



Author/Lead Officer of Report: John Priestley,
Senior Transport Planner

Tel: (0114) 2734479

Report of: Executive Member for Climate Change,
Environment and Transport
Report to: Councillor Douglas Johnson
Date of Decision: 1st February 2022
Subject: Double Yellow Lines Programme 2021/22: Report
on the objections to the proposed advertised TRO
for Double Yellow Lines at a number of locations.

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 Executive Member Portfolio does this relate to? Climate Change, Environment and Transport Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? Economic and Environmental Wellbeing		
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? 988		
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:- <i>"The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)."</i>		

Purpose of Report:

This report describes the measures to restrict inappropriate parking at seven locations across the city through the introduction of double yellow line (no waiting at any time) parking restrictions.

It sets out officer's responses to objections received and seeks a decision from the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development.

Recommendations:

Having considered the representations received and having determined that the reasons to support the proposals outweigh any unresolved objections, it is recommended that:

The Traffic Regulation Order is made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

Introduce the associated double yellow lines as shown on the plans in Appendix B;

Inform the objectors accordingly.

Background Papers:

Appendix A: Original TRO proposals plans

Appendix B: Revised TRO plans

Appendix C: Objections - full responses

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: Damian Watkinson, 11/11/21
		Legal: Mr Richard Cannon, 01/12/21
		Equalities: Annemarie Johnston, 28/10/21
<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:	Mr Michael Crofts, Director of Business Strategy
3	Executive Member consulted:	Councillor Douglas Johnson, Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport
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: John Priestley	Job Title: Senior Transport Planner
	Date: 20/10/21	

1. PROPOSAL

- 1.1 As part of the 2021/22 Double Yellow Lines Programme, Traffic Regulations advertised the intention to introduce double yellow line parking restrictions at the locations listed below. In each case, objections to the advertised restrictions have been received.
- 1.2 The junction of Button Hill and Ranelagh Drive
The junction of Carter Knowle Road and Fossdale Road
High Street, Beighton, south of its junction with School Road
Medlock Drive, north of its junction with Orgreave Lane
Sevenairs Road, Beighton
Town End Road, Ecclesfield
Willow Drive, Handsworth
- 1.3 These sites come from the scheme request list and have been prioritised for delivery, in 2021/22, using the Council's approved methodology

2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?

- 2.1 The functions of the schemes include improving visibility for vehicles and pedestrians at junctions and removing parking that obstructs footways and traffic flows. There is no impact on climate change and there is no economic impact. The situation will be improved for pedestrian safety, HGVs, delivery vehicles and emergency vehicle access at all of the locations. Looking at each scheme separately:
- 2.2 At Button Hill and Ranelagh Drive, the Council received a number of complaints, from residents in the local area, concerning vehicles parking at the junction. The parking on Button Hill obscures visibility for vehicles exiting Ranelagh Drive. The parking on Ranelagh Drive obstructs the flow of vehicles through the junction. The requestors claimed that the parking was by parents from Mylnhurst School and clients attending a local business.
- 2.2.1 To address the problem, double yellow line (no waiting at any time) restrictions were proposed on Button Hill, on both sides of its junction with Ranelagh Drive and on both sides of Ranelagh Drive. The original scheme proposals are shown in the plan in Appendix A.
- 2.3 At Carter Knowle Road and Fossdale Road, the Council received a lot of complaints, from local residents, concerning parking at the junction. Parking on Carter Knowle Road blocks visibility for vehicles exiting Fossdale Road. The parking on Fossdale Road seriously obstructs the flow of vehicles through the junction.
- 2.3.1 To address the problem, double yellow line restrictions were proposed on Carter Knowle Road, on both sides of its junction with Fossdale Road

and on both sides of Fossdale Road. The original scheme proposals are shown in the plan in Appendix A.

- 2.4 The parking on High Street obscures visibility for traffic exiting School Road and disrupts the traffic flow southwest of the junction.
 - 2.4.1 Double yellow lines were proposed on High Street to address these issues. The original scheme proposals are shown in the plan in Appendix A.
- 2.5 At Medlock Drive there are existing double yellow lines at its junction with Orgreave Lane. The Council received numerous requests for these lines to be extended, further along Medlock Drive, in order to prevent parking, from the ends of the double lines northwards, along Medlock Drive. This is because the parking, in relatively close proximity to the junction, obstructs traffic and that results in congestion (bottlenecks) at the junction.
 - 2.5.1 In accordance with the requests received, the Council advertised an extension of the existing parking restrictions, on both sides on Medlock Drive, as shown in the plan in Appendix A.
- 2.6 The Council has received a large number of requests for additional parking restrictions on Sevenairs Road. The requestors complained about parking obstructing the traffic flow and restricting accessibility and also obstructing the footways. The situation was particularly severe in the vicinity of the Becton Centre for Children and Young People.
 - 2.6.1 The Council advertised additional parking restrictions, on several locations on Sevenairs Road, as shown in the plans in Appendix A.
- 2.7 At Town End Road the Council received complaints about parking on the north side of the road. This parking obstructs the footway due to drivers parking partly on the footway and also obstructs the traffic flow. In addition, some private drives are blocked by inconsiderate parking.
 - 2.7.1 To try to address these issues, the Council advertised parking restrictions, as shown in the plan in Appendix A.
- 2.8 The Council received a number of requests for parking restrictions on Willow Drive. Parking on Willow Drive, between its junctions with Handsworth Road and Hall Road, creates a bottleneck that obstructs access from and egress onto Handsworth Road. The parking also obstructs the traffic flow and sight lines at the Hall Road junction.
 - 2.8.1 To try to address these issues, double yellow lines were advertised on Willow Drive. The original scheme proposals are shown in the plan in Appendix A.

3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

3.1 Legislation requires that a notice describing the proposed legal restrictions is advertised in the local press. There is a three week consultation period for people to object in writing to the proposal, or submit comments in writing. In addition to the press advertisement of the notice, Sheffield also put up notices on-street, together with plans of the proposals

3.2 The consultation, for all of these schemes, took place between Thursday 8 July 2021 and Thursday 29 July 2121. An advertisement was placed in the local press on 8 July 2021. 35 notices were displayed on street, for the public to read, as follows:

Button Hill / Ranelagh Drive	4
Carter Knowle Road / Fossdale Road	4
High Street	4
Medlock Drive	2
Sevenairs Road	8
Town End Road	9
Willow Drive	4

The following responses were received from the consultation:

3.3 Button Hill / Ranelagh Drive

3.3.1 There were three objections to the proposals on the grounds of loss of parking provision. One of the three objections was on the grounds that the proposals are of an inadequate length. It may be concluded therefore that this objector supports the restrictions that were advertised except to say that they did not think they went far enough. One response was in support of the proposals.

3.3.2 In order to mitigate the objections, the proposed restrictions are to be reduced as follows:

The eastern side of Button Hill, on the north side of its junction with Ranelagh Drive - to be reduced from 25m to 12m

The eastern side of Button Hill, on the south side of its junction with Ranelagh Drive - to be reduced from 24.5m to 18m

Ranelagh Drive, north and south sides - to be reduced from 18m to 12m

3.3.3 The proposed amendments will still serve to improve visibility for drivers exiting Ranelagh Drive and pedestrians crossing the road, albeit to a lesser extent than the measures originally proposed. The revised proposals allow more on-street parking, than the original proposals, for any driver wishing to visit Mylnhurst School or the nearby business.

3.4 Carter Knowle Road / Fossdale Road

- 3.4.1 Objection one was on the grounds that the proposals are of an inadequate length. In effect, therefore, this supports the restrictions that were advertised although the objector thought they did not go far enough.
- 3.4.2 Objection two requested a gap in the proposed restrictions, to permit private, on-street parking. This was not considered to be practical, on the basis that it would likely be in permanent use, not be exclusive to the requestor and would, in all likelihood, result in the obstruction of the requestor's driveway by parked vehicles.

3.5 High Street, Beighton

- 3.5.1 There were four objections and one expression of support.
- 3.5.2 Between the four objections, inconvenience caused by the loss of parking, increased traffic speeds and the displacement of parking were cited three times each by the objectors.
- 3.5.3 In order to mitigate the objections, the proposed restrictions are to be reduced by a total of 67.5 metres. This should still achieve the traffic management benefits expected upon introduction of the restrictions. Refer to the plans in Appendices A and B.

3.6 Medlock Drive

- 3.6.1 There were five objections to the proposals on the grounds that the restrictions are unnecessary (cited three times), will displace traffic (cited three times) and will cause inconvenience (cited five times).
- 3.6.2 In order to mitigate the objections, the proposed restrictions are to be reduced by 18m on the northeast side and 23m on the southwest side. For a total reduction of 41 metres. Refer to the plans in Appendices A and B. It is considered that this reduction should be sufficient to address the objector's concerns and that the introduction of the reduced restrictions will still achieve the original aim of the scheme to prevent congestion at the junction.

