Agenda Item 8



SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL Report to Community Assembly

| Report of: | eport of: Transport, Traffic and Parking Services Manager | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|--|
| Date: | 5 July | <i>y</i> 2012 | |
| Subject: The 2012/13 South Community Assembly Local Highways Programme | | | |
| Author of R | eport: | Dick Proctor and Nigel Robson Transport, Traffic & Parking Services Nigel.robson@sheffield.gov.uk | |

tel: 0114 27 36161

Summary:

 South Community Assembly has delivered its agreed programme of local highway schemes in 2011/12, including consultation and development work on further schemes for future delivery. The Assembly now needs to set out its priorities for spending in 2012/13 as described in the programme now proposed

Reasons for Recommendations:

 South Community Assembly has funding in 2012/13 for a further programme of local highway schemes. Members are now asked to confirm their priorities for inclusion in this programme.

Recommendations:

- That Members note the 2012/13 allocation of £40,000 for new small highway schemes, and approve the draft programme now proposed.
- That Members delegate to the South Assembly Manager in conjunction with the Community Assembly Chair decision on the schemes to be funded by any underspend of the highways funding allocation.

| Background Papers: No | one | | |
|-----------------------|------|--|--|
| Category of Report: | OPEN | | |

Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

| Financial implications |
|-----------------------------------------------|
| YES Cleared by: |
| Legal implications |
| YES Cleared by: Julian Ward |
| Equality of Opportunity implications |
| NO Cleared by: |
| Tackling Health Inequalities implications |
| NO |
| Human rights implications |
| NO : |
| Environmental and Sustainability implications |
| NO |
| Economic impact |
| NO |
| Community safety implications |
| YES |
| Human resources implications |
| YES |
| Property implications |
| NO |
| |

1. Summary

1.1 South Community Assembly has delivered its agreed programme of local highway schemes in 2011/12, including consultation and development work on further schemes for future delivery. The Assembly now needs to set out its priorities for spending in 2012/13 as described in the programme now proposed

2. What does this mean for people within the South Community Assembly Area?

2.1 The local highway schemes now proposed will assist local people in using pedestrian routes in their area, crossing roads or in the control of vehicles (moving or stationary) in and around their area, adding to improved community safety.

3. Outcomes and Sustainability

3.1 The funding and construction of the local highways schemes contributes to meeting the 'Increase mobility and provide safer routes for pedestrians' priority in the South Community Assembly Plan. It also contributes to the Council's Corporate Plan "Standing Up for Sheffield", particularly the "Great Place to Live" and "Safe and Secure Communities" outcomes.

4. Full Proposal

- 4.1 The South Community Assembly is sponsor for the development and delivery of a programme of local highway schemes. The 2011/12 programme was delivered in full (apart from works on Psalter Lane which are now progressing on site).
- 4.2 For 2012/13 the Council has reviewed its priorities and allocated a further £40,000 to each Community Assembly –essentially for continued delivery of "small schemes" (typically costing up to £3,000 £4,000).
- 4.3 Of the £40,000, Members have already agreed in principle to commit some of this for core activities, namely:
 - Maintenance of SIDS signs £5,200
 - A match funding contribution to SY Police road safety work around primary schools - £3,500
 - A small overspend from last year £460
- 4.4 The remaining funds are proposed to be allocated for small schemes equally to the four wards. This leaves £7,760 per ward.
- 4.5 Members will be aware that as part of the Council's planned way of working within the Highways PFI contract, all new changes and improvements to the highway now require a 'commuted sum' to cover the altered maintenance requirement over a 25 year period as a result of those modifications. The changed requirements can be either positive or negative. For 2012/13 onwards, Community Assemblies are required to

- budget for these commuted sums as part of their programme of small schemes.
- 4.6 Different types of small scheme can vary greatly in the scale of commuted sum associated with these. Appendix A lists typical 2012/13 prices and associated commuted sums for Members' guidance when selecting priorities for this year's programme.
- 4.7 Members have previously been consulted on initial lists of requests for the four wards to identify whether there were high priority schemes that could be approved at an early date. Appendix B shows these four lists, with requests previously suggested for early implementation highlighted in bold.
- 4.8 The lists also show a selection of known requests considered by officers to be some of the more easily deliverable. There are still other requests on the Community Assembly's "waiting list" but even this short selection exceeds the funds available.
- 4.9 Those requests involving single or double yellow lines can sometimes lead to divided opinions within the local community resulting in objections to the proposals. This has been the case at Bunting Nook, which was originally intended to be implemented last year but only recently obtained clearance to proceed, meaning that funding is now required from this year's programme.
- 4.10 Members therefore need to indicate their preferences for how this year's programme might be "topped up" from the lists of outstanding requests. All the schemes shown have merit, but officers have indicated those with asterisks that might be most easily delivered within the remaining resources. Members are asked to consider whether they support these suggested schemes.

5. Financial Implications

5.1 The implementation of these schemes would be supported by an agreed allocation within this year's Local Transport Plan (LTP) programme for the South Community Assembly.

