

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session

Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session held 9 June 2016

**PRESENT:** Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Chair) (Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport)

**OFFICERS IN ATTENDANCE:** Tom Finnegan-Smith (Head of Strategic Transport and Infrastructure) and Simon Nelson (Traffic Management Engineer)

.....

**1. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

1.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the press and public.

**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 17 November 2015 were approved as a correct record.

**4. OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMIT IN GREYSTONES AND WHIRLOW**

4.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the response from residents to the proposed introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Greystones and Whirlow, reporting the receipt of objections and setting out the Council's response.

4.2 Simon Geller, a local resident in Greystones, attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He commented that overall he welcomed the scheme. However, he had concerns that certain roads were to be omitted from the proposed 20mph speed limit, particularly Ringinglow Road (from Knowle Lane to Common Lane). This section of road fronts Bents Green School and he believed officers were being timid in not extending the scheme to this part of Ringinglow Road. The road did not distribute traffic and there was not a clear need for through traffic to use the road. He believed the officers should be a little more ambitious with the scheme and include Ringinglow Road.

4.3 In response, Tom Finnegan-Smith, Head of Strategic Transport and Infrastructure, commented that there was a difficult balance to strike. The scheme proposed sign only measures as there was no funding to introduce physical measures. It was felt that an advisory 20mph speed limit, operational at times when pupils were arriving at and leaving Bents Green School was more appropriate.

- 4.4 Simon Nelson, Traffic Management Engineer, added that advice from the Department for Transport was that roads on which existing speeds averaged more than 24mph were not normally suited to a 20mph speed limit unless that limit were accompanied by other measures to reduce speeds. The Council has decided to consider the inclusion of roads with higher average speeds but wherever they drew the line there would be opposition from some residents. The roads referred to by Mr Geller were not suitable for a 20mph limit.
- 4.5 Simon Geller believed the introduction of 20mph schemes was a long term project to change driver culture. Getting the community involved was key and he was not sure how successful the Council had been in this respect thus far. It was possible that the 20's Plenty Group could assist with that. He believed that drivers welcomed consistency and where there were part time changes from 30-20mph, drivers would get confused.
- 4.6 Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, commented that, in relation to comments about consultation, resources were no longer available to consult as widely as the Council would like. There was currently a project being undertaken on Play Streets to get as many people as possible out to enjoy their environment.
- 4.7 Don Lennox, a long term resident of Greystones, also attended the Session to make representations to the Cabinet Member. He had no objection to the proposals in principle and a number of his concerns had been addressed. His major concern was in respect of enforcement and compliance with the limits imposed. He therefore asked what action would be taken where the 20mph limits were ignored and what the ongoing programme was for driver education about the new limits?
- 4.8 Mr Lennox acknowledged the severe restraints the Council had in respect of resources. The report submitted to the Cabinet Member should have outlined the costs of introducing the scheme with physical measures and Mr Lennox believed driver education would take longer if the schemes were introduced in the way proposed.
- 4.9 The report should also have indicated the potential reduction in accident numbers associated with the introduction of 20mph schemes which was considerably greater with physical measures also introduced. Mr Lennox asked if, for the first three months of the scheme, enforcement could be undertaken by Police Officers?
- 4.10 Tom Finnegan-Smith stated that he noted some common concerns with the policy approach of sign only measures but it was important to get them to work. There was no further prospect of additional traffic calming measures at this time although issues would be looked at as and when they arose.
- 4.11 The position of the Police was that they wouldn't routinely enforce the 20mph limits when they were introduced. The arrangement the Council had with the Safety Camera Partnership was in relation to predetermined routes following an

accident. The majority of the roads included in the 20mph schemes were not related to specific accident problems. The Police were rolling out the Community Speedwatch scheme and this may be an opportunity to monitor speeds on specific roads.