3.7 Sevenairs Road

- 3.7.1 There were eight objections to the proposals. The objectors claim, in varying numbers:

that the proposed restrictions will cause inconvenience	8
that they will result in an increase in traffic speeds	7
that they will result in parking displacement	6
that the proposed restrictions are unnecessary	3
- 3.7.2 A comparison of the proposed and revised plans will show that the proposed double yellow lines, on the southwestern part of Sevenairs Road, have been reduced. This will address the concern, expressed by

seven objectors, that some motorists may take the opportunity to speed if the carriageway width is not restricted by parked vehicles. The proposed restrictions at the junction of Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove have been almost entirely removed. These changes should entirely address the concerns about inconvenience and displacement of parking.

3.8 Town End Road

3.8.1 There were eight objections and one expression of support to the proposals for Town End Road, on the following grounds:

Five of the objectors complained about the reduction in on-street parking availability.

Three of the objectors complained that removing parking would lead to higher traffic speeds.

Two of the objectors complained that deliveries would be problematic as vehicles would have nowhere to park and unload.

Two of the objectors requested the provision of parking bays, using the grass verges on the north side of the road, to mitigate the loss of on-street parking

One objector described the parking restrictions as unnecessary.

3.8.2 In response to the objections received the original proposals, which were for 370m of double yellow lines, have been reduced by 78m. In this way, the availability of on-street parking has been less severely reduced. This area will be available for use by vehicles making deliveries, as well as residents. Vehicles that are making deliveries will also be able to park on the double yellow lines in order to carry out this function. This is because the proposals do not include any 'no loading' restrictions.

3.8.3 The proposed 78m space in the double yellow lines will have a speed-reducing effect on vehicles entering Ecclesfield due to vehicles being parked partly on the carriageway.

3.8.4 The provision of parking bays is completely beyond the scope of this scheme. The Council will, however, continue to monitor the efficacy of the measures introduced in these proposals and will review the introduction of parking bays in the event that it is considered expedient.

3.9 Willow Drive

3.9.1 There were three objections. Two residents of Willow Drive objected on the grounds of inconvenience, because they would no longer be able to park outside their property. They also cited displacement, because they would be constrained to park their vehicles outside other resident's properties.

- 3.9.2 A business owner objected both to the original proposals and to the revised, less extensive proposals. They objected on the grounds that (i) parking restrictions are unnecessary and (ii) if any restrictions are introduced, the loss of passing trade will result in the closure of their business.
- 3.9.3 A comparison of the plans, in Appendices A and B, will show that the proposals for Willow Drive have been reduced to the bare minimum needed to keep two junctions clear of parked vehicles. The proposed restrictions outside a property on Willow Drive, jointly occupied by two of the objectors, have been completely removed. It is considered that the concerns of all the objectors have been accommodated as far as it is practical to do so.
- 3.10 A full presentation of all the objections and responses appears in Appendix C.

4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications

The measures will improve safety at junctions and other locations, through the removal of parking that obstructs both vehicles and pedestrians and blocks sight lines. This should have a positive impact for all highway and footway users particularly disabled people, older people and school age children.

4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

- 4.2.1 The total cost of implementing the schemes, including the commuted sum payments for ongoing maintenance costs, is to be funded from the allocated capital budget for 'Double Yellow Lines 2021/22' within the Local Transport Plan. The total cost of implementing these works is £20770.75, comprising £11500.00 staff costs, £3684.24 lining works + £368.43 HMD fees + £5218.08 commuted sum costs.

4.3 Legal Implications

- 4.3.1 The Council has powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ('the 1984 Act') to implement the improvements requested in this report. The Council has the power to make Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) under section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ('the 1984 Act') for reasons that include the avoidance of danger to people or traffic and for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians). In exercising the powers under the 1984 Act, the Council must have regard to its duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) as well as the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway.

- 4.3.2 Before the Council can make a TRO, it must consult with relevant bodies and publish notice of its intention in a local newspaper in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 ('the 1996 Regulations') as well as take such steps as it considers appropriate for ensuring that adequate publicity is given to the proposed order. This includes the display of notices on street. The Council has complied with these requirements.
- 4.3.3 The Council is required to consider all duly made objections received and not withdrawn before it can proceed with making an order. Those objections are presented for consideration in this report. The Council may modify an order, whether in consequence of any objections or otherwise, before it is made. The modifications described within this report are not considered to be, individually, substantial changes in the proposed order.
- 4.3.4 The Council is under a duty contained in section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 to manage their road network with a view to securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network, so far as may be reasonably practicable while having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives. This is called the network management duty and includes any actions the Council may take in performing that duty which contribute for securing the more efficient use of their road network or for the avoidance, elimination or reduction of road congestion (or other disruption to the movement of traffic) on their road network. It may involve the exercise of any power to regulate or co-ordinate the uses made of any road (or part of a road) in its road network. The proposals described in this report are considered to fulfil that duty.

4.4 Other Implications

- 4.4.1 The implementation of these schemes will improve road safety for pedestrians and motorists as sight lines will not be blocked by parked vehicles.
- 4.4.2 The introduction of parking restrictions may have a positive impact on the way people choose to travel. Where on-street parking is limited, it may encourage people to use bikes and / or public transport, in preference to cars. This, in turn, supports the Clear Air Zone initiative.

5. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 5.1 The only alternative is to not introduce any parking restrictions at these locations. This is not considered to be an acceptable option. The measures proposed will contribute to pedestrian safety by improving visibility at crossing points and preventing parking that blocks footways. The improvement of sight lines at junctions also contributes to vehicle safety. The removal of obstructive parking ensures accessibility for all vehicles, including emergency service vehicles.

- 5.2 Without the introduction of the parking restrictions, outlined in this report, all of the road safety and accessibility issues, for both pedestrians and vehicles, will remain.
- 5.3 The beneficial effects of the proposed measures do not incur the penalty of having adverse effects on either the climate or the economy as there are none. No other alternatives to parking restrictions have been considered.

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The proposed measures will address obstructive parking. This will improve access and visibility and thereby safety for all road users. It will also achieve the removal of parking that obstructs footways and thereby improve pedestrian safety and access and also assist traffic flows.

Appendix A: Original TRO plans

See separate document

Appendix B: Revised TRO plans

See separate document

Appendix C: Objections

Button Hill

Objection One

write in relation to the restricted parking on Button Hill S11 9HF. I would like to relay that there is resident at xx Button Hill who is registered as disabled. On a regular basis parking is required outside the house to ensure that the disabled individual can access the car comfortably, unfortunately due to the drive way being narrow the car has to be parked outside on the road in front of xx Button Hill to ease transportation into the vehicle.

I am not sure at which point you wish to cease the yellow lines but I would respectfully like to request that the double yellow lines are not placed directly outside of xx Button Hill, as this would hinder the care plan that we have in place for the disabled individual. It would create a barrier to the pick up and transportation of the said individual. I would also like to confirm that there are two young disabled Children that also visit the property frequently and also require parking outside of xx Button Hill (they have been issued with a disabled blue badge due to their disabilities), if double yellow lines are placed outside xx Button Hill, this would also cause an issue to their care plan.

Officer Response

The 25m length of double yellow lines that were originally proposed would have partly covered the frontage of the property in question. Now that the proposed lines have been reduced to only 12m, that is no longer the case.

Objection Two

I hope that this finds you well. I am writing to you regarding the Proposed Traffic Regulation Order, dated 8th July 2021, which has appeared on lampposts on Button Hill and the surrounding area, directly affecting Mylnhurst Preparatory School and Nursery.

The notice appeared the day before school closed for the summer holiday and the period allowed for challenges to be raised closed before term started. I suspect that the proposed changes are, at least in part, in an effort to prevent Mylnhurst's parents from stopping in this area whilst dropping off their children. I am therefore enormously disappointed that the school was not advised of this proposal or consulted on any changes to give us a reasonable opportunity to raise any concerns or adequate time to plan for these changes. I wonder if other local schools such as St Wilfrid's or Dobcroft would have been afforded more of a cooperative approach?

Whilst I am sympathetic to our neighbours wish for considerate parking, I feel that the school's needs should also have been taken into account as I am greatly concerned that the addition of further restrictions will endanger our pupils' health and safety by causing dangerous driving and stopping of cars and only push any perceived issues with parking further down the road.

Officer Response

The proposal notices for the Traffic Regulation Order were posted on street at the first available opportunity, in order to progress this year's programme of parking restrictions. Although this objector is complaining about the timing of the notice placement, they clearly saw it and read it. The fact that the TRO notice was erected only one day before Mylnhurst School closed for the summer holiday is simply unfortunate timing. Sheffield City Council has, nevertheless, fulfilled the statutory consultation requirements.

The objector is correct in that the restrictions are clearly intended to deal with obstructive parking by parents of children attending Mylnhurst School. Parking restrictions at the junction of Button Hill and Ranelagh Drive will, if adhered to, keep the junction clear of parked vehicles. This will make the junction much safer for children who need to cross it, on foot, on their way to and from school.

Some displacement of parking is almost inevitable, but this will not endanger pedestrians and vehicles at the junction and so the overall effect, on road safety, will be beneficial.