6. Legal Implications

- 6.1 The Council, as the highways authority for Sheffield, has powers under Part V of the Highways Act 1980 to implement the improvements requested in this report. This funding is allocated from the Council's Local Transport Plan budget provided by central government and as such all projects using this funding will need to comply with the aims and objectives of the Local Transport Plan.
- 6.2 The Director of Neighbourhood Renewal and Partnerships in consultation with the Head of Transport & Highways and Director of Legal Services has confirmed this is an approved use of LTP funds, the Head of Transport & Highways has authority to undertake the wider feasibility work now described, as part of the Council's overall transport capital programme.

7. Equality of Opportunity Implications

7.1 There are no specifically direct equality implications, but all of the options have some impact on the overall quality of life for residents, and for pedestrians and other users who might have mobility problems. The options are intended to assist all members of the local community regardless of gender or ethnic origin.

8. Human Resource Implications

8.1 Any measures agreed by the South Community Assembly Highways
Budget would be delivered by the City Council through the newTransport,
Traffic and Parking Services Division, working with the PFI Client team
and contractor as part of the Council's overall transport capital
programme

9. Environmental and Sustainability Implications

9.1 The options now discussed could be regarded as having a neutral overall contribution to the City Council's carbon reduction strategy.

10. Mitigation of risk

10.1 The risks in developing the schemes now identified relate to the time required to undertake broader reviews, and to the scale of increased costs for those wider solutions.

11. Public Consultation, Alternative Options

11.1 The options available at present are of necessity very limited until further decisions of funding have been made

12. Reasons for Recommendations

12.1 South Community Assembly has funding in 2012/13 for a further programme of local highway schemes. Members are now asked to confirm their priorities for inclusion in this programme.

13. Recommendations

- 13.1 That Members note the 2012/13 allocation of £40,000 for new small highway schemes, and approve the programme now proposed.
- 13.2 That Members delegate to the South Assembly Manager in conjunction with the Community Assembly Chair decision on the schemes to be funded by any underspend of the highways funding allocation.

Dick Proctor and Nigel Robson Transport, Traffic & Parking Services Nigel.robson@sheffield.gov.uk

0114 2736161 18th June 2012

APPENDIX A – 2012/13 Price List" for new small schemes

| Category of Scheme | "typical" 2012/13 price (£) | "typical" commuted sum (£) | "typical total cost" (£) |
|----------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------------|
| single lowered kerb (no tactiles) | 322 | 0 | 322 |
| double lowered kerb (no tactiles) | 644 | 0 | 644 |
| double lowered kerb (with tactiles) | 984 | 416 (+42%) | 1400 |
| tactile paving, existing crossing (single) | 170 | 208 (+120%) | 378 |
| tactile paving, ex. crossing (double) | 340 | 416 (+120%) | 756 |
| "H" marking | 76 | 144 (+200%) | 220 |
| bollard | 260 | 295 (+110%) | 555 |
| double kerb (alternative to bollard) (per m) | 64 | 0 | 64 |
| pedestrian guardrail (per m) -typically 5m length | 138 690 | 47 235 (+34%) | 185 925 |
| "Visirail" guardrail (per m) - typically 5m length | 194 970 | tbc (+53%?) | |
| cycle stands | 230 | 122 (+55%) | 352 |
| handrails (per m) - typically 3m length | 62 186 | 39 122 (+64%) | 101 303 |
| single yellow lines - typically 10m length | 1000 | 2.13 per m 21.30 | 1021 |
| double yellow lines – typically 10 m length | 1400 | 4.26 per m 42.60 | 1243 |

Appendix B - South Community Assembly Small Highways – 2012/13 recommended requests (requests in bold are already approved)

Beauchief & Greenhill ward

| Location | Proposed Action | Cost | Requester details | Date requested |
|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------|----------------------|----------------|
| Selly Oak Road outside No.18 | 2 lowered kerbs, H marking plus accommodation works | £918 | | |
| Ormond Road (end of path between 7 and 27) | 1 lowered kerb and H marking | £542 | | |
| Ormond Close (junction with Ormond Road next to 114) | 2 lowered kerbs with tactiles | £1400 | | |
| Reney Avenue (either side of cul-de-sac, 107,151) | 2 lowered kerbs with tactiles | £1400 | | |
| Reney Avenue (either side of cul-de-sac, 16,67) | 2 lowered kerbs with tactiles | £1400 | | |
| (sub-total of approved schemes) | | £5660 | (£2050 available) | |
| Greenhill Main Road and Greenhill Main Road service road at entry and exit to BP garage | Double Yellow Lines on all sides of the end of the service road to prevent parking on street of cars for sale | £1100+ | | |
| Gresley Road, outside Gresley Road Meeting Room | Disabled parking bay + H marking | £400? | * suggested priority | |
| Lowedges Crescent, at Lower Bowshaw View Nursing Home | 2 lowered kerbs with tactiles | £1400 | | |
| Lowedges Drive, junction with Lowedges Crescent | 2 lowered kerbs with tactiles | £1400 | | |
| Reney Road, on either side of cul-de-sac between nos. 65 and 99 | 2 lowered kerbs with tactiles | £1400 | * suggested priority | |
| Total (proposed for now) | | (£7300) | | |

