

MINUTES of a meeting of the **CABINET MEMBER FOR HIGHWAYS, TRANSPORT AND INFRASTRUCTURE** held at County Hall, Matlock on 10 October 2019

PRESENT

Cabinet Member - Councillor S A Spencer

Also in attendance – Councillors T Ainsworth and G Hickton.

52/19 **MINUTES** **RESOLVED** that the Minutes of the meeting of the Cabinet Member for Highways, Transport and Infrastructure held on 12 September 2019 be confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Cabinet Member.

53/19 **PETITION - RIPLEY, WAINGROVES, PIT LANE – REQUEST FOR NO PARKING AT THE JUNCTION WITH CHURCH STREET** Following receipt of a petition received requesting measures to improve access and egress at the junction of Pit Lane and Church Street, Waingroves, Ripley, investigations have been undertaken.

Where the highway was not subjected to any formal parking restrictions, the law still made it an offence to wilfully obstruct the free passage along a highway and was enforceable by the Police as a moving traffic offence.

The junction of Pit Lane with Church Street was regularly used by the residents and their visitors to access their respective properties on Pit Lane and was used by vulnerable road users; cyclists, pedestrians, people with prams, wheelchairs and people walking aids utilise this designated public bridleway. These levels of service demand coupled with the high degree of on-street parking on both Church Street and Pit Lane, provided constraints to visibility and unhindered access at this busy junction.

In order to maintain the safe and expedient movement of traffic at this junction, reduce the potential for the dropped crossing to be regularly obstructed and maintain the movement by vulnerable road users that are utilising the public footpath (Pit Lane), it was proposed to put forward a scheme that would rationalise the on-street parking, this being double yellow lines around the junction of Pit Lane and Church Street. This would be subject to the formal consultation process.

RESOLVED (1) to supports the introduction of no waiting at any time double yellow lines for the junction of Pit Lane and Church Street, Ripley as shown in Appendix 1 to the report; and

(2) that the Local Member and Lead Petitioner be advised of the decision.

54/19 PETITION: CHESTERFIELD, HEATON STREET – REQUEST FOR ONE WAY TRAFFIC SYSTEM Following receipt of a petition requesting a one way traffic system for Heaton Street in Chesterfield, investigations had been undertaken.

Heaton Street and St Thomas Street had, for a significant number of years, been subject to various consultation exercises and debate upon various traffic management proposals, with a proposal to provide waiting restrictions and a no left turn from Heaton Street onto Chatsworth Road, which prompted a review of alternative schemes that had been suggested at the time. These included one way systems, and reports were presented to previous meetings of the Cabinet Member for Highways and Transport on 2 July 2009 and 10 February 2011. These reports had given careful consideration to all options and were attached as Appendix 2 to the report.

The results of further consultation, following the Cabinet Member report in 2009, was to consider the appropriateness of the provision of traffic calming measures along Heaton Street, St Thomas Street and Rhodesia Road to try to deter through traffic. The results of the consultation on traffic calming were not conclusive and the scheme was not implemented. However, in 2017, it was agreed to revisit the situation to provide traffic calming, as there was an opinion that the residents of Heaton Street and St Thomas Street should be given a further opportunity to express their views and, as such, it was added to the Capital Programme of Local Transport Plan schemes in the financial year 2017-2018. Again, the consultation proved inconclusive and residents wanted the Council to revisit alternative measures, including a one way system, access only restrictions and additional waiting restrictions around junctions. As the capital funding was specifically for traffic calming, it was removed from the Capital Programme.

Whilst the lead petitioner consulted with the residents of Heaton Street and got support from 77 residents at 51 properties, the proposed one way system would actually effect around 340 properties. Officers accepted that the residents of Heaton Street were directly affected and did experience the most disruption from the through traffic. There were also wider network implications and impacts upon other residential areas. There were also concerns raised, during the recent consultation process, about the existing one way systems on Old Hall Road and Victoria Street West and many respondents wanted these removing or reversing, as this would alleviate some of the congestion on Heaton Street. Currently, both systems operated in the direction from Chatsworth Road to Old Road and were originally provided following a collision which involved vehicles emerging out of Old Hall Road onto the Chatsworth Road roundabout, and were intended to deter through traffic movements across the town. If Victoria Street West had not also been one way in the same direction, then through traffic would simply have transferred onto it with it being very close to Old Hall Road. Victoria Street West would have been unsuitable for the large volumes of traffic that previously used Old Hall Road. Bearing this in mind, it was not intended to reverse these one way controls.

Local Borough Councillors had been proactive in gaining support for a one way system along the whole length of Heaton Street, with the surrounding streets remaining two way. This would effectively prohibit all access into the residential area from Chatsworth Road, would stop through traffic in one direction and potential conflict along the route. However, it would also cause quite a long detour for residents along Chatsworth Road to Storrs Road and along Old Road, and increase the volume of traffic using St Thomas Street. It would also leave only two routes out of the residential area instead of three and doubling of the traffic emerging out of Heaton Street onto Chatsworth Road. Such increases in traffic flow would increase the risk of conflict, bearing in mind the busy nature of Chatsworth Road and the limited gaps in the traffic flow to emerge onto the main road.

