



Author/Lead Officer of Report: Chris Galloway –
Principal Engineer, Scheme Design & Assurance

Tel: 0114-2736208

Report of: *Ed Highfield*

Report to: *Lewis Dagnall – Cabinet Member for Environment & Transport*

Date of Decision: *16/4/2019*

Subject: *WOODHEAD RD/BRAMALL LANE COLLISION
REDUCTION SCHEME – REPORT ON
CONSULTATION/OBJECTIONS*

| | | |
|---|---|--|
| Is this a Key Decision? If Yes, reason Key Decision:- | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| - Expenditure and/or savings over £500,000 | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| - Affects 2 or more Wards | <input type="checkbox"/> | |
| Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to? Environment & Transport | | |
| Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? <i>(Insert name of Committee)</i> | | |
| Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken? | Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | No <input type="checkbox"/> |
| If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? 487 | | |
| Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? | Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:- | | |

Purpose of Report:

To report the comments and objections received to the consultation and Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) advert on the proposed scheme.

To approve the scheme and proceed to implementation and the making of the TROs as advertised.

Recommendations:

- That the scheme be implemented subject to further approval via the Council's formal Capital Approval processes for the additional funds allocated from the LTP in 2019/20 necessary to cover the costs of construction.
- That a yellow box junction marking be included in the design on Bramall Lane to facilitate access and egress from Harwood St along with temporary signing to re-route traffic displaced by the closure of Hill Street at Bramall Lane.
- That the Traffic Regulation Orders be made and implemented in full as advertised.
- That those who have objected to the scheme be informed of the decision.

Background Papers:
None

| 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>Gaynor Saxton – approved 24/1/19</i> |
| | | Legal: <i>Bob Power/Richard Cannon – 1/3/19</i> |
| | | Equalities: <i>Annemarie Johnston – approved 28/1/19</i> |
| | <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>Lorraine Manley</i> |
| 3 | Cabinet Member consulted: | <i>Cllr Lewis Dagnall – Environment & Transport</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>Chris Galloway</i> | Job Title: <i>Principal Engineer – Scheme Design & Assurance</i> |
| | Date: <i>tbc</i> | |

1. PROPOSAL

- 1.1 This location is high on the city wide collision savings priority list which focuses action to reduce clusters of killed and seriously injured casualties. Most of the 21 recorded injury collisions that occurred between 2012 and 2018 at this location can be attributed to the complex nature of the junction and the demands on drivers to make decisions and undertake manoeuvres safely in a short period of time.
- 1.2 A scheme has been developed which seeks to simplify the junction interactions by physically closing off the end of Woodhead Rd/Hill St at its junction with Bramall Lane and introducing a prohibition of driving order for motor vehicles. See plan 2002-DA-TRO1 shown in Appendix A.
- 1.3 A two-way cycle link will be maintained through the physical closure along with access in a westerly direction by coaches for away fans visiting the Bramall Lane football stadium. The coaches will be escorted and at other times, lockable bollards will prevent access by motor vehicles.
- 1.4 Whilst the scheme will improve the pedestrian route on the western side of Bramall Lane, traffic which currently uses the junction to access Hill St will be displaced onto other roads, principally Harwood St. Therefore, changes to the existing waiting/loading restrictions are needed in the area,
 - Additional peak hour waiting and loading restrictions are proposed in Harwood St with at any time waiting and loading restrictions at its junctions with Hill St and Bramall Lane to accommodate turning manoeuvres in and out of Harwood St by larger vehicles and two way movements along it.
 - The permit holder only bays outside no. 76 Hill St and some of the Pay & Display bay between no. 121 Harwood St and Bramall Lane will also be removed.
 - The current uncontrolled parking sections on the south eastern kerb line of Harwood St will be replaced with Pay & Display Bays Mon-Fri 9:30am-4:00pm; Sat 8:00am-6:00pm (4hr max stay) except Permit Holders.
 - No waiting at any time restrictions are also proposed on both sides of Woodhead Rd and Hill St along the new road alignment to maintain forward visibility and the unobstructed movement of traffic.