Objection Three

I'd like to write in full support of the proposals for Button Hill. As a local resident, his is well overdue.

However, I feel the restrictions need to be extended further along Button Hill towards the junction with Springfield Road. Parents taking children to Mylnhurst School park on both sides of Button Hill from Ranelagh Drive down towards Springfield Road (which is quite narrow) often making it impossible for the bus to negotiate the junctions with Springfield Road and Woodholm Road.

Officer Response

It is not possible to extend the proposed restrictions without first advertising them to anyone likely to be affected by them and give people a further opportunity to make representations. The modifications would be considered to substantially change the order so as to make that necessary as per the order making regulations. There is also no scope to do this in the 2021/22 parking restrictions programme. The existing proposals have generated objections and an extension of the proposed yellow line parking restrictions would likely lead to an increase in the number of objections. Transport Planning have received no complaints, from any bus operators, concerning accessibility.

Carter Knowle Road / Fossdale Road

Objection One

"Thank you for giving local residents the opportunity to comment on the proposed traffic regulation (double yellow lines) for the corner of Fossdale Road and the junction with Carterknowle Road.

Whilst in principle I agree with the proposed traffic regulation, existing street parking for residents is already a concern for those who live on Fossdale Road. Any existing changes will push the existing problem on the corner just further down Fossdale Road.

For example we already have two households, on my side of the street that between them have seven vehicles; this combined with the morning rush to drop children off at the three surrounding schools, existing street parking is already limited. Note, cars generally park on both sides of the street during the day, which narrows the width to drive down the road, only allowing one car to pass at a time. I would like to propose that the yellow lines be extended down further to the start of number 46 on the left hand side as you drive down Fossdale Road, so that in order to park my car on or in front of my drive I can do so, because if cars are parked both sides of the gate and the opposite side I will be unable to manoeuvre my car onto the driveway. In addition, if cars are parked both sides of the gate and opposite, it would be difficult to manoeuvre the car off the driveway and I am unable to see both ways down Fossdale Road which could increase risks of accidents. Having the yellow lines up to 46 on the left hand side as you drive down Fossdale Road, would eliminate cars parked on one side allowing me safer access to and from my driveway. I look forward to you response."

Officer Response

This is not an objection to the double yellow lines that have been advertised. As noted above, to extend the restrictions would require further advertisement, which is not possible as part of this year's programme. The parking restrictions that have been advertised are intended, primarily, to keep the junction of Carter Knowle Road and Fossdale Road clear of parked vehicles during school start and finish times. This will enhance the safety of those children crossing this junction, on foot, to attend Mercia School. Resolving wider parking issues on Fossdale Road is beyond the scope of this scheme.

Objection Two

A neighbour recently and he expressed regret that the proposed yellow lines which you helped us secure before the pandemic struck will make parking his car more difficult than it has hitherto been. His drive is relatively narrow and he has difficulty getting out of his car, needing a wide-open door. He lives in the house on the corner of Fossdale Road and Carter Knowle Road, but his drive is reached via Fossdale Road, next door to number xx. The yellow lines are scheduled for both sides of the road. Turning right is the problem manoeuvre, turning left not so much so.

xxxx and I were out for a walk when we were approached by this neighbour, who is someone we and others get on well with, so I said that I would acquaint you with his misgivings and this is what I am doing in this email. He didn't feel able to raise the issue himself and it may well be too late in the process.

All other comments have been massively in favour, especially the yellow lines that are going to be put on the Junior School side of Fossdale Road and which should make visibility regarding cars coming up the hill much better -- of course, we very much appreciate the work you local councillors did to help us in this matter and the cooperation of Bob Johnson and his colleagues. There it is, then. I am acting as a conduit for a local opinion. Can you advise?

Officer Response

The consultation period for objections closed on 29 July 2021. This objection was not received until 3 September. Furthermore, this objection was submitted via a third party. This person did not submit a written objection to Traffic Regulations as the consultation rules require. Consequently, under the regulations, the Council is not required to consider this objection. The Council can however, at its discretion, choose to consider this objection. It is being presented, in this report, for that purpose.

The decision is that it would be impractical to accede to the request. There is a heavy demand for parking in this area, which is why the parking restrictions have been advertised. If Transport Planning and Traffic Regulations were to omit a length of double yellow lines, as requested, then that section of Fossdale Road would be permanently parked up. Not only would the person in question not be able to park on-street but would, in all likelihood, find their drive frequently obstructed by parked vehicles.

Transport Planning officers have to consider the wider situation, as the scheme is designed to enhance pedestrian and traffic safety at the junction.

High Street, Beighton

Objection One

There have been no recent incidents that justify reviewing the road markings. Reducing the parking will increase the speed of passing cut through traffic. The proposals will have a detrimental effect on the Lifestyle Centres service to the community. We are a community owned, not for profit organisation whose driving mission is to help combat social isolation and mental health issues by providing a place for people to meet. We have over 800 people a week who visit our centre. The oaps Luncheon Club and Dementia Dance is attended by 40 people each week with the majority being over 80 and they need to be able to close nearby. We do have limited parking and making people park a considerable distance away from our site, especially those dealing with infirmity, or young mums struggling with a pram or toddlers, will put a barrier to people using the centre. The impact on our service to our local community will be catastrophic, I can easily see this severely curtailing our ability to deliver our activities for these vulnerable people along with having an impact on people jobs.

Officer Response

Transport Planning and Traffic Regulations have read and accept the objection submitted by the Bighton Lifestyle Centre. A study of the originally proposed and revised parking restriction plans will show that the parking restrictions for High Street have been reduced to the minimum necessary for considerations of improved road safety.

Objection Two

I hereby lodge my opposition to the proposed traffic order number 1133. High Street, Bighton in respect to the extension of the existing double yellow lines on the South side of the road.

As a parent with children at Bighton Nursery Infant school and the adjacent childcare centre, I walk my children along the High Street and pass over the zebra crossing to School Road no less than six times a day.

One concern I have stems from the observable difference in speed and manner with which drivers take this bend depending on how clear it is. Simply put, on days where several cars are parked along the bend, drivers in both directions approach with more caution and I find they are more likely to observe the crossing / stop for pedestrians. However, when the bend is clear the increase in speed of vehicles in both directions is significant, and on countless occasions I have witnessed drivers fail to stop at the crossing.

Although I do not drive my child to school, I am familiar with many children whose parents, relatives and carers do, and know that they rely on the certainty of being able to park along the High Street to be able to access the school within the time they have available. I am sure the majority would prefer to walk to school, but for many this is not viable on certain days, and it is therefore crucial that parking within the area remains as unrestricted as possible.

A further concern I have with the proposition is that by restricting parking on such a large portion of the High Street, it will simply force parked cars further South along the road and toward more hazardous areas. Namely the brow of the hill and down to the junction with Eckington Road and West Street. The 40mph / 30 mph speed limit transition heading North on Eckington Road makes this particular point quite dangerous and in recent memory there has been a child struck down on Eckington Rd and at least one substantial collision (of a bus and car) at this junction. Yet I do not recall any recent incidents around the High Street bend, which raises the question of whether any changes to the road markings are necessary there.

I would also like to make mention of the potential negative impact the proposed changes would make to the Lifestyle Centre located on the High Street. Its own carpark is small and rightfully partly reserved for disability access, so many users of this vital village amenity and the businesses, clubs and groups hosted therein may well struggle to conveniently access it.

Having posted and discussed the proposition on our village community page online I have seen many thoughts raised. I am well aware that for drivers in and through the village parked cars here are a source of frustration, that the bend becomes congested at times of the day and drivers struggle to make progress. However there remains enough room for two streams of vehicles to pass each other provided cars are appropriately parked on the Southern side only. Issues arise when vehicles are parked on both the North and South side which reduces the available road width forcing drivers to have to exchange one another in both

directions.

As a closing sentiment then I stand to say that I prefer to see an accessible village in which residents and visitors can readily park rather than one which people can speed through and utilise as a quick short cut!

Officer Response

Transport Planning and Traffic Regulations accept this objection. The proposed parking restrictions have, accordingly, been reduced by a total of 67.5m. It is considered that this reduction should address the objector's concerns and that the measures to be implemented should still achieve the scheme's objectives.

Objection Three

I am writing to oppose the proposal to introduce prohibition of waiting at any time as per the drawings currently posted outside Beighton Lifestyle Centre.

