

Committee Name and Date of Committee Meeting

Delegated Officer Decision – 22 October 2021

Report Title

Outcome of public consultation for proposed Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the A633 High Street and Bellows Road junction improvement (Clean Air Zone scheme).

Is this a Key Decision and has it been included on the Forward Plan?

No, but it has been included on the Forward Plan

Strategic Director Approving Submission of the Report

Paul Woodcock, Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment

Report Author(s)

Richard Baker, Engineer

Richard-eds.baker@rotherham.gov.uk

Nat Porter, Senior Transport Planner

Nat.porter@rotherham.gov.uk

Ward(s) Affected

Rawmarsh East

Rawmarsh West

Report Summary

To inform the Strategic Director of Regeneration and Environment of the outcome of the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) consultations on proposed bus lanes, prohibited U-turns, waiting and parking restrictions and report receipt of objections. To then recommend that the proposals be implemented with minor amendments.

In the Summer of 2021 public consultation was undertaken on TRO proposals associated with the High Street-Bellows Road access improvement scheme. This was developed to deliver the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) requirements mandated by government for A633 Rawmarsh Hill by assisting with the partial redirection of bus services to meet air quality requirements. This outline CAZ proposal was consulted on in 2019. This most recent consultation associated with the TRO also identified the final design of the scheme to satisfy the clean air requirements.

The 2021 TRO consultation resulted in several objections to TRO specific proposals and the scheme in general to introduce traffic signal control at the junction.

This report seeks to demonstrate that to deliver the maximum benefits by improving air quality on this part of the highway network and by also promoting bus priority and

providing improved pedestrian crossing facilities the scheme and associated TROs should be delivered. The report explains which elements are still considered to be required and recommends that they and the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders are implemented. A number of minor revisions are to be included in the final proposals in light of consultation feedback.

Recommendations

- 1) that the following proposals included in the amended scheme are implemented;
 - introduction of traffic signal control,
 - provision of full time northbound and southbound bus lanes,
 - removal of the pedestrian subway to be replaced by at grade pedestrian crossings
 - provision of a formal parking area on the western side of A633

These are shown on design drawing No 60644404-ACM-HGN-GEN-GEN-ZZ-Z-DR-CH-0004 attached as Appendix 4.

- 2) The following proposed TROs are withdrawn and not progressed further:
 - Prohibition of U-turn manoeuvres
 - Loading and waiting restriction included with the bus lane order

List of Appendices Included

Appendix 1 Equalities Analysis
Appendix 2 A633High Street-TRO plan
Appendix 3 Copy of original public objections
Appendix 4 Scheme Design drawing
Appendix 5 Carbon Impact Assessment

Background Papers

- Delegated Officer Decision report February 2021 – Approval to start TRO process
- Outline Business Case – Joint Sheffield and Rotherham Clean Air Zone
<https://www.rotherham.gov.uk/downloads/file/1294/sheffield-and-rotherham-clean-air-zone-outline-business-case>
- Cabinet report 17/12/2018 – Item 83 [Improving Air Quality in Rotherham](#)
- Cabinet report 22/3/21 - Item 134 :[SCC/RMBC Clean Air Zone Programme-Approval to deliver Rotherham's Air Quality Measures Projects](#)

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel

Name of Committee – Click here to enter a date.

Name of Committee – Click here to enter a date.

Council Approval Required

No

Exempt from the Press and Public

No

An exemption is sought for (insert appendix number) under (Select reason for exemption) of Part I of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 is requested, as this report contains (insert why it meets that paragraph).

It is considered that the public interest in maintaining the exemption would outweigh the public interest in disclosing the information because (insert why)

Outcome of public consultation for proposed Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the A633 High Street and Bellows Road junction improvement (Clean Air Zone scheme).

1. Background

1.1 The Rawmarsh Hill Clean Air Zone Scheme proposals

Rotherham, together with Sheffield, has jointly been mandated by the Government to introduce measures to bring concentrations of nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), a recognised air pollutant, to within legal limits by 2022. New air quality standards, limiting annual average concentrations of nitrogen dioxide to no more than 40 micrograms per cubic metre, came into force in 2010. Along with 26 other local authorities, Rotherham and Sheffield Councils were found to be in persistent breach of this requirement in 2017 in several areas (The National Air Quality Plan, published by Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA) in July 2017). Rotherham was directed to take local action to correct this in the shortest possible time.

With Sheffield, Rotherham Council (RMBC) was initially directed by Government to consider a Road User Charging scheme. Council passed motion (referred to in report to Cabinet 17/12/2018) indicating a charging scheme to be unacceptable, and so RMBC developed alternative proposals.