2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?

- 2.1 The scheme will help reduce collisions at the junction and could lead to a reduction in traffic using Woodhead Rd as drivers take alternative routes. It improves the pedestrian route on the west side of Bramall Lane by removing the conflict with traffic turning into and out of Hill St/Woodhead

Rd.

It will add a little to the journey time of those using Woodhead Rd instead of the principal road network and increase traffic turning into and out of Harwood St from Bramall Lane

Existing customers of the Yorkshire Tile Co who use Bramall Lane will have to use Harwood St; those travelling in a southerly direction may find it difficult to turn round if they miss the turn into Harwood St.

3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

- 3.1 Consultation with the public and statutory bodies on the scheme and the advertisement of the associated traffic regulation orders was carried out in accordance with statutory requirements and local policy between 29th November and 20th December 2018.

This included 300 letters delivered to all properties in the surrounding area, see plan in Appendix B, St notices erected on Street in the same area, traffic signs at the Woodhead Rd/Bramall Lane junction saying “phone for details” of proposed closure, details on the Council’s “Road Improvements & Requests” web page, emails to all statutory consultees including local ward councillors and LAPs.

In advance of this formal consultation period, discussions were held with the Yorkshire Tile Company, Sheffield United Football Club and The Railway Hotel to inform and incorporate any requirements they might have where possible into the scheme. Only the concerns of the Yorkshire Tile Co in terms of customer access and deliveries could not be fully reconciled within the scheme. See 3.5.2 below.

- 3.2 There were 27 requests for further information as a consequence of the traffic signs, 6 responses (phone & email) in support and 8 objections (phone & email).
- 3.3 There have been no objections received or comments made on the scheme by the statutory consultees other than a request by the police to consider the implications on policing on match days at Bramall Lane which has occurred.
- 3.4 Comments in support of the scheme include,
- 3.4.1 *“Supports the scheme, thinks the junction is unsafe, that Woodhead Rd is narrow because of the parking on both sides which has led to residents parked cars being damaged by passing vehicles.”*
- 3.4.2 *“We support the TRO. The Rd closure at the Bramall Lane / Woodhead Rd junction will make this junction safer for all road users. The closure should also help reduce some of the rat running in the area which would be welcome.”*
- 3.4.3 *“Supports the scheme but has concerns about the Woodhead Rd/Alderson Rd junction and wants measures to improve the safety of pedestrians and vehicles.”*

Officer response:

There is unlikely to be any increase in traffic at the junction of Woodhead

Rd and Alderson Rd as a result of the proposed scheme and so any necessary measures that may be required cannot be included at this time. However, the junction has already been looked at over a number of years with action taken to try and deal with problems of junction recognition resulting in junction overshoots.

- 3.4.5 *"In full agreement with the proposal. Has witnessed many collisions at this junction, and had their building struck twice in three years, by cars trying to avoid a crash. We hear daily, the blaring of horns as people almost collide, and regularly witness near misses, and arguments between drivers, who have only just avoided a collision. Although it is a natural assumption that most collisions are caused by vehicles attempting to cross, or join Bramall Lane, the majority of collisions are in fact caused by stationary vehicles blocking Hill St, as they wait to join the traffic trying to navigate the crossroads. This means that vehicles turning off Bramall Lane cannot proceed (due to the obstruction) and subsequently they, or (more usually) vehicles behind them, are involved in a collision.*

Blocking the junction altogether would stop this problem at source, meaning that only traffic with a reason to travel down either Hill St, or Woodhead Rd should use it. There is the potential, however, that the problem may just be moved to one of the other side roads, such as Harwood St, when people determined to use the "rat run" to avoid sitting on Bramall Lane, try to find an alternative short cut. This, in my opinion, would still be less of a problem than the current one, as at least it does not have another road opposite, to compound the issue. It may actually be a good idea, to make one or two of the other streets one way, to mitigate this?

Although I fully support the proposal, I would not want to just move the problem up (or down) a street or two.

The one negative of this proposal, is the reduction of parking provision, even further, when it is already a big issue in this area, although I can't see any easy way to stop this, personally."

