



## 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:** 15<sup>th</sup> December 2022

**Subject:** Double Yellow Lines Programme 2022/23: Report on the objections to the proposed advertised TRO for Double Yellow Lines at 3 locations.

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? 1326				
Has appropriate consultation taken place?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has a Climate Impact Assessment (CIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input 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"The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)."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:

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

It sets out officer's recommendations to objections received and seeks a decision from the Committee.

**Recommendations:****That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:**

- a) Notes the representations received;
- b) Concludes that the reasons to support the proposals outweigh any unresolved objections;
- c) Approves the making of the Traffic Regulation Order, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- d) Approves the introduction of the associated double yellow lines as shown on the plans in Appendix B (Hoyland Road and Bawtry Road) and one plan from Appendix A (Southey Hill);
- e) Requests that officers inform the objectors accordingly.

**Background Papers:**

Appendix A: Original TRO proposal plans

Appendix B: Revised TRO plans

Appendix C: Objections received

<b>Lead Officer to complete:-</b>						
1	<table border="1"> <tr> <td rowspan="4">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.</td> <td>Finance: Damian Watkinson</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Legal: Richard Cannon</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Equalities &amp; Consultation: Ed Sexton</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Climate: Jessica Rick</td> </tr> </table>	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: Ed Sexton	Climate: Jessica Rick
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: Ed Sexton					
	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	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>EMT member who approved submission:</b></td> <td>Kate Martin</td> </tr> </table>	<b>EMT member who approved submission:</b>	Kate Martin			
<b>EMT member who approved submission:</b>	Kate Martin					
3	<table border="1"> <tr> <td><b>Committee Chair consulted:</b></td> <td>Mazher Iqbal and Julie Grocutt</td> </tr> </table>	<b>Committee Chair consulted:</b>	Mazher Iqbal and Julie Grocutt			
<b>Committee Chair consulted:</b>	Mazher Iqbal and Julie Grocutt					
4	<table border="1"> <tr> <td colspan="2">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.</td> </tr> <tr> <td><b>Lead Officer Name:</b> Alex Redman</td> <td><b>Job Title:</b> Senior Transport Planner</td> </tr> </table>	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.		<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> Alex Redman	<b>Job Title:</b> Senior Transport Planner	
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.						
<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> Alex Redman	<b>Job Title:</b> Senior Transport Planner					

## 1. PROPOSAL

- 1.1 As part of the 2022/23 Double Yellow Lines Programme, Traffic Regulations advertised the intention to introduce double yellow line parking restrictions at 14 locations across the city. The 3 locations listed below received objections to the advertised restrictions from the public consultation and the double yellow lines proposals now require Committee approval.
- 1.2 Southey Hill (including the junctions at Northlands Road and Crowder Avenue).
- Bawtry Road (including the junctions at Newburn Drive, Siemens Drive and one side of the junction of Bawtry Gate).
- Hoyland Road (including the junctions at Hillfoot Road and Sandbed Road).
- 1.3 These sites come from the scheme request list and have been prioritised for delivery, in 2022/23, 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 3 locations, looking at each scheme separately:
- 2.2 At Southey Hill, the Council received complaints from residents in the local area concerning vehicles that block sight lines due to obstructive parking on the brow of Southey Hill which continues down Southey Hill. The obstructive parking combined with the gradient of the highway on Southey Hill obscures visibility for drivers including those exiting the junctions of Crowder Avenue and Northlands Road. Cars currently parking fully on the footway and grass verges of Southey Hill creates a safety risk for all pedestrians including those with small children, pushchairs, and those with mobility aids such as wheelchairs.
- 2.2.1 To address the problem, double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) restrictions were proposed on Southey Hill which includes the junctions of Crowder Avenue and Northlands Road. The original proposed scheme plan is in Appendix A to which there has been one objection and one email of support received from the consultation.

- 2.3 The Council has received requests for double yellow lines along Bawtry Road due to obstructive parking that interrupts the flow of traffic. Bawtry Road is a busy road and is often used to access the Motorway. Cars are parking on the footway and are parking on both sides of the highway which is causing increased traffic congestion and preventing a clear highway. Vehicles are parking on many of the side streets off Bawtry Road including Siemens Close and Newburn Drive which contributes to the obstruction of sight lines when exiting the junctions and joining Bawtry Road. There are existing double yellow lines around the junctions of Bawtry Gate, Norborough Road and Harrowden Road. There have been 7 objections received from the public consultation at this location.
- 2.3.1 To try and resolve some of the issues raised, the Council advertised parking restrictions, as shown in the original plan in Appendix A. All of the objections were reviewed and considered leading to changes to the original plan. The amended TRO proposal plan can be found in Appendix B.
- 2.4 The parking on Hoyland Road is extremely obstructive on both the highway and the footway which, is preventing pedestrians including those with mobility aids, from safely using the footway. This is forcing pedestrians to walk along the highway and navigate through parked vehicles. Both large and small vehicles are parking on both sides of the highway which makes accessibility and visibility extremely difficult for all drivers including visitors attending the local businesses. There have been 9 objections and 2 emails of support received for the TRO proposal at this location.
- 2.4.1 Double yellow lines have been proposed along Hoyland Road including the junctions of Hillfoot Road, Fairfield Road and Sandbed Road to reduce obstructive parking and to ensure the footways are clear and safe to use by all pedestrians. Visibility at several junctions off Hoyland Road is very limited visibility for drivers when trying to exit on to Hoyland Road. Appendix A includes the proposed TRO plan for this location. All of the objections were reviewed and considered, leading to changes to the original plan. An amended TRO proposal plan is located in Appendix B.