As the parking situation stands, the parked cars during busy periods of business at the Beighton Lifestyle centre provide much needed, natural traffic calming which protects the pedestrians using this area at those times, including the elderly and small children who are more vulnerable to the traffic which otherwise is inclined to continue at speed out of the nearby 40 zone. If a prohibition is introduced, a need will arise for further infrastructure alterations to create enforced traffic calming which will inconvenience traffic 24/7 and not just during Lifestyle's business hours

At present, if residents request traffic calming, they are advised to park in a fashion which creates traffic calming by creating a chicane. The current parking arrangements outside the Lifestyle Centre force vehicles to take turns to pass, which also creates safe gaps for pedestrians to cross

The introduction of double yellow lines as per the proposal drawing will force vehicles to park over the brow of the hill which cannot be seen on this 2 dimensional plan, creating a greater hazard than is immediately evident

The current arrangement also provides protection for the pedestrian crossing in the vicinity, as traffic is forced to slow past the parked vehicles before approaching the crossing. Removal of the available parking will result in more vehicles approaching the crossing with residual speed from the preceding 40 zone. Again, if the parking is altered, further infrastructure will be required to tackle the behaviour of motorists in the area, either by upgrading the crossing to one with control lights rather than flashing beacons, or the introduction of a speed camera

Officer Response

Transport Planning and Traffic Regulations accept this objection. As noted above, the proposed parking restrictions have been reduced by 67.5m. It is considered that this reduction should address the objector's concerns.

Objection Four

I wish to raise objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order and placing of double yellow lines on Main Street at Beighton.

My first objection is to the planning process itself. The closure date for objections is 29th July 2021 and the letter dated 8th July 2021. The notices appeared on street lamps at Beighton in mid September. Surely this process is defective.

Otherwise, my objections are as follows and relate to the 92 metres of lines to be painted on Main Street.

1) Placing restrictions on the right side of the road (towards Beighton) will displace school drop-off traffic to park on the left side of the road instead. Drivers doors will then open into the road instead of the footpath and parents will undoubtedly cross the road here rather than walk down the road to the crossing. They will take the easiest option.

Aside from the obvious dangers, this will surely create more traffic disruption due to the opening of doors into live lanes.

2) A lot of people who use cars for school runs, do so out of necessity. Some have to shoot straight off to work and don't have time to walk. Personally, as a grandparent, I do walk sometimes, and sometimes drive. Walking 3/4 mile in winter rain and wind with a pram and 7 year old school child is terrible, so I should be able to use my car if I choose.

Parking restrictions here, will not change vehicle usage, but will push even more vehicles into the nearby residential streets which are already chaotic during school start and finish times. Have they been consulted?

3) Traffic flows quite well (although slower) on High Street even when cars park on the right hand side. In fact it creates a traffic calming effect around school times. Only when the odd driver decides to park opposite, is a pinch point created and the flow is genuinely disrupted.

So my objection is based on the inevitable negative effect, when balanced against the perceived positive effect on traffic flow.

My suggestion would be to place the restriction on the opposite side of High street. This will prevent the odd car from causing chaos by 'double parking' on High Street and there will be no displacement into the residential streets or dangerous loading and unloading at school times into live lanes.

In an ideal world everyone would live within sensible walking distance of schools, but the reality is quite different and displaced drivers will find somewhere to park. Probably creating more problems.

Officer Response

The publication of the Council's proposal for this TRO was carried out in conformance with the statutory requirements. The Council's Traffic Regulations team contacted the objector regarding the dates when the notices were posted on-street. The objector acknowledged that they had made a mistake about the dates. This element of their objection has, therefore, been resolved satisfactorily.

As noted above, the proposed restrictions have been reduced in length to the minimum required to improve road safety. It is not possible to propose restrictions in an alternative location without advertising them to anyone likely to be affected by them so as to give people a further opportunity to make representations. There is no opportunity to do this within this year's programme of parking restrictions schemes.

Support One

I write in regards the proposed traffic regulation order. I am fully in support of the proposal. We live directly adjacent to the proposal.

Regularly our peace is disturbed by road aggression from either the parking causing an obstruction on the road or cars parked on the pavement preventing people and especially prams / disability scooters being able to progress on the path safely.

We are acutely aware that by supporting this proposal it risks pushing more parking onto the residential roads where we live, however, we feel this is a safer option for all and a lesser inconvenience than worrying someone has been seriously injured on the main road.

We hope you are able to action this proposal ahead of the new school year in September to start the school year with safer roads near the school and on the High Street in Beighton.

Officer Response

In response to the objections received, it has proved advisable to reduce the proposed restrictions. Due to public consultation timescales and limited staff resources it has not been possible to introduce the planned restrictions in September.

Medlock Drive

Objection One

I am responding to your plans to add further yellow lines to Medlock Drive, and extend the ones on Orgreave lane to further exasperate the residents living in that area.

I and other residents, have been in contact with yourselves in the past regarding the REMOVE of these lines, due to parking tickets being given out by over enthusiastic traffic wardens. (Also speeding along Orgreave lane, but that's another issue that's been on going for at least 3/4 yrs to my knowledge).

I did have a conversation with either yourself or other colleagues, way back in Feb 2020, about the lines, and was informed although he was sympathetic with our problem, it would incur a cost of 5k, to remove them, and there was no money "in the kitty" for such things, I am now informed the cost of putting new ones down, would cost 10K. (Which I find completely unbelievable, the man who paints yellow lines must be laughing his socks off). Please tell me where is the logic in that. And savings for that matter.

Looking at your plan, the 5-6 houses it concerns on Orgreave Lane, and the area on Medlock Dv, constantly have cars parked there, either by residents, visitors to these residents, or visitors to the dentist located on Orgreave Lane. Where would these cars now have to park? Further along Medlock Dv, or Orgreave lane, causing more traffic mayhem, I'm sure the residents concerned, would have something to say about that in the future.

All that you seem to be doing is moving the problem elsewhere, and not sorting the problem out.

Officer Response

A comparison of the advertised and revised plans will show that the proposed parking restrictions at the junction of Medlock Drive and Orgreave Lane have been reduced from 30m and 35m to just 12m on both sides of Medlock Drive. The additional 12m extensions of the parking restrictions are considered to be desirable in order to prevent bottlenecks occurring, at the junction, due to parked vehicles. It is considered that, by reducing the length of the proposed parking restrictions by 18m and 23m, the objector's concerns have been addressed.

Transport Planning has no record of any requests for the existing parking restrictions to be reduced.

With regard to costs, the legal processes required in the making of a TRO contribute to its total cost. This includes the requirement to carry out notification procedures so the public may be adequately informed of the Council's proposals. There is also the officer time of the Council's technical and professional staff and the physical implementation of the restrictions on-street. These costs can total up to £10,000 though this is not always the case.

Objection Two

I am contacting you due to the traffic council notice displayed in our area. I am writing this email on behalf of Orgreave Dental Surgery (25 Orgreave Lane). We have a number of patients who attend Monday-Friday, most who drive, and parking is an issue a lot of the time, as it is. The staff who work here also drive, and we all require a parking space. We use the space we have on our driveway but this is limited due to the amount of cars/space for patients to walk. Placing yellow lines would certainly cause further problems for us, not to mention the people who live in this area. We are hoping you will reconsider this decision, and if a site visit can be arranged to assess the limited amount of parking we have, this would be very much appreciated.

Officer Response

The proposed parking restrictions have been reduced by a total of 41 metres. It is considered that, by reducing the length of the proposed parking restrictions to this extent, the objector's concerns have been addressed.

Objection Three

I live on a section of Orgreave Lane where I am fortunate to have a drive and therefore my personal parking will be un-effected. However I have neighbours on Orgreave lane from numbers 2 – 12 who do not have Drive-ways and have a reliance on the parking opposite on Medlock Drive.

I am in wonderment of the persons lobbying on The Medlock estate as to why they want this as no homes are affected in this section of Medlock Drive. When cars are parked yes you may have to give way, but that is much of the same across the whole country with other Roads been effected much worse than Medlock drive.

There is also a Dentist at Number 25 Orgreave lane with many patients, they also have a reliance on this section of Medlock Drive. As double yellow lines already exist on Orgreave lane.

The cars that park on Medlock Drive, will only be forced to park further into the Medlock estate, causing more complaints from its residents costing the tax payer more money in the long road. They will never be satisfied.

Medlock Drive is seriously not that bad, please just leave it only and spend more money on Skipton Road and Sturton Road Sheffield 4, where there are real parking issues not pretend ones.

Officer Response

It is considered that the proposed 41 metre reduction in the length of the parking restrictions on Medlock Drive should address the objector's concerns.

Transport Planning has no record of any requests for parking restrictions on Skipton Road. Transport Planning has requests on record for parking restrictions on Scott Road. These are not, however, eligible for consideration at the present time.

Objection Four

I am writing to oppose this action, you are removing and Parking for ourselves or visitors or workmen. You have enforced restrictions on Orgreave Lane causing so many problems for us. Now you want to remove the only parking we have. We have requested numerous sdite visits but the council refuses to listen.

Officer Response

The proposed reduction in the length of the parking restrictions on Medlock Drive should be sufficient to address the objector's concerns.

Objection Five

I am contacting yourself due to the traffic notice on Medlock Drive S13. I live on Orgreave Lane, S13 9NE and have two cars and only have space to park one car on my little drive, not only my cars that have to park I also have a daughter and friends who travel by car who will have no where to park as they will no longer be able to park on Medlock Drive or the top of my drive due to yellow lines on the main road as well.

