

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

Meeting held 15 June 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Mazher Iqbal (Co-Chair – In the Chair) Julie Grocutt (Co-Chair), Mazher Iqbal (Co-Chair), Christine Gilligan (Deputy Chair), Andrew Sangar (Group Spokesperson), Ian Auckland, Craig Gamble Pugh, Dianne Hurst, Ruth Mersereau and Richard Shaw

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

2. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 Councillor Richard Shaw declared a personal interest in Agenda Item No. 7, Budget Monitoring Report Month 01, 2022/23, as his employer is a tenant at Electric Works, which is referred to in the papers.

3.2 Councillor Andrew Sangar declared a personal interest in Agenda Item No. 10, 20mph Speed Limit Scheme in Crosspool, as a local ward Member.

3.3 Councillor Ian Auckland declared a personal interest in Agenda Item No. 11, 20mph Speed Limit Scheme in Woodseats, as a local ward Member.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

4.1 The Policy Committee received an electronic petition “Stop Cross Border Vehicles Using SCC Bus Gates/Lanes, Approved Test Centres”. There was no speaker to this petition. The petition was noted and the petitioner be provided with a written response in respect of the cross border vehicle issue. The approved test centre issue be referred to the Waste & Street Scene Policy Committee.

4.2 Question from Geoff Cox, representing the South Yorkshire Climate Alliance:

I would like to remind the Committee of the Arup report, the question relates to decarbonisation of privately owned housing stock; will the Council set up a impartial advice centre for homeowners who wish to invest in this way? It will stimulate the market and have regeneration and climate benefits for a relatively small investment.

The Chair stated that he would be meeting with the petitioner next week to discuss the issue further. Earlier this year the Climate Change, Economy and Development Transitional Committee undertook a short review of domestic retrofit in Sheffield. The review acknowledged the urgency of acting on climate change and the need to push forward at our earliest opportunity to introduce and support Domestic Retrofit in Sheffield. A report is being drafted on the back of these sessions and will be shared with the committee and relevant officers to consider how we move forward, including how we support homeowners to decarbonise their properties. The Council will further explore how it supports and delivers retrofit programmes as part of the development of a Housing Decarbonisation Route-map for the city, and will include engagement with residents, communities and other organisations across the city to support delivery.

4.3 Question from David Cobley:

In Month 1 of this financial year SCC have an overspend of circa £19m of which the Transport Regeneration & Climate budgets have contributed £1.7M and further against this Streetscene and Regulation, which includes Parking, has contributed an overspend of £1.1m for Month 1.

In answer to a FOIR, Highways Officers have advised this scheme will cost some £650,000 to set up, will incur annual running costs of £241,000 and will achieve income of only £57,000 annually. This amounts in round terms to costing over 4 times more to run against income perceived... I repeat 4 times as much! Leaving aside that the TRO consultation has provoked considerable opposition – ie it is a fact that by even by 23 March 2022 1077 responses had been received of which 895 were objections, that well in excess of 2000 individuals have signed a petition asking for the scheme to be abandoned, then in order this committee can provide maximum budget savings to offset the aforementioned overspend, which in itself could lead to commissioners being appointed by central government, then my first question is whether or not the Scheme is already accounted for in the financial budget for 2022/23?

2. Secondly If so then would it not make financial common sense to abandon the current scheme in its entirety forthwith vis the current savings now required by the Director of Finance?

3. Thirdly If not then will the council be able to justify a future scheme which runs at a considerable year on year loss in any event?

4. For my final question a local councillor stated in writing on the Norfolk Park Facebook site on 17 October 2019 that “Residents will have an opportunity to design a scheme.....” “... it won’t be a council one imposed on them” “... it won’t be huge or it’ll be too unwieldy”

None of this has happened except the scheme covers some 67 roads across 2 wards and is indeed unwieldy! Councillors Fox and Miskell have also stated at the last LAC East meeting and in an email that if the majority of residents are not in favour of the scheme it will not be imposed by the Council.

Could you please confirm the number of responses to the Citizen Space survey and also the number responding to the council by separate email and letter. In each case please confirm the number of responses which objected to the scheme.

The Chair stated that the Budget monitoring item will be on every agenda of this committee to monitor it. Current schemes are proposed in line with the 2018 Parking Strategy, which sets out the ways in which we will manage parking in order to achieve our wider aims in transport and land use planning. The scheme consultation has provided residents and local businesses the opportunity to comment on the proposals and this will be reported in full, along with survey data, to the Committee meeting in September 2022 to decide whether a scheme, in some form, should proceed to implementation.

The cost and income figures that have been quoted are estimated figures based on the scheme size at this time. The scheme is still in the early stages of development and assumptions have been made at this point. As the scheme moves to its design stage and the number of bays are established, the figures for the installation, administration and income related to the scheme will become more precise.

The £57k annual income is an estimate based on the potential number of permits expected to be issued, – at this stage it does not include the potential revenue from pay and display bays or Penalty Charge Notices. We will be reviewing the potential scale of this income as part of the scheme development but our initial estimates indicate that it is expected that this would cover the annual running costs and partly offset the initial implementation costs. The full financial implications will be reported to Committee as part of the decision making process.