### **3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?**

- 3.1 The intention to introduce the proposed parking restrictions 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. The local Ward Members and Statutory Consultees were informed about the proposals.
- 3.2 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*".

- 3.3 All Traffic Order notices which are published as advertisements state that objections can be made by email, as do the notices placed on street.
- 3.4 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.

### 3.5 CONSULTATION RESPONSES

- 3.5.1 Officers have replied to all correspondence with an acknowledgement or answering specific questions and clarifying the proposals if required so that constituents are fully informed before making formal approvals/ objections to the scheme. Objections and support received for all 3 locations can be found in Appendix C.

### 3.6 Southey Hill

- 3.6.1 2 responses were received for the proposal at Southey Hill, of which one response was an objection to the scheme and the other response was in support of the scheme.
- 3.6.2 The objection to the proposal was based on the grounds of displaced parking resulting in unsafe parking and congestion on the west side of Southey Hill. The TRO proposed a total of 87.5m of double yellow lines on Southey Hill, including 10m around the junctions of Crowder Avenue and Northlands Road due to obstructive parking and poor visibility for drivers and pedestrians at this location. The introduction of double yellow lines on the east side of Southey Hill will address the issue of obstructive parking on both the highway and the footway and improve visibility and sight lines for drivers travelling down Southey Hill and when trying to exit Crowder Avenue and Northlands Road. Double yellow lines were considered but not proposed on the west side of Southey Hill as the issues regarding obstructive parking and blocked sight lines was prominent on the east side of Southey Hill causing an increased safety risk.
- 3.6.3 There may be a degree of displaced parking on the west side of Southey Hill to accommodate those vehicles that have frequently parked on the east side of Southey Hill. However, a large proportion of those vehicles will include patients visiting the dental surgery where there is currently no available onsite parking. However, this would only be during the opening hours of the dental surgery and there is still ample parking available on Southey Hill and the side roads to absorb the loss of on street parking on Southey Hill. 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 where it identifies sufficient benefit to doing so and after having regard to its

broader duties. It is recommended that the proposed TRO plan remains as advertised with no amendments required to the extent of the double yellow lines.

### 3.7 Bawtry Road

3.7.1 7 objections were received for the proposed TRO at Bawtry Road. The main concerns raised in all 7 objections were regarding displaced parking because residents would be constrained to park their vehicles outside other resident's properties due to having no off-street parking.

Subsequently, concerns around increased tensions between residents and a breakdown of neighbourly relationships due to a reduction of available parking was also included in one of the objections.

3.7.2 The proposed TRO plan contained a total of 390.5M of double yellow lines along Bawtry Road and around the junctions of Siemens Close and Newburn Drive (see Appendix A). This was to address the issues of obstructive parking on both sides of Bawtry Road including vehicles parking on the footway. This is causing disruption to traffic flow which, reduces visibility of oncoming traffic and the footway is unsafe for pedestrian use. The junctions of Siemens Close and Newburn Drive are also obstructed with parked cars, reducing sight lines for drivers entering and exiting the junctions and blocking the formal crossing points for pedestrians. Bawtry Road is an extremely busy road due to direct links to the motorway and so maintaining traffic flow is essential at this location. Visitors of Tinsley Green Park may use on street parking if travelling from wider areas of the city which will contribute to the impact on the flow of traffic. The proposed 160m of double yellow lines along the east side of Bawtry Road would improve the traffic flow along Bawtry Road.

3.7.3 After consideration of all the objections and to mitigate the concerns raised in the objections, the double yellow lines have been amended and reduced by 53m to 337.5m as follows. The amended plan can be found in Appendix B.

- By 10m (5m from each side of the junction from 12m to 7m) at the junction of Siemens Close
- By 5m (from 12m to 7m) at junction of Newburn Drive at the corner of No.116 Bawtry Road.
- By 38m (from 49m to 11m) located outside No. 116 and 118 Bawtry Road.

3.7.4 Bawtry Road including the side Roads consists of many residential properties which do not have off street parking facilities. Understanding the concerns raised by the objector's, the proposal includes 39m of highway that is not subject parking restrictions between properties 98 – 112 Bawtry Road and an additional 38m from 118 Bawtry Road continuing south to the existing double yellow lines where vehicles can park. No parking restrictions are located on Siemens Close, Newburn Drive, Norborough Road and Harrowden Road located off Bawtry Road, other

than the existing double yellow lines and the minimal amount of proposed double yellow lines required to protect the junctions. Subsequently, these roads can accommodate vehicles for parking if required.