In 2019, RMBC held a public consultation on the principles of the air quality measures. One of the areas in breach of the NO₂ levels is A633 Rawmarsh Hill, and the proposed measure included rerouting of buses on Rawmarsh Hill. This indicated 48% of respondents supported the proposals, compared to 43% against (ref Appendix 2 of the March 2021 cabinet report).

To reduce vehicle emissions on A633 Rawmarsh Hill it has been proposed to split the bus services that operate along A633 (Taylors Lane Roundabout to Bellows Road junction) to also use the parallel route along Barbers Avenue. Buses would then re-enter and exit A633. Initially this was to be via the Dale Road junction but on further investigation there is insufficient highway space to accommodate the appropriate junction geometry for safe bus movements. The alternative, which is now proposed, is to access A633 via Bellows Road.

In order to ensure optimum journey time reliability for buses and in order to provide an at grade crossing on the A633 High Street it is proposed to control the existing priority controlled junction by traffic lights with pedestrian facilities. Pedestrian surveys indicate that 80% of pedestrians crossing the A633 High Street at this point do not use the subway and cross the dual carriageway at grade. A traffic signal-controlled crossing will provide a much-improved means of crossing the road for pedestrian and bus users.

1.2 Traffic Regulation Order to support the traffic management scheme

To support the implementation of the traffic management elements included

in the scheme a series of Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) are required. The statutory process for promoting and implementing TROs requires suitable consultation with statutory bodies and organisations such as South Yorkshire Police, Fire and Ambulance services, Ward and Cabinet Members and also the public.

The TRO proposals developed and advertised for this scheme consisted of the following. A plan of the proposed TROs is included as Appendix 2.

- Bus Lanes: Proposals to introduce a full-time bus lane on the southbound carriageway of the A633 High Street with signals in advance of the junction, to expedite buses to re-joining the main flow of traffic. It is also proposed to introduce a full-time bus lane northbound between Rockcliffe Road and the bus stop prior to Haugh Road. This can be achieved by reallocating a lane of the existing short section of dual carriageway in each direction to become bus lanes as traffic flows do not necessitate two all traffic lanes in each direction. The bus lanes would operate at all times. Currently the carriageway where it is proposed to introduce the bus lanes is regulated by yellow line waiting restrictions to deter parking at any time therefore the bus lanes will not adversely affect parking in these specific areas.
- Prohibited U-turns: To ensure potentially inappropriate or unexpected manoeuvres are not made at the signal-controlled junction it is proposed to prohibit 'U'-turns from each direction on A633.
- Waiting and Parking restrictions: The new highway layout will result in a short section of carriageway on A633 between Rockcliffe Road and Abbeydale Nursing Home being narrowed in order to provide a wider footway and formal on street parking on the western side. To promote the free movement of vehicles it is proposed to extend a section of No waiting At Any Time on the western side of A633 and amend the existing 'daytime' waiting restrictions on the eastern side of A633 to become No Waiting At Any Time. To provide a turnover of parking and make more parking space available it is proposed to introduce a 3 hour time limit at the new parking bay, operating on weekdays between the hours of 9am and 4pm.

These proposals were advertised by notice in the Rotherham Advertiser and on street on 17th June 2021 giving a period of four weeks for representations to be made. A consultation letter including scheme drawings was delivered to 80 residential and business properties along A633. Scheme information and consultation was also available via Rotherham Council website.

2. Key Issues

- 2.1 During the consultation period and prior to submitting written objections, members of the public requested a meeting with council officers to discuss

their concerns. A meeting was arranged on site during this period to try to best accommodate residents and the requirements for social distancing due to the Covid-19 Pandemic. At the meeting a number of residents expressed their concerns and dissatisfaction with the proposals, scheme rationale and consultation. They also explained that this was the first they'd heard of the CAZ issues despite the above mentioned standard approach to advertisement of the proposals, and despite the 2019 public consultation.

At the end of the four weeks consultation period twelve objections had been received from residents and businesses regarding the proposals. These ranged from objecting to individual elements of the TROs up to and including the scheme as a whole. A letter was then sent to objectors in an attempt to address the common concerns and objections raised and provide clarification on some misconceptions specifically regarding the impact of buses on access to private property. The letter also explained that some elements of the proposals would be withdrawn in light of objections. The objectors were offered the opportunity to withdraw their objection should they wish to do so in light of this clarification. No objections were withdrawn.

For purposes of clarity, extracts and comments from the twelve objections have been presented below under headings that represent the main elements of the scheme. The RMBC response to these objections is then provided within each section. Appendix 3 includes the original representations made by those objectors.

