



Report to Policy Committee

Author/Lead Officer of Report: Alex Redman – Senior Transport Planner

Tel: 0114 205 6444

Report of: Executive Director, City Futures

Report to: Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

Date of Decision: 21st September 2022

Subject: Report objections to the Traffic Regulation Order for the installation of a disabled parking bay at Woodhouse Local District Centre

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? 1226				
Has appropriate consultation taken place?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has a Climate Impact Assessment (CIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
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“The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).”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:

To report details of the consultation response to proposals to install a disabled parking bay at Woodhouse Local District Centre, report the receipt of objections and set out the Council’s response

Recommendations:

Install a disabled parking bay on Chapel Street in Woodhouse in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

Inform objectors accordingly.

Background Papers:

Appendix A – Consultation letter

Appendix B – Plans of the proposed disabled parking bay

Appendix C – Consultation 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
		Legal: Richard Cannon
		Equalities & Consultation: Annemarie Johnston
		Climate: Jessica Rick
	<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:	Kate Martin
3	Committee Chair consulted:	Mazher Iqbal and Julie Grocutt
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 Committee 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: Alex Redman	Job Title: Senior Transport Planner
	Date: 31/08/2022	

1. PROPOSAL

- 1.1 The Council is often requested to provide additional disabled parking bays across the city. This could be due to the high demand for existing spaces in certain areas or requests for spaces in new areas, including local district centres. It is also important to reduce barriers that could be discouraging and preventing disabled drivers from leading independent lives. Easy access to local amenities within a short distance should be available to all and include the provision for disabled parking bays with sufficient space, for those with wheelchairs and mobility aids to safely enter or exit a vehicle.
- 1.2 There is emphasis on the development and sustainability of local district centres within the Council's Local Plan. This includes providing an improved range of retail, leisure, and community facilities at each local district centre across the city. Easy accessibility for all is essential to ensure the function and role of the local district centre is maintained. There are 14 Local District Centres within the scheme listed below. This is a rolling programme, where the completion of each local district centre is dependent on the amount of funding available. An initial desktop survey will be completed to identify the number of public disabled parking bays that are currently installed at each centre and whether the current bays provide direct access to local amenities. This will be followed by a site visit to identify whether the location of the proposed public disabled parking bays will be both feasible and beneficial to disabled drivers and passengers.

Priority for the installation of the disabled parking bays will be given to the local district centres that do not have any public disabled parking bays or a very limited number of bays that are not located with direct access to local amenities. The first two projects to be delivered are Woodhouse and Darnall local district centres, as they do not have public disabled parking bays which is why they are the first two centres to be completed. Other bays will follow in the other Local Plan identified Local District Centres;

Banner Cross
Chapeltown
Chaucer (proposed)
Darnall
Ecclesall Road
Firth Park
Heeley
Hillsborough
London Road
Manor Top
Spital Hill
Woodhouse
Woodseats

- 1.3 The aim is to implement a programme of disabled parking facilities at local district centres across the city. The revised Initial Business Case for the feasibility of the installation of disabled parking bays for all 14 sites including Woodhouse Local District Centre, was approved at Transport Board in April 2022. The scheme will also include providing dropped kerbs at each location if there is not a dropped kerb already installed. This will provide safer and easier accessibility on to and off the footway for wheelchair users and those with mobility aids.
- 1.4 Disabled drivers can park on double yellow lines for up to three hours. However, this does not guarantee safety including space from traffic and other drivers, nor are all double yellow lines easily accessible to amenities within a short distance. The installation of specified disabled bays with a dropped kerb ensures there is sufficient space surrounding the vehicle and allows safer access on to the pavement. Allocated disabled bays also alerts other drivers that the disabled driver requires more space.
- 1.5 This report details the consultation response to the installation of the disabled parking bay at Woodhouse Local District Centre, reports the receipt of objections and sets out the Council's response and recommends a way forward.

2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?

