

Appendix A

Public Petitions and Questions –Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee– 19th July 2023

N.B - Please note that a period of up to 30 minutes shall be allocated at meetings of Policy Committees and other appropriate bodies for members of the public to present ordinary petitions or to ask questions of Members and officers present.

Petitions Received from Members of the Public x 16

	Petitions	Response:
1.	<p>Lead Petitioner: Elizabeth Larminie</p> <p>Provide pedestrian crossing points at Fulwood Rd./Hangingwater Rd./Gladstone Rd. junction</p> <p>We, the signatories to this petition, are concerned about an extremely dangerous crossing point on a major route to numerous schools. We want facilities to enable pedestrians to cross safely at the junction of Hangingwater Rd., Fulwood Rd and Gladstone Rd. Currently, there are traffic lights for road vehicles at this junction but no provision for pedestrians. The lights change very quickly and the junction is busy. There is no viable alternative to crossing here that doesn't add a significant amount to journey times.</p> <p>Numerous children cross over at this junction every school day, including without adult supervision, to access their catchment schools Nether Green Juniors and Nether Green Infants, and also to get to Notre Dame and Saint Marie’s. There is a care home and nursery school in the vicinity as well as a parade of shops that is difficult to access due to the lack of a crossing. Even as an able-bodied person with no additional needs or mobility issues, the level of threat crossing here feels very high and parents report near misses. Unaccompanied children can be seen running across the road trying to avoid cars that come close to them. The speed limit is also still 30 mph here, at which there is a very significant risk of death in the event of a person being knocked over.</p>	<p>Thank you for your petition requesting improved crossing facilities at the Fulwood Road/Hangingwater Road junction. We receive many requests for road safety and highway improvements including improvements to assist pedestrians crossing roads throughout the year. Limitations on resources mean that we have to assess, score and prioritise locations city wide and are currently only able to progress a small number every year as part of the rolling Pedestrian Improvement Programme. The number of requests we receive for a site does not have any bearing on the prioritisation of the site.</p> <p>Requests are prioritised purely on their assessment score to ensure fairness across the city. Having the set criteria enables us to focus our attentions effectively on locations where measures are most urgently needed. The request for pedestrian crossing facilities at this location has been assessed and did score well and will hopefully be considered for future years programme as delivery of the sites for the 23/24 Pedestrian Improvement Programme are already underway.</p>

	<p>All this flies in the face of government and local council aims to encourage active travel. Active travel, such as walking and cycling, is associated with health benefits in children and lower death rates from a wide range of causes. It also reduces air pollution, the largest environmental risk to public health in the UK. According to a recent survey, two thirds of drivers were found to believe it “often not safe for children to move around by walking in UK cities because of the threat of traffic.” Sadly, dangerous crossings like this fuel such perceptions, pushing more parents towards car usage.</p> <p>This crossing should be viewed as a priority for action. It meets criteria for funding quoted to us as including “degree of fear and intimidation”, “major walking and cycling routes”, “impact on local amenities”, “impact on people with disabilities”. We want to avoid a death rather than wait until one has happened. There is ample evidence from around the world and within Sheffield that investing in road safety pays for itself due to the high costs to the community associated with a road casualty</p> <p>Finally, Sheffield City Council has one of the worst records in the country for child road deaths measured against other metropolitan areas. It should therefore be making road safety improvements an absolute priority.</p>	
2.	<p>Lead Petitioner: Julian Cope</p> <p>Sheaf Valley Cycle Route</p> <p>We the undersigned petition the council to Complete and extend the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route.</p> <p>The recent traffic filter on Little London Road has had a markedly large effect on the number of people cycling along the Sheaf Valley over the last few months. Recent counts have seen the number of people cycling on the road increase by more than 50% month on month, and have provided a safe alternative to the main arterials of</p>	<p>The Sheaf Valley Cycle Route is part of our Connecting Sheffield vision, running from Norton Hammer to the City Centre via Shoreham Street and Little London Rd. The enhanced cycle route empowers more people to walk or ride, more of their daily journeys more often.</p> <p>As part of the Sheaf Valley Cycle route, several traffic filters and parking restrictions were introduced on a trial basis from May 2022, using an experimental traffic regulation order (ETRO). This includes interventions at:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Little London Rd - Rydal Rd /Langdale Rd - Cherry St/Shoreham Street

Chesterfield road and Abbeydale road which even very confident and experienced cyclists are afraid to cycle on.

However, Little London Road is only one short road, and without the full cycle route, the full potential of the scheme won't materialise. If the council are serious about decreasing Sheffield's reliance on cars, decreasing emissions and the amount of pollution we have to breath daily on the path to net zero, and increasing the mobility options for people who aren't able, don't want to or can't afford to drive, then we need proper joined up cycle networks that are safe from end to end and go to where people need to get to.

The Sheaf Valley Cycle route was proposed years ago, and the delays to finishing the route are perpetual.

We need commitment to this scheme and more. Please finish the route that has already been agreed inline with modern cycle infrastructure standards, and extend it out past Millhouses park to Dore and Totley railway station. This cycle route would then have a massive 'catchment area' which would allow those wanting to cycle, but afraid to along the busy main arterial roads that we currently have, the ability to get out of their cars.

- Hackthorne Rd/Scarsdale Rd
- Saxon Rd

The Transport Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee must decide to make these interventions permanent or to return the highway to its former state before the ETRO expires in November 2023. Detailed monitoring and evaluation of the scheme is underway, which includes a range of both quantitative and qualitative survey work that will help to inform this decision.

The interventions above compliments other schemes that are already being implemented on a permanent basis along this route, including:

- A new toucan crossing on Bramhall Ln (between Asline Rd and Shoreham St)
- An improved segregated cycle track on Asline Rd
- An improved modal filter and parking restrictions on Glover Rd/ London Rd
- A signalised junction at Wolseley Rd and Staveley Rd

The designs of the Shoreham Street elements of the scheme are under secondary review due to a combination of price inflation, and the need to ensure that cyclists can travel safely between Matilda Street and the two-way segregated cycleway on Shoreham Street. However, Sheffield City Council remains committed to delivering the route in its entirety. Once the revised designs have been approved, we will advertise a Traffic Regulation Order with the intention of implementing the proposals.

Extending the Sheaf Valley Cycle route complements Sheffield City Council's ambition for a city-wide active travel network. This may include a branch to Dore and Totley train station and a branch out to Meadowhead. Development of these routes must be prioritised against other schemes, which includes a busy programme of active travel infrastructure projects already funded. All future schemes are also subject to securing Central Government funding from Active Travel England/the Department for Transport.

