

NEIGHBOURHOODS, STREET SCENE & REGULATIONS CORE INVESTMENT PERIOD (CIP)

NOTES OF MEETING

Held on Friday 18th July 2025 in Town Hall.

Present:

Councillors: Barbara Masters (CllrBM) Peter Gilbert (CllrPG)	SSTP members Nathan Edwards (NE) – Chair Christine King (CK)
SCC Officers Mohamed Edroos (ME) David Wain (DW) Rebecca Boyd (RB) Amanda Preston (AJP) (part of Meeting)	Mott Macdonald James Tweddell (JT) Amey Representative Jeremy Hurst (JH)

Apologies: Cllr Shaffaq Mohamed, Paul Selby (PS) – Deputy Chair and (SCC)
Peter Hancock (AMEY), Richard Eyre (RE), Andrew Butler (AB) and Charlotte Osbourne (CO) (Mott Macdonald)

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
1.0	<u>Welcome and introductions</u> NE welcomed everyone to the meeting.	
2.0	<u>Notes of last Meeting – actions and updates</u> The notes of the previous meeting were agreed as a true reflection of that meeting subject to the following amendments: - CllrPG clarified that he didn't agree to the removal of the Cherry Tree if the exploratory excavation works were to show that it could not be retained, <i>only that he would consider it</i> - Area 5 – should read 85 Banner Cross not 81. All agreed.	
3.0	<u>Design proposals for Banner Cross Road</u>	
3.1	<u>Proposals for Cherry Tree</u> DW informed the Task and Finish Group that Amey had completed the exploratory excavation works and that the buildout was no longer needed. This would be removed from the designs. This has saved the	

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	loss of 1 or 2 parking spaces depending on vehicle size. CllrPG thanked everyone for this.	
3.2	<u>Finalise and Agree recommendations for Banner Cross Road</u> - Area 1 Junction of Banner Cross with Ecclesall Road - Buildout on left (looking away from Ecclesall Road down Banner Cross Road) extends beyond existing double yellow lines. No loss of legal on street parking provision. Existing yellow line extents will be retained. - Buildout on right (looking away from Ecclesall Road down Banner Cross Rd), will extend up to where current yellow lines stop resulting in no adverse effect on parking. - Area 2 – 116/114 Banner Cross - Buildout to be retained from original proposal. - No loss of parking spaces as buildout sits between drives. Vehicles can traverse over buildouts for parking provided they do not block access to driveways. This is common across many residential streets across the city. - CllrPG asked JT if Motts could see any better option? JT replied no, the design fulfils every option. - Area 3 – 103/105 Banner Cross - A build-out would be required. Proposal will likely impact 1 parking space. - Speed Bumps will be removed and relocated further down the road. - NE asked if the speed bumps need to be put back in? ME replied that provision of speed bumps is a council policy requirement for implementing traffic calming measures. - Area 4 – 95/97 Banner Cross - Buildout will be required as per original proposal. - Proposal will impact 1 or 2 parking spaces, one in front of each tree. Agreed to maintain continuous dropped kerb in front of tree outside 95 between the 2 driveways and a buildout around tree in front of no. 97. - It was noted that in this part of the street most of the houses have driveways. - Area 5 – 85 Banner Cross - Buildout to be retained as per original proposal. - Loss of 1 parking space	

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	- Area 6 – 77/79 Banner Cross - Loss of 1 parking space, buildout would be required as per original layout. - Area 7 – 67 Banner Cross - Discussion around tree health - existing tree to felled due to its poor condition and replaced. - Area 8 – 48/50 Banner Cross - Following further exploratory works, no buildout is required, existing tree will be retained. - Area 9 – 40 Banner Cross - After further site inspections, no buildout will be required. Existing tree is not damaging the road and has short remaining lifespan. Retain existing kerb detail around the tree. - Agreed to omit buildout from design on grounds of limited root growth into highway, limited CAVAT value and therefore on balance the provision of a buildout would not be considered reasonable. The group confirmed and agreed to the above. NE asked that existing drawings be marked up for a visual representation of these actions. ME agreed to take this away as an action for his team	ME
3.3	<u>Way forward</u> The Group discussed how to proceed, either by re-consulting with residents, report to Committee or knowledge briefing etc. NE asked how SCC we will go back out to residents. MH suggested a drop-in session to explain the process that SCC had undertaken. NE stated the importance of transparency, and that SCC should not go back out to 'consultation' if the design was fixed. CllrBM asked that the word "Consultation" isn't used. DW suggested that SCC would write to residents, saying we had listened to and acted upon feedback from the previous public consultation, held several meetings of the Working Group and concluded with revised design solutions which reflected this feedback.	

