

PUBLIC

MINUTES of a meeting of the **CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE** held at County Hall, Matlock on 26 April 2018

PRESENT

Cabinet Member - Councillor S A Spencer

Also in attendance – Councillor T Ainsworth.

In accordance with Standing Orders, Councillor S Burfoot attended the meeting as local Member in respect of Minute No. 40/18.

38/18 PETITION RESOLVED (1) to receive the under-mentioned petition:-

<u>Location/Subject</u>	<u>Signatures</u>	<u>Local Member</u>
Chinley, Buxton Road – Request to Improve Road Safety	119 additional signatures	Councillor A Fox

(2) that the Strategic Director – Economy, Transport and Environment be asked to include this with the petition received on 5 April 2018.

39/18 MINUTES RESOLVED that the Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Infrastructure held on 5 April 2018 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Cabinet Member.

40/18 PETITION REQUESTING HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS – A615 TANSLEY

Following the receipt of a petition requesting consideration of traffic calming, a pedestrian crossing facility, bus stop improvements and footway repairs on the A615 at Tansley, investigations have been undertaken.

The classification of the A615 as a Principal Road limited the types of traffic calming measures that could be introduced. A vehicle activated sign has been provided on Nottingham Road which illuminated when it detected vehicles exceeding a set speed. The centre line has been recently been omitted to highlight to motorists that they have entered a different environment to the rest of the route. The Derby and Derbyshire Road Safety Partnership has recently adopted a Speed Management Protocol Engineering Technical Annex and this was attached to the report.

The collision statistics during the period from 1 September 2014 to 31 August 2017, recorded five injury related collisions within the 30mph section of the A615.

Only one of the collisions appeared to involve inappropriate speed as a factor. Speed cameras were only ever considered to address a known speed related collision problem, however, as highlighted on the CREST website, the A615 in Tansley was already identified as a mobile speed camera location. A speed survey was undertaken in 2016 which revealed that 15% of the total traffic flow within the 30mph speed limit exceeded 37mph in both directions at the Nottingham Road location and 15% exceeded 33mph at the Alfreton Road location. The results of a previous pedestrian count fell below the required criteria for a pedestrian crossing facility. A further count could be undertaken however, if there was sufficient justification this might require land acquisition to accommodate the equipment.

The Cabinet Member allowed Councillor Vicki Raynes, Chairman, Tansley Parish Council to address the meeting. Councillor Raynes was accompanied by Parish Councillor Barry Hopkinson. Concern was expressed that the data provided was not current. The speed data was from 2016 and it was felt that the situation on the A615, which was the main road to the M1, warranted an up to date survey. The Parish Council has, in consultation with Police, begun operating a Community Speed Watch. It was acknowledged that the most viable site for a pedestrian crossing was in vicinity of Thatchers Lane, as it was impossible to cross near Alders Lane. Issues were also raised relating to the parked vehicles outside the wood yard and the narrow width of the pavements. The road was heavily trafficked and vehicles were speeding, the Parish Council felt that speed cameras would resolve this situation and the provision of a pedestrian crossing would provide a crossing point for pedestrians and slow vehicles down.

It was agreed that the traffic count data for the last 3 years be provided to Councillor Raynes, that County Council officers correspond with CREST regarding speed enforcement and discussions be held regarding the ownership of land in the vicinity of Thatchers Lane.

RESOLVED that (1) a further survey be carried out to determine the current pedestrian demand on the A615, Tansley;

(2) the Parish Council be informed of the outcomes of the further investigations; and

(3) the local Member and lead petitioner be informed accordingly.

41/18 PETITION REQUESTING A PEDESTRIAN CROSSING FACILITY – A6 DALE ROAD SOUTH, TWO DALES Following the receipt of a petition requesting a pedestrian crossing facility on the A6 Dale Road South, Two Dales between the Greenaway Lane and Old Road junctions, investigations have been carried out.

The A6 was classed as a Primary Route within the existing road hierarchy in Derbyshire and, as such, carried a high volume of traffic. The road width, presence of side roads and bus lay-bys and the sub-standard width footway to the north of the

nursery at the location; meant that there were no suitable locations to install a crossing facility that would be safe to use and also on the pedestrian desire line.