1.	<p>Question from David Cronshaw</p> <p>Now the Clean Air Zone has been going since 27th February 2023</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How much money has been received from vehicles who have been charged • Have pollution levels on the inner ring road now improved • How many companies have applied for Grants • How many Grants have been given • How many Companies are still waiting for there Grant Application to be considered 	<p>Response:</p> <p>CAZ Charges</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Below is the available data, which covers the period 27 February to 31 May. • By ‘charges’ we are referring to CAZ entry fee payments made by motorists using the <u>national clean air zone payment service</u>. Motorists have a 13-day payment window to pay the entry fee for the Clean Air Zone (CAZ), covering six days before, six days after and the day of travel. • During this period, CAZ charges received were £371,121.04 (income less debit and credit charge service fees and refunds issued) <p>CAZ Fines</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By ‘fines’ we are referring to Penalty Charge Notices (PCNs) which are issued when a motorist does not pay their CAZ entry fee within the 13 day CAZ entry fee payment window. PCN payments were taken through Sheffield City Council’s payment channels, rather than the national CAZ payment service. • The value for the reporting period was £394,880.00 <p>Q. Have pollution levels on the inner ring road now improved?</p> <p>Air quality data is not evaluated in real-time, and observations are made over longer periods of time because of the how data is collected, post collection ratification requirements and trends and as such we work on a retrospective basis.</p> <p>Sheffield City Council are in the process of publishing 2022’s data in accordance with government guidance. As such, ratified data for the period you are interested in (2023), which will include the CAZ launch will not be available until 2024.</p>
----	--	--

		<p>How many companies have applied for Grants? - total applications 4171 on upgrade scheme and 796 on the retrospective Already Replaced scheme.</p> <p>How many Grants have been given? - 1755 basic eligibility approved and referred for a grant with 335 paid</p> <p>How many Companies are still waiting for their Grant Application to be considered - UPGRADE SCHEME 752 applications yet to be determined. There are 401 applications yet to be determined on the retrospective already replaced scheme.</p>
2.	Question from Colin Early	Response:
	To put to the meeting Why are there so many demolished sites in Sheffield (Peniston road, netherthorp road, Stones Brewery rutland road and many more left with no sign of development. Is this another council cock up or did the council have serious developers.	<p>Apart from the former Brewery site on Rutland Road it is not clear exactly which sites are being referred to.</p> <p>In point of fact, a planning application has been lodged by Capital and Centric Limited to redevelop the former brewery site on Rutland Road (reference 23/01746/OUT - Hybrid Planning Application: Full permission for partial demolition of existing buildings; Outline permission for a mixed use development including the construction of new buildings and conversion of any structurally suitable existing buildings to accommodate residential dwellings (Use class C3) and commercial floorspace (Use class E), together with new public realm/open space and associated infrastructure (all matters reserved)).</p> <p>Development proposals have previously received planning permission for the large vacant sites at the bottom of Netherthorpe Road but the prospective developers of these sites have not commenced development, presumably because of the very difficult economic circumstances at the present time.</p> <p>Discussions are actively ongoing with the Council's Property and Regeneration Team to unlock the potential of these sites, with substantial assistance from Homes England.</p>
3.	Question from John Slater	Response:

As a resident of Kelham Island I would like to know why all traffic leaving the area is directed towards the Clean Air Zone? This applies to anyone leaving their home, visitors, traders and businesses. Prior to blockading all other access routes, we had the option to avoid driving towards the city centre. My vehicle no longer complies to the city's requirements, by less than 6 months, and since February I'm being asked to pay £300 per month just to leave my home. With only one route now available directing ALL traffic into an area SCC are trying to reduce levels of pollution.

Tradespeople are cancelling work at the last minute after realising this or charging an extra £10-£15 per day which has been my experience. Surely, an area outside the Clean Air Zone should have an option to avoid it otherwise we have created a prison system by penalising anyone who wishes to leave.

This is causing considerable stress due to spiraling costs. Ford manufacturers have advised against the modifications SCC propose and exemptions just delayed the inevitable and there has been no support from local Councillors who either ignore any correspondent or fear opposing the plans. While a number of Councillors from other areas of Sheffield are appalled but can only advise we speak to our local representatives.

I would like to know how this is being addressed going forward and whether there will be any compensation for those who have suffered financially since the Clean Air / Road Closures were implemented?

Thank you for your question we apologise for any distress the implementation of the Clean Air Zone may have caused you and I understand officers have recently written to you on your specific circumstances.

Whilst the underlying Clean Air Zone (CAZ) road user charge is/was validly imposed on drivers entering the CAZ from Kelham Island, we have received feedback from a small number of affected motorists based in Kelham, on how their non-compliant vans/campervans are charged to leave the area.

We have had to take some time to identify what solutions were available to us and seek relevant advice and approvals before a course of action could be communicated.

We will be making changes to the access and egress arrangements into Kelham Island. These changes will be made on an experimental basis and will complement the existing road closures at Ball Street Bridge and Alma Street which were aimed at reducing the level of through traffic using the Kelham Island area but provide a further egress point for those residents or businesses to the west of the Alma Street closure that wish to travel to the north or west of Kelham Island. Currently the only egress points from Kelham Island take drivers in a south or easterly direction.

The traffic management changes described above will see the current one-way entry into Kelham Island via the Penistone Road Service Road north of Dixon Street turned into a one-way exit point for motorised traffic. It should be noted that the 2-way use of the service road for cyclists will be retained and unaffected. Vehicles will still be able to access premises in Kelham Island from Penistone Road via Cornish Street.

		<p>Information on the proposed changes will be sent to all relevant residents and businesses in Kelham Island in advance of the works starting as part of the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) that will be promoted to implement the changes.</p> <p>As there is now the ability to introduce an alternative exit via Dixon Street, the Council will put measures in place to exempt resident and business vehicles based within the affected area of Kelham Island from the Clean Air Zone charges when exiting Kelham Island until the works to implement the alternative exit have been implemented.</p>
4.	<p>Question from Joyce Greene</p> <p>I wish to submit two brief public questions to be read out at the next transport meeting. I will not be available to attend in person.</p> <p>The first is on item 8: "Approval is sought today for the concept of bus priority measures at abbeydale road and abbey lane crossroads. Will the desire to extend the Sheaf Valley route as expressed in Active Travel Fund 4 bidding be considered when designing this location? Or is there a risk the junction will be rebuilt twice?"</p> <p>The second is in regards to agenda item 10. "After reading the responses to the TRO objections, officers have stated at Rutland Road / Neepsend Lane cross roads, there is not enough space to provide a separate cycle and pedestrian crossing on the Eastern side. Capital & Centric will be demolishing the buildings closest to the junction on the east side and creating public realm at the brewery. Will the design be revisited?"</p>	<p>Response:</p> <p>Unfortunately we were not successful in securing development funds through Active Travel Fund 4 for the next stages of the Sheaf Valley cycle route. However, as the interventions included in the South West Bus Corridors Project report at the junction of Abbey Lane and Abbeydale Road are traffic signal upgrades and new loading and waiting restrictions, the junction is not proposed to be rebuilt. Therefore, should a future Sheaf Valley cycle route use this junction, any work undertaken now is unlikely to need significant replacement.</p> <p>Any schemes being proposed both now and going forward must consider the needs of all transport users in order to meet the current and future transport needs across the city. The Connecting Sheffield programme includes a wide variety of active and sustainable transport schemes currently being developed. These highlight the Council's aspiration for a truly multi-modal transport network that helps to reduce car dependency in order to manage current and future traffic flows. Wherever possible SCC want to ensure that interventions in the highway support bus journey time reduction and improve the overall quality of the public transport experience for those travelling by bus or train. Similarly, SCC want to deliver a coherent, direct, safe, comfortable and attractive active travel network for those choosing to walk, wheel or cycle. SCCs design and planning process must consider the impact schemes will have for decades or even generations to come, not just for the next few years. Therefore any interventions being</p>