- 2.1 The Council's Core Strategy includes the expansion and development of local district centres to provide accessibility to a range of facilities and amenities for all local people. Providing public disabled parking bays supports this strategy and ensures inclusivity to accessible parking.
- 2.2 Policy 9B of the Sheffield Transport Strategy states 'We shall ensure all transport modes and services are integrated and inclusive such that people and businesses have the flexibility to travel seamlessly'.
- 2.3 The implementation of disabled parking bays supports the approved Parking Strategy which aims to provide appropriate disabled parking for those with mobility difficulties to make access to their homes and key destinations easier.
- 2.4 Installing the disabled parking bay at Woodhouse Local District Centre will contribute to the reduction in inequality of accessible public parking facilities within the village. There will be a positive impact on disabled drivers and passengers as the formal disabled parking bay will provide a safer environment to access the footway with the proposed dropped kerb.

3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

- 3.1 The intention to introduce the proposed disabled parking bay has been advertised in the local press, street notices put up throughout each affected area and letters delivered to all affected properties inviting residents to comment on the proposals (see Appendix A). The local Ward Members and Statutory Consultees were informed about the proposals. (need to add in paragraph numbers on next section)

The Council has a legal responsibility to comply with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. This states that "*An objection [to the making of a Traffic Regulation Order] shall be made in writing*".

All Traffic Order notices which are published as advertisements state that objections can be made by email, as do the notices placed on street.

The Regulations stipulate that "*Any person may object to the making of an order by [...] the end of the period of 21 days beginning with the date on which the order making authority [publicises the order].*" However, comments and objections received after the closing date are normally added to the collation of responses and duly considered.

CONSULTATION RESPONSES

12 responses were received for the proposal at Woodhouse, of which all of these were objections to the scheme and are detailed in Appendix C below.

Officers have replied to all residents with an acknowledgement or answering specific questions and clarifying the proposals if required so that the residents are fully informed before making formal approvals/objections to the scheme.

8 of 12 of the objections for the proposed disabled parking bay at Woodhouse mention that there is already a disabled parking bay near to the proposed bay that is rarely used and so installing a further disabled parking bay would affect the residents and family who are visiting and their ability to park. The existing marking located outside 18 Chapel Street is an advisory disabled parking bay intended for use by a specific resident. There is currently no allocated public disabled parking bay on the highway, within the village.

One comment suggested making the existing advisory bay into a public disabled parking bay. This would not be viable as applications for this type of bay are subject to strict criteria and only deemed acceptable where they are intended to be used only by their applicant, who is also responsible for the associated maintenance cost.

4 of the objections stated non-disabled drivers find it difficult to park and the one proposed disabled parking bay will discourage people coming to

the village. There was also an objection that stated the disabled parking bay would create further parking issues in an already thriving shopping area. It is important to ensure local district centres are easily accessible and available for all. There is currently on street parking available through the village but no public disabled bays for disabled drivers that require larger spaces to the standard parking space. If there are no public disabled parking bays that provide direct access to the local amenities, this would discourage or prevent disabled drivers and passengers from visiting the centre. This would not be supporting the Council's Core Strategy to develop and expand local district centres by providing everyday needs with a range of retail, leisure, and community facilities available to all local people.

Comment was made in relation to the disabled parking bay having an impact on the property value due to restricting the possibility of parking. A further comment was also made in one objection that stated owners of the properties on Chapel Street purchased their properties on the suggestion they would have availability to park on Street. The properties on Chapel Street are predominantly terraced houses that were built or purchased without off street parking nor purchased with a parking permit for this section of highway. Chapel Street is an adopted public highway which does not guarantee specified or allocated parking for residents or visitors. There is no right to park on the highway in any particular place, including on the highway near to one's property. The primary purpose of the highway is to 'pass and repass', parking being incidental to the public right to do that. Where parking is available, the Council may use its powers to restrict that parking to specific classes of traffic (including disabled drivers) where it identifies sufficient benefit to doing so and after having regard to its broader duties.

A few objections suggest the location of the disabled parking bay needs to be changed, such as outside the bank or the fruit and vegetable shop on Cross Street. The original proposal issued to the local ward members before consultation included 3 disabled parking bays. One proposed bay on Chapel Street (which is the proposal described in this report and has been consulted on) and converting two existing parking spaces in the current bay outside Lloyds Bank in to two disabled parking bays. This was to ensure there was sufficient space in the bay and easier access to the amenities in the village. The proposal was not accepted, and it was agreed only one disabled parking bay was to be proposed which was agreed would be on Chapel Street.