To enable a central refuge to be accommodated between the two side roads, the road would need widening, bus stop lay-bys removing and re-positioning of the give way lines at the adjacent side roads. In engineering terms the work was not insurmountable however it could be unviable from a cost/benefit point of view when competing for the limited funding that was available with other scheme proposals.

The Police's injury related collision database showed no injury collisions in the vicinity of the junction involving pedestrians in the last 13 years.

RESOLVED that (1) the situation continues to be monitored on the A6 Dale Road South, Two Dales, and any further action be taken where appropriate in accordance with current national guidance; and

(2) the lead petitioner and local Member be informed accordingly.

42/18 PETITION : CHESTERFIELD, OLD ROAD AND SURROUNDING STREETS – REQUEST TO INVESTIGATE A RESIDENTS ONLY PARKING SCHEME

An Epetition has been received requesting that consideration be given to introducing a Residents' Only Parking (ROP) scheme on Old Road, Chesterfield and surrounding streets.

Officers have looked at the approximate number of properties on each street in question, and the approximate number of kerb side parking spaces available for these properties to currently park. The result was that there was not enough space for one car per household to park on Old Road, Old Hall Road or Victoria Street West and that did not take into account any second cars, visitor and business permits that would be available to purchase.

The request was very remote from the existing schemes currently operational in Chesterfield, and whilst it was appreciated that some residents were unable to park near to their property, there was not enough kerb side space available. This would make the scheme oversubscribed and ineffective, resulting in households purchasing permits and still being unable to park on their street.

Reducing the length of double yellow lines on the approach to the traffic signals would be considered as it might be possible to create additional parking spaces on Old Road and Old Hall Road.

RESOLVED that (1) the Cabinet Member does not approve the request for a Residents' Only Parking scheme on Old Road, Chesterfield and surrounding streets;

(2) some reduction in lengths of double yellow lines be considered to generate additional parking spaces; and

3) the Local Member, lead petitioner and the Chief Constable be notified accordingly

43/18 SECTION 116 OF THE HIGHWAYS ACT 1980 – PROPOSED STOPPING UP OF HIGHWAY BETWEEN 32 AND 33 WOOD GARDENS, HAYFIELD

Following the development of Wood Gardens, Hayfield an area of land between numbers 32 and 33 was not stopped-up. The area of land has been incorporated within the curtilage of 33 Wood Gardens and a formal request has been made for the Council to use its powers under Section 116 of the Highways Act 1980 to process the Stopping-Up Order. The applicant has agreed to pay the Council's reasonable costs of making the application.

RESOLVED to authorise the Director of Legal Services to undertake all the necessary steps to obtain a Stopping-Up Order under Section 116 of the Highways Act 1980 for the area of land, shown hatched red on plan ref HMT/IM/626/17 attached to the report, between 32 and 33 Wood Gardens, Hayfield.

44/18 OBJECTIONS TO THE (CHAPEL LANE EAST, EASTWOOD PARK DRIVE, NEWBOLD ROAD, GATEFIELD CLOSE, BARN CLOSE, FIELDHEAD WAY, OLD BRICK WORKS LANE, PARK ROAD AND NEW STREET, CHESTERFIELD)(NO WAITING AT ANY TIME) ORDER 2017

The No Waiting At Any Time Order 2017, included five different locations in the Chesterfield area and was initially consulted upon in July 2017. The Order was then advertised on street and in the local paper on 30 November 2017 to 22 December 2017. Following these statutory processes a number of objections were received which were detailed in the report.

Consequently it was proposed that a short section of double yellow lines be removed on Chapel Lane East (Proposed Double Yellow Lines) where the road was at its widest to allow vehicles to park here.

Numerous objections have been received from residents in the vicinity of the Gatefield Close/Newbold Road/Barn Close/Fieldhead Way – Proposed Double Yellow Lines, who believe that proposals would shift vehicles onto neighbouring roads. It was agreed that officers would look at the surrounding roads to assess if parking restrictions should be put down to help residents access and egress these neighbouring properties.