		considered as part of bus priority on Abbeydale Rd, must consider current and future interfaces with cycling, wheeling and walking schemes including any proposals to extend the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route.
5.	Question from William Exley	Response
	<p>I would like to ask about the consideration that has been given to the following point, taken from SheffNews summary of the committees proposals, published in the article "Next steps for bus corridors on southwest of Sheffield to be discussed" on the 12th of July 2023 (https://sheffnews.com/news/next-steps-for-bus-corridors-on-southwest-of-sheffield-to-be-discussed). Regarding Ecclesall Road / Hunters Bar:</p> <p>"The bus stop immediately after the roundabout on Ecclesall Road, heading out of the city centre, would be removed to ensure smoother traffic flow. Other bus stops in close proximity will still be available."</p> <p>How can it be justified by the committee that the removal of a bus stop is essential to this plan? Removing part of the public transport network for the benefit of private car drivers seems completely at odds with any city transport plan that has people, community, accessibility and the climate at its core.</p> <p>We frequently use this stop and encounter many doing the same - it is an important access point up the significant hill of Ecclesall Road, an important link to the Peak District, the closest stop to one of the largest green spaces in the area Endcliffe Park, and a connection to play space for children in the parks & playground and the local independent businesses in the sharrow area.</p> <p>I'd also note that the two closest alternative bus stops (as referenced in the proposal) are not suitable or accessible replacements for this stop - the stop after is a significant distance up a hill, has no covering or protection from the road. The stop before is on a very narrow section of pavement, with poor visibility from street furniture and confusing layout (we have been missed by bus drivers at this stop on multiple occasions in the past few months). Not to mention the obvious: removing the stop between these two creates too large a gap</p>	<p>The outbound bus lane between Hunters Bar Roundabout and Rustlings Road would be removed and replaced with two general traffic lanes, along with the removal of the bus stop immediately after the roundabout. This will allow a smoother flow of traffic exiting the roundabout to reduce congestion and delays to buses at the roundabout, by encouraging more vehicles to use both lanes on the outbound approach. This should improve bus journey time reliability and consistency.</p> <p>If the bus stop remained this would impact upon the flow of traffic leaving the roundabout, affecting congestion and delays to buses at the roundabout. We will investigate if it is feasible to undertake improvements to alternative bus stops close by.</p>

	<p>where a bus cannot be hailed, a huge issue in an area where certain buses run as infrequently as one an hour - often less.</p> <p>Public transport and pedestrian accessibility should be at the heart of all decisions on this development, not the prioritising of the free flow of cars. At a time when the city should be investing more into public transport, active travel and deprioritising car use this feels like a backwards step.</p> <p>Thank you for reading,</p>	
6.	Question from James Stevenson	
	<p>1.1.3 “The Kelham Island and Neepsend Active Travel and Public Transport Scheme has been designed to reinforce the regeneration of Kelham Island and Neepsend, helping to improve the environment and linking them into the city centre through, high quality cycling and walking infrastructure and improved routes for bus services”</p> <p>Q: The proposed changes and the introduction of the bus gates / one way systems greatly increases the travel distances and routes for staff and customers reaching the established businesses within this industrial zone. This has an impact on Cars, Vans, Trucks and arctic lorries which are the vast majority of traffic in this area during the working week.</p> <p>How are these changes and increased distances / journey times helping the environment, especially when placed next to the clean air zone.</p> <p>Q: Why is there emphasis on improving the industrial zone towards Cyclists, Pedestrians and bus routes who are not the main visitors to this area, also do you feel that encouraging cyclists and pedestrians into an active industrial zone poses potential risks with the number of large vehicles and machinery being used and moved around the location.</p> <p>1.2.4 “There is also a need to introduce parking restrictions due to parking on footways and on (or close to) junctions, which impacts on access for larger vehicles and obstructs pedestrians. Kelham Island and Neepsend are also popular for long stay parking as it is free and unrestricted. This leads to a lack of parking opportunities for</p>	<p>The aim of the scheme is to encourage more sustainable travel for journeys for existing (and planned future housing) that can be made by more sustainable modes, especially between Kelham, Neepsend and the city centre through the provision of high-quality cycling and walking infrastructure, public realm improvements and bus priority measures. Additional loading and waiting restrictions – which still allow loading and unloading - should help reduce vehicle conflict and potential delays in the area too. The scheme has been designed so that access to all businesses and residential properties by all motor vehicles including HGVs is maintained, though in some circumstances the access route for some drivers may vary.</p> <p>The scheme aims to provide the facilities to enable the local community and visitors to choose a range of transport modes to travel to and from the area. The design of the scheme is based on providing a cycle route through Kelham and Neepsend that utilises quieter roads: the proposed bus gates and ‘no through roads’ help achieve this lower level of traffic. Junction improvements for pedestrians and cyclists will enhance crossing opportunities too. Whilst the aim of the scheme is to encourage sustainable travel, access, parking and loading opportunities will still be maintained for all drivers.</p>

customers of local businesses as well as for residents. The construction of properties at West Bar is expected to provide additional parking demand in the area too. It is therefore proposed to introduce a parking scheme in Kelham Island and Neepsend. The scheme supports the proposed moving traffic restrictions within the Kelham Island and Neepsend Active Travel and Public Transport Scheme. There is a separate TRO and Committee report for the parking scheme with the proposed parking restrictions.”

Q: What allowances will be made for staff at the established businesses in the area who do not have onsite parking and rely on the free parking in the area?

2.3 • Clean economic growth o There is a relationship between high quality active travel and public transport infrastructure, and regeneration. The proposed scheme will enhance sustainable access between Neepsend, Kelham Island and the city centre for residents and support regeneration in the city. o The scheme will also improve access to businesses in the city centre. o The scheme will encourage an increase in journeys by low carbon sustainable modes, reducing private car use, queues, and delay”

Q: Why is the access of established businesses within the Neepsend area being sacrificed in favour of public transport towards the city centre. Especially when there is a major arterial road within a 5 minute walk of the area (an element the scheme is keen to promote) which could easily cope with increased public transport.

Q: The changes within the Neepsend area will vastly increase queues and delays in both private and commercial vehicles. What information has been used to derive this will improve and reduce usage?

There is no right to park for free on the public highway. However, the Kelham/Neepsend parking scheme report includes a recommendation to not implement the ‘pay and display/permit’ scheme at this stage, but to work with businesses in Neepsend to see how the effects of the originally proposed scheme could be mitigated. The report includes a number of initial suggestions as to how this could be achieved.

Access to all businesses and residential properties in Neepsend by all motor vehicles including HGVs is maintained, though in some circumstances the access route for some drivers may vary. The bus priority measures aim to improve bus journey time reliability and consistency to increase the attractiveness of the bus. Maintaining public transport routes through Neepsend is important to enable access to residential and business properties for people who don’t have access to a vehicle, or choose not to use a vehicle.

Traffic modelling of the area has been carried out to assess the likely impact of the scheme on traffic at the key junctions in and around the area and along key internal roads. The modelling compared the modelled traffic conditions associated with the current layout with those that would result from the preferred scheme. Whilst the results highlighted the potential for

“Tackling inequalities o The scheme will help to improve employment prospects, through enhanced sustainable access to employment opportunities.”

