



Author/Lead Officer of Report: Paul Sullivan
Senior Transport Planner

Tel: 2053073

Report of: *Edward Highfield*

Report to: *Cllr Jack Scott*

Date of Decision: *September 2017*

Subject: Darnall Cycle Route – Phase 1 Parkway Market

Is this a Key Decision? If Yes, reason Key Decision:-

Yes ☐ No ☒

- Expenditure and/or savings over £500,000

☐

- Affects 2 or more Wards

☐

Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to? ***Transport and Sustainability***

Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? **Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee**

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? *125*

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-

“The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).”

Purpose of Report:

To inform the cabinet member of the proposal to construct a cycle route through the Parkway markets area as part of Darnall cycle route.

Appendix A Plan of the route section to be constructed

Appendix B Sketch showing complete route and strategic context

Recommendations:

The scheme is approved and constructed, subject to the dedication of a section of housing land as public highway (as indicated within the plan attached as Appendix #) and the implementation of the necessary Traffic Regulation Order.

After considering the objections, the Traffic Regulation Order is made taking into account the mitigation proposed.

Background Papers:

Design Standards

Lead Officer to complete:-		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.	Finance: <i>(Insert name of officer consulted)</i> Gaynor Saxton
		Legal: <i>(Insert name of officer consulted)</i> Richard Cannon
		Equalities: <i>(Insert name of officer consulted)</i> Annemarie Johnstone
	<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>	
2	EMT member who approved submission:	<i>Edward Highfield</i>
3	Cabinet Member consulted:	<i>Cllr Jack Scott</i>
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Decision Maker by the EMT member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	Lead Officer Name: <i>Paul Sullivan</i>	Job Title: <i>Senior Transport Planner</i>
	Date: <i>Insert</i>	

1. PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The proposal is to use **STEP funding from the Local Growth Fund** to construct a segregated cycle route between the NCN cycle route 627 on the Manor and Kettlebridge Road. This would be first of four phases to build a complete route from Manor through to the Olympic Legacy Park, with improved links through to Darnall.

Detail of phase 1 (See Appendix A – Route Plan)

Phase 1 of the scheme will run from the off road cycle route (NCN627) at Manor through to Kettlebridge Road. Kettlebridge Road a no through road, is a signed cycle route, and leads to quiet residential roads around the western end of Darnall.

The route will be built to an improved standard. That standard is based on the peak motorised vehicle flow. Having undertaken counts and assessed vehicle movements in the area, it has been determined that the route should be segregated, and the crossing point be undertaken uncontrolled in one stage

Design detail

We will aim to construct the track to a width of 3.5m. This is the minimum width required for cycling in both directions comfortably

The crossing point will be of similar width (3.5m) and approximately 2.9 in length in order to accommodate 3 cyclists

The route crosses one side road where we will give priority to cyclists.

In order to build the northern section of phase 1 we will

- need to remove some on highway unrestricted car parking – approximately 20 spaces.
- through the design process identify areas to replace some or all of this loss of parking. To date we have identified a number of areas that could provide approximately 10 car parking spaces
- make use of existing footway and verges
- This section requires a traffic regulation order for it to progress as designed

The southern section of the route requires land under the ownership of Housing, We

- have produced a report for housing board that was presented in September
- will widen the existing shared use path, and create segregation
- will make use of existing footway and verges.
- This section can be built without the need for a traffic regulation order

Aside from the loss of parking there is minimal impact on the highway, and this will provide a suitable location in which to learn about the new design standards both in terms of design and in terms of build. Appendix B shows the complete route and how it fits in with existing and proposed routes

2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE ?

- 2.1 It has the potential to take pressure off the existing road network in the area, and may improve air quality and reduce Co2 levels.

It will form a strategic link improving access to multiple destinations (retail educational, and leisure) from a residential area that has significant amount of social housing.

It will provide opportunity to learn and apply new design standards before they are applied city wide.

3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

- 3.1 A Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) was advertised for four weeks from mid December 2017. It proposed to replace approximately 20 unrestricted parking spaces (110m) with double yellow lines to maintain adequate road widths to enable safe movement of traffic once the path has been widened to facilitate the improved cycle route.

The results of the consultations are summarised below

Response to objections from Parkway Drive for the removal of 110m of unrestricted parking

We received 21 objections to the TRO, but also had three emails supporting the wider scheme with one including comments for improvements of the wider scheme.

The objections to the TRO were based on the loss of the unrestricted parking on Parkway Drive. It appears that the majority came from employees working in Quadrant One and Quadrant Two on Kettlebridge Road – which runs parallel to Parkway Drive and is connected by a footway.

However, in recommending that the TRO should be made after considering these objections, the following should be considered:

- We have added in an additional 40 metres of unrestricted parking (approximately 7 spaces) in close proximity to Parkway Drive

meaning the total loss of parking is only 70m (approximately 13 spaces)

- There are other significant lengths of unrestricted parking within 500m of Quadrant Two. The current walking distance from Parkway Drive is 450m.
- Occupiers of both Quadrant One and Two have been conditioned to develop and implement a travel plan to reduce car use, a key element of this is a car park management strategy. We will ask the occupiers to relook at how they prioritise their car park use. In addition, we will offer businesses in the area incentives to encourage people to walk and cycle to work, using the initiatives within the Sustainable Transport Access Fund.
- We will look at options at increasing unrestricted parking on street on Kettlebridge Road.
- There are no businesses in the area that heavily rely on passing trade that could/would use the 110m area for parking as adjacent businesses have sufficient parking of their own.

