

Committee Name and Date of Committee Meeting

Delegated Officer Decision – 01 August 2023

Report Title

A6021 Broom Road and Wellgate, Active Travel proposed amendments to waiting restrictions, bus lane and speed limit.

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

No, but it has been included on the Forward Plan

Assistant Director Approving Submission of the Report

Simon Moss, Assistant Director, Planning Regeneration and Transport

Report Author(s)

Nat Porter,

Interim Group Lead, Transport Planning Policy & Programmes

nat.porter@rotherham.gov.uk

Ward(s) Affected

Boston Castle

Report Summary

To report on response to statutory advertisement of proposed amendments to waiting restrictions, bus lane and speed limit, associated with the construction of cycleways along Wellgate and Broom Road, Rotherham.

Recommendations

1. Proposed waiting restrictions in respect of waiting and parking restrictions bus lane changes and speed limit changes, on Broom Road and Wellgate, and on side roads in the immediate vicinity, in so far as is required pursuant to the delivery of the cycleways scheme.

List of Appendices Included

Appendix 1 – Cycleways scheme general arrangement

Appendix 2 – Advertised Traffic Orders

Appendix 3 – Initial Equalities Screening Assessment

Appendix 4 – Carbon Impact Assessment

Background Papers

None

Consideration by any other Council Committee, Scrutiny or Advisory Panel

None

Council Approval Required

No

Exempt from the Press and Public

No

A6021 Broom Road and Wellgate, Active Travel proposed amendments to waiting restrictions, bus lane and speed limit.

1. Background

- 1.1 Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) has a policy commitment to create a network of cycleways which can have a transformative impact on active travel. This proposed Broom Road scheme represents an important investment to continue the development of a comprehensive cycle network. This scheme will see construction of cycleways along Wellgate and Broom Road, Rotherham and associated connecting works at junctions and crossings. The scheme will re-allocate road space towards cycling and walking to improve the safety and quality of the cycleway network. The scheme layout is shown in Appendix 1.
- 1.2 In order to operate satisfactorily, and so as to minimise impacts on the travelling public, a number of Traffic Orders are proposed. These are shown on Appendix 2, and are summarised as –
- Changes to the existing bus lane on the A6021 Broom Road between Broom Terrace and Fraser Road
 - Amendments to waiting and parking restrictions along Broom Road, Wellgate and side roads,
 - Reduction in the speed limit on Broom Road.
- 1.3 The proposed bus lane changes are for the purpose of mitigating for a narrow general traffic lane, and potential increased congestion in the morning peak, associated with geometric changes to Clifton Roundabout and Broom Road required to accommodate the proposed cycleways.
- 1.4 The proposed waiting restrictions are proposed to ensure the free flow of traffic in light of the narrower carriageway arising from the cycleways scheme. Loading will remain permitted at all times.
- 1.5 The reduced speed limit is considered to be more appropriate in light of current speed limit guidance, having particular regard to the proximity of pedestrian and cyclists to the carriageway (including for the effect of the cycleway scheme) and the presence of direct vehicular access. The reduced width of carriageway will also ensure speeds are effectively reduced, carriageway width reduction being generally more effective in reducing speeds than changing speed limits.

2. Key Issues

- 2.1 No objections were received in respect of the proposed Traffic Orders.

3. Options considered and recommended proposal

3.1 As no objections were received to the formal advertisement, no alternative options have been considered.

4. Consultation on proposal

4.1 The proposal to make TROs were advertised in accordance with the procured set out in the Local Authorities (Traffic Orders) (Procedure) Regulations 1996, on 31st October, 2022. Objections were invited with a deadline of 11th November, 2022. In addition, letters were sent to frontagers informing them of the proposed Orders.

4.2 In addition, in advance of advertisement, Cabinet Member for Transport and Environment and Ward Members for Boston Castle were consulted in respect of the proposed Traffic Orders and raised no concerns about the proposal.

