Transport, Traffic and Parking Services, reported that a petition, containing 5 signatures, had been received requesting a pedestrian crossing on Glossop Road. This would be added to the petitions list and a response provided at a future Session.

4.3 Outstanding Petitions List

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

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 Rupert Lyons, a representative of Transport Planning Associates who had been appointed by Tesco to assess the potential impact of the proposed Traffic Regulation Order to prohibit the left turn into Herries Road South, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He welcomed the recommendations, in particular the recommendation to defer a decision on a proposal to prohibit the left turn into Herries Road South pending further consideration.

5.3 In respect of the proposed no left turn, currently vehicles exiting the Tesco site were it occupied and travelling north could turn left on Herries Road South. If this left turn was banned vehicles would have to travel down the A61 and do a u turn on Livesey Street before travelling back North and this added an extra 1.29km onto journeys. This equated to an additional journey length for vehicles of 155km and 4 1/4 hours on any weekday. This would also impact on air quality. Mr Lyons concluded by stating that he welcomed the opportunity to work with officers to find an optimum solution to suit all.

5.4 John Bann commented that he welcomed Mr Lyons support for a deferral of the proposal for a no left turn. Officers were trying to create a balance between all users. The increase in delays was a valid point. He asked Mr Lyons if Tesco had considered other access to the store?

5.5 In response, Mr Lyons commented that currently there were 4 ways to access the store. The proposals would remove 2 vehicular crossovers and he had concerns about that. If the proposals were agreed there was potential on Penistone Road North for vehicles to slow down for cyclists and pedestrians which would have an

impact upstream. Creating a balance for all users was key.

- 5.6 Councillor Jillian Creasy also made representations to the Cabinet Member. She stated that her specific concern was the proposal to raise the speed limit from 30mph to 40mph between Infirmary Road and Capel Street. She believed that the report did not fully address the impact of the proposals on air quality. It would not save time as there were a number of junctions with heavy traffic which would not change as a result of the proposal.
- 5.7 She questioned why there was a need to raise the speed limit at this time in the context of the recent Scrutiny Cycling Inquiry and the recently launched Green Commission. There had been no evidence presented of a positive impact on air quality as a result of the proposals.
- 5.8 Andrew Richards, representing Cycle Sheffield, commented that he was disappointed with the summary of the objections in the report as this did not fully reflect the objections submitted. He congratulated the Council on their commitment to encourage people to cycle but was concerned that with schemes such as this there would be no proper legacy of cycling in the City.
- 5.9 There appeared to be a 'bolt on' approach to cycle infrastructure and audits. Measures to encourage cycling were often an afterthought to appease cyclists. Cycle audits were not being done properly as a matter of course. There was a need to provide good facilities to encourage people to cycle.
- 5.10 Despite the proposals presented in the report the best way to reduce congestion on Penistone Road was to provide the infrastructure for people to cycle. At Rutland Road there was nothing in the proposals for a pedestrian phase on the traffic lights at a junction already difficult for pedestrians and cyclists.
- 5.11 Mr Richards added that for many residents the design effectively barred them from using the healthy transport option and as a result many would drive and congestion would not be eased. The proposals would not reduce air pollution at a time when Sheffield was already on course to attract EU fines for breaching air quality regulations.
- 5.12 The new bus lane proposed had been identified as mitigation against the potential dangers in increasing the speed limit but as the bus lane only existed on one third of the proposed increase the mitigation would only be partial.
- 5.13 Matt Turner, also representing Cycle Sheffield, cited what he believed to be a lack of attention paid to non-motorised travel. He gave a multimedia presentation of the situation which currently existed on Penistone Road and the potential impact of the proposals. He expressed concerns at the planned removal of the pedestrian crossing used by some Hillsborough College students which would mean they would have to use the crossing on Bradfield Road which took approximately 4 minutes to get across as opposed to approximately 30 seconds with the crossing which was proposed to be removed.
- 5.14 The presentation highlighted how not many pedestrians waited for the green man