2.2 **TRO - Objections to the proposed bus lanes**

1. *Crossing into household drives and the car park will be causing a perilous situation for car drivers. How will a bus driver know that a car crossing in front of him into the bus lane know that they are wanting to turn into their driveway. This will be a dangerous manoeuvre, surely Health and Safety come into this decision for the West side of High Street residents.*
2. *I think a bus lane will cause more problems on this only stretch of road in Rawmarsh has it has free running traffic it will have a major impact on residents living on street cause issues when pulling in and out of their drives buses are used very little these days and would be beneficial if they used smaller buses*
3. *Bus lane that will run for at most a ¼ of mile up High St from Rotherham I feel is a complete waste of time and valuable council funding, buses run quite freely on this stretch of road, and I can see no reason why this would not continue. The bus lane I feel will also pose a danger to myself and visitors accessing my driveway which is concealed as it is now, I indicate, slow down, break and it is not until I begin to turn that traffic behind me realise what I am doing then they go into the outside lane to avoid bumping into me, the bus lane will mean there is no outside lane for them to go into, resulting in the back end of my car getting hit. I have been told that I will be allowed to drive in the bus lane because of needing access but unless there is clear signage explaining this, I feel I*

may receive a fine for driving in said bus lane and abuse from bus drivers!

- 4. The bus lane on A633 South will also cause problems for business and access on the south bound side of the rd.*
- 5. I am strongly opposed to the bus lane and cannot see any benefit whatsoever (traffic currently passes the bus in the outside lane anyway) The bus lane will serve in making travelling and access driveway on the A633 North bound dangerous!!*
- 6. The added bus lane is quite unnecessary, especially since it only covers 200 yards*
- 7. [I/We] do not understand what the benefit of this bus lane would be as it would hold traffic up whereas a bus bay would keep it flowing.*

Response:

Purpose: The bus lanes are intended to allow buses to reach the head of the queue when the traffic signals are at red to mitigate the small increase in delay to buses on the main road that might otherwise be expected as a consequence of the signals. Without the bus lanes, bus services would run with general traffic and potentially suffer more variable delays throughout the day further impacting the effectiveness and reliability of the service. This would impact the commercial viability of bus services, and may also encourage a small mode shift from bus to car which would be contrary to air quality objectives.

Access: Anyone wishing to access/ egress a property or the car park may enter and drive in the bus lane for this purpose. This includes allowing drivers to pull to the kerb to reverse into a driveway. This is a common situation in Rotherham and throughout the region, and as such bus drivers are aware of this - particularly if the driver is indicating their intended manoeuvre. These concerns will be raised through the Rotherham Bus Partnership to ensure bus operators and drivers are aware of the concern, and take particular care to enable local people to become used to the new arrangements.

As part of the scheme development a Road Safety Audit has been undertaken. No issues were raised regarding ingress or egress to private accesses.

Loading & unloading: The proposed loading and waiting restriction included in the bus lane proposals will be withdrawn and not progressed further. This will allow for short periods of loading, deliveries and alighting of passengers as happens currently. Buses would overtake any stationary vehicles undertaking this activity.

2.3 TRO - Objections to the proposed prohibited U-turns

1. *As a lot of people visiting the high street centre have never been there before this will mean that they will have to drive past all the way down Rawmarsh hill to the roundabout to turn round legally putting more traffic in Parkgate causing more pollution, as well as putting more strain on the dale road junction enabling residents on the northbound side to enter their properties now off Bellows road instead of been able to perform a U turn upon High street.*
2. *The proposal is hoping for the reduction of NO2 but surely the alternative direction for vehicles not having the u turn facility to get to their homes is a worse scenario. Traffic coming from Greasbro[ugh] Lane and the old and new estates off Haugh Road have to stand normally in an already congested junction to turn left onto Blyth Avenue for approximately 200 yards before queuing again to turn right onto Dale Road up to the traffic light junction at Bellows Road to turn right again to get to their destinations. How can this procedure be helping alleviate carbon emissions?*
3. *This will cause issues for residents and business trying to access their property we will have to go through an already busy road making right turn at the junction on dale road which already has issues with oncoming traffic then waiting in a queue to come across on to high street where i immediately have to turn in to my property crossing the bus lane*
4. *The proposal of no U-turn coming down A633 heading south at the junction of Bellows Road means residents of High Street and numerous visitors to The High Street Centre will have to travel along Dale rd., then Bellows rd. to gain access to A633 again to travel north. And for myself I don't U-turn I simply turn right into my driveway, likewise when travelling to Parkgate I cut across and turn right toward Rawmarsh Hill (south on A633) with the proposed new scheme I will have to turn left and travel north on A633 to U-turn at the bottom of Haugh Rd back onto High St. to travel south. a filter lane will need to be added otherwise traffic turning right and U-turning will cause standing traffic northbound as all lights will turn green at the same time so traffic will have difficulty accessing A633 south.*
5. *Prohibiting the 'U' turn on the A633 will have a major impact on members of the public's ability to access our building (High Street Centre) and the services it provides – I cannot see how people accessing the centre from the northbound A633 will be able to get to the building without travelling further down the A633 which will actually increase the traffic this scheme aims to reduce.*
6. *Users of the High Street Centre coming down from Haugh Rd will now have to turn left onto Blyth Avenue to the junction with Dale Rd, it is a very busy on this road as it is the main road through Rawmarsh, wait to cross into Dale Rd, travelling along Bellows Rd which is also a very busy road due to parked cars for the fish shop, doctor's surgery and the shopping centre, then onto the junction with High Street, and then wait*