These new yellow lines won't only affect me and my family but the businesses who have employees that and customers that use Medlock Drive to park. This will lead to many residents, employees and customers to park further down Medlock in front of houses which I am sure the residents of Medlock won't want

this to happen and will be unable to get on and off their drives and will have no where else to park.

Officer Response

The proposed reduction in the length of the parking restrictions on Medlock Drive should be sufficient to address the objector's concerns.

Sevenairs Road

Objection One

I have been over this with my husband and it appears that we will be affected and therefore would like to object to the proposed order.

Looking at the plans you have sent through they do not account for our house that is on Sevenairs Road. I have marked in blue below which is our house and we exit onto Sevenairs Road.

We bought the house in November last year and the on street parking is something that we have to consider. We have elderly visitors to the house and therefore there will be nowhere for them park if there are double yellows in front. Also, I am concerned that if there are no cars parked on the road vehicles will speed up and down the road as this definitely happens at night when there is nothing parked there. Has a different speed limit been considered as it worries me?

I realise that we are the only house on Sevenairs Road and therefore it will not affect anyone else but this is something we would like to discuss further with someone. As a compromise would it be possible to keep 5 metres either side of our driveway that allows us to park on the road or have a residence parking permit something along them lines?

Officer Response

As comparison of the advertised and revised plans will show, the originally proposed parking restrictions at the junction of Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove have been reduced. It is considered that this reduction should address the objector's concerns.

Sevenairs Road currently has a 30mph speed limit. It is, however, within the Beighton 20mph area, which is scheduled for introduction in 2022. This should address the objector's concerns regarding traffic speeds.

Objection Two

With reference to the above "Traffic Regulation Order" displayed on the 8th. July 2021, on the street lighting pole, I wish to 'formally object' (and the neighbours at xx; xx and xx Sevenairs Road) to the proposals around the junction of Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove.

My family have occupied number xx Sevenairs Road, Beighton from the property first being built, e.g. for the last nineteen years.

I have a disabled son and wife and I have previously applied to the Highways

Dept, and been refused for a disable parking bay to the rear of our property, within Sevenairs View, this after neighbour objections. As a consequence I have to park directly outside of our house – partly with the wheels on to the public footpath, while maintaining a minimum of 1500mm public foot path, clear access for pedestrians and other disabled residents on Motability scooters. This has caused no issues and we have had no adverse comments from the police who regularly patrol the estate. Yes I have a double garage and a double width drive – the garage is full of belongings etc. When one of our vehicles are park on the drive it is impossible to open the doors fully to aid my wife or son out of the vehicle, hence the reason for parking as we do and as previously described, this has never caused any issues with road users or pedestrians.

Over the last nineteen years there have been no significant road traffic accidents at this junction. I would suggest that if the double yellow lines are installed, there will be a higher risk of a severe road traffic accident at this junction, due mainly to speed and anti-social driving. Historically we do suffer from anti-social driving from the top end of Sevenairs Road and the parking as existing does restrict the speed of these vehicles – a clear road will promote faster speeds and faster speeds around the junction itself.

There are more incidences of near misses of vehicles colliding when I stop and reverse my vehicle on to my drive – other drivers speed up to the rear of my vehicle expecting me to turn into Springwell Grove, this even though I have all four indicators flashing on, in these incidents it is just easier to drive and stop outside of our property on the road/pavement.

On behalf of the adjacent neighbours at N°s xx; xx and xx Sevenairs Road, who also object formally, the proposed yellow line restrictions will cause havoc for these families.

All the above properties have a minimum of two vehicles per house hold. Both xx and xx use their garages for household storage (the garages being very small to accommodate a vehicle) Number xx have had approval to convert their attached garage into living accommodation, xx/xxxxx/FUL | Alterations to convert garage into habitable room | xx Sevenairs Road Sheffield S20 1NY (now completed) leaving one car hardstanding within the curtilage of the property and only street parking for their other vehicle, this as approved by the Sheffield City Council Planning Dept,

Installing yellow lines outside of these properties will cause issues as to where to park their second vehicle, with the worry of security issues and causing upset and annoyance with adjacent neighbours etc.

We respectfully request that the Highways dept reconsider the proposed “yellow lines” and allow us to continue to ‘manage’ the parking as existing.

Consideration by the home owners, as to the possible provision of car hardstanding on the front of their properties has been rejected as these will fall far short of the minimum size required for a parking space.

If however the proposed traffic order does go ahead we would appreciate your

help and comments as to where alternative parking may be used or provided for these properties without just moving the issue somewhere else!!!.

Officer Response

As comparison of the advertised and revised plans will show the originally proposed parking restrictions, at the junction of Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove, have been reduced. It is considered that this reduction should address the objector's concerns.

Objection Three

I am writing to formally object to the Councils proposals regarding new parking restrictions on Sevenairs Road S20 1NY on the following grounds;

The current parking situation is far from ideal already on Sevenairs Road the majority of residents have 2 cars including myself and need to park across on the road outside my home due to no other space available. These new proposals will only make the situation worse with many people unable to park close to their homes as there is no alternative.

If the Council were to introduce a permit scheme this could help regulate car parking on Sevenairs Road.

The current parking of cars on both sides of the road most evenings acts as a natural buffer to slow traffic down compared to daytime workdays when drivers excessively speed past the houses regularly. These proposals will mean cars will travel up and down quicker, putting all residents and children visiting the playground at risk. I feel that having cars parked on both sides of the road calms traffic down and by restricting parking in this area and keeps the public and the regular children outside playing safe, your proposal will have the effect of increase in the speed of vehicles who will be given free reign.

On a personal note, I use the available parking on a daily basis outside my home always for the safety of being able to supervise my 2 week old baby in and out of the house when returning home by car whilst always insuring there is ample room for passing vehicles. I have a 2-week-old baby and I need to park outside my home to safely remove her from the car as my drive and garage is not connected to the property and is at the other side of the next-door neighbour's property 50 meters from my front door (please see attached image). There is insufficient space to remove the car seat from the car when the next-door neighbour is also parked on his drive (see attached image). There is not always 2 adults with our baby meaning in order to follow your proposal I would have to neglect my baby unsupervised risking her to come to harm to park the car after either putting her in the house or leaving her by the side of a busy road unsupervised when solo parenting. This is not something we are able to do which I'm sure you have responsibilities to keep the public safe you can understand this is a huge safeguarding matter for me and my family.

Our garage is used for storage and I own a car and a van , we would have nowhere to park one of these vehicles if you put this plan in place.

We purposely purchased this home to ensure we had off road parking to get our daughter in and out of the house safely, we had garage storage and room for two vehicles which our family needs for work purposes . If this plan was already in place we certainly wouldn't of purchased our home and this decreases the value

massively . If there are no areas left to park how will this affect the resale ability of our homes?

The properties were developed long before the level of traffic we deal with on a daily basis was even a consideration. We do not park on the road to be difficult but we are left with no choice to do so.

I trust you will consider these objections and I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Officer Response

As comparison of the advertised and revised plans will show, the originally proposed parking restrictions at the junction of Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove have been reduced. It is considered that this reduction should address the objector's concerns.

The Council would not consider introducing a permit parking scheme on Sevenairs Road. This is because the permit parking schemes that are currently in operation are not intended to manage the level of parking demand from residents themselves.

Objection Four

I am writing to formally object to the Councils proposals regarding new parking restrictions on Sevenairs Road S20 1NY on the following grounds;

The current parking situation is far from ideal already on Sevenairs Road the majority of residents have 2 cars and need to park across the road due to limited space available. These new proposals will only make the situation worse with many people unable to park close to their homes as there is no alternative.

If the Council were to introduce a permit scheme this could help regulate car parking on Sevenairs Road.

The current parking of cars on both sides of the road most evenings acts as a natural buffer to slow traffic down compared to daytime workdays when drivers excessively speed past the houses regularly. These proposals will mean cars will travel up and down quicker, putting all residents and children visiting the playground at risk. I feel that having cars parked on both sides of the road calms traffic down and by restricting parking in this area this will have the effect of increase in the speed of vehicles who will be given free reign. We need traffic to go slower because of the children's playground and not for cars to go faster.

On a personal note, I use the available parking on a daily basis outside my home always insuring there is ample room for passing vehicles. I have a 2-week old baby and I need to park outside my home to safely remove her from the car as my drive and garage is not connected to the property but is at the other side of the next-door neighbour's property 50 meters from my front door, (please see image below) There is insufficient space to remove the car seat from the car when the next-door neighbour is also parked on his drive (see image provided).

If the council was to go ahead with these new restrictions the only option I would have when returning home in the car would be to have to take my baby out of the car and put her in the house (further up the road away from me) whilst leaving the car illegally parked before returning to my car and leaving my baby on her own out of sight inside my home to go and park my car on our drive away from

the house , or the alternatively would have to leave my baby on a footpath in her car seat or pram on the side of the road on her own whilst I parked my car onto my driveway . This would be a huge safeguarding matter and negligence to my baby, I would in fact have to neglect my child to follow these new restrictions risking no supervision in the house or no supervision by a main road . Cars use this junction to turn around and a car seat with a child in on a footpath would in fact be in a blind spot of a drivers vision followed by many other risks of her been left by the side of a road on a public footpath- to approached by strangers, dogs, and many other risks that could cause her serious harm. I can not agree to these restrictions that clearly lead to neglect and harm of my child.