Results of consultation: Citizen space - 1088 responses, 879 objections, 37 in support and the remainder did not give an answer to this question and neither objected or supported in their written text.

Emails - There have been 260 emails into our inboxes. 128 of these were objections, 7 were in support and the remainder were asking questions about the scheme or requesting paper copies of plans.

Letters - We have received 15 letters. 13 were objecting to the scheme, 2 were supporting the scheme.

With regard to Councillors comments, it is important that we listen to residents, regardless of their comments being positive or negative. There is a commitment to keep residents informed throughout and the decision will be taken in September after taking on board all comments.

4.4 Question from David Cobley:

For over 30 years the residents of Donnington Road and Norfolk Park Avenue have continued to campaign for some form of traffic calming/speed reduction measures given the fatal accident which took the life of young Georgina Stubbs. Subsequent to that accident No right and left turn restrictions were imposed at the junctions of Essex Road, Holdings Road, Donnington Road with St Aidans Road. Unfortunately, these restrictions are largely ignored by those using the roads, in

particular Donnington Road, be they locals or those using it as a rat run with dozens of vehicles ignoring the restrictions daily. South Yorkshire Police cannot or will not reply to a FOI asking the numbers of Penalty Notices issued to the literally 100's of drivers ignoring the restrictions. The guess amongst locals is that these breaches are not being policed and the situation is worsening daily with no Notices actually issued

For the last 3 years or so our Councillor Richards has been leading attempts to install some form of traffic calming but without success and consultations we were told would occur on 3rd and then 10th March 22 have not happened. However in the last few days she has informed us that " I have been assured that the Donnington Rd plans have been drafted. I have seen an early draft. As you know, no traffic calming is being undertaken by the council due to costs but we have indicated that we would use our CIL money to implement a scheme." and further she said that the CIL money is already there to use now.

Assuming this is correct it is disconcerting not to see any mention of such plans etal in the work programme. Could you please confirm that a draft scheme for traffic calming measures etc for the roads in question is in draft form, that the finance is available via CIL and when the consultation will occur."

The Chair stated that the local Member had requested that options for Traffic Calming on Donnington Road were developed by our Engineers. As we currently look to prioritise investment in accident saving schemes based on Citywide accident data, this site is not included in this years programme. The developed options have been sent to the Local Area Committee to decide whether they can fund such a scheme.

However, following a recent change to legislation the Council do now have the opportunity to choose to apply for enforcement powers to use camera enforcement for moving traffic offences such as people driving through banned turns, the wrong way on one-way streets, etc.

Given the limitations on current SY Police resources this would potentially provide an ability for SCC to take action at locations such as this where the abuse of restrictions is having an adverse impact on safety, wellbeing and effective movement of traffic. This will be the subject of a future committee paper. Regarding the Freedom of information request to the Police I would suggest that you contact Police and Crime Commissioner.

4.5 Question from Steve Burgin in relation to the Park Hill/Norfolk Park permit scheme:

Given

- The council is heading for an £18m - ~£60m plus shortfall in 22/23.
- 90+% of respondents in the consultation were not in favour of the scheme.
- Initial council calculations show a loss of £184k per year on running costs vs income.
- The proposed scheme would cost 4.22 times more to run than it would bring in.
- And in line with Cllr Fox's statement at the last LAC (witnessed, currently

un-minuted, but to be corrected) that if the 'local community' didn't want the scheme it would be shelved,

Can this committee now formally close down the proposed scheme and if necessary, work with local residents on the roads affected to realise a solution?

The Chair referred to the response to the earlier question and stated that the decision will be taken by the committee in September and gave a commitment to something that works for the community.

4.5 Question from Sandra France about the Park Hill and Norfolk Park parking scheme:

Why has the communication and administration of this scheme been so poor ? Residents have asked many times for a meeting or workshops with Councillors and the Transport Dept to answer questions about this scheme and have had no response. This was also promised at the Full council meeting. Some houses affected have not even received notifications or letters about this scheme, how can they comment on this. The whole administration and communication has been appalling, with conflicting or no information being given and no responses to emails or queries. Our councillor always promising to find out and get back to residents but never does.

This proposal has upset so many people, worried their road is going to look like a car park and having to find extra money. I would hope that Sheffield Council has learnt lessons from the Tree Saga which was and continues to be an embarrassment to Sheffield. It has been noted many times that peoples experience of engaging with the Council is not positive and difficulties getting responses to concerns and issues.

Please listen to the concerns of our neighbours, your constituents, and engage with us. Councillors keep saying they want to work together to deliver a better future for Sheffield and listen to their constituents more, so do this. I would like to add that you have said you will involve us in the final decision in September and I hope this will be done and also be involved in the traffic calming decisions.

The Chair stated that the size of the Parkhill scheme meant that it was decided to send out a postcard with important information (such as scheme operation times, permit prices etc) and have the plans available online and in two designated public spaces. We also offered to send out copies of plans showing the restrictions outside individual resident's houses should people not be able to access the plans any other way. Many residents took us up on this offer.

