

APPENDIX 6 – OBJECTIONS RECEIVED

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Jackys Lane</i></p> <p>I am in receipt of your letter ref.RP/122/21647/HW, Dated 01/10/2024 concerning proposed waiting restrictions in Harthill.</p> <p>I am resident on Jackys Lane at <i>[personal information redacted]</i>.</p> <p>My suggestion is that you extend the restrictions to level with the rear walls of the shops. You will be aware that delivery lorries have always had problems with shoppers parking on the left (looking west) of this short stretch which covers the depth of the shop structure. There are two large parking areas, front and rear of the shops which are adequate for short term parking.</p> <p>The road is not wide enough for lorries reverse into the delivery area while other vehicles are parked in this spot.</p> <p>Restrictions are definitely needed from your proposed area to level with the back wall of the shops to avoid the frequent chaos that occurs due to inconsiderate parking by shoppers and workmen purchasing their breakfasts and lunches.</p>	<p>Consideration was given to this and discussed with ward members but Jackys Lane is unadopted so we couldn't extend the restrictions.</p>
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Union Street</i></p> <p>I have received the plans for the waiting restrictions. It appears that the line showing no waiting at any time, which I assume will be double yellow lines does not continue at the bottom of our drive.</p> <p>We have had issues over the years where the road is busy if the space in front of our drive is clear, people will just park their cars in front of it regardless of the fact they are blocking the drive preventing us from being able to drive out onto Union Street.</p> <p>Can you please confirm the yellow lines will run along the bottom of our drive ensuring our access is not blocked.</p>	<p>Explained that unfortunately, the lines cannot be extended as required at this time but will be added to our small schemes intervention list for further consideration at a later date</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a business owner in Harthill</i></p> <p>I am <i>[personal information redacted]</i> and I would like to raise my concerns in double yellow lining Union Street as per your plans provided.</p> <p>I do agree that certain sections the road would benefit from double yellow lines to avoid pinch points, but there does need to be consideration given for road side parking where suitable.</p> <p>The Beehive pub gets blamed for a lot of the road side parking in the village but local villagers do not take into account activities that occur at the Church, namely, Weddings, Funerals and Christenings. On these occasions we find they park all the way down Union Street and even in the Beehive car park.</p> <p>There is a section of road I have highlighted on the plan below which is wide enough so that when cars are parked on the roadside, two vehicles can easily pass each other without giving way to another. This would at least allow some roadside parking for the Church and other residents.</p> <p>My concern is that if you don't provide any road side parking around the Beehive, they will simply park in our car park which is for the use of our customers. If our customers can't park, they can't visit our business.</p> <p>We have had numerous disruptions in the village over the past 3 years including, water works, 9 months of electricity upgrades and various traffic lights for new developments. These have been extremely damaging to our business. I understand residents' concerns but hopefully there is some common sense and common ground found to alleviate the parking problems.</p>	<p>Plans for waiting restrictions have been amended in consultation with ward members to reduce the waiting restrictions outside the Bee Hive pub</p>
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Chapel Yard</i></p> <p>I received the above correspondence but can't work out any of the labels on the map you sent as the printing isn't very clear.</p> <p>Can you confirm the waiting restrictions proposed between the beehive and the shops? I live on Chapel Yard, and my only parking is street parking so concerned the proposals will impact where I currently park.</p>	<p>Confirmed that the proposed double yellow lines on Union Street end outside No22 going south towards the shops and don't resume until you get to Jackys Lane.</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Union Street</i></p> <p>In general I am in agreement with this scheme but I am concerned that where yellow line restrictions are only present on 1 side of the road it implies parking is allowed on the other side and in many places that would be even worse than the status quo;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -along Hard Lane from Northlands to Thorpe Road on the east side of the road -along Union Street on the east side from Thorpe Road outside the church (where people sometimes park for funerals blocking buses) extending to Rectory Gardens <p>Along the rest of Union Street From Rectory Gardens to the shops a line is needed on the west side. Residents do not park here but visitors to the Bee Hive do and park on the pavement to avoid totally blocking the road.</p> <p>Given that parking is only really a major issue when the Bee Hive pub is open consideration should be given to making all of the on street parking in this area residents only.</p> <p>Finally given the narrow nature of the road through our village it should all be a 20mph limit.</p>	<p>Advised that the waiting restrictions have been revised following this consultation period but introducing a 20mph zone is not part of the current proposal.</p>
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Union Street</i></p> <p>I have just received a letter regarding the proposed waiting restrictions in Harthill which I fully agree to.</p> <p>However this will just force people to park on the areas with no restrictions. I live on Union Street and our drive is regularly blocked with cars parking on both sides of the road. In addition the drive is on a slight bend so it is impossible to exit our drive when cars are parked on the road and pavement at the top of our drive.</p> <p>In addition there are four community benches opposite our drive where people sit and chat. The restrictions you have suggested will simply cause vehicles to park in this area.</p> <p>I would like to suggest that parking restrictions are imposed further down Union Street especially past the community benches.</p>	<p>This request was considered and discussed with the ward members but was rejected.</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Union Street</i></p> <p>Please find below my objection to the Harthill waiting proposal as per your letter dated 1st October 2024 and drawing No. 126/18/TT784</p> <p>The objection is pacifically the exclusion of a “No waiting at any time restriction’ outside of the residential property 66 Union Street and Harthill shops.</p> <p>By omitting to continue the no waiting area in the proposed Safety Scheme from No.72 Union street to the bus stop out side of the shops it has introduced a ‘High impact / medium probability’ risk to road users and pedestrians and fails to mitigate the current risks for road users and pedestrians. Areas of new risk that are introduced and non mitigated risks are noted below.</p> <p>1) There have been two road traffic incidents this year and an access restriction incident at the junction of Serlby Lane and Union Street, waiting restrictions would have reduced these risks by insuring clear line of sight for drivers and removal of obstacles and restrictions.</p> <p>2) By allowing vehicles to park along the section in question, it will greatly reduce vision of the road and traffic when leaving 66 Union Street, introducing a risk of collision.</p> <p>3) By allowing vehicles to park along the section in question, it will introduce an access and egress obstruction risk to 66 Union Street, clear access / egress is required at all times.</p> <p>4) By allowing vehicles to park along the section in question, a risk is maintained to pedestrians crossing the road via the purposely installed “drop curb” crossing outside of the shops, obstructed line of sight and restrictive access.</p> <p>5) By allowing vehicles to park along the section in question, a risk is maintained to pedestrians and pacifically to school children that use the very narrow footpath leading to the bus stop. The plans fail to recognise that the foot path along the section in question is extremely narrow and has a sharp slope to the road, by allowing vehicles to park along this section will greatly restrict movement and access and as such will introduce further risk.</p> <p>I question the omission of the no waiting restriction in light of the substantial easy access, free parking directly in front of the shops (spaces for 20 + cars) and further free parking in the large parking area to the rear of the shops that will accommodate HGV’s and vans. The plans fail to recognise the current risks and introduce further risks for pedestrians, road users and residents. There is an opportunity to improve safety to this very busy area of Harthill and protect pedestrians and road users and encourage good safety practice by using the free off road parking.</p> <p>Thank you for taking the time to read my observations / objection</p>	<p>This request was considered and discussed with the ward members but was rejected due to the delays that would be incurred if another TRO was developed. Can be added to our small schemes intervention list for further consideration at a later date.</p>