to cross 3 lanes to enter the car park at the High Street Centre.

- 7. Object strongly to the proposal of no U turns on the High Street (A633) as we believe this would cause numerous traffic delays/ holdups for our funeral cortege.*

Response:

These objections and comments make clear the apparent usefulness of this manoeuvre as an option for drivers. After consideration of this and a review of the traffic flows making the manoeuvre and the layout of the junction it is proposed that the prohibition of U-turns TRO should be withdrawn. Traffic surveys indicate that between 7am-7pm in 2017 and 2019 that 59 vehicles were recorded making this manoeuvre from the southbound carriageway. In the opposite direction in 2017 there were zero vehicles and 4 in 2019.

The safety of the new pedestrian crossing on the northbound carriageway would not be compromised as this will have separate traffic signals and stop line thereby, in effect, acting as a remote crossing. Southbound traffic making a U-turn manoeuvre would then be required to observe the status of these traffic signals.

It is therefore proposed that the option to perform a U-turn manoeuvre remains to give drivers the opportunity to turn either during gaps in traffic as they do presently or during the 'intergreen' period (the period between the traffic light changes e.g. from main road to side road).

2.4 TRO - Objections to the proposed parking bay arrangements

- 1. If the proposed parking area on the Western side outside St Marys Church is full this will cause the funeral vehicles to park in the road causing more traffic problems and standing traffic.*

Response:

The proposed parking area will provide a greater turnover of parking opportunities than the current section during weekdays 9am to 4pm. Waiting restrictions on the opposite side will ensure the free movement of vehicles on the Highway due to the revised carriageway width. A provision on the widened western footway is to be made for the funeral cortege to be able to park without affecting the free and safe movement of traffic on A633.

2.5 Objections to the proposed scheme to add traffic signal control to the junction regarding perceptions of additional congestion and effects on air quality

- 1. No need to install traffic lights on Bellows road /High street, this could all be achieved by better lane/junction markings. As the traffic lights would create more carbon fumes...more vehicles having to perform hill starts...more carbon fumes, as this will now happen to give way for vehicles turning left out of Bellows Road down High Street towards Rotherham not just to let a bus out like a bus gate as currently traffic can*

perform this manoeuvre without affecting any traffic flow.

- 2. I believe that this is going to create no end of accidents for people entering their properties and visitors to the high street centre... (Traffic lights) are going to cause queues down Rawmarsh hill when on full cycle including pedestrian demands and excessive noise from stationary vehicles stopped at the lights especially at nights as the majority of traffic then is HGV'S due to no by-pass.*
- 3. Having traffic lights on the main road will cause more pollution with already heavy traffic on rawmarsh hill parkgate and retail world standing traffic especially heavy goods and Buses i also feel with our property being on the junction and close to the proposed traffic lights it will be more dangerous when we are accessing our property*
- 4. The proposed traffic lights on the A633 north bound will result in standing traffic backing up, down onto Rawmarsh Hill causing more pollution to the air than the buses do, also standing traffic will result in more noise for residents*
- 5. In my opinion, accessing and exiting my driveway will be almost impossible once the proposed traffic lights and bus lane are in place.*
- 6. We believe traffic lights on Bellows Road would cause huge hold ups on Rawmarsh Hill with standing traffic therefore causing more pollution rather than less.*
- 7. More pollution is generated with standing traffic. Buses and cars don't get held up at the bellows road junction. New laws stating electric buses by 2025 so why do this now for 3/4 years money could be better spent on the retail/parkgate roundabouts*
- 8. ... envisage that the new traffic lights positioned at the Bellows Road junction with the A633 will make this junction more popular with drivers as the lights will guarantee timed priority access onto the A633... consequently the traffic congestion outside my property resulting from the new traffic lights halting traffic on a regular basis will be an unacceptable nuisance to myself and my neighbours.*
- 9. The result of implementing this scheme will only make traffic congestion far worse along the proposed bus route.*
- 10. Very concerned about a marked increase in vehicle noise and emissions pollution that will result from the imposition of this scheme right outside my property. The noise from cars, buses, lorries etc which will be stationary right outside my windows waiting for a change in the traffic lights, plus the added pollution from exhaust fumes which inevitably increases when vehicles have to start moving off after being halted by*

the traffic lights is very concerning. The pollution from HGV's, buses and cars will be made much worse since they will all be making a hill start.