- 3.4.6 *"I agree that the junction near the Sheffield United football stadium is not safe and does need modifying but I don't think closing the access from Woodhead Rd / Hill St is the answer.*

This route is used by me and many other people to avoid the congestion around the Waitrose roundabout when travelling between Ecclesall and the city centre. Using this route can sometimes save me around 10 minutes when the congestion is really bad.

I think by closing off this route you will significantly increase congestion around the Waitrose roundabout. To avoid the significant traffic jams going into Sheffield from Ecclesall, I use..... Psalter Lane, Sharrow Lane, Woodhead Rd, Bramall Lane. Your colleague that I spoke to also uses this route. If I could not do this, due to the number of one way roads around Bramall Lane, I believe I would have to go via the Waitrose roundabout.

Have you looked at other option such as closing off the end of Woodhead

Rd but not closing Hill St?

What about traffic lights for the various roads?"

Officer response:

As stated, most of the traffic using the Woodhead Rd route is trying to avoid congestion on the main Rd network, and whilst it is not ideal that streets such as Woodhead Rd should be used in this way, it will still be possible to access Bramall Lane from Woodhead Rd/Hill St via Harwood St. This would still be quicker than staying on the main road network to avoid going via J5 the Moore St Roundabout (Waitrose), therefore there is unlikely to be any increase in congestion on the ring road as a result of this proposal.

A number of other options were considered including installing traffic signals. However, the latter was ruled out because of the delays it would create on Bramall Lane and would cost twice as much as the available budget. The other options which kept Woodhead Rd open did not simplify the junction movements sufficiently to address the collisions that occur there on a regular basis.

- 3.4.7 *"In principle I'm very supportive of the plan to reduce collisions at that junction, but as a business owner on Alderson Rd I have some observations about the wider impact the scheme may have and I'd welcome your feedback.*

The scheme is not likely to reduce the volume of the traffic that needs to access Bramall Lane, which of course is not the intention. Traffic will be displaced, ostensibly onto Harwood St. Currently at Peak times there is a considerable queue on Woodhead Rd, which the new scheme will in all likelihood exacerbate. So it seems likely that a proportion of the traffic will displace onto Alderson Rd, in an attempt to access Bramall Lane via Rowland Rd.

As you know, Alderson Rd is a 20mph zone (which is rarely observed), a residential Rd, and already carries a high volume of traffic. The junction between Alderson Rd and Woodhead Rd is similar in layout to that between Woodhead and Bramall Lane, and is already quite hazardous. My observation is that the scheme has the potential to increase the volume of traffic turning right from Woodhead Rd onto Alderson Rd, which will create a new set of hazards, in effect displacing the same problem into a new area and not necessarily reducing the overall risk of collisions."

Officer response:

There is the potential to create new safety concerns elsewhere on the road network if traffic seeks out alternative routes and it is accepted that, given that the majority of traffic currently exiting Hill St turns right, having this traffic exiting Alderson Rd (where turning right at the junction is illegal) would be potentially dangerous. For this reason the scheme includes measures on the alternative route via Harwood St that keeps it clear of parked vehicles during the peak periods and at all times at the junctions with new waiting/loading restrictions. A yellow box junction marking, see Appendix C, on Bramall Lane at Harwood St will help

vehicles turn in and right out during peak periods.

It is unclear what the level of displacement might be onto other routes, but it is anticipated that the measures promoting Harwood St will be sufficient to discourage additional traffic on Alderson Rd. The scheme will be reviewed post implementation as part of our Rd safety audit process. If remedial measures are needed elsewhere on the network then these will be looked at and appropriate action taken to address them where necessary.

Vehicles over-shooting the priority markings at the Alderson Rd/Woodhead Rd have been an issue for some time and interventions have been made to try and address the problem.

3.5 Objections to the scheme

3.5.1 *"Have the planners considered other options to improve this junction? i.e. Traffic Lights. This junction is used by all 3 emergency services and a physical closure could cause life threatening delays plus would not cut down the traffic just increase traffic on Hill St. and Harwood St. Removal of the three pay and display areas on Harwood St would cause more congestion.*

The only people I can see this being of benefit to is the football club. I hereby object to the proposed Physical Closure of this junction."