From a private individual residing on Thorpe Road

I am writing regarding the above named subject, the proposed waiting restrictions in the village of Harthill.

I refer to your letter dated 1st October 2024 and the received drawing, 126/18/TT784 and specifically the first panel of the drawing outlining the proposals affecting the Union Street, Hard Lane, and Thorpe Road junction.

I appreciate the plan is not to scale but, my understanding of the drawing is that no waiting restrictions (double yellow lines) are to be introduced along Union Street and Hard Lane, stretching from before The Beehive Public House, across the entrance to the pub and continuing to the point that Hard Lane leaves the village heading towards Kiveton Park. I note that the no waiting area is further bolstered around the immediate junction with Thorpe Road, extending up to my driveway on my side of the road but, falling short of my driveway on the opposite side of the road, the Church side.

Please note that I am not against these restrictions but, it is my argument that the boundaries detailed for Thorpe Road do not extend far enough to adequately protect my right of access and egress to my property, for the reasons detailed below:

[Personal information redacted] I own a large 4 x 4 vehicle which I need to transport my wife to her multiple Dr and hospital appointments and for our daily business. *[Personal information redacted]* it is likely that in the near future we will need to purchase an even larger vehicle to fulfil her needs. Also, we own a small touring caravan which is kept on our drive, the only way to move it off the drive being to manoeuvre it across to the Church side of the road. *[Personal information redacted]* it is vitally important that we have unencumbered access and egress to our property 24/7.

For many years I have wished for the implementation of no waiting restrictions around my home as my wife and I have suffered numerous incidents of inconsiderate parking around my driveway despite the placing of a number of signs, erected by me which are largely ignored. Predominantly, these drivers tend to be visitors to the location attending The Beehive and, occasionally Church goers. It is rarely a single vehicle. Often, there is a line of vehicles parked from the junction extending past my house, directly opposite my drive.

My driveway is positioned such, that, if a vehicle parks directly opposite the entrance to my drive (as described above) it is impossible for me to manoeuvre my vehicle out of my driveway without colliding with the parked car. Even though some vehicles do park with two wheels on the small pavement, this does not negate the risk of me hitting their vehicle with mine and, in any case this then causes a problem for pedestrians who may be forced into the road in order to pass the parked cars.

Historically, this influx of vehicles has been at weekends or the evening when the pub is at its busiest and especially in the lighter summer months. Over the years I have moderated my frustrations over this inconsiderate behaviour, in the main so as not to further stress my wife and risk aggravating her condition.

This person contacted the transportation team several times regarding extending the DYs along Thorpe Road. After consideration by managers and ward members, he was informed that the lines couldn't be extended without the need for another TRO which would delay the implementation of the scheme.

Response received	Officer response
<p>However, I feel strongly that if the no waiting restrictions outlined in your plan are implemented as per the drawing the above problems are likely to be intensified and become intolerable. If I am suffering this problem now, when there is currently alternative parking on Union Street and Hard Lane, I believe that when that alternative parking is removed it will displace a deluge of vehicles onto my road and, given my experience, directly across the entrance to my drive effectively rendering my wife and me prisoners in our own home.</p> <p>I respectfully request that, in order to alleviate the above potential problem, consideration be given to amending the plan by extending the double yellow lines on Thorpe Road on the Church side of the road from the junction with Union Street and Hard Lane, along Thorpe Road, concluding after the passing of my driveway.</p> <p>I anticipate that the extension to the no waiting restriction to beyond my driveway would only be for a distance of 20 metres or so. I believe that the impact of this on vehicle users would be negligible, having simply to travel a few more metres on foot to the Beehive, whereas, the impact on my wife and I would be immense, bringing peace of mind not having to worry every time we leave the house if a vehicle is blocking our exit or return.</p> <p>I really cannot stress how concerned I am at the potential prospect of having to regularly battle inconsiderate drivers simply to gain access and egress to my home. The provision of double yellow lines opposite my driveway would, at least, require law-abiding road users to park a little further down the road whilst also providing some enforcement options for those drivers choosing to ignore the no waiting restrictions which, I know some will.</p>	