11. The proposals, if implemented, would increase congestion and cause more, NOT less emissions as traffic would be stationary whilst buses are given priority. It is not a very busy bus route and a permanent bus lane is totally unnecessary. Traffic would have to divert down Blyth Avenue and Dale Road and this would increase the emissions to properties on these roads as well as disruption and congestion on Rawmarsh Hill.

Response:

The introduction of traffic light control at the A633 High Street/ Bellows Road junction has been developed to facilitate a safe and efficient manoeuvre of traffic including pedestrians at this junction which is currently under priority control. This is considered as being especially useful for the buses that are intended to be diverted from A633 Rawmarsh Hill to the parallel route along Barbers Avenue which then would re-join A633 High Street via Bellows Road. The traffic lights will operate using modern technologies which aims to optimise traffic movements and minimise delay.

Traffic modelling to assess current and future operation at this junction indicates that significant congestion is unlikely during usual operation as a consequence of this scheme. In the worst scenario (in the busiest evening peak, with 7% traffic growth, and with every pedestrian crossing called every cycle) there is still 12% practical reserve capacity. This is within acceptable norms for scheme development and implementation. However, existing bottlenecks elsewhere on the A633 corridor (in particular at Parkgate) will continue to result in delays upstream of those pinch-points. Other schemes are in development to improve the situation at Parkgate.

This improvement to access from Bellows Road will, by consequence of adding traffic light control, have an impact on air quality over current levels. Air quality modelling techniques have been used to predict future levels of NO₂ because of this scheme. These methods predict air quality in the High Street and Bellows Road area would remain within acceptable and legal levels. This is one of the reasons why this scheme has been promoted. In summary – the impact of the package of Clean Air Zone measures, including this scheme but also vehicle fleet upgrades and measures elsewhere in Sheffield and Rotherham, on concentrations of NO₂ in the area at 2022 is shown in the table below.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Without CAZ measures</i>	<i>With CAZ measures</i>	<i>Difference</i>
Rawmarsh Hill*	41	39	▼ 5%
No 20, Bellows Road	28	27	▼ 5%
No 16, Bellows Road	30	27	▼ 4%
No 10, Bellows Road	29	27	▼ 2%
Dale Road opp. Aspire PRU	29	29	▼ 2%

№ 1, Dale Road	31	29	▼ 2%
№ 24, Dale Road	32	30	▼ 3%
Green Lane	32	31	▼ 3%
№ 2, Durham Way	38	37	▼ 3%
Barbers Avenue opp Durham Way	39	38	▼ 3%
№ 15, Barbers Avenue	35	34	▼ 3%
Earl Grey P.H.	32	30	▼ 5%
Bellows Road Pharmacy	31	30	▼ 5%
Tyconnett, High Street	31	29	▼ 5%

Forecast annual mean concentrations of NO₂ in 2022 (µg·m³)

Only location marked with asterisk () is pertinent for determination of legal compliance – other locations as included as indication of impact only.*

Statutory limit is 40 µg·m³

Measures assume a CAZ 'C' road user charging scheme is introduced in central Sheffield. Scenario testing indicates Rawmarsh is beyond the area of influence of the Sheffield scheme, with variations in that Sheffield scheme results in no more than 0.1 µg·m³ variation at Rawmarsh Hill.

In respect of noise, an increase in noise is forecast on Bellows Road as a consequence of the proposals, with the greater part of the increase related to the rerouting of buses as opposed to the introduction of traffic signals. On the A633, no change in noise is forecast immediately north of Bellows Road, and a small reduction is forecast to the south as a consequence of reduced bus flows on that link, as a consequence of re-routing.

Conversion of a proportion of buses to electric was considered as a potential mitigation of the NO₂ levels on Rawmarsh Hill. Unfortunately, the position of the central Government's Joint Air Quality Unit is that they are only prepared to offer funding sufficient to upgrade buses to the 'cleanest' standard of diesel vehicle (i.e. the Euro 6 standard). This limited funding rendered electrification of (part of) the bus fleet unaffordable. Therefore, this was not an option available to the Council. Alternative funding is being sought to allow to upgrade to electric buses on this corridor, but there is no certainty this will be available in time to deliver the required air quality improvement in the mandated timescales.

Access to private dwellings should not be negatively impacted as residents or visitors will be able to use the bus lane for this purpose (see 2.2). This has been explained at meetings and in correspondence referred to section 4 below.

