

## MEETING OF THE CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE

held 14 June 2012

PRESENT: Councillors Leigh Bramall (Chair), Isobel Bowler, Mazher Iqbal  
and Bryan Lodge

.....

### 1. **APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- |     |  |  |
|-----|--|--|
| 1.1 | <u>Apology</u><br>Councillor Harry Harpham | <u>Substitute</u><br>Councillor Mazher Iqbal |
|-----|--|--|

### 2. **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 2.1 There were no declarations of interest.

### 3. **MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**

- 3.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 26 April 2012 were approved as a correct record.

### 4. **PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

- 4.1 There were no public questions or petitions.

### 5. **ITEMS CALLED-IN FOR SCRUTINY/REFERRED TO CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEE**

- 5.1 There were no items called-in for Scrutiny or referred to the Cabinet Highways Committee.

### 6. **PETITIONS**

#### 6.1 New Petitions

The Committee noted for information the receipt of petitions (a) containing 6 signatures objecting to the proposed changes to on street parking around St Phillip's Road and that this would be considered as part of a report on the Uppertorpe Permit Parking scheme to be submitted to this Highways Committee in July, (b) containing 9 signatures requesting the maintenance of trees on Willington Road and that a report was on the agenda of this meeting of the Highways Committee, (c) containing 277 signatures objecting to the highway proposals to change the road layout outside the surgery at 299 Main Road, Darnall and that a report was on the agenda of this meeting of the Highways Committee and (d) containing 106 signatures objecting to the Uppertorpe and Netherthorpe Permit Parking scheme and that a report would be submitted to the July meeting of this Highways Committee.

6.2 Outstanding Petitions List

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

7. **DARNALL MEDICAL CENTRE, HIGHWAYS PROPOSAL FOR MAIN ROAD**

7.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report informing Members of comments received following public consultation on proposed highway works on Main Road, Darnall, relating to the construction of the new health centre. The report included a response to the comments received and recommended that a scheme be approved.

7.2 Mr Driver, a local resident made representations to the Committee that he favoured Option 2 as outlined in the report as he did not believe that a pedestrian refuge was needed as this would draw people away from the main crossing further down the road.

7.3 Melanie Dewar, Practice Manager at the local Dental Surgery, made further representations to the Committee that she believed that the proposals would not allow patients to park nearby or be dropped off and this would cause difficulties for those with disabilities who were currently escorted onto the premises. She also questioned the proposed location for the pedestrian refuge and did not believe that pedestrians would use the facility.

7.4 Members commented that they endorsed the representations heard at the meeting from members of the public. They believed that Option 2 presented in the report was the most appropriate and did contain additional safety measures. Members also requested a review of the scheme be undertaken six months after its implementation to assess its success.

7.5 Members further expressed concern that NHS Sheffield were not adhering to the nature of the planning condition to provide parking in the area by charging a high rate and restricting the hours at which the parking facility could be used. They requested that their concerns be raised with NHS Sheffield.

7.6 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:-

- (a) overrules the objections to the Traffic Regulation Orders, as discussed in paragraph 4.10 of the report, in the interests of pedestrian safety, and requests that the Orders be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- (b) approves the construction of the scheme designs, as shown in Appendix D-TM-BR250-C1 Option 2 of the report;
- (c) requests that a review of the scheme be undertaken in approximately

six months following its implementation;

(d) requests that the Executive Director, Place enter into discussions with NHS Sheffield with a view to seeking a financial contribution should additional works be required following the outcome of the review; and

(e) requests that all respondents be informed of the decisions made.

## **7.7 Reasons For The Decision**

7.7.1 The Transport Assessment submitted with the planning application was fundamental in defining the highway-related conditions on the planning consent. The measures developed to address the relevant planning conditions had been further consulted upon throughout the immediate area, with significant changes made. The recommendation relating to progression of the measures followed an indication of full or partial support from a majority of respondents asked directly. However, this then becomes a minority when the 277 petition signatures were taken into account.