- 3.7.5 It is considered that the above reductions of double yellow lines 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 obstructive parking and prevent disruption to the traffic flow on Bawtry Road and its existing side roads.

### 3.8 Hoyland Road

- 3.8.1 9 objections and 2 emails of support were received for the proposed TRO at Hoyland Road which included a total of 356m including the junctions of Hillfoot Road, Fairfield Road, and Sandbed Road. Hoyland Road consists of multiple local businesses that all provide different services. One of the main grounds for objection received was regarding the negative impact the parking restrictions would have on the businesses, including the ability to continue to function correctly without available parking for customers due to the nature of the business. 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' and not be used as designated space for parking of vehicles to support any business or resident.

- 3.8.2 Comment was made in relation to the proposed parking restrictions preventing disabled drivers from parking within a close distance to the business they would be visiting. Any disabled driver who is a blue badge holder can legally park on double yellow lines for a maximum time of 3 hours when displaying their blue badge clearly in the vehicle. The proposal TRO would not prevent disabled drivers from parking within close proximity to the businesses on Hoyland Road. The proposals do not include 'No Loading' restrictions which would also permit any driver to load and unload their vehicle whilst parked on the double yellow lines.

- 3.8.3 A further comment was raised regarding how the proposed TRO to reduce the amount of on street parking will affect the custom of the business, if customers and visitors are not able to park to on Hoyland Road. The proposed TRO does not include the full length of Hoyland Road and so available parking for customers and visitors is available further along Hoyland Road if required. The purpose of the TRO is to prevent obstructive parking on the highway and the footway of Hoyland Road that is unsafe for all drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians. This affects sight lines and dramatically reduces visibility which can result in collisions.

- 3.8.4 A comparison of the plans, in Appendices A and B, will show that the length of the double yellow lines at Hoyland Road have been reduced by a total of 52m to 304m. This maintains a considerate level of available on-street parking and mitigates the concerns raised in the objections received

from the public consultation. The amendments recommended for this location are as follows: -

- 37m reduction of of double yellow lines on the east side of Hoyland Road (see Appendix B)
- Reduction of 15m of double yellow lines on the west side of Hoyland Road outside units 19 and 21.

#### **4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION**

##### **4.1. Equality Implications**

- 4.1.1 The measures will improve safety at junctions, on footways and on the highway, through the removal of parking that obstructs visibility for both vehicles and pedestrians. This should have a positive impact for all highway and footway users particularly those with disabilities, older people, and school age children.

##### **4.2. Financial and Commercial Implications**

- 4.2.1 The total cost of implementing the full double yellow lines programme for 14 locations, including the commuted sum payment for ongoing maintenance costs, is to be funded from the allocated capital budget for 'Double Yellow Lines 2022/23' within the Local Transport Plan.
- 4.2.2 As the programme is an annual rolling programme, only a revised Final Business Case is required which has not yet been submitted for this year's programme. The total cost for implementing the works for all 14 sites are as follows: -

£12,824 lining works  
£1,282 HMD fees (10% of the total construction works)  
£29,777 Transport and Traffic Regulation fees  
Grand Total £43,883

£13,331 Commuted Sum (Revenue)

##### **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.

4.3.5 The Council has a duty under section 149 of the Equality Act 2010 (the public sector equality duty) in the exercise of its functions to have regard to the need to:

- a) eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under this Act;
- b) advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- c) foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

The proposed measures described in this report, as amended in light of the objections received, are considered to comply with this duty.

#### 4.4. Climate Implications

4.4.1 There are no climate implications from the proposed scheme.

#### 4.5. Other Implications

- 4.5.1 The implementation of these schemes will improve road safety for pedestrians and motorists as sight lines will not be obstructed by parked vehicles.
- 4.5.2 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 prevent 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 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, accessibility and assist traffic flow. Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce the double yellow line restrictions be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

Appendix A – Proposed TRO Plans

Appendix B – Amended TRO Plans

Appendix C – Objections and support

Southey Hill

Support	<p>I've lived on Southey Hill for 32 years. I proposed similar restrictions when I was chairman of the (now defunct) Tenants Association (25 years ago). I was told by the council at that time that cars parked on the street acted as a safety measure by slowing traffic down! I thought that that reason was ridiculous at the time as motorists did NOT slow down. Needless to say I fully support this proposal.</p>
objection	<p>We received your letter about the proposal to introduce waiting restrictions on Southey Hill, Northlands Road and Crowder Avenue. I scanned the letter and circulated it to XXX for their comments. XXX has the following objection:</p> <p>I think my concern would be that everyone going to the dentist, NHS building etc would then park on the opposite side of the road (ours) which already gets congested so it would just move the issue to our side of the road!! I think we need to object on the grounds that we will be impacted by this in that our side of the road will be where everyone parks, and it will cause more congestion and unsafe parking!</p> <p>My comment is: We have meetings with young people and professionals in our building and the XXX also delivers XXX sessions from the building on Thursday mornings and need to be able to park as close as possible to our front door (on Southey Hill) when they are unloading the food that has been donated to the project. The proposed yellow lines will mean that people attending the BUPA dentist (30 Southey Hill, not labelled) and Northlands Community Health Centre (labelled on your map as 'Southey Hill House') are much more likely to park in front of our building which will reduce availability of parking for people using our building.</p> <p>I would also like to comment that on your map our building has the label 'Surgery' against it. The building hasn't been a surgery for a long time – we moved into these premises in 2011. Please could you change the label on the map to read XXX?</p>