The properties were developed long before the level of traffic we deal with on a daily basis was even a consideration. We do not park on the road to be difficult but we are left with no choice to do so.

I trust you will consider these objections and have take into account the importance of safeguarding my daughter. I look forward to hearing from you in due course.

Officer Response

As comparison of the advertised and revised plans will show, the originally proposed parking restrictions at the junction of Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove have been reduced. It is considered that this reduction should address the objector's concerns.

The Council would not consider introducing a permit parking scheme on Sevenairs Road. This is because the permit parking schemes that are currently in operation are not intended to manage the level of parking demand from residents themselves.

Sevenairs Road currently has a 30mph speed limit. It is, however, within the Beighton 20mph area, which is scheduled for introduction in 2022. This should address the objector's concerns regarding traffic speeds.

Objection Five

Could I please provide some feedback relating to the above traffic order, relating to Sevenairs Road.

Overall I am pleased to see additional double yellow lines are being proposed, parking has been horrific for years.

However the additional double yellow lines proposed at the furthest end of the road opposite Springwell Grove could cause us an issue as residents of Sevenairs View.

In previous years we have had issues with the residents of No 51 building a gate in their rear garden and trying to use the turning area for permanent parking, recently new occupants of No 53 have also commented this would be an ideal place to park cars behind their property.

If double yellow lines are put in front of their houses this will encourage them

even more to try and park in our cul-de-sac. This area has always been a dedicated turning point only.

Officer Response

As comparison of the advertised and revised plans will show, the originally proposed parking restrictions at the junction of Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove have been reduced. It is considered that this reduction should address the objector's concerns.

Objection Six

I'm writing to you with regard to the notice for proposed waiting restrictions that has appeared on Sevenairs Road.

Whilst I do have some sympathy with the issues caused by unrestricted daytime parking between Eckington Way and the Becton Centre, the proposed changes outside numbers 51 to 59 Sevenairs Road will have significant impact on residents in these houses. The proposed changes would cause the residents of 51-59 Sevenairs Road to relocate from the previously unrestricted parking on street outside their homes to Springwell Grove, where an increase in parking there would cause a more significant problem for residents on that street and for others wanting to access beyond to the rest of the Springwell Grove estate.

I'd like to register an objection to the proposals as they are presented. My objections are on the following basis:

- The statement of reasons states that the restriction is required to facilitate the movement of traffic and improve access and visibility at junctions – The current arrangement that has been in place for several years, provides parking for vehicles such that traffic can pass at several locations between Eckington Way and Springwell Grove and the speed of traffic is attenuated to a level appropriate to a residential street. Removal of this parking will facilitate two way traffic running, which will inevitably increase the speed of traffic along Sevenairs Road, which may consequentially increase the risk of collisions, especially collisions involving young pedestrians. I note from www.crashmap.co.uk that no collisions have occurred in the area of the proposed restrictions since 2002.*
- The statement of reasons states that the restriction is required to facilitate the movement of traffic and improve access and visibility at junctions – Access is always available along Sevenairs Road, with refuse vehicles, home food deliveries and other delivery vehicles travelling this road unobstructed. I'd like to request evidence that traffic cannot currently freely move along this road.*
- The statement of reasons states that the restriction is required to facilitate the movement of traffic and improve access and visibility at junctions – The proposed restrictions are indicated in areas of kerbside that do not form any part of the visibility splay of junctions, in particular the frontage to numbers 51 to 59 Sevenairs Road.*
- It is my understanding that the waiting restrictions outside numbers 51 to 59 Sevenairs Road are proposed to protect access onto driveways – In the 18 years that I have lived here, I have never had any issues with vehicles blocking my driveway – I do not wish for my driveway to be protected by*

double yellow lines and acknowledge that any other road users could park in a way that may make access to my driveway difficult.

- The removal of the current unrestricted areas on Sevenairs Road, will increase the demand for parking further into the Sevenairs Road / Springwell Grove estate and is likely to also increase demand for parking on Lilac Road. The restrictions as proposed will see an increase in parking in areas of Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove, this was demonstrated in the past when construction work was underway in Crystal Peaks, at the Guinness Partnership Independent Living site and also at the Becton Centre Site.*

As a regular user of Sevenairs Road, I'd like to suggest as a compromise some minor tweaks to the area between Eckington Way and the Beckton Centre. The original restrictions were promoted at a time when demand for parking was high due to construction works in the area, although the available space around the Becton Centre does currently appear to be well used, more so than the section between Eckington Way and the access to the former Damon's Restaurant. The latter has planning consent for change of use from a restaurant to a public house, plus a fast food takeaway, which will increase traffic on this first section in a few months from now. Also, a new house has been built on Sevenairs Road, their driveway is not currently protected, but may, benefit from protection (subject to their agreement). As such, I'd recommend the following amendments to the existing order;

- Sevenairs Road – South eastern side – Remove the short section of unrestricted parking outside the Guinness Partnership Independent Living site and replace with no waiting at any time – This section causes the greatest issues with drivers heading towards Eckington Way often taking a middle path which does on occasion cause some frustration for drivers heading away from Eckington Way.*
- Sevenairs Road – Eastern side – Extend the no waiting at any time past the new house opposite the Becton Centre access – This Will improve access to the Becton Centre for larger vehicles and also protect the driveway to the new house – the length shown on your proposals seem reasonable, but could be shortened a little.*
- Although not entirely necessary in my view at the moment, one side of Sevenairs Road between Eckington Way and the Damon's access could be restricted – Increased traffic to the Damon's site, which will soon become a Wetherspoons and a Taco Bell, may make this more necessary in my view, but restrictions on both sides is excessive, will increase speeds on this section and will remove a regular rest space for taxi drivers waiting for calls for Crystal Peaks.*

Please could you confirm receipt of my objection and update me on the outcome of this consultation.

Officer Response

As comparison of the advertised and revised plans will show, the originally proposed parking restrictions at the junction of Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove have been reduced. It is considered that this reduction should address the objector's concerns regarding that part of the proposed

restrictions.

Sevenairs Road currently has a 30mph speed limit. It is, however, within the Beighton 20mph area, which is scheduled for introduction in 2022. This should address the objector's concerns regarding traffic speeds.

None of the objector's proposed changes to the parking restrictions are possible due to the fact that they would require the advertisement of a further set of proposals, which is not possible at this time.

Objection Seven

I'm writing to you with regard to the notice for proposed double yellow lines on Sevenairs Road. I would like to object to the proposals. I agree that with the Damon's site re-opening, traffic flow will increase in that area and double yellow lines may be necessary to keep traffic flowing freely. Double yellow lines on just one side of the road in just that section could be an option as the road is wide enough for this to let traffic still flow freely. The sections beyond this have already been altered and reduced the parking dramatically. Further reductions will push even more cars up the road causing problems for residents on Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove. The staggered yellow lines at the moment slow traffic down naturally and leaves ample parking for the Becton Centre, however, two way free flowing traffic from the park onwards is an accident waiting to happen – especially around the Springwell grove area. The cars parked outside 51 -59 homes are crucial for slowing traffic thus greatly reducing the risk of an accident. A lot of children reside and play in the area. These spaces are used by the residents as on street parking, all homes have two cars. Double yellow lines will as mentioned cause problems for these and other residents as these cars parked outside these homes will have to park further up Sevenairs Road or on Springwell Grove – outside other residents homes – where they park their own cars thus having a knock on effect. This will also have an effect on car insurance and the value of the properties will decrease. Having to park outside other residents' homes may also lead to criminal damage of vehicles ! Double yellow lines would be more appropriate opposite 53-59 Sevenairs Road as this will increase a drivers view when exiting Springwell Grove and looking up Sevenairs Road and still reduce traffic speed going up Sevenairs Road with parked cars outside 51-59. Some homes have very young children, having to park 50 + yards away from your home is not practical. If all the residents were pensioners or disabled, yellow lines would most likely not be considered outside these properties. The spaces outside 51-59 will have no impact on the rest of the project but will greatly impact these residents and in turn make a lot of other residents very angry, unnecessarily.

Officer Response

As comparison of the advertised and revised plans will show, the originally proposed parking restrictions at the junction of Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove have been reduced. It is considered that this reduction should address the objector's concerns.

Objection Eight

I would like to add my objection to the ‘Prohibition of waiting at any time’ on the parts of Sevenairs Road.

Although I understand there are issues with overflow parking, caused by Crystal Peaks shopping centre. I feel that this would only cause more problems for me personally.

I have spoken to some homeowner on my road, and they have stated that if there were to have yellow lines placed outside their house, they would simply park on the opposite side – meaning in front of my house.

This in effect would cause major issues to my property.

I already have problems with cars parking on my driveway and in front of my garden wall where I have some block paving. This has caused damage to the blocks, and they are all now uneven. It has been quoted that it will cost me £3,000 to redo.