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual who lives in Harthill</i></p> <p>Proposed yellow lines in Harthill NF/73608</p> <p>Whilst I have no objection in principal to these yellow lines being proposed I have a few observations to make.</p> <p>Our village has so far been spared the installation of yellow lines, spoiling the ambiance of the Village, apart from outside the Village Hall.</p> <p>I am most concerned about the plan to put the lines on BOTH sides of Union Street between the mini roundabout and the shops.</p> <p>Vehicles currently park on the Southbound side of Union Street and these have the effect of slowing down vehicles in both directions. Nobody parks on the Northbound side.</p> <p>If yellow lines are installed on both sides, it will not take long for drivers to realise there are no parked vehicles and therefore drive with impunity, particularly mornings and evenings, when our main street is used as a rat run from Junction 30 on the M1.</p> <p>I am also concerned about drivers trying to emerge from Orchard Lea, who currently have poor visibility to the right and rely on parked vehicles to slow oncoming traffic.</p> <p>Without the help of parked vehicles, emerging vehicles from Orchard Lea will be in great danger from speeding vehicles suddenly appearing.</p> <p>The other comment is regarding the enforcement of the parking rules. We currently receive no visits from traffic wardens or Police for traffic issues.</p> <p>If the parking restrictions are not going to be enforced, again it will not take people long to realise this and ignore them.</p>	<p>Their observations were noted and informed of the minor changes we are making. Parking services were informed of their concerns.</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Woodall Lane</i></p> <p>We are in receipt of your letter of intentions, and we would wish to lodge an objection to the proposed 'waiting restrictions' outside our garage doors on Woodall Lane. The proposed lines will start outside our pedestrian gate on Union Street and continue around the corner down past Harthill Garage and the property next to that. In addition, the same lines are proposed to extend on the other side of Woodall Lane. We appreciate that the Union Street lines are of benefit as cars are currently parked outside the front of our house almost right up to the junction and on the north side of the roundabout outside No 69 it is dreadfully dangerous trying to see round the bend in the road to pass the parked cars. However, down past our property on Woodall Lane has never been an issue. We were content for the previous plan of double yellow lines to run round the corner past our house but they would have stopped half way along the side of our house on Woodall lane and would still have allowed us to park our car or our visitors cars outside our Garage. Our kitchen window and garage are far enough from the roundabout to not cause any issues with cars coming on to Woodall Lane from Union Street either way. We have lived in our house for over 25 years and have never seen any accident or any issues there. We would therefore ask that the line does continue round from Union Street to Woodall Lane but stop short of our garage door, leaving a place for us to park our car if we don't wish to garage it immediately. Our garage is a tandem garage opening directly onto the pavement and we have no driveway. Once our cars are in the garage (and we do keep them in there when not in use) we cannot access anything else in the garage for example our boiler without getting both our cars out again. I currently have a Blue Badge and although I can 'wait' for up to 3 hours, it does make a nonsense of the fact that this particular area of the road is well wide enough not to cause an obstruction, nor traffic calming benefits. The benefit of the Blue Badge is because <i>[personal information redacted]</i> but note that a gap in the restrictions on Union Street has been left outside the only residential property, by number 69, where the real problem is, is so the owners of that house, who to our knowledge are not disabled, can still park outside their house, even though they do have a driveway This area is exactly where the problem lies in preventing drivers to see round the bend in the road if any cars are coming towards them. We are struggling to see why a gap is being left where the main problem lies, yet outside our house where there has never been a problem, restrictions are going to be in place. We feel this is discriminatory against us who are disabled, and unless I garage my car immediately I will have to park my car a considerable walk from my house, but they who are not disabled, will not. It does not seem as if any effort is being made by RMBC to make the required reasonable adjustments under the Disability Discrimination Act 2005. We do hope you consider our objections with the view of changing this initial plan but if not we will be contacting solicitors with regard to what we perceive to be disability discrimination.