4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications

- 4.1.1 Overall there are no significant differential, positive or negative equality impacts from this proposal. It will be positive to the majority, but in particular those with mobility issues or who are new to cycling, as there is minimal interaction with traffic, parked cars and other street clutter. It will also provide improved access around the area for those who don't have access to a car. For those that do use a car, this may improve conditions to the local road network as some local journeys could be undertaken more sustainably using this route. However some free unregulated parking will be lost – though we hope to keep this to a minimum

The route will improve transport links/options between residential areas with a large percentage of social housing and educational and leisure facilities.

4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

- 4.2.1 The estimated total cost of implementing the scheme is £425,635 and is funded by the Combined Authority STEP programme. In line with the Council's capital approval process the initial business case was approved by the Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities Board on 10th

November 2015.

The capital budget was endorsed by the Capital Programme Group with the delay caused by lack of resource to progress the scheme at the time. The IBC covered other schemes that are being taken forward in advance of this scheme

The outline business case has been presented to the Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities Transport Sub Board in October 2017 and the final business case (February 2018) will be subject to the Capital Gateway Approval process.

- 4.2.2 The commuted sum to cover future maintenance is to be confirmed once preliminary design has been assessed. The sum is paid to Amey at the end of the financial year to cover related maintenance expenditure over the next 25 years. The amount will be minimised by managing the design process, and will be funded by existing commuted sum credits

4.3 Legal Implications

- 4.3.1 The City Council, as Highway Authority for Sheffield, has powers under Part V of the Highways Act 1980 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement the scheme requested in this report.

In particular, the Council has powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to make a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) where it appears to the Council that it would be expedient to make it for, inter alia, avoiding danger to pedestrians and other road users or for preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the highway runs.

Before the Council can make a TRO, it must consult with relevant bodies in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. It must also publish notice of its intention in a local newspaper. Where objections are received, Regulation 13 places a duty on the Council to ensure that these objections are duly considered. The Council has complied with these requirements.

In exercising its functions under the Road Traffic Regulation Act, the Council is required under the Section 122 of the Act to (a) secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic and (b) the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway, and so far as practicable having regard to the matters listed below.

The matters to be considered before reaching any decision are:

- i) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to

premises;

- ii) the effect on the amenities of a locality and (including) the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles;
- iii) the national air quality strategy prepared under Section 80 of the Environment Act 1995;
- iv) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of passengers/potential passengers; and
- v) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

The Council received 21 objections to the proposed TRO in response to the consultation. The Council is required to consider whether any concerns raised in those comments outweigh the benefits of implementing the proposal, taking into account the mitigation proposed. If the Council is satisfied that the benefits of implementing the proposal outweigh any concerns, it will be acting lawfully and within its powers should it decide to proceed.

In proposing to dedicate the area of housing land referred to within the proposal as a highway, the Council must have sufficient interest in the land so as to bind it in perpetuity. It must also be satisfied that the purpose and powers of the Council have been construed so as to include the power to dedicate land as a highway, and that this is not incompatible with the other statutory functions of the Council. Accordingly, the relevant housing board has agreed to the dedication in principle,

4.4 Other Implications

- 4.4.1 There may be implications around land owned by Housing. Housing have stressed the route should be adopted and maintained by Amey, and that they would not fund this element. It is intended that the highway, once dedicated, will be adopted and accrued into the Amey contract for ongoing maintenance..
- .5.1

Summary of impact

Potential negative impact on parking in the area, otherwise positive.

5. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

(Outline any alternative options which were considered but rejected in the course of developing the proposal.)

- 5.1 At request of the Thriving Neighbourhoods and Communities board, officers (transport planning, highway design and Amey) were asked to investigate a route along Cricket Inn Road and Woodburn Road. To

connect NCN 627 at Parkhill across to Attercliffe.

After a thorough investigation via a walk through it was felt there would be value in building a scheme. However the complication of the junctions and the close proximity of the tram network meant we would not have sufficient time to design and build, and get the relevant permissions within the time frame. It was also felt that this would not be a simple introduction to the new design standards.

Do nothing – this provided an opportune moment to develop knowledge around implementing improved design standards in an area that has no public transport, and is not part of the key road network (but could play a part in the strategic cycle network). So if we had not applied this here we would have spent time investigating other locations with a similar transport infrastructure, potentially this may have implications for the existing network.

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The preferred option allows us to develop and learn about new standards with minimal impact on the highway and public transport
- 6.2 Once built we will be able to direct planners and designers to a living example of how we want to develop elements of the cycle infrastructure for the city.
- 6.3 Provides a useful link between significant residential area of Manor and further afield via the NCN and key destinations – retail, educational and leisure – OLP, Attercliffe and Darnall centres
- 6.4 Will ultimately form part of the strategic cycle network for the city.