Officer response:

- A number of other options were considered including installing traffic signals. However, this was ruled out because of the delays it would create on Bramall Lane and would cost twice as much as the available budget.
- As part of the consultation process the emergency services are consulted and their comments on how the proposal might affect their ability to respond in emergencies will be reported and considered before any decision is reached on how to proceed. In this case no concerns or objections were raised other than by the police who asked that the requirements for policing matches at Bramall Lane be taken into account which they were in discussions with Sheffield United.
- Whilst the closure of any road will generally increase some journey times there are alternative routes. Traffic will be displaced onto other routes, however, it is likely that all drivers will not use the same one and so traffic will be displaced through the area and not all onto Harwood St. Most of this traffic is trying to avoid the main road network and it is not appropriate that streets such as Woodhead Road should be used in this way.
- The proposal only reduces the number of available P&D spaces on Harwood St by 3 on the northern side, however, new P&D spaces are being created along the southern side which will provide more spaces locally and discourage commuter parking. This is not expected to increase congestion but should enable traffic to use the alternative route unimpeded.

3.5.2 "Formal Objection"

The closure of the junction will directly hinder a high percentage of my visiting customers. It's difficult enough to attract 'passing trade' but with the current access route we manage it quite well. With the proposal any passing trade will have to work out an alternative route to locate my property, something most won't do. Only major advertising/ signage MAY help here but something we have no budget for!

The TRO being advertised at the same time that seeks to allow the police to place temporary signs to close off Harwood St and Randall St on match days to allow away supporters coaches to be parked, will be the alternative route to my business. If this is closed on match days then my customers won't be able to gain access to us and we won't be able to operate our own delivery vehicles in and out freely.

As most of our deliveries arrive on articulated vehicles keeping these Roads/junctions clear is imperative. I see from the proposals you intend to extend restricted parking at junctions to allow this but who will monitor this ongoing as we see now that cars are parked on pavements, in restricted zones etc. etc. but very little enforcement in ever witnessed.

The changes proposed will impact my business, either through loss of trade and or additional costs I'll need to plough in to advertise the routes and restrictions to access the premises both for customers and suppliers.

If there is additional support, i.e. erecting of signage locating our business from Bramall Lane, upgrading the land/access we rent from the council adjacent to our property to accommodate customers entrance/exit to Bramall Lane, reduction in rates to accommodate potential impact on our business, available then please advise as this may have an impact on our objections."

Officer response:

Another TRO was advertised at the same time that seeks to allow the police through temporary signs to close off Harwood St and Randall St on match days to allow away supporters coaches to be parked up. This is for police operational reasons and is already in use this season. It replaces the previous arrangement where coaches were parked on Asline Rd. This will mean that the cycle lane will no longer be obstructed by coaches on match days.

At times when Harwood St and Randall St is proposed to be closed, Bramall Lane will also be closed in 8 out of 10 times. This means that customers cannot get to their premises from Bramall Lane at these times currently. At other times the alternative route will be available so the two advertised orders do not compound the problem for local businesses on match days.

The current restrictions in the area are regularly patrolled on match days / nights and have been for many years. There are usually at least 4 Civil Enforcement Officers on patrol during the match. It may look like no enforcement is taking place but this can be due to the amount of vehicles displaying blue badges that park around the junctions where yellow lines are in place. If the scheme goes ahead then the enforcement team will

increase their patrols so that drivers understand the new restrictions and that they will be enforced. This will ensure that the alternative route can be used by all vehicles.

It is difficult to assess what impact the changes will have on passing trade. Driving into city the alternative route will be the best option since drivers will have passed the advertising signs on their building and boundary fence. Coming from city it could be more problematic. First time visitors will usually plan their journey before setting off and there is an opportunity for advice to be given on their web page to help with this. In terms of additional support, for the first 3 months there will be temporary signs in advance of the closed junction so drivers coming out of city can be directed onto Harwood St for Hill St and Woodhead Rd. These could remain for an extended period if problems arise and persist beyond the 3 month period.