Bawtry Road

Objection	<p>I object to the waiting restrictions proposed by the Sheffield City Council.</p> <p>Its not acceptable to issue these because there will not no space to park for myself and my family. There has already been dispute among the other residents and even got into fights about parking and this will make the neighbourhood even more difficult to live in. You don't understand the detrimental effects this will cause. The main road you have proposed to have no waiting restrictions, but have you thought where the residents there will park? Obviously will crowd siemans close and its already difficult to park as it is.</p> <p>This really is going to cause more harm to the neighbourhood you will be ruining the relationships between neighbours and causing more aggressive behaviour. It will severely effect mental health and cause harm to the community by increasing stress and worry about where to park and putting vulnerable adults at even more harm thus increasing the crime rates in the area.</p> <p>Not the way forward.</p>
Objection	<p>Hello XXX,</p> <p>I like to object to the new proposals.</p> <p>Kind Regards.</p>

Objection	<p>I object the proposed traffic orders. Parking has always been a issue, as I'm disabled I can't get parked. Parking has caused a nuisance so has the old school building. If you want restrictions then give us parking in the council building which is the Tinsley infants school which is getting used a drugs den and not a gym.</p> <p>XXX</p>
Objection	<p>Reference;-TR-22-BR-AG1</p> <p>For the attention of XXX.</p> <p>Regarding;-Proposed Traffic Orders.</p> <p>Location;-Bawtry Road,Newburn Drive,Siemen Close.</p> <p>This Email is sent to register my initial objections to your proposals and proposed alterations as stated in your letter dated 24th August 2022.</p> <p>Supporting emails relating to my total objections to your proposals,will be submitted to next week.</p> <p>Thank you..</p>
Objection	<p>See letter in consultation file</p>

Objection	: Hi its XXX from XXX iam objecting yellow lines on bawtry road in tinsley area reason being new burn drive and seimens close are already conjested with cars ,people from new burn drive and seimens close are parking their car ...
Objection	Hi its XXX from XXX .I am objecting yellow lines on bawtry road people from new burn drive and seimens close are already paking their cars on bawtry road if u put yellow lines on bawtry road where all cars is going to park. Yes...

Hoyland Road

Suppor	Hi andrew, my name isXXX , my premises are on XXX I have just received your letter and I think the proposed double yellow lines are a great idea. The cars that are dumped around the area are getting out of controll , I hope this will sort the issue out . My only request is that possibly could a single yellow line but put at the front of my gates allowing my customers to park temporarily so I can give them estimates ? ( marked in blue on the attached photo ) no vehicle will be left there as it would block my gates , thanks XXX
--------	---

objection	<p>Good evening</p> <p>I'd like to object to your planned proposal of double yellow lines on Hoyland Street, sanbed Road and Hillfoot Road.</p> <p>By putting these marking you are restricting several businesses as people will avoid them due to not being able to park.</p> <p>The financial loss to companies could force closers of businesses meaning people will lose jobs</p>
objection	<p>Objection to Proposed Traffic waiting restrictions - Hoyland Road</p> <p>Dear XXX, I Hope you are well. I am emailing as I wish to oppose the proposed traffic waiting restrictions you wish to impose on Hoyland Road, Neepsend.</p> <p>There are a number of reasons (seven I believe) in which i wish to oppose this proposal of traffic waiting restrictions on Hoyland Road.</p> <p>My main reason is that I regularly visit this area and as I have several disabilities one at present being that I cannot walk far and I use crutches and the fact that I have serious breathing issues (in which I was recently hospitalised for) meaning I struggle to walk far without getting breathless.</p> <p>I regularly visit the business XXX</p> <p>By imposing the waiting restrictions you are intending to propose are discriminating against me under the Equality Act 2010.</p> <p>The Equality Act 2010 states that: People who access goods, facilities and services possessing the following 'protected characteristics' are protected by EqA 2010: - disability</p> <p>As I have several disabilities I am protected under the Equality Act 2010 for a protected characteristic.</p> <p>The Equality Act 2010 prohibits discrimination whether this be Direct or Indirect discrimination. As your intentions are to put no waiting restrictions on both sides of Hoyland Road all the way almost to the top this is discrimination as this is preventing me from accessing a business I regularly use on this road and I feel that by attempting to place traffic waiting restrictions on both sides of the road you are treating me (a person with a protected characteristic as defined under the Equality Act 2010) less favourably than someone without a disability.</p> <p>You are attempting to refuse me or cause me great difficulty access to a public business I regularly attend. It can also be argued that as</p>



the proposal is to go from the bottom of Hoyland Road to almost the top that this is in fact victimisation towards the businesses at the bottom and users who attend these businesses especially people like myself who have a disability and have limited walking ability. By placing restrictions on both sides and so far up the road limits my ability to be able to access the business I intend to safely.