- at the crossing at Hillfoot Bridge and this had obvious dangers. The solution for this was for there to be a red light on the left turn when anyone was crossing.
- 5.15 Mr Turner concluded by stating that, as his presentation had shown, any scheme could prevent all the potential conflict between motorists and other users and such works did not need to come at the expense of cars and buses.
- 5.16 Councillor Janet Bragg, local Ward Member for Hillsborough, commented that it was Council policy to present alternatives to the motor car. The cycle route currently meant cyclists having to get on and off their bikes to avoid traffic on side roads. The signage for the cycle route was also currently not clear. If some motorists could be persuaded to use a bike instead this would ease congestion. To not make any improvements to the cycle route as part of this scheme would be a missed opportunity.
- 5.17 John Bann responded that he took on board all the points raised in relation to cycling and pedestrian facilities. The scheme was possible because of funding from the Government specifically targeted at easing congestion through easing the traffic flow and helping bus services.
- 5.18 Ian Taylor reported the findings of the air quality report carried out for the 2009/2010 Smart Route scheme. The report found that the Smart Route scheme, on which the Pinchpoint/Better Buses scheme was based, would lead to a slight improvement in air quality. The report was based on a 40mph speed limit throughout the scheme.
- 5.19 Officers had considered cyclists from the outset of the design of the scheme. The Council's Cycle Officer had worked with Andrew Marwood, Highways Engineer, to see what could be done for cyclists. The Council were still investing in other areas on cycling. 10% of the highways budget was spent on cycling.
- 5.20 Andrew Marwood reported that a speed limit assessment had been undertaken which had indicated that 40mph was appropriate for the whole length of the road concerned. However, officers believed this didn't take into account the different environments of areas along the road and did not believe that it was suitable for the area from Herries Road South to Hillsborough Barracks.
- 5.21 Andrew Marwood added that 10 buses an hour were expected along Penistone Road. When no buses were there cyclists would be able to use the bus lane keeping them away from traffic. He confirmed that pedestrian and cycle facilities had not been an afterthought when designing the scheme. Existing problems had been looked at and attempts made to resolve these. He accepted the point made about the lack of footway for pedestrians in certain areas and commented that officers were trying to address this, particularly around Bradfield Road. It was about striking a balance between carriageway and footway.
- 5.22 In response to a question from Councillor Leigh Bramall as to why the scheme proposed to remove the shorter crossing around Bradfield Road, Andrew Marwood commented that there was a proposal for a toucan crossing at Hillsborough Barracks and observation of pedestrian movements had highlighted

that this wasn't a well-used crossing.

5.23 Councillor Leigh Bramall commented that part of the problem in relation to the objections raised was around the way that the funding came through and what the Government required it to be used for. Improving bus times and viability was a crucial element to the scheme as, after the Parkway, this was the major traffic corridor into the City.

5.24 **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 and the raising of the speed limit to 40mph between Infirmary Road and Capel Street, 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.

5.25 **Reasons for Decision**

5.25.1 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.

5.25.2 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.

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

5.25.4 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.

5.25.5 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. However, the Cabinet Member requested that this element of the TRO be deferred to allow for further discussions on the proposed increase.

5.26 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 5.26.1 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.
- 5.26.2 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.
- 5.26.3 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.

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.

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.

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.

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 Councillor Jillian Creasy made representations to the Cabinet Member and asked why a report on the petition on permit charges had been delayed? She welcomed the report but stated that many people were questioning how much money was

raised in individual zones from permits and meters and where the money was spent. Many residents believed that more money was raised than was spent on the cost of maintaining the scheme.

9.3 Councillor Leigh Bramall commented that he had given a detailed response to the petition at Full Council when it was presented but the reason that a report had not yet been submitted was that more detailed information was required and this would be submitted in due course.

9.4 Councillor Bramall then commented that he supported the recommendations but that he wished to defer recommendation 7.5 to give further consideration to the terms and conditions of the RingGo scheme.

9.5 **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.

9.6 **Reasons for Decision**

9.6.1 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.

9.6.2 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.

9.7 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.7.1 Alternative options do not exist for utilisation of parking income, as the use of this income is specified by legislation.

- 9.7.2 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.
- 9.7.3 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.