2.7 General objections and comments to the proposed scheme on grounds of the form of the scheme, value of the benefits and effects on this area

- 1. The High Street Centre entrance is narrow and only allows one vehicle in or out at a time we currently have issues queuing down the high street to gain access and believe this would worsen and be more dangerous under this new scheme having to cross an additional lane to gain access.*

2. *I strongly object to all proposals except the proposed alterations to the subway. I see no benefit to the other alterations all this will cause is further difficulties to the residents impacted and a higher build up of congestion on the A633 (additional traffic lights)*
3. *Worried that this scheme will make groups and activities less likely to use the building as the access in the future will be negatively affected. One of the main advantages of using The High Street Centre is easy access, location and parking – this will all be disadvantaged by the proposed scheme and could affect the sustainability of the organisation as it will be harder to access.*
4. *Instead close the subway and add a pedestrian crossing in its place.*
5. *Provide cleaner buses i.e. electric or cleaner diesel*
6. *Impacts on Rockcliffe Road as potential means to avoid traffic lights*

Response:

Access to businesses, community facilities and private dwellings will not be adversely affected. Some changes to how access is taken or approached will occur but should not be more onerous. Suitable advance notification via new junction layout signs will be displayed for a period of six months following completion of the scheme to advise those using the area.

Impacts of the scheme on the surrounding road network will be monitored and addressed if required.

2.8 Positive comments around the scheme

1. *I am all for the subway to be filled in as it attracts undesirable people using it for drugs, using it as a public toilet and children vandalising it all the time. A staggered pedestrian crossing to be in its place that would allow/create further gaps in the traffic allowing vehicles to merge off of Bellows Road easier.*
2. *Agree that removing the subway and putting a pedestrian crossing there is a good idea*
3. *The pelican crossing, I feel is an excellent proposal you will be aware the underpass is seldom used mainly because it smells and is most unpleasant and I am led to believe that homeless people sleep under there (which is sad)*
4. *I have no objection to the buses being rerouted.*
5. *I am not opposed to the buses being rerouted or the traffic lights although I cannot see how this scheme will reduce any emissions*

6. We agree that it is time to remove the subway as this is nothing but a filthy mess.
7. *Pleaded RMBC is looking at introducing measures to reduce traffic and emissions on Rawmarsh Hill and removing the current subway which isn't used as it is in a terrible condition and unpassable due to excrement.*

Response:

The proposed closure of the pedestrian subway and replacement with at-grade pedestrian facilities received almost universal approval.

3. Options considered and recommended proposal

- 3.1 As outlined in this report Rotherham is mandated by government to reduce NO₂ levels. To address this on Rawmarsh Hill the preferred solution is the option to reduce bus emissions by redirecting some of these services.

The first proposal developed was to redirect some of these bus services to the parallel route on Barbers Avenue in order to then re-join A633 via Dale Road. However, this routing was not possible because the extent of the Highway was insufficient for the appropriate road geometry required. This left the alternative routing to and from A633 via Bellows Road.

To then provide a suitably safe and efficient means to access and egress this junction the proposed introduction of traffic signal control was developed. This then forms the basis of the 'scheme' which has then allowed for additional accessibility improvements such as the proposed closure of the pedestrian subway and replacement with at-grade pedestrian crossings on A633 and Bellows Road. It also enables a repurposing of the existing dual carriageway section of A633 High Street to create new bus lanes and therefore complement the ideals of promoting the use of public transport.

- 3.2 It is recommended:

- that the following proposals included in the amended scheme are implemented;
 - introduction of traffic signal control,
 - provision of full time northbound and southbound bus lanes,
 - removal of the pedestrian subway to be replaced by at grade pedestrian crossings
 - provision of a formal parking area on the western side of A633

These are shown on design drawing No 60644404-ACM-HGN-GEN-GEN-ZZ-Z-DR-CH-0004 attached as Appendix 4.

- 3) The following proposed TROs are withdrawn and not progressed further:
- a. Prohibition of U-turn manoeuvres

- b. Loading and waiting restriction included with the bus lane order

4. Consultation on proposal

- 4.1 Authorisation to commence statutory consultation on the TROs was given by the Assistant Director of Planning, Regeneration and Transport in January 2021.
- 4.2 Cabinet Members and Council Members for Ward 10 were initially consulted about the proposals in December 2020 (pre reorganisation of council wards). Following reorganisation of Council Ward boundaries in the spring of 2021 Cabinet Member and Members for Rawmarsh East and West wards were informed of forthcoming TRO public consultation in June 2021.
- 4.3 Responses received from Ward Members included:
 - 4) Cllr. Shepherd in support of the scheme proposals and the proposed amendments.
 - 5) Cllr. Bird acknowledged the consultation and information but did not have any comments.
 - 6) Cllr. Thompson expressed concerns about the scheme and echoed residents' opinions and objections. Correspondence and meetings between Cllr. Thompson and RMBC officers provided further information and clarity regarding the scheme requirements and short timescales. Further information was then provided to members of the public via meetings.