</p>	<p>Minor changes are to be made removing the yellow lines that affect the residents on Woodall Lane. Ward member to contact to resident</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a business owner on Woodall Lane</i></p> <p>I am in receipt of your letter of intentions, and I would wish to lodge an objection to the proposed 'waiting restrictions' outside my place of business, on Woodall Lane.</p> <p>If your map is correct, the proposed lines will start outside the pedestrian gate area of 94 Union Street and continue around the corner down past my business, Harthill Grange, and continue past the property next to mine. In addition, the same lines are proposed to extend on the other side of Woodall Lane, opposite my property, where rarely people park anyway.</p> <p>I appreciate that the Union Street lines are of benefit as cars frequently park right up to the junction on either side of the roundabout, with no regard to other road users' safety, however, down past my neighbours and mine, on Woodall Lane but stop short of my neighbour's garage door, leaving a place for my customers to drop off cars or pull in for maintenance queries, and the like.</p> <p>I can only fit three cars on my garage front pad, and this does mean that I regularly need to shuffle cars round to work on in the actual garage.</p> <p>I also would suggest that the choke points which do need doing are further down between the Blue Bell and the Leisure Centre, where every day there are cars parked which cause issues for cars travelling in either direction along Woodall Lane.</p> <p>I do hope you consider my objections with the view of changing this initial plan or a solution as to my personal loss of business, and revenue, and your suggestion as to RMBC proposal for compensating me for those issues.</p>	<p>Minor changes are to be made removing the yellow lines that affect the business owner on Woodall Lane.</p>
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Orchard Lee</i></p> <p>The roads around my village have been troubling me and other residents for many years now. I am getting increasingly worried about the speed some road users are passing at through the main road with the school and the precinct.</p> <p>The junction entering Orchard Lee is very concerning and has me wondering daily how there has not been more accidents. I think that a curved mirror would be a great help to those residents.</p> <p>The parked cars have actually provided a natural contraflow which has impacted the speed and flow of traffic through the village. This has provided much relief for the residents which require access to the main road.</p> <p>With the village not having a long stretch of main road, the speed in which cars enter is an issue in itself which I think there must be ways to control.</p>	<p>Advised that a curved mirror is not part of the current proposal</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From businesses on Hard Lane</i></p> <p>With regards to the Harthill waiting restrictions on Hard Lane stretch of the proposal will significantly impact the Businesses on hard lane (Shops/Beehive) as out car parks for patrons of our businesses will become a dumping ground for anyone coming to Harthill and we need passing trade to survive.</p> <p>Will the residents who park on the street be given parking permits? If not where will they go?</p> <p>Having spoken to residents will the fact that there would be no cars on that street, would this not encourage drivers to speed through the village?!</p> <p>We really feel a meeting/public forum to discuss the proposed would benefit everyone, as businesses we have had the impact of hard lane being closed on and off for the past 3 years and feel this plan is another unnecessary complication,</p> <p>It would also impact deliveries to the shops/access to the car park for lorries/Vans</p>	<p>Letter acknowledged for discussion with ward members.</p> <p>Another consultation process via a public forum was not thought to be viable given how far along the whole LNRS process has moved along.</p>
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Orchard Lee</i></p> <p>I am pleased to hear about and welcome your proposals for waiting restrictions, they are much needed.</p> <p>Harthill is a very busy village. The main road is narrow. The foot paths, uneven and very narrow. The road is a motorway cut through and takes a lot of traffic. There is a school.</p> <p>I have concerns about the access onto Union Street, the main road and particular from Orchard Lee into Union Street.</p> <p>Turning right out of Orchard Lee, there is a bend to the right, on Union street near the round-about help to slow the traffic and if visiting friends I can drive out of Orchard Lee with some safety but only with extra caution, cars coming along Union Street after the roundabout tend to speed up being unaware o Orchard Lee and people wishing to turn into Union Street.</p> <p>When yellow lines are instated, there will be nothing to slow the traffic. The road will be clear of parked cars and vehicles will be driven faster.</p> <p>I strongly suggest you reduce the speed limit to 20mph.