Q: It has been raised by many businesses in the Neepsend area that this will ultimately lead to reduced trade and business closures, with the potential impact taking merely a couple of months to take hold. How is this enhancing employment opportunities in the area.

3.1 “Consultation Approach”

Q: Why is it not mentioned within this section the number of concerns raised that the initial consultation had a very subtle approach via reaching out to businesses through a postcard approach which would normally be instantly dismissed as junk mail and not read.

Additionally, there were a number of people unable to access or be accepted onto the zoom call.

“3.3 Impact on Businesses (32 references) 3.3.1 There were 32 references that related to the schemes impact on businesses which tended to raise issues which were financial in nature and related to a number of perceived negative impacts that the scheme could have on certain local businesses, mainly reduced ease with which potential customers can access such businesses, concerns regarding impact on current delivery arrangements, loss of passing trade for individual businesses and reduced footfall. 3.3.2 The most frequently mentioned roads where it is perceived that the scheme will have a detrimental impact on businesses are: • Neepsend Lane due to the closure to motor vehicles at the south side of the junction with Burton Road/ Rutland Road and the access to a number of businesses on this part of Neepsend Lane. • Percy Street due to the introduction of a north easterly one way along its length. • Burton Road due to the introduction of full time bus gates which remove general through traffic between Percy Street and Rutland Road, though access is retained.”

some additional delays it indicated that the links and junctions would operate within capacity levels, during both the morning and evening peaks. We will monitor traffic numbers at key junctions over the first 12 months following the implementation of the scheme to determine if any further amendments are required.

The scheme aims to improve sustainable access to employment opportunities in Kelham, Neepsend and the city centre. This aims to widen access for potential employees to businesses by providing high quality facilities for travel to the area other than just by private vehicles.

Following the Traffic Regulation Order consultation, officers have undertaken investigations to determine if amendments to the scheme could be accommodated. As a result, amendments to the original scheme are proposed including keeping the lower half of Percy Street two way between Neepsend Lane and Burton Road to improve access from the north to businesses on Neepsend Lane. The effect of this amendment will be monitored following the implementation of the scheme to determine if any further amendments are required.

It is also proposed to keep Wilson Street and Rowland Street in Neepsend two way to assist businesses operating between multiple sites. Officers propose to promote further waiting restrictions in and around Paradise Street and Silver Street and reduce a section of an existing parking bay to improve access for deliveries to a business located on Paradise Street.

High quality active travel infrastructure between Neepsend, Kelham and the city centre provides alternative facilities for sustainable access to and from the city centre for journeys that can be made by more sustainable modes. However, it is not expected that all current journeys will be made by more sustainable modes. The scheme has been designed so that access to all businesses by all motor vehicles including HGVs is maintained to deliver large and heavy items. The proposed introduction of double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) with loading permitted in Kelham and Neepsend as part of the Kelham Island and Neepsend Parking Scheme will also improve access and loading for HGVs.

	<p>Q: Why has there been no attempt to address any of the concerns raised from the established businesses and no adjustments proposed to ease these real concerns.</p> <p><i>“3.3.7 The scheme has been designed so that all businesses remain accessible by all motor vehicles including HGVs, but in some circumstances the route to or from the business may change. The positive side of which is that active travel is more attractive, inclusive and safer, which aims to reduce the number of vehicle trips overall.”</i></p> <p>Q; Why is active travel seen as a realistic option within an industrial zone where vehicles are required to collect and deliver large and heavy items which could not be carried on a bicycle or by foot?</p> <p><i>Section 3 as a whole</i></p> <p>Q: It is apparent that all concerns raised by the established businesses have been ignored and paid mere lip service within the report which would suggest that these businesses are not within the long term plans for the area. What is the next planned phase for Neepsend once you have successfully ousted most of the long term established businesses which this scheme aims to achieve and what will be the approach to remove those that remain, e.g compulsory purchases etc...</p> <p>Summary of concerns: At the point of the initial consultation it was raised with the planning department that these plans had been pre-approved and the consultation was merely a process. Unfortunately, despite assurances this wasn't the case, it is apparent that none of the concerns raised have had any effect on the overall scheme which is designed solely at removing existing businesses from the area, at the expense of a number of jobs. There is clearly a larger plan to develop the area into a faux-industrial residential quarter, of which the existing businesses hold no part in.</p>	<p>The concerns raised by businesses during the Traffic Regulation Order consultation have been investigated and if feasible amendments to the Traffic Regulation Orders have been proposed such as on Percy Street, Rowland Street and Wilson Street. The aim of the scheme is to encourage sustainable travel between Neepsend, Kelham and the city centre whilst retaining full vehicle access for all existing businesses and residents, though in some circumstances the access route for some drivers may vary.</p>
7.	Question from Matthew Windle	
	Hi, I'm not sure what my question regarding the road changes in Neepsend is supposed to be, this is what I've put down, think it's a bit	In summary; to get controlled pedestrian and cycle facilities across each arm at Neepsend Lane / Rutland Road, the end of the Southern section of

more of a statement but in general the question is why do we need to close Neepsend lane, I was told it's because there can't be crossings on a five way junction, my statement explains this better below.

Im Matthew Windle, the owner of P&W services.

You can find our business on the one way system on Neepsendlane.

This has been my businesses home for nearly 60 years, originally founded by my dad who is still currently hard at work /sat next to me.

Throughout this whole process from when we received the first letter about potential plans, to standing here today, we've felt nothing but anxious. The reason why? The plans suggest to turn the road outside my business into a dead end street, therefore cutting off passing trade.

I could stand here and talk on and on about how every one of the suggested changes to Neepsends roads are going impact the area negatively, but I'm sure you've read everyones comments regarding this already and hopefully, you understand the disastrous impact they will have on Neepsend, take it from someone who has spent 6 days a week here, for 36 years.


At the meeting held in Kelham Island museum months ago, my daughter Dana Windle, who organises Rex Market in neepsend, asked why they are planning to cut off our road. They responded saying that their plans to install pedestrian crossings to the crossroads means that a 5 way cross road would need to be reduced to 4 to make it work.

Id now like to direct your attention to the picture I have passed around.

Here you'll see a picture from google images, of the crossroads in Broomhill on Newbould lane. Here is proof that having a 5 way crossroad with pedestrian crossings on each road WORKS! It works efficiently, it works safely, of course it does – its sandwiched

Neepsend lane must be closed. Without doing this it is not possible under the current layout to provide much needed facilities for pedestrians / cyclists now or for the future.

Proposed Design at Neepsend Lane / Rutland Road




There are currently no controlled facilities for Pedestrians and Cyclists at the Neepsend / Rutland Road junction.

To address this, the junction of Neepsend lane/ Rutland Road has been designed to have separate stages within the signal timings for pedestrians and cyclists to safely cross each arm. To create time within the junction to allow Pedestrians and Cyclists to cross and still have the junction operate for limited traffic volumes, we propose to close the end of the southern section of Neepsend lane and allow vehicles to travel ahead only on all arms of the junction.