The Equality Act 2010 (EqA 2010) prohibits businesses who provide services to the public (for payment or not) from discriminating against, harassing and victimising certain classes of persons. The Act also places an obligation on such businesses (referred to as 'service providers') to make reasonable adjustments for disabled people.

The business I attend always makes reasonable adjustments to allow me to park near the entrance of the business to assist me due to my disability however Sheffield City Councils proposal to restrict waiting times prevents this and therefore this impacts my disability drastically and in effect means that Sheffield City Council are discriminating against people with disabilities attending the businesses.

Furthermore the Act states that "reasonable adjustments" must be made for disabled people and I believe that Sheffield City Council are attempting to remove this "reasonable adjustment" by not allowing me to park at the bottom of the road near the business I am regularly attending.

Everyone has the right to be able to access any public business safely and by restricting parking prevents this drastically and in fact discriminates not only visitors to the business who have disabilities but people generally visiting the businesses.

Therefore I **STRONGLY OPPOSE** to the waiting restrictions intended on both sides of Hoyland Road from the bottom of the road for this first reason given above.

The second reason I oppose is I generally feel that the businesses at the bottom in particular XXX are being victimised and targeted by potentially other businesses and/or Sheffield City Council themselves. The reason for this is the restrictions you are proposing only affects their business. Their business has been there for several years without any previous issues regarding parking and this is would no doubt probably be detrimental to their business as people who regularly visit their business will no longer be able to do so. The restrictions stop almost at the top of the road before another business and this is also why I feel is it targeted towards the business I attend.

Also the business I attend has recently done me a recovery as my cars engine had blown up on the motorway with my children present. If the business could not have taken my car to their business on their recovery truck my children and I would have potentially been stranded

on the motorway.

The business is evidently a recovery business and therefore I presume they would need to be able to park their truck on the road to be able to recover cars needed. They will also need some space to park the car should it need repairing (as they need to place it somewhere before they can get it into their yard to work on it)

This business has been here for several years before the industrial units were taken over by the new owners and I feel that they could be part of this sudden proposal of restrictions.

I feel that XXX are deliberately being victimised and targeted and this now includes those people doing this using Sheffield City Council as a way to do this further.

I would also like to point out that victimisation and harassment is covered under the Protection of Harassment Act 1997 and this includes and is not restricted to victimisation using a third party.

For this second reason I STRONGLY OPPOSE the proposed traffic restrictions.

It has also been suggested that the reason for this alleged proposal is that the vehicles being able to wait there restricts access to the paths, particularly to disabled users. Again I dispute this point as stated above I am a disabled person and I can access these paths without any issues and therefore refer to the fact I feel the business is being targeted.

I would also like to point out that this is NOT a regular main road, it is not accessed often and is only accessed mainly by users using the businesses near most of which are businesses regarding vehicles in some way such a skip company, car painting, recoveries and repairs etc.

As this road mainly is for these businesses the majority of people accessing this road do so in a vehicle and the road is mainly used by these. The footpath is rarely used as there is no where to "walk too" as such.

For this third reason I STRONGLY OPPOSE the proposed traffic restrictions.

The restrictions as previously explained only seem to restrict the main two bottom companies XXX and I therefore feel it is targeted towards them. By putting these restrictions on both sides of the road would make their businesses hard to run and I therefore oppose to the restrictions being placed on both sides of Hoyland Road. It is evident that this is a targeted attack to these companies especially "Independent Recovery Services" which has been there a considerable amount of time and never had any issues previously. XXX have been there for a lot longer than most businesses there and these restrictions would have a negative impact on their business being able to function correctly. The restrictions would have a

negative impact on this business and users attending this business dropping vehicles off for repairs or needing recovery. As standard if a car has been recovered it obviously no longer runs and needs repair, therefore it needs to be dropped at a place where the repair can take place and therefore there needs to be somewhere for this to happen.

For this forth reason I STRONGLY OPPOSE to the proposed traffic restrictions

Also i would like to draw your attention to the car parks that are near the business i regular attend. The car parks near by are all privately owned and have parking restrictions on therefore these are not accessible to myself when visitingXXX. Furthermore, due to my disability and breathing difficulties I may require to park up longer than normal in order to resume driving safely. Therefore I need to be able to wait in my vehicle if needed.

The car parks are privately owned meaning if I am not visiting one of the privately owned businesses I cannot park there. This is also the same for any other visitors attending any other businesses in the area therefore restricting parking drastically. If the proposed waiting restrictions were implemented this would cause further issues for all visitors attending businesses on or near Hoyland Road.