</p>	<p>Speeds through the village are low and will be monitored to ensure that these do not increase because of the waiting restriction. Figures obtained from vehicle telemetry indicates 85th percentile speeds of 27.4mph along Hard Lane, 23.2mph along Union Street and 28mph along Woodall Lane with all day average speeds of 18.2mph, 17.3mph and 21.4mph, respectively.</p> <p>A 20mph speed limit along the entirety of the village on Hard Lane and Union Street was considered but is out of scope of the proposed order.</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Orchard Lee</i></p> <p>I wanted to express my comments on the new road safety measures in Harthill.</p> <p>I have heard many times we should have yellow lines on Union Street mainly near the school and on the road to the shops.</p> <p>From the roundabout going towards the shops there is a slight bend in the road which constricts your view of oncoming traffic any cars coming out of drivers and from orchard Lee. I think it is important to have a 20mph speed restriction to allow time for oncoming traffic to stop. When the yellow lines are in place traffic can go up to 30mph and could cause cause an accident.</p> <p>The only comments I have to make is when there is a funeral or wedding at the church the main road around the church is used for visitors. Also, the visitors to the Beehive pulb use the road further down, one option would be to have yellow lines only on one side of the road round these areas. This does work in many roads in Rotherham and throughout the country. I see it in Europe too and it works well.</p>	<p>A 20mph speed limit along the entirety of the village on Hard Lane and Union Street was considered but is out of scope of the proposed order.</p> <p>The proposed yellow lines close to the Bee Hive pub and church have been amended</p>
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Orchard Lee</i></p> <p>I am pleased to hear about and welcome your proposals, they are much needed.</p> <p>Harthill is a very busy village, The main road is narrow. The foot paths, uneven and very narrow. The road is a motorway cut through and takes a lot of traffic. There is a school.</p> <p>I live on Orchard Lee, Harthill and I have concerns about the access onto Union Street, the main road. I hope you will give this some attention.</p> <p>Turning right out of Orchard Lee, there is a bend to the right, on Union Street, this limits the area of vision.</p> <p>At present the traffic problems and cars parked on Union Street near the round-about help to slow the traffic and I can drive out of Orchard Lee with some safety.</p> <p>When yellow lines are instated, there will be nothing to slow the traffic. The road will be clear of parked cars and vehicles will be driven faster.</p> <p>I strongly suggest you reduce the speed limit to 20 mph.</p>	<p>Email acknowledgement</p> <p>A 20mph speed limit along the entirety of the village on Hard Lane and Union Street was considered but is out of scope of the proposed order.</p>
<p><i>From a private individual residing in Harthill</i></p> <p>With regards the above I am concerned that the bus stop heading north out of the village has been omitted. Please see annotated drawing attached.</p>	<p>Thank you for your email and for pointing out the missing bus stop marking. I will add this to any revised plans we make moving forward.</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Rectory Gardens</i></p> <p>I'm responding to the letter sent on the 1 October 2024. I object to the scope of the proposed work, as I feel the proposal isn't wide enough. We reside on Rectory Gardens so all residents constantly take a risk when leaving our road to go left or right as we can't see either way due to cars are parked in both directions. The restrictions you are proposing are going to make the situation worse for us as it's already bad when people park there for Church and Beehive pub. No consideration has been given to how dangerous it is for us when trying to leave our road in either direction, as you literally cannot see anything.</p>	<p>This request was considered and discussed with the ward members but was rejected due to the delays that would be incurred if another TRO was developed. Can be added to our small schemes intervention list for further consideration at a later date.</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Union Street</i></p> <p>I am writing to you regarding the proposed waiting restrictions that are due to be implemented along Union Street, Harthill, later this year.</p> <p>Firstly we strongly urge you to extend the proposed double yellows <i>North [personal information redacted]</i> (number 66, and the shopping precinct). Current proposals have the double yellows terminating just after our property entrance.</p> <p>If vehicles begin to park here (due to not being allowed elsewhere) we are going to find it extremely difficult and dangerous to pull out of our already difficult driveway due to an even greater obscured view.