RESOLVED that (1) the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (Chapel Lane East, Eastwood Park Drive, Newbold Road, Gatefield Close, Barn Close, Fieldhead Way, Old Brick Works Lane, Park Road and New Street, Chesterfield) (No Waiting At Any Time) Order 2017 be introduced as advertised and implemented in due course, with one minor amendment as recommended in the report; and

(2) the Local Members and objectors be informed accordingly.

45/18 OBJECTIONS TO THE BUS AND HACKNEY TAXI LANES AND STREETS, CHESTERFIELD

Consultation had been undertaken on the (Rose Hill/Knivesmithgate, Beetwell Street, Church Way, Holywell Street, Park Road, Brimington Road, Chesterfield) (Bus Lanes & Bus Only Streets) Order 2017 and the proposal had been advertised.

In the centre of Chesterfield, there were six 'bus only' facilities which included bus lanes and bus only streets which also permitted cyclists. The bus gate on Beetwell Street already allowed Hackney taxis through it and a request has been made to allow motorcycles through it to gain access to the motor bike parking on Old Ship Lane and this has been included within the advertised Traffic Regulation Order.

One objection from an owner of a taxi company has been received stating that they represented the whole of the private hire drivers which they estimated at 600. The grounds of objection were the discrimination to private hire vehicles and the variance in cost their customers would experience. They request that the bus facilities were made available for both Hackney and private hire vehicles or for none at all.

Concerns were also raised from the bus operator Stagecoach after the closing date, which stated that it was not aware of the proposals. It also stated that currently there was no enforcement in the existing facilities and could not therefore support the proposal. In April 2017, the initial proposals were e-mailed to Stagecoach but no response was received and the proposals were forwarded again at a later date inviting comment.

The Police have given their support to the proposals providing that it was only Hackney taxis and have agreed to enforce this restriction.

The concerns expressed by the objector and the local bus operator were noted however, the majority of representatives from The Trade were supportive of the proposal to allow only Hackney taxis into the bus facilities.

The Council has recently been made aware of a loop hole in taxi licensing in that Hackney taxis registered in neighbouring towns and cities could operate as private hire in Chesterfield. It was therefore proposed to make the Traffic Regulation Order experimental for the maximum of 18 months and monitor the usage and safety of the bus facilities.

RESOLVED (1) to approve the introduction of the (Rose Hill/Knivesmithgate, Beetwell Street, Church Way, Holywell Street, Park Road, Brimington Road, Chesterfield) (Bus Lanes & Bus Only Streets) Order 2017 but on an experimental basis only with a view to reviewing the situation in 18 months' time; and

(2) the Local Members, objectors, Chair of the Taxi Consultative Committee, and the Chief Constable be notified accordingly.

**46/18 RESPONSE TO THE DEPARTMENT FOR TRANSPORT'S
CONSULTATION ON THE USE OF SECTION 19 AND 22 PERMITS FOR ROAD
PASSENGER TRANSPORT**

In February 2018, the Department for Transport (DfT) launched a consultation on future guidance on the use of sections 19 and 22 permits for road passenger transport. This followed considerable discussion in the Community Transport sector nationally on the topic and the issue being the subject of a Transport Select Committee inquiry in November 2017.

Under the current arrangement, the majority of the transport services Community Transport Organisations (CTOs) provide on a contractual basis to the County Council were provided under a permit in accordance with Section 19 of the Transport Act 1985 ("a Section 19 permit"). This exempts organisations from the need to hold an Operator's Licence (known as "O licence"). The DfT, in July 2017, had written to all Section 19 permit issuing authorities, indicated that if CTOs wished to compete for local authority contract work they would need to do so under an O licence and meet all the standards associated with this. On 16 November 2017, Cabinet agreed to help alleviate some of the problems associated with the change from a section 19/22 by providing funding as part of the Passenger Transport Driver Training Initiative to pay for the costs associated with drivers gaining their O license qualification.

The DfT consultation asked a series of very specific question on the proposed changes and the County Council's proposed responses were attached as an Appendix to the report.

RESOLVED (1) to note the Department for Transport's consultation on the proposed changes in the interpretation of the sections 19 and 22 permit system; and

(2) that the proposed response to the consultation questions shown in Appendix 1 to the report be agreed.