I feel that the issue of parking is just being moved to different roads.

What needs to happen is an adequate parking area for the employees and shoppers from Crystal Peaks Centre.

The council continues to build but doesn’t think of the effects of more cars that brings with it and the problems it is causing.

Another look at how cars come in and out of the area would also be helpful. On some days it can take ½ hour to get through the traffic jam at the junction of Drake House retail Park.

I also feel we need speed limits on Sevenairs Road. This is an area where pensioners live and there are lots of families with young children.

Earlier this year my property was involved in 2 incidents of speeding cars.

The first one the car hit the streetlight in front of my living room and the second time the car hit the house causing the corner of my house needing to be rebuilt.

Officer Response

As comparison of the advertised and revised plans will show, the originally proposed parking restrictions at the junction of Sevenairs Road and Springwell Grove have been reduced. It is considered that this reduction should address the objector’s concerns.

It is not within the Council’s area of responsibility to provide parking provision for shopping centres.

Resolving the issue of traffic difficulties at Drake House Retail Park is outside the scope of this scheme.

Sevenairs Road is subject to a 30mph speed limit. There are no ‘30’ signs on the road because Highway Law states that local authorities may not use 30mph repeater signs in built-up areas (paragraph 2 of part 4 to schedule 10 in Traffic Signs Regulations and General Directions 2016). The general rule is that motorists should be aware that they are in a 30mph area because there are street lamps, which are 183 metres (200 yards) apart and the area is built-up. Apart from 30mph signs at the locations where the speed limit changes (for example from 40mph to 30mph), no other 30mph repeater signs or ‘30’ road markings, which are also classed as repeater

signs, are permitted. The general prohibition was the result of case law which makes it difficult to gain convictions for speeding if some restricted roads and not others have repeater signs.

Sevenairs Road is, however, within the Beighton 20mph area, which is scheduled for introduction in 2022. Sevenairs Road will, at that time, receive 20mph repeater signs. This should address the objector's concerns regarding traffic speeds.

Town End Road

Objection One

I am the owner of number xx Town End Road, and would like to submit this e mail as a formal objection to the proposal / request for alternative parking arrangement should the Council proceed.

I understand that the proposal is for no waiting at any time restrictions and that it is alleged that this is required to facilitate the movement of traffic, improve access and visibility at accesses for all road users and prevent footway parking. The code for this is TR/20/TER1.

While I appreciate that the road is narrow, the Council must appreciate that the houses on this section of the road do require facility to park hence the fact that visitors may often park half on the pavement and half on the road. Most houses in 2021 will have at least 2 cars and the limitations imposed by this order will make life even more difficult than it already is. Residents are forced to find alternative parking as it is, with very limited availability.

I accept, as stated above, that the road is narrow and that if cars park on that side of the road, then traffic has to travel in a single flow, however, this does at least slow down the vehicles travelling on the road.

If the Council feel that this is the only option available to them, then please accept this e mail as a formal request that the council investigate alternative parking options in the form of parking bays in the extensive grass verges on the road either side of the accessways to people's drives. This would prevent people having to park on the actual road where the proposed double yellows will end outside number 132 and further up, which again, will lead to a single flow of traffic.

In particular I suggest that parking bays be created in the grass verges outside the properties from number 126 and up the road on all grass verges.

I am aware that the Council have done exactly this in local areas, including on Ecclesfield Road, on the bottom of Sicey Avenue, near the Park View Residential Care Home, and in and around Hartley Brook Road, Shiregreen. I see no reason why this could not be done here. This would solve all of the issues, by allowing the continuous flow of traffic on the road, and also addressing the parking restrictions that have existed for some time and which will be exacerbated by the proposed double yellow lines.

I look forward to your thought on the matter and should there be a formal document that I need to suggest to allow the Council to investigate the proposed parking bays, please advise and I will complete the form accordingly.

Officer Response

The objections that have been submitted all contain similar concerns. The original proposal, to implement 370m of double yellow lines, has been reviewed in response to these objections. It is now proposed to reduce the length of the parking restrictions by 78m, between the Full Gospel Mission and number 126 Town End Road. Some parking restrictions are, however, required to prevent parking that obstructs both the footway and traffic flow on the carriageway, causing traffic jams.

The revised arrangement provides for some parking midway along Town End Road. This means that residents, their visitors and delivery drivers (as examples), can park in relatively close proximity to the nearby houses. The double yellow lines will improve the flow of traffic and provide clearer visibility of the road, given that parked cars will no longer be obstructing the sight lines of drivers and pedestrians. The yellow lines will remove parking from the footways thereby enabling pedestrians, including those with prams and small children, the elderly and wheelchair users to use the footway safely.

The proposed space in the double yellow lines will have a speed-reducing effect on vehicles entering Ecclesfield due to vehicles being parked partly on the carriageway.

There is no right to park on the highway in any particular place, including on the highway outside one's property. The primary purpose of the highway is to 'pass and repass', which includes the passage of pedestrians and vehicles. The Council may use its powers to facilitate that. Residents should not assume that they can park on the carriageway as their ability to do so is incidental to the right to use the highway and may be restricted. The provision of parking bays is not within the scope of this scheme.

Objection Two

I have just seen the proposal to ban parking on part of Town End Rd. I have noted longer parking outside houses on lower numbers before Harmony Music school, but few incidents outside my block 38-44. I don't have a car and so rely on occasional grocery delivery. Parking on the other side of the road is very limited so this would be problematic. If its your aim ,traffic flows freely enough and is often too fast from The Wheel we could do with some "please slow down signs painted on the road" in my opinion to slow the traffic down

Officer Response

The initial proposal, for 370m of double yellow lines on Town End Road, has been reduced by 78m. This provides a 78m length of parking, on the north side of Town End Road, for residents and their visitors, including delivery drivers.

The proposed 78m space in the double yellow lines will have a speed-reducing effect on vehicles entering Ecclesfield due to vehicles being parked partly on the carriageway.

All of the signs and markings that are installed on the carriageway have to be pre-approved by the Department for Transport and published in their Traffic Signs, Regulations and General Directions (TSRGD). There is no marking, of the type requested, in TSRGD and the provision of speed reduction measures is outside the scope of this scheme.

Objection Three

I have been a resident on this road for the past 34 years and have never witnessed any issues that have warranted double yellow lines on the road. I therefore object to this proposal on the basis that as a 2 car family we will have nowhere to park our second car plus it will also effect any delivery's we or anyone on the road have. If this were to go ahead, which we hope it won't, will there be parking bay's put where the grass verge is opposite nos 63 to 53 Townend road similar to the ones on the wheel and Woolley wood Road and Sicey avenue.

Officer Response

There will be 78m of parking available, on the north side of Town End Road, between the Full Gospel Mission and number 126. This is an increase in available parking compared to the original proposal for 370m of double yellow lines. There is some limited parking available on the south side of Town End Road. The implementation of double yellow lines on Town End Road is to improve traffic flow, increase visibility for drivers and pedestrians and to clear the currently obstructed footway on the north side of the road. In this way, it is easier and safer to use for all pedestrians.

If the property does not already have off street parking that would probably have been the case when the current occupiers purchased the property. They should have been aware at that time that there was limited on-street parking available. They should also not have made the assumptions that they had a right to park on-street and that on-street parking would not be restricted at some point in the future.

Some residents of Town End Road clearly consider that there are parking and traffic issues, hence the requests received for parking restrictions.

There is no right to park on the highway in any particular place, including on the highway outside one's property. The primary purpose of the highway is to 'pass and repass', which includes the passage of pedestrians and vehicles. The Council may use its powers to facilitate that. Residents should not assume that they can park on the carriageway as their ability to do so is incidental to the right to use the highway and may be restricted. The provision of parking bays is not within the scope of this scheme.

Objection Four

I am writing to you with regards to a proposal to have double yellow lines on Townend Road. I am objecting to this as this road already has minimum parking for residents, some whom have 2 cars and struggle to park.

Officer Response

There will be 78m of parking available, on the north side of Town End Road, between the Full Gospel Mission and number 126. This is an increase in available parking compared to the original proposal for 370m of double yellow lines. There is also some limited parking available on the south side of Town End Road. The implementation of double yellow lines on Town End Road is to improve traffic flow, increase visibility for drivers and pedestrians and to clear the currently obstructed footway on the north side of the road. In this way, it is easier and safer to use for all pedestrians.

There is no right to park on the highway in any particular place, including on the highway outside one's property. The primary purpose of the highway is to 'pass and repass', which includes the passage of pedestrians and vehicles. The Council may use its powers to facilitate that. Residents should not assume that they can park on the carriageway as their ability to do so is incidental to the right to use the highway and may be restricted.

Objection Five

I want to object to the proposed order of no waiting time on 77 Townend Road. I live on the road with no off road parking however my main concern is that many drivers speed in excess of the limit on this road as it is & by removing the obstacle of parked cars which force drivers to slow down its an accident waiting to happen.