</p> <p>The reason for this is that it is already extremely difficult for us to pull out of our drive onto Union Street, due to not being able to see beyond neighbouring walls, and as such we have to creep out onto the road, firstly trying to avoid anyone walking along the pavement and then hoping that any oncoming traffic will see us and slow down/stop in time to allow us out. This sometimes happens, but mostly traffic just tries to drive round the back of us these days. This is already extremely dangerous as if we were to nudge into them, they would likely cause a crash and mount the pavement - which obviously could have disastrous consequences.</p> <p>As this is already a very difficult situation for us, having cars parking up right outside our neighbours properties would significantly reduce our visibility even further, and pulling out onto Union Street would literally be a gamble every time. I am convinced that having any cars parked here would inevitably lead to an accident as we would have to pull out totally blind and just hope that nothing is coming (North to South).</p> <p>This leads me to my second point, and that is regarding the speed limit through the village. I would therefore advocate for a 20mph restriction through the heart of the village. We already have issues pulling out of our drive as previously stated, and this is exacerbated with cars frequently whipping round the corner (from South to North) exceeding the 30mph speed limit. Even at 30 it is hard for us to see them coming and react in time. We are often confronted by vehicles speeding right up to us as we are trying to negotiate out of our drive - with some choosing to drive round the back of us while we are still reversing - which comes close to causing an accident each time. With the traffic flow being currently slowed somewhat by parked cars on the blind corner, it does at least give us some chance of pulling out of our drive. With the double yellows being implemented, and traffic flowing more freely, this is going to result in vehicles speeding faster round the corner from the mini roundabout direction.</p>	<p>This request was considered and discussed with the ward members but was rejected due to the delays that would be incurred if another TRO was developed. Can be added to our small schemes intervention list for further consideration at a later date.</p> <p>A 20mph speed limit along the entirety of the village on Hard Lane and Union Street was considered but is out of scope of the proposed order.</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Orchard Lee</i></p> <p>I have concerns about the above proposals due to our position on Orchard Lee. We already have a restricted view (10-15 metres) of traffic from the right at the end of our driveway. The introduction of yellow lines will increase the speed of traffic on the blind bend which will give us a better chance of pulling out safely onto Union St.</p> <p>If the proposal goes through I would recommend a 20mph speed limit throughout the whole village as the footpaths are very narrow, this would be beneficial not just for us but for pedestrians too.</p> <p>Additional suggestions</p> <p>Vision mirror installed opposite Orchard Lee</p> <p>Signs to advise of concealed driveways</p>	<p>A 20mph speed limit along the entirety of the village on Hard Lane and Union Street was considered but is out of scope of the proposed order.</p>
<p><i>From a private individual residing in Harthill</i></p> <p>I am a parent who chooses to walk further down Union Street so I can negotiate the roads better in what is a naturally a very busy time of the day, the resulting cars parked around school can also make this quite challenging, in order to cross safely. This has on occasions caused what is classed as an unreported Near Miss (an event that when occurred did not cause injury, however under slightly different circumstances could cause serious injury or death) and I fear that as the volume of traffic through Harthill is increased, these events will become more common in occurrence resulting in the classic Health & Safety pyramid dictation of a serious injury or worse.</p> <p>I understand a survey has previously been carried out in relation to a Zebra Crossing type solution, is it possible to socialise the process, criteria and time of day this was completed or signpost me to the relevant site? I am familiar with the Road and Street Works Act, and as per this legislation understand that a point of works risk assessment needs regular amendment in industry due to the constant change in environment and/or time of day off weather, hence why I'd like to understand the outcome of your survey as in my opinion, this area of the village, and the nature of the school location (and it's success to attract pupils from out of the village), needs revisiting.</p>	<p>Advised that a zebra crossing is not part of the current proposal. However, we have had several requests for this so has been put on the pedestrian crossing list for future consideration when funds become available.