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	CllrPG – stated the need to review what was previously said to residents and consultations. ME informed the group that as there is no material changes there is no need to go to ER&S Committee. ME Agreed to check and confirm the process. Possible Knowledge briefing. DW asked the Group about green streets (low complexity streets) and how to move forward on these. After a discussion, the Group agreed for ME to map out the process/timelines.	ME ME
4.0	<u>Design proposals for Dunkeld Road</u>	
4.1	<u>Review and agree options layout for Dunkeld Road/Ecclesal Road intersection</u> 3 Options were shared for review: 1 – Parking provision retained on one side of carriageway with buildout and 2- way traffic – the northern footway width would be reduced to accommodate this parking layout. This option would retain 2 way traffic. 2 – Parking on both sides retained with buildout. To maintain 2 way traffic the northern footway width would be reduced to accommodate this road layout. 3 – Parking retained on northern side of carriageway. Southern side of carriageway to be widened but parking removed. Comments/views: Broadly speaking any of the options would amount to approximately £51,000 construction works not including utilities costs. Utilities are likely to be approximately 1.5 x construction cost. Amey proposed to undertake more detailed C4 (NRSWA) estimates, Options were discussed as follows: Option 1 Potential to remove double yellow lines on north side of road, a little way beyond the junction. This would result in additional parking provision that in balance with parking lost to create buildouts at the junction would on balance deliver no net loss of on-street parking.	

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	• A TRO would be required but this could be worked into the overall proposal. • This approach mirrors the original proposal for this area with the exception that the northern footway will not be narrowed which could have potentially compromising mobility users. Option 2 • Concern raised about narrow carriageway width if parking bays retained on both sides. Parked cars both sides if the junction could present a safety issue if vehicles are coming out of Dunkeld Road onto Ecclesall Road and vice versa. • Option potentially impacts those with mobility Issues Option 3 • 2 Way flow retained with proposed buildout. Northern footpath will not be modified. • Road cross-section remains the same in principle, 1 no. parking space on the southern side of the footpath would be lost. • This option provides a betterment to the baseline design that went to consultation, where the northern section parking bays was not presented. • Amey to feedback with costings. • 73 Dunkeld ○ Exploratory excavations commissioned around the birch to establish if the kerb line can be re-laid and buildout omitted from design - additional 1 parking space created. • 60/62 Dunkeld – ○ Exploratory root excavation commissioned to establish whether a reduced sized buildout could be accommodated without damage to the tree roots within the edge of the carriageway. Buildout is currently lopsided either side of the driveway and seeking to understand if it could be made more symmetrical on a smaller footprint. • 56/58 Dunkeld – ○ Further inspection of tree to be undertaken, this will be reported back to the working group.	SCC / AMEY SCC/AMEY SCC/AMEY

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	• 45 Dunkeld – ○ Would lose 2 parking spaces with buildout, Tree is in an advanced stage of Ash Dieback, all agreed to omit buildout as tree removal is likely within the next 2 -2 5 years. DW action to attain an up-to-date condition survey and make recommendation on removal if it has a short remaining Safe Useful Life Expectancy. • 39 Dunkeld – ○ Build-out to be retained. Loss of 1 parking space. • 32/34 Dunkeld – ○ Build-out to be retained • 31/33 Dunkeld – ○ Retain build-out as proposed, extents to be reduced to allow scope for parking and turning in and out of driveway. • 28/30 Dunkeld – ○ Exploratory excavations commissioned to establish if kerb line can be re-laid and buildout omitted from design. • 24 Dunkeld – ○ Retain build-out as proposed • 20/22 Dunkeld – ○ Loss of 1 parking space. Build-out to be retained as proposed. • 16/18 Dunkeld – ○ Build-out to be retained as proposed, loss of 2 parking spaces, however based on observations this section of Dunkeld Road from this property to its junction with Button Hill does not experience significant parking challenges. • 46 Button Hill – ○ Intersection of Button Hill and Dunkeld Rd – Proposed build-out to be retained as proposed. • 50 Dunkeld – ○ Tree is shown on Google Streetview but is no longer there.	DW

	Item	Lead/ date action taken
	Dunkeld Road All trees retained. Further investigations of 4 trees required. NE asked that existing drawings be marked up for a visual representation of these actions. ME agreed to take this away as an action for his team	ME
4.2	<u>Finalise and agree recommendations for the street</u> Proposals for consultation / engagement with residents to be agreed Online meeting to be arranged for Dunkeld and Banner Cross once investigations concluded. Marked up plans of agreed actions to be shared before the meeting.	ME ME ME
5.0	<u>Any Other Business</u>	
5.1	None	
6.0	<u>Date of next meeting</u> TBC	AJP