Gleadless Valley ward

| Location | Proposed Action | Cost | Requester details | Date requested |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------|
| Cliffe Field Road / Meersbrook ave | double yellow lines around junction to prevent obstruction | £1400 | | |
| Midhill Road / Midhill Crescent | double yellow lines around junction to prevent obstruction | £1400 | | |
| (sub-total of approved schemes) | | £2800 | (£4910 available) | |
| Bankwood Close, outside Bankwood School | Pedestrian Guardrail / Visirail (2m) | £400/ £510 | * suggested priority | |
| Constable Drive, outside no. 24 | 1 double width Lowered Kerb, no tactiles | £404 | * suggested priority | |
| Farmstead Close | double yellow lines in turning area | £1100- £1500 | | |
| © aunt Road, outside No.88 | series of handrails – total length approx. | £2430 | | 2010 |
| ா Gaunt Way, on footpath to shops o | handrail (length unclear? – assume 10m?) - £101 per metre plus stats | £1100+ | * suggested priority | |
| Mawfa Crescent, at car park between nos. 23 and 31-53 | "Keep Clear" on carriageway or Double Yellow Lines | £295 / £1100+ | | |
| Nicholson Road (outside no.107) | Lowered kerb for disabled access | £404 | * suggested priority | 2008 |
| Norton Lees Road, south side, between Norton Lees Lane and Lees House Court | Double Yellow Lines to stop parking that blocks sight lines | £1100+ | | |
| Tillotson Rise, at bottom of footpath between 20 Tillotson Rise and 184 Gleadless Rd | Pedestrian Guardrail / Visirail (1m) | £215/ £270 | * suggested priority | |
| Total (proposed for now) | | (£5500+) | | |

Graves Park ward

| Location | Proposed Action | Cost | Requester details | Date requested |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------|----------------|
| Bunting Nook (junction with Hemsworth Road) * | Double Yellow lines *combined scheme including Warminster Road - final cost TBC | £3700* | Cllr Auckland + residents | 2011/12 |
| Smithy Wood Crescent | "No Access" TRO | £1200 | | |
| Holmhirst Drive – extra bollard outside No.13 to complete previous work | 1 Alto bollard | £555 | | |
| Norton Church Road, ped entrance to Graves Park | 1 lowered kerb and H marking | £542 | | |
| Norton Lane, end of path opp. Norton Church Road | 1 lowered kerb and H marking | £542 | | |
| (sub-total of approved schemes) | | £6539 | (£1171 available) | |
| <u>හ</u> | | | | |
| Athol Road – Little London Road to Woodseats Road | Double Yellow Lines | £1400 | see below | |
| Little London Road - S bend to north of Athol Road junction | Double Yellow Lines | £1100 | see above | |
| Cherry Bank Road, opp. Cavill Road | Double Yellow Lines | £1400 | | |
| Holmhirst Close (Holmhirst Drive to No. 12) | Double Yellow Lines | £1400 | | |
| Norton Lees Lane, steps in verge Nos.30-32 | 2.1m handrail | £242 | * suggested priority | |
| Norton Lees Lane, steps in verge No.44 | 2.1m handrail | £242 | * suggested priority | |
| Total (proposed for now) | | (£7000+) | | |

Nether Edge ward

| Location | Proposed Action | Cost | Requester details | Date requested |
|-------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|----------|---------------------------------|----------------|
| Hardwick Crescent, j/w Psalter Lane | 2 lowered kerbs with tactiles | £1400 | | |
| Rupert road, j/w Sandford Grove Road | 2 lowered kerbs with tactiles | £1400 | | |
| Stretton Road, j/w Psalter Lane | 2 lowered kerbs with tactiles | £1400 | | |
| Thirlmere Road, j/w Abbeydale Road | 2 lowered kerbs with tactiles | £1400 | | |
| (sub-total of approved schemes) | | £5600 | (£2110 available) | |
| Adelaide Road / Chelsea Road | double yellow lines at junction | £1100+ | | |
| Bedale Road, Tesco exit | turn right road markings | £200 | * | |
| , | | | suggested priority | |
| Brincliffe Crescent, narrow section | extend double yellow lines | £1100+ | | |
| r incliffe Edge Road, j/w Archer Lane | double or single yellow lines | £1300+ | | |
| Broadfield Road opp. Saxon road | extend double yellow lines to protect cycle route | £1000+ | * suggested priority | |
| - Fulmer Road, footpath to Penrhyn Road ◯ | 1 bollard | £555 | | |
| Glen Road, access to Lucknow Court | 2 double width lowered kerbs, no tactiles | £808 | * suggested priority | |
| Grasmere Road (junc. Abbeydale Road) | 2 lowered kerbs with tactiles and bollard | £1955 | Mrs Podoski (Woodseats Road) | 2009/10 |
| Psalter Lane, car access to Hallam Uni site | 2 double width lowered kerbs, no tactiles | £808 | | |
| Psalter Lane, steps to Ecc.Rd outside William Brown Estate Agents | handrail (approx. £1.5m) | £182 | * suggested priority | |
| Total (proposed for now) | | (£7900+) | | |