For this fifth reason I STRONGLY OPPOSE to the proposed traffic restrictions

In addition sometimes I can be attended the business or sat in my car for several hours and therefore any parking restrictions would be detrimental to me and my health and prevent me from doing so and potentially forcing people to drive when unsafe to do so.

Furthermore, I would like to draw your attention to the fact that their is a Skip business near by whose drivers also regularly park up due to them needed breaks in line with driving regulations and therefore need somewhere to be able to pull up safely to do so. If the restrictions were imposed this would prevent this and potentially cause further parking issues on Neepsend Lane, which is also a main road and public bus route, which can get extremely busy especially during rush hour.

For this Sixth reason I STRONGLY OPPOSE to the proposed traffic restrictions.

I would also further like to point out that whilst i appreciate some roads having parking restrictions and these are needed I do not feel Hoyland Road needs these restrictions for parking or waiting. The road is not busy, it is not a main road and it is mainly accessed by vehicles attending businesses on the road and is rarely used by pedestrians. It seems evident to me that someone near or the Sheffield City Council are attempting to prevent disabled users from accessing the area and businesses within the area.

	<p>For this Seventh reason I STRONGLY OPPOSE to the proposed traffic restrictions.</p> <p>To confirm I am FULLY OBJECTING to the proposed traffic waiting restrictions on both sides of Hoyland Road.</p> <p>The area is a business industrial estate mainly consisting of businesses who use vehicles or repair, recover or repaint them and I feel that the restrictions would impact these. I also feel that if the waiting parking restrictions were put in place this would have a negative impact on the businesses and the area and as the area is currently thriving this would be detrimental to all.</p> <p>The parking currently available does not prevent or restrict anyone from attending any businesses in this area and does not restrict any traffic to or from the area. The parking if anything increases visits to the area and allows businesses to run effectively.</p> <p>Therefore I strongly oppose to any waiting parking restriction within this area especially at the bottom of Hoyland Road in which i access regularly.</p> <p>I also ask that i am notified and given the opportunity to attend any council meeting or decision regarding this as I would like to be involved in the consultation process fully. Therefore, please can you make me aware and invite me to any intended meetings/discussions/panels</p>
objection	<p>I am a regular user of the garage on Hoyland Road and travel quite a distance to use it. It has always been my trustworthy, reliable garage since before I left the area and I travel some distance from my home in Grimsby, I need to be able to park my car up there to await repair etc.</p> <p>So I oppose the proposed restrictions as with me travelling such a long distance to the garage I've used for many years. At times I have had to park my car on the road outside the garage as I sometimes have to arrive at different times.</p> <p>Kind regards,</p>

objection	<p>Objection to Hoyland Road traffic restrictions</p> <p>To whom it may concern,</p> <p>I am writing to object to the proposed plans for parking restrictions on Hoyland Road, Neepsend Sheffield.</p> <p>I currently work on this road and I believe my work place is personally being targeted for whatever reason. I have been working here for several years with no issues and now a new company has taken over the industrial estate. We seem to be being targeted for several things, parking being one of them. My workplace relies on customers being able to park their vehicles on the road whilst attending my workplace and with this removed will cause issues to my workplace as well as financial implications. We are being harassed and bullied after working here for approximately 12 years with no previous issues at all.</p> <p>Also the restriction would mean i would not have nowhere near my workplace to park my own personal vehicle to attend work. I can work various long hours which can range from 7am until 10pm and the parking restrictions would mean i would not have anywhere to park. The car parks near are private and have parking time restrictions so this is also not an option for me.</p> <p>My workplace recovers cars, some of which are in the middle of the night. The recovery drivers sometimes have to drop the cars outside the business on the road until the business is open or someone is able to move it. As a lot of these are broken it is not as simple as just driving and parking the cars somewhere else. The recovery driver needs to leave it near the business so that it can be dealt with the next day or so. All cars that are left outside my workplace are all road worthy and legal containing the correct requirements as defined in law</p> <p>Some people who attend our workplace are disabled and therefore require access to be able to park closer to use our business. Also once a car has been fixed the car is often parked on the road so the owner can collect it and know it is ready and can collect it if the business is not open as some of our customers work different hours to us.</p> <p>I feel we are being accused of some vans that have been parked around the back of our company. I can confirm none of these belong to us.</p> <p>The current proposed restrictions mean that no one can park at the bottom of the road on either side and the only suggested parking is at the very top of the road which impacts our company.</p> <p>often we have elderly customers who also attend who struggle to walk distance and these restrictions would prevent this</p>
-----------	---

We often work on customers' vans who need to drop the vesicles out of our hours to enable them to then proceed onto their work for the day.