RMBC officers have met with members of the public on three occasions, one of these via 'Teams', to discuss the elements of the TROs, listen to objections to these and the scheme. Residents in the main were left unsatisfied with the proposed scheme and its rationale. However, feedback and the objections outlined in this report have resulted in some amendments being made to the elements to attempt to reduce the impacts on the community. This has included a proposed withdrawal of the prohibition of U-turns, accommodating private access arrangements within the traffic signals design to provide a safe means of access and removing loading restrictions from the proposed TROs. A letter clarifying the proposals and offering the opportunity to withdraw objections was delivered in July 2021 (see 2.9). However, no objections were withdrawn.

- 4.4 The most recent meeting was held with members of the public on 27th September, at which a number of matters relating to the scheme were discussed. The overarching concern was one that local residents felt they had not had sufficient, or sufficiently early, opportunity to inform the development of the proposals. A number of specific concerns relating to the proposals were discussed – a summary of those matters not raised and addressed elsewhere in this report follows. Matters covered elsewhere in this report are not duplicated in the interests of brevity; nor are matters unrelated to the scheme at hand.

- 4.5 Concerns were raised about right-turners into Rockcliffe Road, obstructing northbound through traffic, and potentially resulting in disruption to traffic, and potentially conflicts between drivers in the bus lane to manoeuvre into driveways, and those 'dipping' into the bus lane to pass waiting right turners. In respect to this, scheme designers have been instructed to review and revise road marking detail at the Rockcliffe Road junction to ensure through traffic can pass waiting right-turners without entering the bus lane. This has no impact on TROs.
- 4.6 Concerns were raised around the blocking of the junction on occasions where queues form on the wider A633 corridor. Resident's requests a box junction marking, to encourage drivers to keep the junction clear. Designers have been instructed to prepare an amendment to the design to include this marking. This has no impact on TROs, although a final decision as to this matter will need to be taken following consultation with South Yorkshire Police.
- 4.7 Residents raised various concerns regarding construction phasing, including co-ordination with the ongoing works at Greasborough, avoiding disruption in busy periods around Christmas, and restrictions on night working to avoided e.g. noise nuisance. These are standard considerations and will be considered in jointly with the Council's network management team and the contractor. Affected frontages will be written to in advance of works commencing, and in advance of significant changes in working arrangements during the works, so they are full aware of arrangements in good time.
- 4.8 The proposal not to progress the prohibition of 'u' turns from north to south was welcomed; however, concerns were raised that southbound drivers travelling straight ahead may not expect vehicles to slow or stop so as to 'u' turn and that conflicts may arise as a consequence. An additional lane was suggested. In response to this, the designers have been instructed to consider additional road markings and, if required, adjustments to kerblines so as to provide more positive guidance for southbound motorists past any drivers waiting to 'u' turn. This has no implications for TROs (beyond the proposal not to progress the 'u' turn prohibition).
- 4.9 A request was made for additional air quality monitoring on the northbound approach to the junction. Discussions with air quality officers indicate it would be possible to provide additional diffusion tubes in this area to monitor air quality; these will not be appropriate to test compliance with the statutory limit but, with suitable adjustment from control sites to adjust for variations in weather and dispersal, should allow for the broad trend in air quality in this vicinity to be monitored. A proposal is in development and will be shared with ward members prior to implementation.
- 4.10 A number of matters were raised, not directly related to the scheme, including –
- 7) Concerns about a local car wash opening up new access(es) onto the highway;
 - 8) Maintenance of the central reservation at the Haugh Road junction;

- 9) Winter maintenance, including a request for a grit bin.

TIS Officers will forward these concerns on to the relevant parts of the authority.

5. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

- 5.1 If it is determined that the recommendations should be approved and the scheme should proceed then the Head of Legal Services will be instructed to make the legal orders. All objectors and local Ward Members would be notified of this decision prior to starting on site
- 5.2 The highway scheme is required to be sufficiently completed to allow re-routing of buses sufficiently early in 2022 to ensure compliance with annual average concentrations of NO₂ across the 2022 calendar year. To ease public understanding and manage disruption, it is preferred to re-route buses at the planned South Yorkshire wide service change in April 2022.