</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Orchard Lee</i></p> <p>I am pleased to hear that there is a commitment to improving road safety in the borough. In the eight years we have lived in Harthill we have seen more housing built, which has, in turn brought more traffic to the village. There are narrow footpaths and roads along with a school and shops on the main road which all adds to safety concerns. Although pleased that action is being suggested, I would like to draw attention to the problem of the people living on Orchard Lee. It is getting increasingly difficult to move out of the road onto Union Street. We have a clear view to the left, however to the right we have a bend which restricts our view. It is always difficult get out of Orchard Lee however it is made much easier with the cars that parked further round the bend near the roundabout. The traffic has to slow down which helps us to safely get out onto Union Street. My fear, a fear shared by neighbours, is that with yellow lines along the main road there will be nothing to slow the traffic down. I foresee the traffic speeding up through this part of the village and increasing safety worries. I think there must be other traffic calming measures to improve safety in this part of the village. A lowering of the speed limit has been suggested by many residents.</p>	<p>A 20mph speed limit along the entirety of the village on Hard Lane and Union Street was considered but is out of scope of the proposed order.</p> <p>Many residents on Orchard Lee have raised the same issue and the situation will be monitored once the scheme is live.</p>
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Orchard Lee</i></p> <p>I would like to say that I have read the documents pertaining to the above project and now with the ever-changing transport needs I agree that the time has come to carry out most of these proposed changes.</p> <p>Having said that I feel that something important has been overlooked.</p> <p>I live on Orchard Lee which leads out onto Union Street. When the end of the road is reached the view to the right is impaired due to the bend in the road. It is at all times of day difficult to exit the driveway to turn either right or left due to cars approaching from the right at speed. It is especially difficult during the morning and evening work traffic. I understand that part or the work to be undertaken is to prohibit cars parking along Union Street with double yellow lines.</p> <p>While I can see the reasoning behind this it will make exiting Orchard Lee potentially a lot more difficult and I am certain, a lot more dangerous. At present traffic is slowed due to cars been parked on the road where the restrictions are proposed. The speed of the cars using Union Street is somewhat self-regulated as it narrows the road.</p> <p>I don't want this letter to sound too negative as I am sure road planning is not easy.</p> <p>However, what I have written above is not just an opinion, it is a fact and one that can be verified by you or your colleagues by driving onto Orchard Lee and then exiting a couple of times.</p> <p>I understand that Union Street is a main road and sometimes used extensively as a alternative route if there is a problem on the M1 motorway. A 20-mph speed limit from the roundabout would maybe help. At the very least a mirror mounted across the road to enable people exiting Orchard Lee to see if it is safe to do so.</p>	<p>A 20mph speed limit along the entirety of the village on Hard Lane and Union Street was considered but is out of scope of the proposed order.</p> <p>Many residents on Orchard Lee have raised the same issue and the situation will be monitored once the scheme is live.</p> <p>Advised that a curved mirror is not part of the current proposal.</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual residing in Harthill</i></p> <p>To who is in charge of saving children & people from being knocked over in Harthill,</p> <p>Simply put, both my wife and I are extremely in favour of all these proposals going ahead as soon as possible! Our son is in Y6, who wishes to walk to Harthill school with friends, however as caring parents - we are extremely anxious about letting him do so. The parked traffic in our village is absolutely horrendous and completely out of control. Far too many inconsiderate people (including lazy careless parents) are parking their vans and oversized vehicles in front of the school, making it extremely dangerous for children to cross over safely!!!</p> <p>Only this morning, a very careless van driver almost hit one of Sams class mates. This MUST now be the last straw of having proper road management in our once quiet safe village.</p> <p>Also, the roads going down the village before and next to the church often are single lanes all way down one side, especially with visitors to the two pubs! This is what taxis are for.</p> <p>So absolutely PLEASE get in with every double yellow lines painting in our village. Many people feel this is still not enough. We should have a proper zebra crossing outside the shops and especially the school. Plus, 20mph speed restrictions, with speed cameras and more higher road bumps to slow the speeding idiots down.</p> <p>Thank you and let's get this sorted!!!!</p>	<p>Advised that the scheme was going ahead in the spring of 2025.</p>