7.7.2 Two options had been presented within the report – Option One included a pedestrian island and Option Two without the island. The island was included in the original proposal. Both options 1 and two were presented as acceptable by officers. However, as the pedestrian island was not part of the planning conditions – the decision for which option to approve rested largely on the balance between retaining residents and visitor parking, including drop off to the dental surgery, against improving pedestrian facilities.

7.7.3 It was acknowledged that the majority of people who responded to the consultation – including a petition of 277 signatures, did not support the pedestrian island and associated waiting restrictions. However, it was anticipated that the medical centre would bring with it an increased desire for pedestrians to cross at this location. Main Road is a wide, heavily trafficked, classified road which presented a challenge, for those less able to cross. For this reason officers favoured Option 1 which contained the pedestrian island.

7.7.4 Having considered the report and the representations at the meeting, Members considered that Option 2 outlined in the report presented the best option as it provided safety measures as well as allowing people to park close to the dental surgery. A review six months following the implementation of the scheme would give a clear indication whether this had been successful.

## **7.8 Alternative Options Considered And Rejected**

7.8.1 The planning conditions identified the mitigation measures which subsequently formed the basis of the associated highway proposals, as seen in Appendix A of the report.

7.8.2 As discussed within the report, the mitigation measures had been revised in response to comments received during the public consultations, in effect resulting in the development of alternative solutions/options.

## 8. **ECCLESALL ROAD TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER**

8.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out the response to advertised amendments to loading and waiting restrictions on Ecclesall Road, Ecclesall Road South, Moore Street (Charter Row side) and associated side roads.

8.2 He further reported that there had been an administrative error in the consultation process which had resulted in letters informing objectors of the date of the Highways Committee not being sent to all those affected.

8.3 Members commented that, in the light of the above a decision on the scheme should be deferred to the July meeting to allow all those affected the opportunity to make representations at the Committee should they wish to.

8.4 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee defers a decision on the scheme to allow the objectors to the proposals to be advised about the Committee date in July.

### 8.5 **Reasons for the Decision**

8.5.1 The Committee believed, following information provided by the Head of Transport and Highways, that insufficient notice of the Highways Committee had been given and therefore deferred a decision to allow this to be undertaken.

### 8.5 **Alternative Options Considered And Rejected**

8.5.1 To approve the proposals as outlined in the report.

## 9. **OBJECTIONS TO PROPOSED TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS ASSOCIATED WITH COMMUNITY ASSEMBLY SMALL HIGHWAY SCHEMES**

9.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report setting out the public response to the advertised Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) to introduce waiting restrictions at several locations in respect of small highway schemes being promoted by the Community Assemblies.

9.2 Members of the public made a number of representations on the various schemes as follows:-

Hemsworth Road/Warminster Road/Bunting Nook/Bunting Close  
Councillor Ian Auckland commented that he was broadly supportive of the proposals. He requested that the waiting restrictions on Hemsworth Road

be extended opposite the two houses on the cul-de-sac. He also requested that a review of the Hemsworth Road/Warminster Road scheme be undertaken six months after implementation. In relation to the Bunting Nook/Bunting Close proposals, he commented that should they lead to issues of displacement parking the introduction of further restrictions be discussed with local Ward Councillors and affected residents before they are implemented on street.

Vicarage Road, Dore

Councillor Colin Ross commented that, following discussions with local residents, he would request that Members resolve that the proposed waiting restrictions should be reduced to 5 metres on each side of the junction of the cul-de-sac serving properties Nos. 22-38 and on the main carriageway of Vicarage Lane;

Carr Bank Lane/Carr Bank Close/Armthorpe Road

Barry Tickell, a local resident, submitted a petition at the meeting containing 28 signatures of local residents. He commented that, along with the other petitioners, he did not feel there was a need for the extent of waiting restrictions shown in the various scheme options now under consideration. He claimed that a special meeting of local residents and representatives of the South West Community Assembly, including local Ward Councillors, which had recently been held to discuss this matter, had achieved a consensus that only a minimum of waiting restrictions were necessary on the corner of Carr Bank Close and Carr Bank Lane as indicated in a plan attached to the petition. Mr Tickell also expressed the view that the access/manoeuvrability for refuse collection vehicles was not a problem and felt that the main issue was the lack of clear road markings and Give Way/Stop signs.