4.3 South Yorkshire Police were also consulted in advance of advertisement. They indicated that they cannot guarantee any level of enforcement of the proposed restrictions.

4.4 Prior to advertisement of Traffic Regulation Orders, non-statutory consultation was undertaken on the broader cycleway scheme, with the public and broader stakeholders. Feedback from these consultations was considered as part of the design process. In summary, 50% of respondents indicated support for the proposals, as opposed to 40% indicating opposition.

5. Timetable and Accountability for Implementing this Decision

5.1 Following approval of the proposed Orders, officers in the Transportation Infrastructure Service will write to Objectors informing them of the decision, and the measures implemented and Orders sealed in time for completion of the cycleway scheme in winter 2023/24,

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 current budget for this scheme is £3,383,452. This is funded £2,075,133 from CRSTS, £500,000 from Gainshare and £808,319 from Active Travel Fund. The TRO costs will be funded from within this budget.

6.2 There are no direct procurement implications arising from the recommendations detailed in the report.

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

7.1 The relevant Traffic Regulation Order will be amended as set out in the body of the report to reflect the proposals described. The TRO is made pursuant to the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 which helps the Council to manage the highway network for all road users, including pedestrians with the aim to improve road safety and access to facilities.

7.2 The appropriate statutory procedure including consultation had been followed as set out in the body of the report.

8. Human Resources Advice and Implications

8.1 There are no direct human resources implications arising from the recommendations within this report.

9. Implications for Children and Young People and Vulnerable Adults

9.1 In respect of the proposed speed limit, lower vehicle speeds will slightly reduce the likelihood of, and reduce the impact of, road traffic collisions involving children, young people and vulnerable adults.

9.2 The wider cycleways scheme will also improve accessibility by foot and by bicycle, improving the access to services and opportunities for children, young people and vulnerable adults. The bus lane changes should also improve the reliability and commercial viability of bus services, on which children, young people and vulnerable adults are particularly dependent.

9.3 An adverse impact can be expected for disabled people using their car, in that for some destinations, the distance from their parked vehicle will increase. This is mitigated for by the national Blue Badge Scheme, which allows blue badge holders to park for up to three hours on the double yellow lines. No parking provision reserved for, or specifically intended for use by, disabled people is removed as a consequence of the scheme.

10. Equalities and Human Rights Advice and Implications

10.1 An Equalities Assessment has been completed for this report and is attached at Appendix 3. In summary, no impact has been found in respect of equality or diversity, noting that the impact of the waiting restriction is mitigated by the national Blue Badge scheme, which will allow cars carrying disabled people with a blue badge to park for up to three hours.

11. Implications for CO2 Emissions and Climate Change

11.1 A Carbon Impact Assessment has been completed for this report and is attached at Appendix 4. In summary, a (likely very small) increase in emissions is forecast as a consequence of the recommendation, associated with –

- Works to change signing and lining indicating (all measures); and,
- In the case of the 30mph speed limit, less optimal vehicle speeds from a carbon perspective.

12. Implications for Partners

12.1. As with any TRO, an additional burden is created on South Yorkshire Police in respect of enforcement. In respect of waiting restrictions and bus lanes,

Rotherham MBC holds powers to enforce these restrictions, which can be used should this prove necessary. In respect of the proposed speed limit, it is anticipated that the reduction in carriageway width between Clifton Roundabout and Fraser Road should ensure the proposed speed limit is self-enforcing.

13. Risks and Mitigation

13.1 Project risks are identified within scheme design, business case preparation and then at operational level during the construction process. These are managed using recognised risk register approaches and in accordance with the Council's contract procedure rules for the approval of any project or programme changes.

14. Accountable Officers

Matthew Reynolds, Head of Transportation Infrastructure Service
 Nat Porter, Interim Group Lead, Transport Planning Policy & Programmes

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)	Judith Badger	Click here to enter a date.
Head of Legal Services (Monitoring Officer)	Bal Nahal	Click here to enter a date.

Report Author: **Error! Reference source not found.**
 This report is published on the Council's [website](#).