4.12 Mr Lennox believed that the 20mph signs were too small. However, as Tom Finnegan-Smith highlighted, the Council had to work within the regulations of the Department for Transport. Mr Lennox also commented that the way the scheme was being introduced would have a much reduced impact than what the Council hoped.

4.13 Tom Finnegan-Smith stated that a consistent approach was needed across the City and one of the biggest successes would be if the majority of drivers were compliant to set the pace of traffic in the area. He had been contacted by Greg Fell, Director of Public Health, and they would be having discussions about wider engagement issues.

4.14 **RESOLVED:** That:-

(a) the Greystones and Whirlow 20mph Speed Limit Order be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, omitting Bents Road and Knowle Lane from that Order;

(b) the objectors be informed accordingly;

(c) a proposal be submitted to Cabinet to effect the necessary works to introduce the proposed 20mph speed limit in accordance with the Capital Gateway Process;

(d) the intention to introduce a 20mph speed limit on:

- Broad Elms Lane from Alms Hill Road to Whirlow Hall Farm and the adjoining Broad Elms Close and Whirlow Elms Chase; and
- Highcliffe Road and Hangingwater Road (between Greystones Road and Oakbrook Road), Armthorpe Road, Bramwith Road, Carr Bank Lane, Fulney Road, Frickley Road and Westwood Road

be advertised and the receipt of any objections be reported to the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport; and

(e) in the event that no objections to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit on the roads described in paragraph (d) above are received, a proposal be submitted to Cabinet to effect the necessary works to introduce the proposed 20mph speed limits in accordance with the Capital Gateway Process.

4.15 **Reasons for Decision**

4.15.1 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.

- 4.15.2 The introduction of a 20mph speed limit in this area would be in-keeping with the City's approved 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. Having considered the objections to the principle of introducing a 20mph speed limit in Greystones and Whirlow, the officer view is that the reasons set out in the report for making the Speed Limit Order outweigh the objections.
- 4.15.3 Consideration has been given to objections to the inclusion of a number of specific roads within the Greystones and Whirlow 20mph speed limit area (see paragraph 4.13 of the report). Of these, it is recommended that the objections to the inclusion of Bents Road and Knowle Lane be upheld.

#### 4.16 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 4.16.1 Those objections that relate to the principle of introducing sign-only 20mph speed limits into residential areas are effectively objections to the approved Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. As such, no alternative options have been considered.
- 4.16.2 Objections to the inclusion of specific roads have been considered as described in paragraph 4.13 of the report.

### 5. **OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED 20MPH SPEED LIMITS IN FIRTH PARK AND WOODHOUSE**

- 5.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report describing the response from residents to the proposed introduction of 20mph speed limits in Firth Park and Woodhouse, reporting the receipt of objections and setting out the Council's response.

#### 5.2 **RESOLVED:** That:-

- (a) the Firth Park and Woodhouse 20mph Speed Limit Orders, as described in this report, be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) the objectors be informed accordingly; and
- (c) a proposal be submitted to Cabinet to effect the necessary works to implement the proposed 20mph speed limits, subject to the appropriate approvals being obtained through the City Council's Capital Gateway Process.

#### 5.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 5.3.1 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.

- 5.3.2 The introduction of a 20mph speed limit in these areas would be in-keeping with the City's approved 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. Having considered the objections to the introduction of a 20mph speed limit in Firth Park, the officer view is that the reasons set out in the report for making the Speed Limit Order outweigh the objections.

5.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 5.4.1 The objections relate to the principle of introducing sign-only 20mph speed limits into residential areas, and therefore are effectively objections to the approved Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. As such, no alternative options have been considered.

6. **TRAM/ CYCLE INFRASTRUCTURE REVIEW STUDY**

- 6.2 **RESOLVED:** That the item relating to the Tram/Cycle Infrastructure Review Study be deferred and a meeting be arranged with Cycle Sheffield to ensure that they were content with the report and an action plan be agreed which all relevant groups could contribute to.

This page is intentionally left blank