When arranging deliveries there is an opportunity to inform suppliers of the changes to the road layout in the area at little extra cost.

There is no funding in the budget to upgrade land/access of Bramall Lane nor could a reduction in rates be offered because of the precedent that it would set.

3.5.3 *“The alternative is not suitable, want to maintain use of Woodhead Rd/Hill St because of problems getting into and out of Harwood St/Bramall Lane junction”*

Officer response:

The alternative route,

- uses roads and junctions that are comparable in width and geometry to Woodhead Rd;
- is approximately 300m further than the current route;
- may lead to less delay at the junction with Bramall Lane as it should be easier to turn in and out of Harwood St in comparison to Hill St/Woodhead Rd.
- A yellow box junction marking, see Appendix C, will be provided on Bramall Lane inbound at its junction with Harwood St to make it easier for traffic to turn right onto Bramall Lane or turn right into Harwood St.

In view of the above and the fact it is a T-junction compared to a staggered crossroads it should be easier with less risk of an collision to use this junction compared to the Woodhead Rd/Hill St junction with Bramall Lane.

3.5.4 *“Use Woodhead every day and alternative route is not suitable.”*

Officer response: see 3.5.3 above.

3.5.5 *“Match day issue, because Bramall Lane is closed an hour before the game, access to the Cherry St car park would not be possible using Woodhead Rd or the suggested alternative. Need to know what police would recommend as an alternative.”*

Officer response:

According to the club, the Cherry St car park, is mainly for club staff, Players, VIP's and commercial Guests, most of these are normally parked up by the time the Rd closures are implemented by the police on Bramall Lane, Randall St and Harwood St.

Although they say the road closures are on from 1.30, in practice they are only put on when pedestrians have to walk in the roadway because the pavements are too busy, this tends to be from 2.15 to 2.30(ish). At the end of the match the roads are re-opened as soon as the away coaches leave, which tends to be between 5pm and 5.10pm.

At the end of the match the majority of vehicles in the Cherry St car park do not leave until after the road closures have been lifted.

The scheme will in fact make it easier for vehicles to join Bramall Lane than at present because of the yellow box junction marking, see Appendix C, and there being fewer conflicting traffic movements.

The car park can also be accessed from Shoreham St which is not closed for the match.

In conclusion the scheme and event closures of Harwood St Bramall Lane and Randall St will only affect a few vehicles and they have an alternative route, albeit slightly longer, via Shoreham St.

- 3.5.6 *"Proposal will make their life "a living hell". Agrees that the junction is dangerous since it is badly laid out with poor road markings. It is made worse by poor driving, a failure to distinguish between real life and computer games, stressed and careless motorists who are unlicensed and have not taken driving tests and without knowledge of the Highway Code (including non-native drivers with culturally different approaches to road safety and the value of human life). Feels the scheme would not address these problems just transfer the problems elsewhere.*

The increase in traffic on Hill St will cause noise, vibration leading to damage to sewers and water systems, light pollution from headlights, increase the risk of collisions at its junction with Harwood St opposite their front door. These "hazards" are constant whilst collisions are not and as such considers the implementation of the proposed scheme to be a "criminal act".

Since this will adversely affect their physical and mental health objects most strongly to the proposal."

Officer response:

The scheme will lead to traffic using other junctions on Bramall Lane, but these will in the main be T-junction's with fewer turning manoeuvres. This should lead to fewer collisions since decision making will be easier for drivers judging when to turn into or out of these junctions compared to the staggered crossroads at the Hill St/Woodhead Rd/Cherry St junction.