Closing the end of the southern section of Neepsend Lane also creates more space to be able to cross both cyclists and pedestrians safely (currently this space is limited and the footway is extremely narrow close to the river /

<p>inbetween two schools. If it can work here, it can definitely work in Neepsend.</p> <p>Thankyou for your time, once again I strongly urge you to consider the impact this will have on neepsend, adding bus gates, closing roads off, creating diversions, its going to cause confusion, and run the local businesses into the ground. We would love to see more pedestrian crossings and more public transport to the area, but you need to bear in mind Neepsend isn't Kelham Island, it is still a working industrial area. Please, leave the roads as they are.</p>	<p>bridge). The closure provides the landing area for pedestrians and cyclists wanting to cross Rutland Road or Burton Road.</p> <p>Closing the road also reduces the amount of through traffic so that cyclists can cycle on Neepsend lane without being segregated from general traffic, allows bus journey time reliability and allows the junction to operate effectively and within capacity (Signals can satisfactory move the amount of traffic expected).</p> <p>The example of the five-road entry at Newbould Lane / Glossop Lane in Crookes (shown below) is different;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are no cycle stages for crossing cyclists. To get separate cycle crossings in at this junction would also mean it would have to be re-aligned / access potentially removed to general traffic to create the space / landing areas for cyclists to be segregated from traffic. • There is a lot more space at the junction (the Neepsend Lane / Rutland Road junction also has private land constraints so creating additional space is difficult and is not within the highway boundary / Council ownership). • The junction isn't as busy (less volume in the peak periods).
--	--

	
<p>8. Question from Leann Marshall</p>	
<p>1. The plans and objectives state: "traffic can be removed from local streets to more suitable routes to create an area where space is predominantly focused on walking and cycling. This will create more of a community feel in the area and provide a meeting place where people can spend time." The designated introduction of only one 'green space' at the bottom of Bardwell Rd is disappointing. As a post-industrial and current-industrial area, there is a significant lack of green space, wildlife corridors and natural habitats. There are a number of small spaces that can be further developed: for example, the tree lined double width pavement</p>	<p>The funding for this project is mainly allocated for bus priority measures and infrastructure interventions for pedestrians and cyclists. Planting is proposed where feasible, such as at the Bardwell Road, Neepsend Lane and Boyland Street junction, though unfortunately funding from this project for further green spaces or trees in Neepsend is not available.</p>

area on Neepsend Lane beside the resident car park which has ample space for planting and benches). There is real opportunity to positively involve local business in creating green spaces, hanging baskets, planting, birdboxes and more. Would the council be prepared to improve the proposed provision of green spaces?

2. Outside my own building on Burton Rd there is a bus stop proposed in our building loading bay, according to the plans. This seems impractical for a number of reasons not only the fact that busses will be obstructed by truck deliveries unloading goods. Those same trucks will then be doing U-Turns to avoid exiting through the bus gates. When will a physical survey be conducted that takes into account details such as the location of loading hatches and the size of the attending flat-beds and delivery trucks? Such details can not be gleaned from aerial images and ordinance maps and do not appear to have been considered in the published plans to date.

3. How will bus gates be communicated? Many of our clients are out of towners, coming from as far as Ireland, Surrey, London, Birmingham and more. They bring their families into this area, spend the day, and spend money here. How will this new maze be communicated to people who don't know the area? Beyond an occasional sign which can be obscured or missed if a bus or van is in the way....as with the woefully communicated tram gate in Hillsborough. Will there be physical tarmac colouring for example, as with the clearly communicated London schemes. Will there be something to prevent this becoming a fine generating trap?

4. In order to prevent and reduce cars passing through the area, presumably there will be a park-and-walk/cycle provision somewhere? Though I have been unable to find any on the plans. The new parking proposals reduce parking capacity significantly. I don't see any car park introduction proposed on the approach to the area so that people can switch to on-foot after arriving from the motorway or the A61 for example. Using my business as an example, if I have a bride and family arriving, from Surrey in a car from the M1, transporting their wedding gown (anything up to 8kg in weight), veil and number of bridesmaid

Officers are undertaking further investigations into the locations of bus stops along Burton Road. Access will be maintained for all businesses in Neepsend including along Burton Road, and the proposed introduction of parking restrictions along Burton Road will assist businesses and customers with loading and unloading.

The signage for the proposed bus gates on Burton Road will be in line with the required regulations. This will include advanced warning signs of the bus gates.

Car parks on the approach to Neepsend and Kelham are not proposed. It is proposed to introduce double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) with loading permitted in Kelham Island and Neepsend as part of the Kelham Island and Neepsend parking scheme. The aim is to improve access and loading opportunities in areas where there can be significant demands on limited kerb space. Pay and display parking bays are proposed in Kelham Island, with 20 minutes free for short visits. Pay and display parking will not initially be introduced in Neepsend to enable additional work to be done with businesses to see how the effects of the originally

dresses with bags of shoes etc, where and how do they unload all of those items and then go to park?

5.The initial consultation in 2021 re: parking regulations stated that it was to reduce the number of people who park and then walk into town. If this is the case, why are parking charges applicable until 8pm at night? People don't park and go to work in town at 8pm at night. Parking congestion significantly reduces after 4pm in Neepsend. If the proposals are genuinely to help tackle townies using Neepsend parking spaces then charges should end at 4pm to allow the evening businesses to cater for their clients without clock watching. People going out for dinner should not have to clockwatch and rush out of places. This will unnecessarily negatively impact some of the hospitality businesses in the area. Will the parking charge period be reduced to a more appropriate 4pm cut-off? And if not, why not?

6.Where will new tree planting occur, in Neepsend specifically (I can see that the West Bar development has much of this)? Surely an important aspect of fighting emissions and creating pleasant space for walking/cycling is introducing carbon reducing trees and foliage?

7.Neepsend is not a particularly safe area. It's poorly lit and is rife with car crime and graffiti vandalism. The newly proposed business parking rules allow only two employees to access a parking permit. For staff who are denied the ability to drive/park, what is proposed to keep those people safe at night. Reducing the movement of cars in the area will make the current semi-busy through-ways more remote/unobserved, particularly for women who are having to walk through the area to get to their, now remote, car or wait for a bus. I last caught the bus on the corner of Rutland Road at 8pm after our evening shift, in Winter when it was dark, and during the 30min wait I

proposed scheme could be mitigated. New car parks on the approach to Neepsend and Kelham are not being proposed as part of the scheme, but tram based park and ride is available on the 'yellow' route (which serves Kelham Island and Neepsend via Shalesmoor) at Nunnery Square, Centertainment and Meadowhall (from the M1), and Middlewood for more local traffic. However, it is understood that not all journeys will be made by sustainable transport modes and people will still choose to drive to park for many journeys.

The Kelham/Neepsend parking scheme was advertised with a evening tariff of £2 after 1630 - with a ticket valid to 2020. However, the current report does also include a recommendation to not implement the 'pay and display/permit' scheme at this stage in Neepsend, but to work with businesses in Neepsend to see how the effects of the originally proposed scheme could be mitigated. The report includes a number of initial suggestions as to how this could be achieved, including reducing the scale of the pay and display scheme or changes to days and times of the week of the pay and display/permit scheme could operate.

