

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 17 November 2015

PRESENT: Councillor Terry Fox (Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport)

ALSO IN ATTENDANCE: Simon Botterill (Team Manager, Scheme Design)
James Burdett (Highways Engineer)
Ian Taylor (Transport Planner)
Gay Horsfield (Transport Planner)

.....

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 There were no declarations of interest.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS SESSION

3.1 The minutes of the previous Session held on 13 August 2015 were approved as a correct record.

4. SHEFFIELD 20MPH SPEED LIMIT STRATEGY: OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED SPEED LIMITS IN GLEADLESS VALLEY, STANNINGTON AND PARK ACADEMY AREAS

4.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the response from residents to the proposals to introduce a 20mph speed limit in Stannington, Gleadless Valley and the area around Sheffield Park Academy and outlining the Council's response.

4.2 Alan Barnett attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He commented that the 15 properties on Roscoe Bank and 17 properties on Long Lane which had not been included in the proposals for a 20mph limit should be included as the roads were similar to those included in the proposed scheme.

4.3 He further stated that there was no bus service on Rivelin Valley Road so people often had to walk to the bus stop on Liberty Hill. Schoolchildren also walked on those roads and it could be very busy with pedestrians at times.

4.4 There was an average of 7-8 cars a minute which used Liberty Hill, Long Lane and Roscoe Bank at peak times and because of parked vehicles it was often like one way roads at times. During recent Streets Ahead works on Bingley Lane, people used Roscoe Bank as a diversion and the number of vehicles using the road increased to around 10-15 cars a minute.

4.5 Mr Barnett had long standing concerns over the speed of vehicles on the roads

not included in the proposals for a 20mph limit. A speed survey had been undertaken but this was in the first week of July when local schoolchildren were on holiday and the traffic was a fraction of what it usually was.

4.6 More houses were being built in the area and Mr Barnett believed the problem would only get worse. He suggested that it would not be difficult to include Roscoe Bank in the current proposals and would actually be cheaper if it could be included in this scheme rather than further down the line. He concluded that Roscoe Bank should be included in the proposals for a 20mph limit as it was only 400m from the urban area and speeding was a major problem. If Tofts Lane could also be included this would save money on signage.

4.7 Matt Turner attended the Session to make representations on behalf of Cycle Sheffield. He stated that one of the outcomes from the recent Cycling Inquiry undertaken by the Council was the aim to introduce two way cycling on one way streets. In May 2015 Cycle Sheffield had examined all the 20mph areas in the City to identify areas which were one way and this evidence was available. He was disappointed therefore that the proposals did not include the option for cyclists of two way on one way streets.

4.8 In response Simon Botterill, Team Manager, Scheme Design, commented that he wasn't aware of the request for two way exemptions for cyclists on one way roads when developing the design briefs for the scheme. He didn't disagree with the principle but would always need to assess the safety implications on a case by case basis.

4.9 The Traffic Regulation Order had already been advertised so for the remainder of Roscoe Bank to be included there would have to be a new order. He was cautious of mixing up a country lane by including a 20mph scheme but would be agreeable should the Cabinet Member request this. If any complaints were received from the Police it was unlikely that Roscoe Bank would be able to be included but officers would have to see if the Police did lodge an objection.

4.10 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the Stannington, Gleadless Valley and Sheffield Park Academy area 20mph Speed Limit Orders be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) the objectors be informed accordingly;
- (c) the proposed 20mph speed limits be introduced;
- (d) an advisory part-time 20mph speed limit on parts of Stannington Road as shown in Appendix C of the report be introduced; and
- (e) a further 20 mph Speed Limit Order be promoted for the remainder of Roscoe Bank.

4.11 **Reasons for Decision**

- 4.11.1 Reducing the speed of traffic in residential areas will, in the long term, reduce the number and severity of accidents, reduce the fear of accidents, encourage sustainable modes of travel and contribute towards the creation of a more pleasant, cohesive environment.
- 4.11.2 Having considered the objections to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Stannington, and Gleadless Valley, the officer view is that the reasons set out in this report for making the Speed Limit Order outweigh the objections. The introduction of a 20mph speed limit in these areas would be in-keeping with the City's approved 20mph Speed Limit Strategy.