4 objections believe the disabled parking bay will restrict parking for residents including more people parking across resident access to their properties, specifically the property that already has a H marking to deter this. The proposed disabled parking bay is for one disabled bay which would have minimal impact on the overall available public parking in the village. Unfortunately, inconsiderate driving behaviours are extremely difficult to control. H markings are used to discourage other drivers from parking across a driveway or access to a property, but these are advisory

parking restrictions which cannot be enforced by the Council's Civil Enforcement Officers.

One comment stated the disabled parking bay would stop the free flowing of parking in the village and that there is already plenty of parking in the village at the Co-Op, behind McCalls and on the Vicar Lane for disabled drivers to park. However, the Co-Op is privately owned and for use only by their customers. The location of the Co-op is at the entrance of the village which for those with impaired mobility, is a distance for them to access many of the amenities. The surface of the car park on Vicar Lane has uneven terrain unsuitable and unsafe for those that require mobility aids. There are no marked accessibility bays at this location. The car park behind McCalls is also private land. The footway leading from the car park to Cross Street is extremely narrow, questioning the ability of whether those with wheelchair and mobility aids can use the footway to access the highway and the shops.

OTHER CONSULTEES

- Southeast LAC
- Estates & Environmental Services
- Community Services
- South Yorkshire Police
- South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue
- South Yorkshire Ambulance
- SYPTE
- Access Liaison
- Parking services

No communication or responses were received from any of the consultees above in relation to the Woodhouse Local District Centre consultation.

Engagement and communication with Disability Sheffield considering supportive measures, required needs of disabled drivers and regular difficulties around accessibility. Disability Sheffield support the proposal.

4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

4.1. Equality Implications

- 4.1.1 There are positive equality impacts from this proposal. The availability of standard public parking spaces available in the village hugely outnumbers available public disabled parking bays at present. Currently, there is only one disabled parking bay on the highway at Woodhouse local district centre which has been privately purchased and maintained by a local resident. The implementation of the disabled parking bay will be fundamental to disabled drivers to access local amenities directly and safely, creating inclusivity for all visitors.

4.2. Financial and Commercial Implications

- 4.2.1 The revised Initial Business Case for the 14 Local District Centre Disabled Parking Bay scheme was approved by the Co-operative Executive in April 2022.

The scheme is funded from the LTP. The full cost of implementing the scheme for Woodhouse local district centre, including construction costs, HMD fees and commuted sum is not yet known as the scheme has only recently completed the feasibility and preliminary design stage. When these costs are known a Business Case will be brought through the Capital Approvals Process to secure the appropriate budgets.

The Initial Business Case was approved for 2021/2022 for £20k under LTP and has included costs for feasibility and preliminary design fees at 3 sites (Crookes, Darnall, and Woodhouse) including TRO fees and consultation costs. One disabled bay was installed at Crookes in 2021 and the Darnall and Woodhouse Local District Centres are included in the 14 Local district Centres included in the full scheme list.

The Initial Business Case from 2021 included the following: -

Client fees - £10,000
Feasibility and Preliminary Scheme Design - £10,000
Total = £20,000

The revised Business Case approved April 2022 includes the following: -

Client Fees - £20,000
Feasibility and Preliminary Scheme Design – Total of £40,000 for 12 of 14 sites
£3,333 per site x12 (Feasibility and preliminary design costs for 2 of the total 14 Local District Centre sites were spent from the approved Initial Business Case funds as stated above)
Total = £60,000

Grand Total = £80k

4.3 Legal Implications

- 4.3.1 The Council has powers under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ('the 1984 Act') and Part V of the Highways Act 1980 to implement the proposal set out in this report. The Council has the power to make Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) under section 1 of ('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).
- 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 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.

4.3.4

Part IV of the Act gives the Local Authority powers to designate parking places on a highway and make such provision as may appear to that authority to be necessary or expedient for regulating or restricting the use of any parking place designated by the order. In the case of the proposal detailed in this report, those powers are being used to designate a disabled parking bay and restrict its use accordingly.

In exercising the aforementioned powers, the Council is under a duty to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) as per section 122 of the 1984 Act. In doing so the Council must have regard to the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises, the effect on the amenities of any locality affected, any applicable national air quality strategy, the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and any other matters appearing to the local authority to be relevant. The Council is considered to be fulfilling this duty in implementing the proposals in this report.

4.4 Climate Implications

- 4.4.1 There are no climate implications from the proposed scheme.