Paul Haywood, a local resident, commented that he supported the representations made by Mr Tickell and many local residents did not wish to see double yellow lines in the area and did not believe there was a need for them.

9.3 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee:-

- (a) overrules the objections to the proposed traffic regulations on Hemsworth Road and Warminster Road and the restrictions be introduced as shown in the plan in Appendix A-1 of the report;
- (b) requests that a review of the scheme at Hemsworth Road/Warminster Road be undertaken six months after implementation with a view to introducing additional waiting restrictions on Hemsworth Road, Warminster Place and Warminster Road (with any amendments related to the bus hot spots work to be funded by that budget);
- (c) upholds, in part, the objections to the proposed traffic regulations for Cadman Street/High Street, Mosborough, and Latham Square/Trap

Lane and resolves that the restrictions be introduced as shown in the plans in Appendices C-1 and C-3 of the report;

- (d) upholds, in part the objections to the traffic regulations for Vicarage Lane, Dore and the extent of the restrictions to be introduced be reduced to 5 metres on each side of the junction of the cul-de-sac serving properties Nos. 22-38 and on the main carriageway of Vicarage Lane;
- (e) defers a decision on the proposed traffic regulation orders on Carr Bank Lane/Carr Bank Close/Armthorpe Road and requests that the proposals be referred back to the South West Community Assembly and a site visit be arranged with Veolia, the Chair of the South West Community Assembly and local residents and, following this, a preferred scheme be referred back to this Committee for consideration;
- (f) overrules the objections to the proposed traffic regulations to introduce a 30 minute limited waiting restriction adjacent to properties Nos. 52-66 (inclusive) High Street, Mosborough and the replacement of a restriction of waiting Monday – Saturday 8am - 6.30pm by a prohibition of waiting at any time adjacent to properties 109-125 High Street, Mosborough and introduce the restrictions as shown in the plan in Appendix A-5 of the report;
- (g) overrules the objections to the proposed traffic regulations on Bunting Nook and Bunting Close and approves, initially, the introduction of the restrictions as shown in the plan in Appendix C-4 of the report with an extension of the double yellow lines on both sides of Bunting Close to the boundary between properties Nos 6 and 8;
- (h) approves the introduction of additional waiting restrictions on Bunting Nook and Bunting Close, if considered necessary as a result of displacement parking, subject to consultation with affected residents and local ward councillors;
- (i) resolves that the Traffic Regulation Orders, as amended, be made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; and
- (j) requests that the petitioners, objectors and other respondents be informed accordingly.

#### 9.4 **Reasons for the Decision**

- 9.4.1 The Traffic Regulation Orders for all the schemes included in the report were considered necessary to introduce parking restrictions at each of the locations with a view to resolving problems which had been brought to the attention of the City Council.

9.4.2 Local Ward Councillors and officers had given due consideration to the views of all the respondents in an attempt to find acceptable solutions. The recommendations were considered to be a balanced attempt to address residents/business concerns.

9.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.5.1 The schemes had been designed to meet local needs/priorities as identified by Community Assembly members. The proposals put forward were considered to deliver the required outcomes to resolve the problems which had been brought to the attention of the Assemblies.

9.5.2 The schemes had since been amended, where necessary, to try and address the concerns raised by residents/businesses.

10. **REPORT ON A PETITION REGARDING TREES ON WILLINGTON ROAD**

10.1 The Executive Director, Place submitted a report outlining his response to a 10 signature petition to fell trees on Willington Road or maintain them on a regular basis and making recommendations on a way forward.

10.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee approves the proposals outlined in Section 6 of the report which were in accordance with the Council's Street Maintenance Policy, Standards and Strategy Statement.

10.3 **Reasons for the Decision**

10.3.1 To accord with 'The Prioritisation Criteria for the Maintenance of Highway Trees in the Council's Street Maintenance Policy, Standards and Strategy Document.'

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 No alternatives were put forward or considered to be appropriate in the circumstances.

Signed \_\_\_\_\_  
(Chair)

Date \_\_\_\_\_

This page is intentionally left blank