4.12 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 4.12.1 In the case of Stannington Road, consideration has been given to two alternative options to that recommended in this report. The first, to introduce a 20mph limit along the full length of Stannington Road as advertised, has been discussed in paragraph 4.8 of the report. The introduction of a mandatory part-time 20mph speed limit in the area around the entrance to Stannington infant school has also been explored and discounted due to the disproportionately high cost involved in providing the correct variable message signing required to render the limit legally enforceable.
- 4.12.2 The other objections relate to the principle of introducing sign-only 20mph speed limits into residential areas, and therefore the approved Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. As such, no alternative options have been considered. Speeds will be monitored and the addition of further measures will be considered if appropriate, as outlined in paragraph 4.14 of the report.

5. NORTH SHEFFIELD BETTER BUSES - RUTLAND ROAD/PITSMOOR ROAD

- 5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to the North Sheffield Better Buses Project at Rutland Road/Pitsmoor Road.
- 5.2 Richard Westaway, a local resident, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He accepted that there was no ideal solution to address the problems in the area and the proposals would go a long way to improving the situation.
- 5.3 Mr Westaway had observed a number of red light violations at the junction and there had been a number of crashes. The engineering aspect of the scheme would also not resolve problems of people turning at Minna Road into the junction. Traffic flow will be impaired and the situation would become more hazardous for pedestrians and the difficulties people experienced crossing on both sides of Rutland Road would only be increased. The proposed traffic island would help but people may get stranded on the island unable to cross. An on demand light facility could be the solution which would only come into effect when a pedestrian requested it.

- 5.4 Mr Westaway further commented that there was a problem with surface water caused by the position of the gully outside 287 Rutland Road. The gully outside Mr Westaway's house was also permanently blocked, as a result the surface water increased the risk of accidents at the junction.
- 5.5 Prior to the road resurfacing, Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) were frequently getting stuck in the road. Despite the resurfacing this still occasionally occurred making the backlog of traffic even worse.
- 5.6 The proposals brought the road closer to residents and as a result it was hoped that Mr Westaway's neighbour would be given a dropped kerb outside his property as he had requested.
- 5.7 An additional cycle advance area was needed on the approach to Minna Road. Mr Westaway then asked if there was any scope for consideration of making the area a 20mph limit given the proximity of the junctions and people turning on and off the road. Many road users also straddled the lanes because of the road markings, increasing the backlog, so Mr Westaway asked if a solid white demarcation line to define the lines could be introduced.
- 5.8 Mr Westaway concluded by asking for careful consideration of where street furniture was to be placed, as local residents will be reversing in and out of their properties, and whether there could be any mitigation measures introduced to address the issues of noise and pollution in the area.
- 5.9 Matt Turner made further representations to the Cabinet Member on behalf of Cycle Sheffield. He stated that the aim of the Council was to ensure 10% of journeys were made by bike within 10 years and the proposals in the report would put cyclists off from using the area. Advance stop lines were of little value.
- 5.10 Mr Turner did not wish to see highway capacity extension at the expense of pedestrians and the footway. Any pedestrians did not have access to a signal control, so there was a dangerous element. The scheme had also not been submitted to the Cycle Scheme Sub Committee despite assurances that all schemes would do so.
- 5.11 In response, Simon Botterill commented that, in respect of the red light abuse, cameras were only usually installed in areas where there were a high number of accidents and the evidence suggested that accidents in this area were mainly damage to vehicles rather than injury.
- 5.12 The drainage issues were in the process of being investigated. Officers would try and incorporate as many of the requests as they could into the scheme whilst bearing in mind the funding was coming from bus operators with the intention of easing congestion and improving journey times. He was surprised about the comments regarding skid resistance as the road resurfacing should have improved that but that could be tested.
- 5.13 James Burdett, Highways Engineer, reported that he had met with Mr Westaway to try and resolve some of his issues. The junction was very intensively used and

it was hoped that the extended right turn would help with that. Regarding Mr Westaways' request for a yellow box at the junction, officers would assess the scheme once it had been implemented to see if a yellow box was needed. It was hoped, given the cost implications, that it would not be needed.

5.14 The road needed to be reprofiled in full if the scheme was approved, so many of Mr Westaway's requests could be looked at at that stage. His neighbour would be getting the dropped kerb he had requested.

5.15 Simon Botterill added that he didn't believe Rutland Road was an appropriate road for a 20mph limit, although the policy on 20mph limits had been amended so as not to exclude B and C category roads. Consideration will, however, be given to including this part of Rutland Road within the 20 mph programme when this area is due for assessment.