Trees are not proposed in Neepsend, however landscaping and planting is proposed at the Bardwell Road, Neepsend Lane and Boyland Street junction.

Thank you for highlighting safety concerns when waiting for the bus in Neepsend, it is not proposed to introduce cameras at bus stops through this scheme, though we will raise these concerns with colleagues at the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority who are responsible for public transport infrastructure and with South Yorkshire Police.

The current Kelham Island and Neepsend Parking Scheme report does also include a recommendation to not implement the 'pay and display/permit' scheme at this stage in Neepsend, but to work with businesses in Neepsend to see how the effects of the originally proposed scheme could be mitigated.

	<p>received 16 propositions from cars driven by men. I have not caught a bus home from work since. Will there be the introduction of bus stop cctv, better streetlighting in areas that are being pedestrianised, attendance of police community support officers and the introduction of a neighbourhood watch scheme?</p> <p>8. Since the council wish to reduce cars and promote use of public transport, will you be working with Stagecoach to allow dogs to be taken on the tram? The one main reason I don't tram to work is because I work 12-13 hr days to make my business pay and so my small dog comes to work with me. I believe a rear carriage could be designated as dog friendly, leaving the rest of the tram dog-free for people nervous or uncomfortable around dogs. This would be easy to introduce via sticker signs on the rear carriage windows. For smaller dogs, a dog 'in arms' or 'dog in bag' policy could be introduced like on the New York and London subway systems. Many weekend visitors to Kelham and Neepsend have dogs with them. I pass at least 20 or so on arrival to each Saturday shift. If you wish to encourage walking in the area, inevitably that will bring more dogs too. Will you work with Stagecoach to address this?</p>	<p>The report includes a number of initial suggestions as to how this could be achieved, including being more flexible in the provision of business permits - providing the opportunity for more business permits to be purchased within the scheme.</p> <p>We will highlight your request to allow dogs on trams with the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority.</p>
9.	Question from Chris Broome	
	<p>"Since a Climate Emergency was declared in 2019, the city has clearly not managed so far to achieve the large year-on-year emissions reductions necessary to address it and play our part in avoiding climate chaos. Can I suggest it is time for Councillors to be very explicit about that being the main reason why we simply have to reduce car use in the city? Where this involves difficult decisions, of course efforts should be made to support any party adversely affected, but that should not unduly delay a shift to the healthier and more sustainable forms of transport, which will ultimately bring benefits for everyone."</p>	<p>Our decarbonisation routemap on the 'way we travel' is one of the main items on today's agenda. This sets out a significant number of objectives that will influence our approach and actions that have been identified for delivery over the next 2-3 years. The evidence is clear that to achieve net zero emissions, public transport and active travel need to increase very significantly, to reduce reliance on car travel and free up road space for people who have no other option but to drive. Proposed actions will involve providing better infrastructure for active travel and public transport which our committed and future programmes of work will need to deliver. We also need to ensure that progressively all remaining motor vehicles transition to EV or zero emission technology.</p>

10.	Question from Sam Wakeling	
	<p>If Sheffield is to reduce car traffic significantly, should we stop increasing capacity for cars? The council's Arup climate report showed a need to reduce car traffic significantly but this is hard to spot in the route map. For example, should traffic creation schemes like Broadfield Road junction be stopped? As well as undermining pedestrian access at the junction, this scheme is designed to increase the 97% of general traffic on that route which is not buses as much as improving bus times, which will mean adding noise, danger and pollution on the road immediately past the most polluted school in Sheffield.</p>	<p>The Broadfield Road scheme is predominantly funded by a successful bid to the Government's National Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF). NPIF aims to support productivity and boost growth by providing additional capital investment in areas critical to productivity – housing, transport, digital infrastructure, and R&D</p> <p>The 2018 business case was submitted to the Department for Transport based on reducing existing journey times, improving journey time reliability, and reducing congestion by all traffic modes – as well as opening up a development site to accelerate business rates growth. This business case has led to the project currently on site, with a scheme that aims to create a high quality bus route on Chesterfield Road while also improving the adjacent parallel, well used, direct and largely low traffic Sheaf Valley cycle route through an improved crossing of Wolseley Road to compliment the investment through the Active Travel Fund.</p> <p>The 2019 Transport Strategy highlights that we need to make sure our transport networks are planned in unison – both separated, to ensure each mode does not unduly impede others and integrated, so people may use a variety of modes, to suit the nature of their journey, as well as supporting activity in and around adjacent buildings and land.</p> <p>In order to provide active travel capacity within Sheffield (which includes ensuring through traffic uses more appropriate routes), there will often be a need for minor junction improvements on Sheffield's Strategic Road Network, including the Inner Ring Road and other arterial routes such as Chesterfield Road/London Road.</p> <p>We will monitor traffic numbers and journey times at key junctions and routes over the first 12 months following the implementation of the scheme to determine if any further amendments to the scheme are required.</p>
11.	Question from Nasar Raof	

	<p>1. thank you for listening to us</p> <p>2. We believe red lines needs to come off the table to give businesses certainty, can that certainty be given ?</p> <p>3. Business impact assessment will this be done and in a meaningful way, which is not behind a desk in the council but coming and speaking to us the businesses ?</p> <p>4. From a post office perspective having spoken to customers and some vulnerable users that need us are going to massively loose out and will loose confidence in coming out do their houses ? Is this the direction of flow the council wishes to continue ?</p> <p>5. Constantly been throwing about by politicians is the issue of clean air and reducing traffic flow to protect our future generations, does the council understand and this committee how one can conclude a very hypocritical stance when areas like Burngreave, Northern general hospital, darnall and Tinsley child mortality rates for pollution and related symptoms is not being challenged ? Does the council have these figure for todays meeting?</p>	<p>The report on todays agenda recommends the implementation of bus priority works at or near specific junctions along London Road, Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, including amendments to sections of bus lanes and a system of traffic signal upgrades with buses given priority at junctions. Existing bus lane hours of operation on London Road, Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road corridors would be enforced using camera technology.</p> <p>A review of the public transport conditions on these corridors including an assessment will be undertaken following the implementation of these works to determine if further bus priority measures are required. There is no decision on red routes or changes to whole corridor bus lane hours of operation on today's agenda.</p> <p>Should any further measures be recommended through the review they will be evaluated carefully to consider the economic, equalities, environmental and other implications of any proposed changes.</p> <p>The project aims to assist local residents by providing more reliable and consistent bus services and localised improvements to pedestrian crossing points where feasible such as at the Ecclesall Road and Rustlings Road junction. The impact upon parking along both corridors from the proposed measures is limited to proposed amendments to parking restrictions near some of the proposed junction improvements. Statutory consultation will be required before any amendments to loading and waiting restrictions at or near junctions as part of the promotion of the Traffic Regulation Order.</p> <p>The Council and this Committee consider that the adverse health impacts of air quality as a key driver in our need to improve our transport system and take action on pollution. The Council has taken important decisions like the implementation of the Clean Air Zone to improve air quality which, as fleet improves in response to the zone, the benefits will be delivered in cleaner air across the city not just in the zone itself.</p>
12.	Question from Graham Wroe	