Officer Response

There will be 78m of parking available, on the north side of Town End Road, between the Full Gospel Mission and number 126. This is an increase in available parking compared to the original proposal for 370m of double yellow lines. There are no parking restrictions on the south side of Town End Road, so residents can park on that side of the road. The implementation of double yellow lines on Town End Road is to improve traffic flow, increase visibility for drivers and pedestrians and to clear the currently obstructed footway on the north side of the road. In this way, it is easier and safer to use for all pedestrians.

The proposed 78m space in the double yellow lines will have a speed-reducing effect on vehicles entering Ecclesfield due to vehicles being parked partly on the carriageway.

Objection Six

Putting yellow lines on an already narrow road without any thought to parking issues that we have is outrageous.

This will impact many lives it will impact not only the residents but visitors ,carers and delivery drivers. You are appeasing a resident at the expense of every one else that lives on the opposite side of the street.

If this proposal goes ahead the residents of this street will be taking legal action, i have 2 neighbours that are solitors,one of which has already emailed you .

Officer Response

It should be noted that a large part of the above objection has had to be omitted from the report. This is because it comprises criticism of another resident and with sufficient information for the resident in question to be easily identifiable.

It is precisely because Town End Road is relatively narrow that parking restrictions are required in order to remove parking that results in traffic jams.

The initial proposal, for 370m of double yellow lines on Town End Road, has been reduced by 78m. This provides a 78m length of parking, on the north side of Town End Road, for residents and their visitors, including carers and delivery drivers.

A solicitor could only challenge the proposal on the grounds that the Council has failed to follow the statutory consultation process. The consultation for the Traffic Regulation Order has, however, been carried out in full conformance with statutory requirements for public consultation of this type. Despite what this objector claims, no objections have been lodged on legal grounds.

Objection Seven

I live at number xx and whilst I have a garage I cant at the moment use it so I use the car park across the road and sometime I park infront of my own garage to drop of shopping and take my daughter into the house because the road is unsafe.

Currently the only thing that slows the speed of traffic is cars sometimes parked on the this side of the road. By putting double yellows you are facilitating individuals to use the road like a race course more than they do. The road needs traffic calming measures and a crossing not double yellows.

The music school has alot of children going to it an parents regularly stop on this side of this road so they can drop them off on this side to avoid having to cross the road. And I dont blame them. My daughter who was in her pram and I have almost been struck by a vehicle mounting the kerb trying to drive by an articulated lorry.

The road needs firstly

A weight restriction to avoid large vehicles using it. It causes excess wear on the road and buildings. They cause traffic to build up.

It needs some form of traffic calming measure. Chicane or speed bumps.

It needs some form of crossing to actually help people cross the road because there isn't one. Someone is going to being seriously injured or killed. And its not going to be an adult its going to be a child due to not being able to be seen as clearly and immaturity and lack of experience.

Ultimately a one way system would be the best answer because it would limit the use of the road to stop boy racers and Channel traffic up stocks hill which is a wider road. This would completely solve the issue of vehicles forcing there way through in the narrow section and having to fight there way through between the kerb and someone's house.

I have a feeling this is going to fall on deaf ears but a reply would be appreciated before the work commences. If you would be willing to discuss this further as I appreciate this is a long email and it may possibly not be explained as clearly as possible.

Officer Response

The proposed 78m space in the double yellow lines will have a speed-reducing effect on vehicles entering Ecclesfield due to the parked vehicles being parked partly on the carriageway.

The provision of physical traffic calming measures and / or an HGV restriction are not within the scope of this scheme. Furthermore, there is no existing budget allocation for the provision of either measure. The double yellow lines will enable larger vehicles, including HGVs, to pass through Town End Road with a reduced possibility of damaging parked cars and without blocking the road and causing a build-up of traffic.

Transport Planning has no existing requests on file for the provision of a pedestrian crossing on Town End Road. The pedestrian crossing budget is heavily over-subscribed. The proposed double yellow lines will increase the visibility of oncoming traffic by providing clear sight lines along the road ahead. This will assist pedestrians crossing.

Contrary to what the objector assumes, one-way systems lead to an increase in traffic speeds due to the absence of an opposing traffic flow to exercise a speed-reducing effect.

Objection Eight

I strongly object as 2 car family will have nowhere to park the second car near the house,also it could devalue the property if we wanted to sell it as any other family with 2 or more cars could be dissuaded from buying it.unless the council are planning to put parking bays where the existing grass verge is across from 53-63 town end Rd

Officer Response

If the property does not have off street parking for two cars that would probably have been the case when the current occupiers purchased the property. They should have been aware at that time that there was limited on-street parking available. They should also not have made the assumptions that they had a right to park on-street and that on-street parking would not be restricted at some point in the future.

There is no right to park on the highway in any particular place, including on the highway outside one's property. The primary purpose of the highway is to 'pass and repass', which includes the passage of pedestrians and vehicles. The Council may use its powers to facilitate that. Residents should not assume that they can park on the carriageway as their ability to do so is incidental to the right to use the highway and may be restricted. The provision of parking bays is not within the scope of this scheme.

Support One

I am in total agreement with the proposed order to prohibit the parking on the grass verges on Town end Road.

Officer Response

This expression of support for the proposals is gratifying.

Willow Drive

Objection One

I am writing to appeal the prohibition of waiting lines proposed at Willow Drive. I currently live with my girlfriend (Property owner) at 17 Willow Drive. Currently the proposed prohibition of parking plan has been placed directly outside our property.

We have two cars and if the plans do go ahead this means we would have to park further up Willow Drive and potentially inconvenience higher residents of Willow Drive - which does not seem right/ fair. This is also very likely to push a congestion of cars further up the road causing danger to drivers going up and down the road.

Therefore if the plans do go ahead it would be an inconvenience for not just me and my girlfriend, but also for other higher residents of Willow Drive. Our neighbours - 19 Willow Drive have also expressed the same concerns that it is simply unfair if we cannot park right in front of our property when we can do so right now.

I do however think the plans could be placed at the entry of Willow Drive as many cars do park there and obscure vision on leaving or entering to/from a main, busy road

Hope this can be taken to consideration.

Officer Response

A comparison of the original and revised proposals will show that the scope of this scheme has been reduced. Only the bare minimum of parking restrictions, that are necessary to prevent obstruction of the Handsworth Road / Willow Drive and Willow Drive / Hall Road junctions, are being proposed.

It is considered that the removal of the proposed parking restrictions, outside this objector's property, fully addresses their concerns.

Objection Two

I am writing to appeal the prohibition of waiting lines proposed at Willow Drive. I live at xx Willow Drive and the proposed prohibition of parking plan has been placed directly outside my property.

Currently the area outside my property is fantastic for loading, parking my own car/ my boyfriend's car (who is also a resident of xx willow Drive) or for my visitors to park.

I would find such plans highly inconvenient/ disappointing if the proposal does go ahead. This means myself, boyfriend, our visitors would have to park higher up on the road and potentially inconvenience other residents of Willow Drive which will result in the road further up becoming congested and potentially a danger/hazard to road users.

We also have seen the plans extend up to xx Willow Drive, whom which are our close neighbours, who also feel the same about the plans - as they too both park their cars outside their property. Therefore, this means all four of us will have to park higher up the street which is highly inconvenient for four working professionals, who contribute to Sheffield Council tax system.

I do think it is a good idea to have the prohibition of waiting/parking plans at the beginning of the T junction of Willow Drive, as quite a few cars do park on both sides at the entry of Willow Drive from Handsworth Road, which can be dangerous for those who are entering the road/ leaving Willow Drive to join Handsworth Road/ as vision can be obstructed.

In particularly on the left corner from Handsworth Road, close to the entry of the junction for Willow Drive. If a large van or car parks there, then view is definately obstructed from cars coming in or out of Willow Drive.

I hope my concerns will be taken to considerations.

Officer Response

It is considered that the removal of the proposed parking restrictions, outside this objector's property, fully addresses their concerns.

Objection Three

I am running a take-away shop in 41 handsworth road sheffield, I am object this proposed order.

My shop needs passing trade, therefore need parking. Since the COVID-19, my trade is very low. If outside my shop is not parking, It look like the council force me close my shop down because short of trade.please help! Thanks

Officer Response

It is appreciated that take-away shops, to some extent, rely on passing trade. The majority of their customers, however, are probably regulars and are among the people who are contributing to the parking problems that have prompted the requested parking restrictions.

In an attempt to accommodate this objector's concerns, the proposed parking restrictions were reduced in extent. A plan of these reduced proposals was sent to the objector and they were asked if the changes were sufficient for them to withdraw their objection. The objector replied that they were not. The proposed restrictions have, therefore, been reduced further and are shown on the plan in Appendix B.

Transport Planning has no wish to adversely affect the trade of this business but the question of access, to and from Willow Drive and Hall Road, also has to be considered. Consequently, the proposals now are for the minimum of restrictions that are needed to prevent obstruction of the Handsworth Road / Willow Drive and Willow Drive / Hall Road junctions. It is considered that this objector's concerns have been addressed, as far as it is possible to do so, short of introducing no parking restrictions at all.