Officers had conducted a bluetooth vehicle recognition survey in 2015 to establish how many vehicles were entering and leaving Heaton Street and St Thomas Street in the morning and evening peaks and these results were shown in Appendix 1 to the report. It could be seen from the results of this survey that in both am and pm peaks the majority of through traffic was travelling from Old Road to Chatsworth Road with very few travelling in the opposite direction. The traffic currently using Storrs Road may transfer to Heaton Street should there be reduced opposed flow, and generally, vehicles speeds did increase with the introduction of one way streets.

Having looked at the speed data taken in 2006, it could be seen that vehicles speeds along Heaton Street had not increased and the collision history was very good, with only one slight injury collision reported along Heaton Street.

In light of the above, there was no overwhelming evidence to suggest that further funding should be provided for traffic management solutions here and it was recommended that the request for a one way system be declined.

Councillor J Boulton, the local Member attended the meeting and suggested a number of alternative proposals that could be considered. However, it was agreed that further discussions between the Cabinet Member, Councillor Boulton and the Principal Engineer – Traffic and Safety, be arranged.

RESOLVED that (1) the proposed One Way Traffic Order for Heaton Street, Chesterfield be refused; and

(2) the Local Member and Lead Petitioner be advised of the decision.

55/19 OBJECTION TO THE (OLD WHITTINGTON LANE AND CHURCH STREET, UNSTONE) (PROHIBITION OF MOTOR VEHICLES) ORDER 2019 The Cabinet Member was informed of an objection following the public advertisement and consultation on the Old Whittington Lane and Church Street, Unstone (Prohibition of Motor Vehicles) Order 2019 which was currently being progressed under the delegated powers of the Executive Director Economy, Transport and Environment for Traffic Regulation Orders.

As part of the construction of the proposed cycle path, it would be necessary to prohibit motor vehicles from entering Church Street and Old Whittington Lane from the B6057 in order to construct a continual cycle path across these access roads. In order to achieve this, it was necessary to advertise a TRO to prohibit motor vehicles. This was advertised on street and in the Derbyshire Times from 6 June 2019 to 28 June 2019 and had received one objection, from Unstone Parish Council.

Whilst officers appreciated the Parish Council's comments relating to additional traffic that would require access to the B6057 along Crow Lane and Whittington Lane, traffic surveys carried out showed that this level of traffic was relatively insignificant and that the improvements planned at both junctions would improve safety by removing fast moving traffic cutting sharply left from the B6057 along Church Street and Old Whittington Lane.

Additional travel time would be incurred by residents travelling to and from the Dronfield direction but this again was minimal, compared to the benefits the cycle path would bring. Officers considered that it would encourage more residents to cycle to local destinations, including employment and leisure, reducing the reliance on motor vehicles.

RESOLVED (1) to note the objection to the Old Whittington Lane and Church Street, Unstone (Prohibition of Motor Vehicles) Order 2019;

(2) that the Executive Director - Economy, Transport and Environment progresses with the (Old Whittington Lane and Church Street, Unstone) (Prohibition of Motor Vehicles) Order 2019 under the scheme of delegation for Traffic Regulation Orders; and

(3) that the Local Member, objectors and the Chief Constable be advised of the decision.

56/19 STATEMENTS OF COMMON GROUND Cabinet Member approval was sought for Derbyshire County Council to enter into and, be signatories to, Statements of Common Ground (SoCG) with other local authorities/organisations within and outside Derbyshire.

Under Section 33A of the Planning and Compensation Act 2004, local planning authorities were under a duty to cooperate with each other, and with other prescribed bodies, when local plans (including mineral and waste local plans) were being prepared which regard to 'strategic matters' that crossed administrative boundaries.

Derbyshire County Council was the minerals and waste planning authority for the County (outside the National Park) and had a statutory duty to prepare minerals and waste local plans which it was discharging in collaboration with Derby City Council to provide new, joint minerals and waste local plans for the collective areas.

It was therefore required to provide SoCG in respect of this specialist local plan provision.

The County Council was also a statutory consultee on general development plans prepared by district and borough councils – both within and adjoining Derbyshire. Therefore, it had a duty to co-operate with these councils on the strategic, cross-boundary matters affecting these plans and was expected similarly to enter into SoCG with the relevant authorities and prescribed parties. Requests for SoCG in which the County Council was expected to enter/be signatories to, had been received from the following local authorities/ organisations:

Local Authority(s)/ organisation(s)	Title/Nature of Statement of Common Ground	Date Received
Sheffield City Region local authorities	Sheffield City Region Statement of Common Ground (draft version)	17 July 2019
Durham County Council	The supply of high grade industrial dolomitic limestone for use in making refractory products (final version)	17 June 2019

RESOLVED that approval be given for Derbyshire County Council to enter into Statements of Common Ground, referred to in the appendices to the report, with Sheffield City Region local authorities (Appendix 1) and Durham County Council (Appendix 2).