	<p>How will we meet our net zero target by 2030 unless we give buses and active travel priority over cars?</p> <p>Why is Ecclesall Road among the most dangerous roads in Europe and what can be done to make it safer?</p> <p>Is there any evidence, empirical or otherwise, that enforcement of parking restrictions has a negative impact on businesses?</p> <p>Is there any evidence that enforcement of parking restrictions has a positive impact on businesses?</p>	<p>Our decarbonisation routemap on the ‘way we travel’ is one of the main items on today’s agenda. This sets out a significant number of objectives that will influence our approach and actions that have been identified for delivery over the next 2-3 years. The evidence is clear that to achieve net zero emissions, public transport and active travel need to increase very significantly, to reduce reliance on car travel and free up road space for people who have no other option but to drive. Proposed actions will involve providing better infrastructure for active travel and public transport which our committed and future programmes of work will need to deliver. We also need to ensure that progressively all remaining motor vehicles transition to EV or zero emission technology.</p> <p>The number of road traffic collisions that have occurred on the A625 Ecclesall Road corridor means that it is considered amongst the worst routes in the country. A total of 27 A roads have been identified by the DfT for improvement because of the number of fatal and serious injury collisions occurring. We are currently investigating a range of potential interventions to improve the safety of the route which we will undertake engagement and consultation on later this year. Funding has been made available by the Department for Transport and we have been allocated £1.425m to deliver the project.</p> <p>The effective management of kerbside space is recognised as having many benefits and no matter what yellow line waiting or loading restrictions, parking places, bus lanes or other measures that are in place they are only as effective as the adherence to them. Unfortunately, we know that people don’t always abide by the rules and the need to enforce restrictions is essential.</p>
13.	Question from Ruth Hubbard	
	<p>My question is about the London Rd and Broadfield Rd “improvements” currently underway.</p> <p>The scheme appears to go back to 2017 with predictions then that the scheme would allow for 300,000 extra car journeys.</p>	<p>Thank you for your question relating to the scheme at the junction of Broadfield Road and the A61 Chesterfield Road / London Road.</p> <p>The 2018 ‘National Productivity Investment Fund (NPIF)’ business case was submitted to the Department for Transport based on reducing existing journey times, improving journey time reliability, and reducing congestion</p>

In all the papers, reports and revisions back to 2017 I can find only one small section referencing air quality, in the original bid to the National Productivity Investment Fund. This section appears to acknowledge that air quality is poor in this area, with a belief stated that the air quality impact will be neutral. This appears to be based on the idea of a trade-off between more traffic and reductions in congestion. When the parallel Abbeydale Rd is so clogged we are not going to see a free-flowing London Rd anytime soon. We all know that most of the time enabling more traffic also enables more congestion, we're just talking dodgy science.

2017 is a long time ago and a lot has happened with the scheme since then, including revisions. Not only have I found no other references to air quality than the original bid, I have also found no reference to any discussion or actions with Lowfield Primary school which lies adjacent to this scheme for generating much more traffic. I was very surprised to learn this might be how the council does business in the context of understanding the impact of pollution, and a climate emergency declaration.

What we also now know that Lowfield Primary is the school with the worst air pollution in Sheffield. In fact, the pollution levels are so high here they are just about the same levels as Tinsley Infant and Junior school that led to its move to another site (which is, of course, what some experts have called for at Lowfield Primary). Lowfield Primary also has over 97% of its children from ethnic minority backgrounds, with over 40% eligibility for free school meals. Amongst the 385 small bodies for which air pollution is so systemically toxic there will, of course, also be a significant proportion of children who have additional physical health vulnerabilities.

So we have the most polluted school in Sheffield, and now the much delayed London Rd/Broadfield Rd scheme on site that appears to have paid quite extraordinarily scant attention over six years to anything to do with air quality in the scheme.

by all traffic modes – as well as opening up a development site to accelerate business rates growth.

The project currently on site, aims to create a high quality bus route on Chesterfield Road while also improving the adjacent parallel, well used, direct and largely low traffic Sheaf Valley cycle route through an improved crossing of Wolseley Road to compliment the investment through the Active Travel Fund.

With regards to the Air Quality concern, Sheffield City Council monitor across the district to understand the impact of Air Quality on our district and safeguard our residents from elevated levels of pollution.

Lowfield Community Primary School currently has a real-time monitor located onsite to allow for Sheffield City Council to observe concentrations of NO2 and PM and benchmark the against health-related objectives. We are confident that the results observed from current monitoring shows compliance with existing UK Air Quality Objectives. The 2022 data has been reported to national government in our Annual Status Report and shows that concentrations at the school have fallen over the last 5 years, are below the objectives and remain so after a return to post pandemic behaviours. We are awaiting national government sign-off for the Annual Status Report, but data and a draft copy of the report is available upon request. The report remains classified as draft until national government signoff has been given and will be published on the council's website once ratification process has been completed.

With reference to the data, please find the table below, which shows no exceedance of health-related objectives for the last 5 years at Lowfield Lane School

Council Realtime Monitoring Data at Lowfield Lane;

	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022
NO2	32	31	22	27	27

<p>Maybe there are things not in the public domain or that I've not found....</p> <p>Can the council comment please on the approach it is taking given very serious air quality issues and Lowfield Primary. What discussions have taken place with Lowfield about the exceedingly high levels of pollution and its impacts - both generally, and in respect of the now revised road scheme here? What actions are involved? What monitoring or mitigations are in place or under way, and why doesn't there appear to be any information in the public domain? Why does there appear to be little or no attention paid to air quality for this particular scheme over six years since inception and did any alarm bells ring on the recent reporting of just how badly Lowfield primary is affected by pollution? Do you agree an early seemingly casual claim of neutrality six years ago (arguably based on dodgy science) and with no updates in relation to changes since then, provides no basis for public confidence?</p>	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>PM10</td> <td>18</td> <td>17</td> <td>12</td> <td>11</td> <td>10</td> </tr> <tr> <td>PM2.5</td> <td>18</td> <td>11</td> <td>7</td> <td>7</td> <td>6</td> </tr> </table> <p>Notwithstanding this, over the last 6 years Sheffield City Council has worked to deliver its Clean Air Strategy, Council Air Quality Action plan and Clean Air Plan, which included delivery of the Clean Air Zone.</p> <p>Using model outputs from the Clean Air Plan works it is predicted that there will be further reductions in NO2 concentrations will occur along Queens Road A61 because of the Clean Air Zone.</p> <p>In addition to the Clean Air Zone work, Sheffield City Council recognise the benefit to resident health and wider environment from continued improvement, which is why the authority will continue to conduct monitoring of concentrations within the district and review council policy & action plans to meet the needs of the district.</p> <p>Sheffield City Council is able to offer support to Lowfield Primary School in order for it to become ModeshiftSTARS accredited. The ModeshiftSTARS scheme aims to reduce the number of families travelling to school by car, which in turn would help to tackle air pollution. As part of the scheme we would help the school set up and run a variety of activities, training sessions and incentive schemes to encourage families to choose an alternative to using the car for the school run.</p> <p>The Council declared a climate emergency in 2019 and made the commitment to become net zero by 2030. We have published several reports to help share important information on our work and progress on climate change and encourage others to also act. This has included Our Pathways to Decarbonisation reports that were produced 2020, and our 10-point plan for climate action that was approved by the Council in 2021. Our Sustainability and Climate Change Team publish a bi-monthly e-newsletter covers activities that both the Council as well as others are delivering in the city. All of these documents can be found on the climate</p>	PM10	18	17	12	11	10	PM2.5	18	11	7	7	6
PM10	18	17	12	11	10								
PM2.5	18	11	7	7	6								