Some recoveries we do means that valuables are sometimes left in the cars as the car has broken down without notice meaning we need to ensure the vehicles are parked as safely and securely as possible being at the top of the road would prevent this

none of our vehicles or any that attend our workplace block anyone from accessing the public pathway if they required to do so, we even attempt to park so that 2 HGV's can access the road at all times so that there is no implications there

This is an industrial estate so not many members of the public walk here the majority of people are attending businesses using vehicles

These restrictions will create extreme difficulty for our company and us trading and potentially lose us customers due to them not being able to park. As we have just survived through a pandemic this would create us great financial hardship and implications and potentially force our company to close.

putting lines down and restricting parking is not needed or required. The parking does not prevent anyone accessing the road, the restrictions would only prevent people from visiting the businesses around there. It is not a main road in which there are residential properties or any schools. There is no need for the restrictions to be in place at all

I feel the XXX are trying to prevent the parking in an attempt to get businesses closed down within the area so that they can expand on it. Their car parks do not allow for any businesses or their visitors that are not part of their industrial estate to park there. This would cause extreme issues for people working in the area and also visiting the businesses.

There are also XXX who regularly use the road to park their HGVs up to have their taco breaks as required by law. If they were not able to park this would cause great difficulty for them and other roads around us.

I feel we are being targeted as the proposed restrictions stop towards the end of the top of the road and do not apply to roads such as Boyland Street (Please see attached image) within the area which are through roads and are accessed by numerous vehicles and members of the public using the footpath and the skate park next to it. As you can see in the image provided this parking seems more problematic than ours.

Furthermore, i would also like to point out that our company gate opens outwards and therefore the restrictions would in effect prevent us from having cars in our drive way and entrance to our company

Several other people also park on this road to use the electrical shop (XXX) and the restrictions would cause issues also for people attending that business.

There is private roads around by company owned by the owners of industrial estate therefore i would not be able to park anywhere near

When repairs are complete on vehicles these are parked onto the road to await collection so i can get on with the next job if these restrictions were granted then it would cause issues as some customers do not collect until after our closing times

Also i do school runs etc and this means i need access to my vehicles to be able to collect the children and return with them

**I DO NOT AGREE WITH THE PARKING RESTRICTIONS AND OBJECT TO THEM BEING PLACED**

support	<p>I am writing to you in support of the proposed traffic regulation orders outlined in the letter sent to local businesses.</p> <p>We opened our business on July 25th 2020, but scouted the area out at least 12 month prior to this. During this time, just over three years, the areas specified in the letter, in particular Hoyland Road, have been filled with scrap vehicles. There hasn't been a single moment in time that this area hasn't been littered with these vehicles.</p> <p>We have several issues with the allowance of this. First and foremost we would question the legality of this; storing vehicles without MOT and tax (in most cases) on public roads. This would induce fines for the general public, yet here it seems to be ok.</p> <p>Most importantly, pedestrians are forced to walk on the road due to vehicles taking up all the space on the pedestrian walk way. This includes forcing disabled persons and parents with children and prams to risk walking on the road. Many people walk to local businesses and these vehicles being in the way increase the risk of road traffic accidents to everyone, including the most vulnerable people in society.</p> <p>The presence of the vehicles restrict your view when turning into and off of the road for oncoming vehicles and pedestrians. This will increase the chances of a collision. Coupled with the above enforcement of pedestrians onto the road, it is a miracle there hasn't already been a serious incident.</p> <p>There are several business within the immediate area. All these businesses rely somewhat on their image to attract new and repeat custom. Unfortunately, the road looks like a scrap yard. Alongside the disused and irreparable vehicles, tyres have started to accumulate. This actively damages the images of local businesses and we believe discourages new custom, simply because it looks so unsightly. It also makes it more difficult to navigate, blocking the view of sign posting. This reduced vision can also mean people feeling less safe, particularly considering the location is near high crime areas.</p> <p>Lastly, the road is supposed to be for the public. It is public property designed to allow the free and unencumbered travel of the general public. The road and roadside is not there for the sole use of a business at the direct impedance of the general public.</p> <p>We know this may have a direct impact on the companies storing these vehicles, but feel that they are acting in an illegal and unsafe manner at the detriment to other businesses and the general public.</p>
---------	--



objection	<p>I am contacting you to express objection to the proposed restrictions.</p> <p>I use a local business for repairs to my car and parking restriction would leave nowhere to park.</p>
objection	<p>12/09/2022 Your Ref :TR-22HRN-AG1</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern</p> <p>Ref : Traffic Regulation Order, Proposed prohibition of waiting on Hillfoot Road &amp; Hoyland Road.</p> <p>I am writing to place on the record Our Strong objections to the above proposal.</p> <p>This is a commercial area with very little footfall and there is no one blocking the freedom of movement of the few pedestrians around on the footpaths.</p> <p>This will severely affect the successful small businesses operating on Hoyland Road which are all Vehicle repair garages. As these have customers dropping off and collecting cars all day , to not allow parking will be removing the rights of the public to freely use the business of their choice.</p> <p>We have been operating our business from these premises for aproximately 15 years with no problems from surrounding businesses.</p> <p>While we have been here there has been one accident caused by someone sliding on ice during the winter.</p> <p>Every day there are articulated trucks (40ft up to 80 tons) driving up and down Hoyland Road , we have never received any complaint from the drivers of these exceptionally large vehicles.</p> <p>Nor any complaints from the drivers of any other vehicles.</p> <p>We do not understand why only businesses on the bottom of Hoyland Road are being targetted for restrictions as the double yellow lines will not be extended to the top of the road where there are no businesses and there for no nessesity for parking.</p> <p>There is an unlicenced business in close proximity (Fairfield Road to the rear of our premises) causing a lot more obstruction to footpaths and the highway which your plans do not ear mark for restricing and</p>