5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 5.1. There were originally 3 proposed disabled parking bays for the Woodhouse local district centre. 2 of which were proposed to be installed in the parking bay outside of the Lloyds Bank on Cross Street and one disabled parking bay on Chapel Street which has been included in the consultation. It was decided after a discussion with the Ward members that only one disabled parking bay was to be proposed at this time.
- 5.2. Apart from the proposed disabled bay in question, there are no other provisions for disabled parking in the whole local district area. Doing nothing to improve this would be contrary to the Councils' equal opportunities commitments.

6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1. The Council’s Core Strategy sets out for the period to 2026, the overall vision for the city, the relationships between the areas within it and how different factors come together in each area. Local District Centres are to provide everyday needs with a range of retail, leisure, and community facilities. This would be supported by improving the quality of the environment, the mixture of uses, and accessibility and safety for all.

To develop and maintain the desired outcome of a thriving local district centre at Woodhouse, it is vital that all local people have direct accessibility to the facilities and amenities within the village. There is currently on street public parking throughout the village, including a public car park off Market Street and Vicar Lane. Unfortunately, the public parking available on the highway does not currently include provisions specifically for disabled drivers.

The recommendation is to install a disabled parking bay within Woodhouse village to provide inclusivity and accessibility for all local people. There are no public disabled parking bays on the main highway that goes through Woodhouse district centre from Chapel Street, through to the end of Cross Street where many of the shops and amenities are located. The surface of the public car park on Vicar Lane is not tarmacked and would cause mobility difficulties for those who require mobility aids such as wheelchairs, tri pods and walkers. There are also no allocated disabled parking bays in the car park to guarantee sufficient vehicle space. The car park off Market Street does not provide direct access to the amenities which would be a disadvantage to many disabled people who are unable to walk the required distance to access the amenities. Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the disabled parking bay on Chapel Street be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the proposal are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

Appendix C – Objections

Woodhouse

1.	I would like to object to the additional parking bays being introduced to chapel street in woodhouse. As a resident of chapel street I feel that there would be an unfair number of spaces accessible for “non disabled users” on an already difficult road. It would also impact on the property value as it will restrict the possibility of parking. Also there is currently 1 disabled space in very close proximity to the suggested plan (outside number 18 chapel street) which is very rarely used/used incorrectly by non badge holders. There is also currently a car park at on Vicor lane, at co op and Nisa with where there are some allocated disabled spaces. I feel that introducing more designated spaces that are disabled parking only will have the opposite effect for supporting the community as many non-disabled drivers find it difficult to park and this would discourage them from coming to the village and therefore impacting on the small businesses in the area. I urge you to reconsider in order to support both
----	--

	residents and the local community. Moving forward I look forward to hearing the outcome.
2.	With reference to the above I would like to point out that over the last 7 years of visiting my family the existing disabled space is invariably empty.it is difficult enough to park on Chapel Street during shop opening hours as it is. Woodhouse is a thriving local shopping area but I feel another disabled bay is not necessary and will only create further parking issues.
3.	I understand there is a proposal to t put more disabled parking bays on Chapel Street Woodhouse. There is already a bay outside the chemist which is very underused and I understand it was put in for the resident of number 18 at the time. When I moved here in 2014, I live at (DELETED). We were constantly blocked in by people who parked over the entrance and I had to pay for the H parking symbol to be painted at £150 and it is better but people still park. I think you will exacerbate the problem if you put the spaces as proposed outside the hairdressers and the next shop. People need to shop in Woodhouse to keep the small businesses running. Why don't you put disabled spaces near the bank or the fruit and veg shop where they might actually be useful. Please list this as my objection. We haven't been sent any information about this and we live so close. That must be incorrect and is very lax
4.	I see no reason to restrict available parking to disabled people only. Currently disabled use the named residents disabled parking bay. Why don't you stop taking that ladies money and make it an official public disabled bay. My fear is that the proposed restriction will mean more people parking across our access protection marking making it impossible for us to get in or out. There is plenty of parking in the village- the co- op for shopping there, vicar lane parking area for central shopping- only a few steps into village, behind mccalls for chemist and shopping at the lower end of the village. I see any restriction being a detriment to the free flowing use of parking in the village Yours sincerely (DELETED)
5.	I'm writing in objection to the proposed disabled bay being put in on Chapel Street, Woodhouse. There are already disabled bays in close proximity to proposed site and I feel there doesn't need to be more. Parking for residents on here is already very bad. The proposed disabled bays would make parking for residents very difficult indeed.
6.	There already is a disabled bay outside number 18 Additional bays mean non disabled visitors and residents will have further restrictions on them. People might not come into the village to use the shops etc as parking is so bad, which will effect small businesses in the village
7.	I writing to say I object to the disabled bay outside 10/12 Chapel street. The road there only fits about 5 cars and each building is also a residential property. Taking one of those spaces would impact on the people living there, as it is already hard to park. This area is always full The street and pavement are narrower on that section of road and not esay to park on, so probably not an ideal place either. Drivers trying to park there block the entire road while doing so. It would not be an ideal place for disabled drivers who require ramps or space to unload. I also don't feel another disabled space is needed there. The disabled space already on the street is free the vast majority of the day. I absolutely agree the pharmacy needs a disabled space and it has one. The other pharmacy in Woodhouse