		<p>emergency response pages of our website and include a link to sign-up to our e-newsletter.</p> <p>In July, the Transport Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee approved the first chapters our decarbonisation routemap. This includes the actions we will take as an organisation, with the overall goal that by 2030 the Council will have reduced its emissions to 95% to lead by example as a net-zero organisation, as well as how we will reduce transport-related emissions by over 400 kilotonnes of carbon through actions such as increasing active travel and public transport patronage, as well as shifting to zero emissions electric vehicles.</p> <p>We are now working on an annual report, which will set out how the progress we have made as a city and as council, and is planned be presented to this Committee for approval before the end of this year.</p>
14.	Question from Oliver Feghali	
	<p>“Has this process been deliberately made difficult for disabled people to gatekeep the passes?” - Kit Dargue</p> <p>“How much council time is spent renewing bus passes each year? How could this time be better spent?/It seems to me that the council time spent on renewing bus passes each year could be put to much better use.” - Kit Swanson</p> <p>“My mother-in-law is absolutely sick of the hoops that disabled people are forced to jump through every day. Whether it’s PIP, getting disabled access in certain locations or applying for a bus pass. You could make it so much easier with so little effort. Will you?” - Aidan Cassidy</p> <p>“Who is responsible for decisions relating to the disabled bus application process?” - Emily Bartholomew</p> <p>“Do you think the current application process is accessible for those who need it? It seems to exclude those with long term disabilities.” - Emily Bartholomew</p>	<p>Absolutely not, we have to follow DfT and South Yorkshire Mayoral Guidelines around what we can accept as evidence for customers who are not classified an ‘automatic’ eligibility typically through a qualifying benefit</p> <p>Again, we have to follow DFT guidance and invite reapplication. Difficult to give actual time spent but we only need to work reapplication for 1 yr. bus pass based on specific criteria i.e. Unable to drive due to certain medial conditions such as Epilepsy.</p> <p>We try and make applications as straight forward as possible, but as above, we must follow government guidelines around eligibility.</p> <p>SCC have delegated duty to look at eligibility but again, this is based on Dft Guidelines.</p> <p>I cannot see any problems with accessibility. Customer can apply under a variety of channels such as Face to Face, Online etc. We will be more than happy to look at any issues that customers have.</p>

	<p>"What are the difficulties associated with removing barriers to accessible public transport for disabled people by means of making the application process easier and providing a 5 year bus pass for people with long term conditions" - Oliver Feghali</p> <p>"Why is there a difference in the level of bus pass for different illnesses, who determines these?" - Liv Dunphy</p> <p>"Do you think it is fair that people with chronic illnesses have to re-prove their disability to you every year?" - Liv Dunphy</p> <p>"How do you think the disabled community of Sheffield should commute to the local community?" - Liv Dunphy</p>	<p>Where we can we do issue for 5 years, it is only specific conditions that we issue for less based on guidelines for example, if a customer has applied under Epilepsy, according to DVLA if they are seizure free for a certain length of time customers can apply for their license back so would therefore not qualify.</p> <p>Please see above</p> <p>Again, this is what we have to do based on DfT Criteria but always happy to discuss with individual customers to offer support and / or advice as to other ways of accessing such as PIP etc.</p> <p>Not sure this is question for individual officers</p>
15.	Question from Emily	
	<p>I would like to submit this question to this week's committee. It aligns with the Net Zero Transport Roadmap on Wednesday's agenda. I will not be able to attend myself due to work commitments. Can my question to be read out by the person who I believe is presenting the Sheaf Valley cycle route extension petition?</p> <p>My question is: How can we have confidence in the council's transport decarbonisation goals when there are tens of millions of pounds sitting unspent for incomplete active travel projects?</p>	<p>The city does have an ambitious programme of active travel improvements in development and we expect that many of these will be reaching implementation over the next 12months. Through the transformational changes that are planned we are committed to delivering major improvements in cycling and walking in the city and the role these will play in creating a more sustainable transport network in line with our decarbonisation goals.</p>
16.	Question from James Martin	
	<p>"With note to the evidence that follows and supplied to the committee in advance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> How does the current policy ensure that people with dementia (or other conditions listed and unlisted) are automatically and efficiently issued with a bus pass, or why has SCC gone against the guidance and why? Is the difficulty and refusal to issue occurred due to an SCC decision to reduce budgets? 	<p>We always adhere to guidance. Would need to understand where this has not been met</p> <p>No, processing is purely based on eligibility.</p>

<p>3. Will SCC work with SYMCA to ensure that 5-year passes covered by the evidence submitted are issued directly by Travel South Yorkshire so that SCC administration can be redeployed to other areas with a backlog such as Blue Badge Issuing?"</p> <p>Evidence: "Thanks to Howard for the clear breakdown: Considering the DFT document: "Guidance to local authorities on assessing eligibility of disabled people in England for concessionary bus travel" Version 1.2</p> <p>https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/919050/eligibility-review.pdf</p> <p>The relevant parts are:</p> <p>54. Under Section 92 of the Road Traffic Act 1988 the Secretary of State may refuse to issue a driving licence on the grounds of the applicant's medical fitness. Those who are currently barred from holding a licence are people with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. epilepsy (unless it is of a type which does not pose a danger - see below); b. severe mental disorder; c. liability to sudden attacks of giddiness or fainting (whether as a result of cardiac disorder or otherwise); d. inability to read a registration plate in good light at 20.5 metres (with lenses if worn); e. other disabilities which are likely to cause the driving of vehicles by them to be a source of danger to the public. <p>58. There are a number of categories of "severe mental disorder" under which people may qualify. Authorities will need to assess individuals on a case-by-case basis as eligibility may depend on the severity of the condition. Such conditions include (but are not limited</p>	<p>This is already in place, customers with qualifying benefits / criteria can apply direct to SYMCA</p>
--	--

to) dementia (or any organic brain syndrome); behaviour disorders (including post head injury syndrome and Non-Epileptic Seizure Disorder); and personality disorders.

56. It is not a condition of entitlement under this category that the disabled person should apply for and be refused a driving licence (which would be unduly burdensome for everyone involved). If, for people with any of the disabilities (b) - (d) listed above, the local authority can be confident that a licence would be refused it should therefore be able to issue the travel pass automatically.

Section 58 confirms Section 54b and section 56 confirms that a pass should be issued automatically (and where a condition such as dementia clearly will not improve it seems inefficient to not issue a pass for the full 5 years).

Addendum from James:

Further to this, any other guidance clarifications from the DfT do not clarify, amend or alter the above referenced clauses (benefits is not the only automatic qualification unless SCC and SYMCA are saying whole aspects of the guidance are being struck out in effect!).

Please also note, though problematic there are other areas of impairment that are issued with a five year pass having jumped through the (distressing and frustrating) hoops.”

This page is intentionally left blank