	<p>we require a reason for this. I have attached Photos Labeled XXX.</p> <p>There are also others parking on footpaths on Parkwood Road/Neepsend Lane and Boyland Street. As these roads are through routes and highly pedestrianised, There are more likely to be accidents causing injury to pedestrians and cyclists. Again I have attached photographs</p> <p>All the vehicles we have parked are road legal, and we pay approx 6000k a year to to keep them that way.</p> <p>The complainants we are told are XXX This XXX will not in anyway be affected by these restricitons as they have sole use of private parking areas within the unit grounds and their own private road.</p> <p>The businesses on Hoyland Road are not permitted to use these parking facilities.</p> <p>We are fighting to keep our business operating, it will be practically impossible to do this if there are parking restrictions on both sides of the road. We therefore thank you for this taking into consideration and looking at the photographs attached.</p> <p>With Regards</p> <p>XXX</p>
objection	<p>12/09/2022 Your Ref :TR-22HRN-AG1</p> <p>To Whom It May Concern</p> <p>Ref : Traffic Regulation Order, Proposed prohibition of waiting on Hillfoot Road &amp; Hoyland Road.</p> <p>I am writing to place on the record my strong objections to the above proposal.</p> <p>I assist my husband with his business XXX.</p> <p>I am a blue badge holder, so if the restrictions go ahead I will not be able to attend the premises as I am unable to walk very far. and there will be nowhere for me to park my vehicle close by I do consider this to be discrimination becasue as disabled person I will not have the freedom of movement I am entitled to. There is not any provision for disabled parking in the area.</p>

	<p>Thank you for your consideration in this matter.</p>
objection	<p>I am writing to object to the proposals of the 2 lines being placed on Hoyland Road s3 8ab</p> <p>I regular visit this area with my 4 year old toddler and to take my car to the local garage there if the parking was restricted this would cause serious issues for me to take my car and for me and my toddler to walk around there. The area is an upcoming area and a nice area to walk around whilst my car is being repaired</p> <p>The reason this objection is slightly late is due to the fact I have only just been informed of this</p> <p>No notifications have been placed around the area informing everyone and this is not showing a true representation of anyone who may wish to object who visits the area</p> <p>There should have been notifications placed around</p> <p>If they had been I would have objected before however it is only slightly late and I have provided reasons why which I see as justifiable and I hope my objection will still be included in any discussions taking place</p> <p>I object to any lines being placed on Hoyland Road s3</p>

objection	<p>I am writing to place on the record Our Strong objections to the above proposal.</p> <p>This is a commercial area with very little footfall and there is no one blocking the freedom of movement of the few pedestrians around on the footpaths.</p> <p>This will severely affect the successful small businesses operating on Hoyland Road which are all Vehicle repair garages. As these have customers dropping off and collecting cars all day , to not allow parking will be removing the rights of the public to freely use the business of their choice.</p> <p>We have been operating our business from these premises for aproximately 15 years with no problems from surrounding businesses.</p> <p>While we have been here there has been one accident caused by someone sliding on ice during the winter.</p> <p>Every day there are articulated trucks (40ft up to 80 tons) driving up and down Hoyland Road , we have never received any complaint from the drivers of these exceptionally large vehicles.</p> <p>Nor any complaints from the drivers of any other vehicles.</p> <p>We do not understand why only businesses on the bottom of Hoyland Road are being targetted for restrictions as the double yellow lines will not be extended to the top of the road where there are no businesses and there for no nessesity for parking.</p> <p>There is an unlicenced business in close proximity (Fairfield Road to the rear of our premises) causing a lot more obstruction to footpaths and the highway which your plans do not ear mark for restricing and we require a reason for this.</p> <p>I have attached Photos Labled XXX.</p> <p>There are also others parking on footpaths on Parkwood Road/Neepsend Lane and Boyland Street. As these roads are through routes and highly pedestrianised, There are more likely to be accidents causing injury to pedestrians and cyclists.</p> <p>Again I have attached photographs</p> <p>All the vehicles we have parked are road legal, and we pay approx 6000k a year to to keep them that way.</p> <p>The complainants we are told are Hillfoot Estates/Industrials and tenants of this letting agent</p> <p>This company and its tenants will not in anyway be affected by these restricitons as they have sole use of private parking areas within the unit grounds and their own private road.</p>
-----------	--

The businesses on Hoyland Road are not permitted to use these parking facilities.

We are fighting to keep our business operating, it will be practically impossible to do this if there are parking restrictions on both sides of the road.

We therefore thank you for this taking into consideration and looking at the photographs attached.

This page is intentionally left blank