	<p>doesn't however, wouldn't this be a better place for a disabled bay. There are also 3 car parks in the area where an additional disabled space might be more appropriate, or a loading zone outside the carpet shop that is vacant most of the day. I don't feel outside the vape shop is necessary.</p>
8.	<p>I am writing to complain about the proposal of extra disabled parking spaces on Chapel Street, Woodhouse. I provide childcare for my grandsons who live at (DELETED). There is already a disabled bay near the chemist and sometimes this is the only parking space vacant on the road. Chapel street has a garage, chemist, hairdressers, cafes and many other well used shops. It also has a very well used gym. There are rarely spaces to park during the day and even the car park on the side road is usually full. It also has a bus terminal for several bus routes. Chapel Street is an extremely busy road. I live in (DELETED) and have no option other than to travel by car. When leaving in the evening and parked in the side road car park it is very dark and leaves me feeling very vulnerable. Making less parking spaces will make the road more congested with cars waiting for spaces. It will reduce footfall at the shops because not everyone is local who use the facilities. It will cause frustration when people who dont own blue badges decide to park in that space and whilst that is illegal you would have to employ a full time traffic warden to enforce it, money which the coucil could spend better elsewhere. Instead of disabled bays perhaps time and money would be better spent in ways to make more not less parking spaces. We are living in financially difficult times and local facilities are vital. I am certain this proposal will reduce footfall and affect local business. Another alternative would be to ask the Co-Op to convert a few more spaces in their car park for disabled parking. I would say that the disabled bay already provided in the street is more than adequate and hope you will review your plans.</p>
9.	<p>I am writing in objection to the proposal to install disabled parking outside 10/12 chapel street, woodhouse. Currently there is already a disabled parking bay outside no. 18. I feel unless there is an immediate necessity outside these properties which requires the occupants to require specified disabled space it will actually be detrimental to other close residents who require the parking for day to day life. Essential visitors like child care providers who would now need to pick up and drop off children having to take a long dark walk down to a secluded carpark is not ideal and appropriate, considering the past incidences occurring in the woodhouse village area. Owners of the properties on chapel street who bought their properties on the suggestion that they would have availability to allow a minimal amount of family members to visit and leave without fear of having to walk into a dark and secluded parking lot were one of the reasons the property was purchased. This re-zoning does not just affect the resident but the grandmother's visiting their grandchildren, the great grandmother also visiting family, we do not wish to see them or imagine them walking into the back lot of a supermarket to find their car and get attacked. Yes that idea might be over the top but its definitely for a fact much safer watching them lrave from the front of the house wouthout gettint w ticket.</p>
10.	<p>In respect of the above proposed change I would like to register my</p>

	objection. We are regular visitors to the village and already find parking to be difficult as there are not many spaces to park for both visiting family and frequenting the shops. Further restriction to this would inhibit us from visiting which would then impact both the local businesses and our family as we would struggle to visit. We are not local enough to be able to use public transport to visit the area.
11.	Hello all. Clearly there are issues with parking in central Woodhouse and in particular at the locations highlighted. However given the proximity to the local elections and the on going health concerns of the pandemic I believe it would be sensible to put the proposals on hold. In addition this is an issue that would be better dealt with in a conversation[zoom or teams if necessary] not by email exchange
12.	I agree with (NAME DELETED)

This page is intentionally left blank