Hill St is already used by HGVs (9 in both directions over 24 hrs) this would increase to 36 HGVs if all transferred onto the alternative route. This level of HGV usage has not caused any structural damage on

Woodhead Rd and so is not expected to cause any structural damage on Hill St. The lack of calming features such as humps and cushions on Hill St will mean that vibrations from HGVs are unlikely to be significant. Their house is set back from all the other houses on Hill St, with only a door and small widow facing the St. It is also beyond the junction with Harwood St such that head lights are unlikely to shine directly through the door. Visibility at the Hill St/Harwood St junction for vehicles turning in and out is good, speeds are low and with the removal of some parking, the increase in traffic (a maximum 3 fold increase i.e. 1695 to 5066 over 24 hrs and a maximum doubling of the hourly flow during the peak hour, i.e. 194 to 390) is unlikely to lead to a significant increase in collisions and their severity is likely to be low at the junction.

- 3.5.7 *"I am now writing to express a preliminary objection as a motorist who is also worried about public health issues. I understand the concerns about the junction and it is one I try to avoid. I am not surprised at the reported collision rate and would support plans to improve the junction. I also have concerns about the crossroads between Woodhead Rd and Alderson Rd where I have seen several near collisions as cars travelling down Woodhead Rd fail to give way. However as far as I can understand from the material I have seen (I have not had time to visit Howden House and there does not seem to be anything on the Council website) the proposed solution is to close the whole junction and divert traffic into Hill St via Howden St. Apart from the effect on residents of Hill St it is entirely unclear to me whether you have considered the likely effect on residents of Alderson Rd and its run-off streets including Rowland Rd. My comments are based on the assumption that you plan to block off Alderson Rd at the Hill St end and also to block off Hill St at the Bramall Lane end. One obvious alternative would be only to block off Hill St/Bramall Lane and allow traffic to turn left from Woodhead Rd into Hill St and thence to Howden St. This would of course make things even worse for residents.*

Much of the traffic using Woodhead Rd appears to me to be travelling from London Rd via Bramall Lane to the city centre, Queen's Rd or Shoreham St and vice versa. If Woodhead Rd is closed, traffic will seek other routes, notably seeking to access Bramall Lane via Rowland Rd or the end of Alderson Rd where the signing is already confusing as the Left Turn arrow is widely ignored by all sorts of traffic including City Council and Amey vehicles who proceed straight down Bramall Lane past JE James. These streets are narrow with parking both sides and already over used by cars. Increased traffic will mean more noise, pollution and risk of collision especially in Alderson Rd.

What traffic modelling exercises have been carried out to determine alternative traffic routes, to consider air pollution for what is already a high risk zone (Lowfield) and the potential transposition of collision risks to other nearby Streets? I do also anticipate that the traffic in other Streets off Alderson Rd will also increase.

At first sight the apparent proposal to close the Hill St/Woodhead Rd/Bramall Lane junction seems to be just the cheapest solution for the Council to prevent collisions at that location without any evidence that it is overall the best plan and will not just transfer problems elsewhere.

Furthermore the consultation for what will actually affect a large number of people, both residents (who have no choice) and motorists is very difficult to access and has been posted just before Christmas when people's minds are on other things. I could not find the documentation anywhere on the Sheffield Council website until after the consultation had finished despite numerous searches. ”

Officer response:

It is not anticipated that traffic in the area between London Rd and Bramall Lane will increase as a result of the proposed scheme. There may be some redistribution but the traffic flows are low and so it is not expected to create significant additional problems of safety or emissions. The air quality issues in the Lowfield area are mainly on London Rd and Bramall Lane, whilst the NOx levels in the Streets affected are low in comparison and because traffic is not expected increase will remain low. The alternative route via the bottom end of Hill St and Harwood St is expected to be used by the majority of traffic that currently uses Woodhead Rd since it only adds a short distance onto driver's journeys and it should have less delay than experienced at the moment at the Hill St/Bramall Lane junction such that displacement onto other roads in the area is expected to be minimal. As a result costly modelling of air quality and changes to traffic patterns was deemed unnecessary. See officer response in 3.4.7 above which deals with the same issue.

A number of options were considered, including Traffic Signals, and the preferred option was not the cheapest identified but it was expected to deliver the greatest savings in collisions.