Response received	Officer response
<p><i>From a private individual residing on Woodall Lane</i></p> <p>I am writing to object to the parking restrictions you are proposing to make and implement on Woodall Lane in Harthill.</p> <p>I am registered disabled, a wheelchair user and own a property on Woodall Lane, Harthill, Sheffield, S26 7YQ. I have two gates that face onto Woodall Lane and are the only two ways of accessing my property. One allows for flat access via the rear / side garden.</p> <p>Should Rotherham council impose restrictions as detailed on your proposal plans I would not be able to park near enough to my own cottage to access it. My wheelchair is self propelling and any distance to the nearest parking that would be available would be too far away for me.</p> <p>We do frequently have problems with people parking and blocking my gates already, especially by people and delivery vans using the surgery opposite. We have asked the council previously for permission to make a single parking area on my property, initially this seemed to be being granted but when we tried to follow it up we were not given a definitive answer. If this was granted it would give me safe and permanent access to my cottage and keep the road clear from parking obstructions.</p> <p>I have photographs showing various vehicles obstructing the road and my access which you may like to view.</p> <p>I look forward to any contact from you regarding your proposals and would be happy to discuss the matter over the phone or by meeting with the planners if need be.</p>	<p>Minor changes are to be made removing the yellow lines that affect the residents on Woodall Lane. Ward member to contact to resident.</p>