6. Financial and Procurement Advice and Implications (to be written by the relevant Head of Finance and the Head of Procurement on behalf of s151 Officer)

- 6.1 The proposed new and amendments to existing Traffic Regulation Orders referred to in this report will use grant funding made available by the Joint Air Quality Unit (JAQU) for the Clean Air Zone joint initiative with Sheffield City Council. The total funding awarded to Rotherham is £2.966m. The budgeted cost of this particular scheme is £1.875m with the TRO procedural elements costing in the region of £4,500.
- 6.2 There are no direct procurement implications in this report however the external organisations engaged to deliver the design and works have been procured in line with the Councils Financial and Procurement Procedure Rules.

7. Legal Advice and Implications (to be written by Legal Officer on behalf of Assistant Director Legal Services)

- 7.1 The Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 allows the Council to make and vary Traffic Regulation Orders to regulate the movement of vehicular traffic, restrict or prohibit certain classes of vehicle and to improve the amenities of an area. The process followed in respect of the relevant Traffic Regulation Orders as set out in the body of the report, is consistent with the Requirements of the Act.
- 7.2 Legal Services will prepare the statutory notices and if the proposal is supported for implementation they will also arrange for the Traffic Regulation Orders to come into effect.
- 7.3 Failure to deliver the scheme would mean the Council would be acting contrary to its Direction from Secretary of State to deliver the scheme pursuant with air quality objectives. Concentrations of NO₂ on Rawmarsh

Hill would remain in excess of statutory limits set out under the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010.

8. Human Resources Advice and Implications

- 8.1 No HR implications.

9. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

- 9.1 Formal pedestrian crossings form an asset for children, young people and vulnerable adults in crossing the road, these crossings should therefore be as safe as possible for them to use.
- 9.2 Research by the Royal College of Physicians and the Royal College of Paediatrics and Child Health indicates *“there is also clear evidence that early exposure to air pollution can damage the lungs, and increase the risk of lung infections that may be fatal... Research is beginning to point towards effects on growth, intelligence, asthma, and development of the brain and coordination”*. In addressing unlawful levels of NO₂ on Rawmarsh Hill, the Clean Air Zone proposals will help avoid these adverse impacts.

10. Equalities and Human Rights Advice and Implications

- 10.1 Accessibility in this area will also be improved by providing new at-grade pedestrian crossing facilities replacing an underused subway on A633 and new crossing at Bellows Road; surveys suggest that 80% of pedestrians crossing A633 do not use the subway.

11. Implications for CO2 Emissions and Climate Change

- 11.1 Carbon emissions impacts have been appraised as part of the overall joint Sheffield Rotherham Clean Air Zone proposals.
- 11.2 Construction of the signals can be expected to result in one-off increase in emissions, and a small increase in emissions can be expected as consequence of the operation and maintenance of the signals. These are estimated to be small compared to the 1.3kt p.a. saving forecast in Rotherham as a consequence of the Clean Air Zone package, although it should be noted almost all of this saving relates to the reduced speed limit on Sheffield Parkway and not measures at Bellows Road, and also that a proportion of this may be an ‘off-shoring’ of emissions associated with traffic redistribution, rather than a genuine saving.

12. Implications for Partners

- 12.1. Bus lane TROs will aid the reliability of public bus services, assist the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive and bus contractors in providing good service considering the change in routing required by CAZ mitigations. The signals will ensure re-routed busses can emerge reliably from Bellows Road.

13. Risks and Mitigation

- 13.1 TROs are required to ensure the bus lanes can operate correctly and are enforceable should it be required.
- 13.2 Failure to secure the TROs for the scheme will require significant changes to the layout and add delay to the scheme implementation.

Bus lanes in Rotherham currently require suitable enforcement by South Yorkshire Police. However, the Council may wish to take on this responsibility in the future in accordance with Traffic Management Act 2004 and guidance from the Department for Transport.

- 13.3 As per 7.3 and 11.1 there is a risk if the scheme and TROs are not delivered by Spring 2022 (or at all) that Rotherham MBC will be accountable for not complying with government directives and national legislation on reducing NO₂, and can be expected to be sanctioned and/or compelled to introduce less favourable alternatives.

14. Accountable Officers

Richard Baker, Engineer

Nat Porter, Senior Transport Planner

Andrew Moss, Interim Head of Transportation and Infrastructure Service

Approvals obtained on behalf of Statutory Officers: -

	Named Officer	Date
Chief Executive	Sharon Kemp	Click here to enter a date.
Strategic Director of Finance & Customer Services (S.151 Officer)	Named officer	10/11/21
Head of Legal Services (Monitoring Officer)	Named officer	10/11/21

Report Authors:

Richard Baker, Engineer

Nat Porter, Senior Transport Planner

Nat.porter@rotherham.gov.uk

This report is published on the Council's [website](#).