Consultation has been extensive and thorough, i.e. all properties in the area received a letter, legal notices were erected on St furniture throughout the area, the consultation material was on the council's web site at [Road improvements & requests](#) albeit a little after the start of the consultation period and large signs were erected at the proposed closure with a phone number to ring for more details. The timing of the consultation was not designed to make it difficult for people to respond and it did not affect the number of responses/enquiries received, i.e. the 41 enquiries/responses are typical for this size of scheme.

- 3.5.8 *“I live on Hill St and traffic in the area is already a major problem. By closing off this junction it will create extremely lengthy traffic queues around Bramall Lane and London Rd. It will significantly make travel difficult during match days in particular, because the bottom of John St is closed off with bollards during this time and then this junction will also close, which means any travelling will follow a one way route down London Rd and into town etc. As you can imagine this will significantly add to the journey time and cause many delays for people.”*

Officer response:

Whilst residents in the area may be concerned by traffic using the roads in the area to avoid congestion on the main roads into the city centre and on the ring road, the proposed scheme should not increase the number of vehicles in the area. The closure of roads on match days has been covered previously above and the fact that the proposed closure included

in the scheme is already closed on match days at certain times means that drivers will not face any additional issues as a result.

In a telephone conversation to clarify their concerns the main issue was an increase in traffic on the northern section of Hill St between London Rd and John St. However, there is expected to be no increase on this section since this would be a significant deviation from existing routes taken.

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. Safer roads and reduced numbers of collisions involving traffic and pedestrians will fundamentally be positive for all local people. No negative equality impacts have been identified.

4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

- 4.2.1 The scheme has an approved allocation of £51k to complete the detailed design an estimated value of £104k for construction. The funding for this is from allocations made in the LTP programme for 2018/19 and 2019/20. In the course of the design process the scheme has changed such that fees (SCC & Amey) are estimated to be £76k with construction at £208k. This leaves a shortfall of £130k in approved funding. Further approval is required via SCC's formal Capital Approval processes subject to the allocation in the LTP programme for 2019/20 being increased appropriately before the scheme can progress to construction.

At this stage, the scheme is considered to be neutral in terms of accruals to the Highways Asset Register so there is no commuted sum.

4.3 Legal Implications

- 4.3.1 All works will be carried out on Highway land. Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) will be required to implement the necessary restrictions on parking, waiting, loading and driving.

The Council has powers under Part V of the Highways Act 1980 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ('the 1984 Act') to implement the proposals described in this report, including the provision of pedestrian crossings and waiting restrictions. Said works do not require planning permission where they are being carried out for the maintenance or improvement of the roads concerned, so long as they do not have a significant effect on the environment.

In exercising the powers under the 1984 Act, the Council is required to secure (a) the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of traffic (including pedestrians) 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 procedure in relation to consultation and notification, which is set out in Schedule 9 of the 1984 Act and the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996 ('the 1996 Regulations'), must be followed and proper consideration given to all duly made representations.

The Council is satisfied that said objections are to be regarded as irrelevant insofar as they pertain to the prohibition of loading or unloading of vehicles for the purposes of regulation 9(3) of the 1996 Regulations and may dispense with the requirement to hold an inquiry.

4.4 Other Implications

- 4.4.1 The scheme will be developed using existing staff resources.

5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 5.1 Introducing traffic signals incorporating an all-round pedestrian stage was considered but the increased delay for traffic on Bramall Lane would make the management of the road traffic problematic in the area. It did not reduce any manoeuvres and had a low benefit to cost ratio.
- 5.2 Closing the end of Hill St, realigning Woodhead Rd to join Bramall Lane directly and making Cherry St one-way in an easterly direction between Bramall Lane and the entrance to the Cherry St car park. Whilst it reduced the number of manoeuvres within the junction and provided some benefit to pedestrian movement on the eastern footway of Bramall Lane, overall it would not have reduced collisions as much as the preferred option.
- 5.3 A do nothing option was not considered to be acceptable in view of the collision record.

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The preferred option which has been the subject of consultation will deliver the collision savings required at an acceptable cost. Whilst there are potential impacts on business, these are considered to be low and should decrease further overtime.