5.16 Simon Botterill believed that the scheme was an acceptable one for pedestrians. Although he acknowledged that it did remove some of the footway, it did not take it all away and it did not reduce it lower than the normal level of provision. There was a balance to take in ensuring the scheme met the needs of the bus operators whilst not having an adverse impact on pedestrians.

5.17 The scheme had had a cycle audit and no adverse issues had been raised. It was the responsibility of the Cycle Auditor to take the scheme to the Cycle Sub Group and he would liaise with the Auditor to ensure this took place in the future.

5.18 **RESOLVED:** That:-

(a) the highway scheme on Rutland Road, between Cooks Wood Road and Pitsmoor Road, as shown in Appendix A, be approved and implemented, subject to any required re-confirmation of costs after detailed design (including any commuted sums); and

(b) the respondents be informed accordingly.

5.19 **Reasons for Decision**

5.19.1 The scheme described in the report will contribute to improving journey times and reliability for bus services along this route. At the same time it addresses the concerns of the one respondent.

5.19.2 The scheme is currently being designed in preliminary detail, with funding available to allow the scheme to progress to detailed design and construction in 2016/17.

5.20 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

5.20.1 The alternative to the scheme would be to do nothing, which would not address the issues that regularly occur at the location.

6. NORTH SHEFFIELD BETTER BUSES - SPITAL HILL

6.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report in relation to the North Sheffield Better Buses Project at Spital Hill.

6.2 Matt Turner made representations to the Cabinet Member on behalf of Cycle Sheffield. He commented that it was a very busy road with a complex junction and the proposals would discourage cyclists from using the road. It was unreasonable to expect people to share lanes with cyclists. Advanced stop lines reduced capacity for traffic and caused conflict. There was a need for a separate space for cycling as the road was too busy for people to realistically share the road.

6.3 Simon Botterill acknowledged that the proposals were not the ideal solution he would wish for cyclists. However, everything could not be started at the same time. Mr Turner's proposals, as highlighted in a video shown to the Session, would cause additional traffic congestion and therefore the scheme would not be implemented as it was funded by bus operators. He was confident that the proposals did not provide a worse situation for cyclists than was currently in operation, whilst having significant benefits for bus operators. It was a low cost change which could be added to or reversed in the future if necessary.

6.4 Councillor Terry Fox, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, commented that he welcomed the scheme. He was aware that bus operators were not taking the needs of cyclists into account and would raise this when meeting with the bus companies on 18 November. Issues of process such as the requirement to take schemes through the Cycling Sub Committee would be followed up.

6.5 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the highway schemes on Spital Hill, as shown in Appendices A and B of the report, be implemented, subject to any required re-confirmation of costs after detailed design (including any commuted sums); and
- (b) the respondents be informed accordingly.

6.6 Reasons for Decision

6.6.1 The schemes described in the report will contribute to improving journey times and reliability for bus services along this route.

6.6.2 The schemes are being designed in detail with funding available to allow the schemes to be built in 2015/16 and 2016/17.

6.7 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

6.7.1 The alternative would be to do nothing which would not address the issues that regularly occur at these locations. The designs are therefore the preferred options.

7. FURNISS AVENUE ZEBRA CROSSING: REPORT ON PROPOSED SCHEME

WITH LETTER OF REQUEST TO CHANGE CROSSING FROM A ZEBRA CROSSING TO A LIGHT CONTROLLED CROSSING

- 7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the proposals for a zebra crossing to be located on Furniss Avenue close to both Totley Brook Road and a footpath. The report also outlined comments received following public and statutory consultations and any responses given.
- 7.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-
- (a) the request for a signal controlled crossing, on Furniss Avenue, be noted but for the reasons stated in the report, approval be given to the installation of a Zebra crossing on the grounds this will be on the desire line and that the overall pedestrian vehicular flows do not warrant a signal controlled crossing at this location; and
 - (b) the relevant consultee be informed accordingly.
- 7.3 **Reasons for Decision**
- 7.3.1 To improve pedestrian facilities and safety at the site of a very busy route to school.
- 7.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**
- 7.4.1 At the time of assessment it was considered most appropriate to have a zebra crossing due to the relatively low traffic speed and the desire line. A light controlled crossing would need to be a minimum of 20m away from the junction with Totley Brook Road and would be difficult to site with the driveways to houses. Moving the crossing away from the desire line would mean it would be less likely to be used. The cost of a signalised crossing is much higher and would not provide materially improved benefits. Therefore it cannot be justified at this location.

This page is intentionally left blank