We have sent out 1 leaflet and a follow up letter extending the consultation deadline. We were aware of an error on the Citizen Space survey where the incorrect scheme operation times were displayed but this was corrected within 24 hours. The post cards were delivered by Royal mail. We were informed of some addresses that had not received a postcard and we then followed up and sent out additional postcards as soon as we were made aware. We extended the consultation end date to ensure these people had enough time to submit a response to the scheme. There were also A3 street notices placed on every street

about the scheme and how to find out more information.

33% of residents and businesses have been in touch through our consultation which is a high response rate. It is disappointing that you (Ms France) feel that the administration and communication has been appalling. All emails that have come into the “parking scheme” inbox in relation to this scheme have been acknowledged and any specific queries have been answered.

Specifically relating to Ms France, the client Officer for the scheme has had several email exchanges with her. She has also visited her home to hand deliver plans and spare leaflets, as requested, as well as an in-person conversation about the scheme during one of these visits. We don't get it right all of the time and for that I apologise. We need to ensure information is identified as important for residents. Concerns were picked up by officers and efforts made to ensure the right information was made available.

4.6 Question from Nigel Slack:

On the 6th May 2022, LRC UK Ltd, as the owners of Chapel Walk House, were served an improvement notice for the apartments (common parts) based on the Council's belief that a 'Category 1 Hazard exists at the premises and remedial action is required'. A Category 1 Hazard is defined as having 'a serious and immediate risk to a person's health and safety' under the Housing Health and Safety Rating System. It also indicates that the remedial work must begin by 28th June 2022.

What exactly is the hazard this notice covers? Has any response been received from LRC UK Ltd about the issue and will they commence the remedial works within the timescale? Why has it taken so long for the hazard to come to light, when the development was approved in May 2017 and has already included a 6 month halt in work, from November 2017, due to asbestos contamination? The apartments finally opened in March 2021, how many people have been exposed to this 'Category 1 Hazard' since then, either within the apartments, the retail premises or on the street? What more can SCC say about the process from here and whether there are ongoing hazards to tenants of the apartments or anybody else?

The Chair stated that as the notice was served by the Housing Team, the question should be referred to the relevant Housing Committee. A written response will be provided.

4.7 Question from Nigel Slack:

Congratulations to SCC in retaining the important role of 'Heritage Champion' within the city's new Committee Structure. This was not a foregone conclusion during the transition process but, following input from the public engagement process, I am pleased to see the retention of the Champion role. Congratulations to Cllr Ridler, I hope she sees the value of the role in protecting and promoting the role of Heritage spaces in the Sheffield economy (estimated at £240M a year). It will be challenging in the face of the city's budget problems but a gentle

reminder that once heritage is sold or demolished it is lost forever.

How will the role of the heritage champion fit into the work of this committee?

The Chair stated that the Committee both notes and welcomes the continuation of the role of Heritage Champion, which is important for a city such as Sheffield given its rich and varied heritage offers. We wish Cllr Ridler every success and also extend our thanks to Cllr Mike Drabble for the time and commitment he has dedicated to this role in the past. The Heritage Champion will be able to influence positively the various workstreams this committee will lead on, and I am sure this will include working closely with officers and partners on key city projects. In fulfilling this role, the Heritage Champion will be able to provide feedback to this and other Committees moving forward, ensuring heritage is represented in the positive light that it should be.

4.8 Question from David Bamford, in respect of the Active Travel Round 3 funding. David did not attend the meeting and will be sent a written response to his question.

4.9 Question from Bridget Ingle:

I would like to say that Sheffield City Council is doing a fantastic job with its regeneration of the city. Why is Sheffield City Council not taking a more proactive approach to removing graffiti tagging from Sheffield City Centre? It is even ignored in and around the key regeneration areas of the Heart of the City.

While I appreciate that Leeds and Sheffield are different cities, there is not one piece of graffiti tagging in their centre. Sheffield and Leeds both have the same graffiti removal policies. And presumably similar financial constraints. Why is it possible in Leeds and not Sheffield? It has a major impact on Sheffield's streetscene and its reputation for being dirty and untidy.

The Chair stated that an uplift survey was commissioned by Highways Maintenance Division and the City Centre Management Team and will involve a purge on a number of high profile, privately owned areas to provide a general uplift to the core retail and hospitality areas of the city centre to make these areas more appealing for the summer months. This will include use of a cherry picker to remove prominent graffiti from high levels such as above shop canopies on the Moor to provide a more welcoming streetscene aesthetic.

It is envisaged this "push" on privately owned buildings will require repeated and sustained removals over the coming months will also include city gateways, as well as City Centre Management Team liaising with the businesses themselves to enable them to manage their own graffiti moving forward, endeavouring to creating a city centre where graffiti is obliterated as soon as it is done in order to render practices such as tagging pointless for those undertaking it their tag no longer lingers in situ.

The Council's highways maintenance division have reached out to all major utility cabinet companies (BT Openreach and Virgin Media) and asked for a push from

their side in repainting their infrastructure in the city centre. Funding has been identified and businesses in the target areas have been written to and informed of the cleaning which will commence on the 13th June , works to be completed in time for the University Open days and the Euro's.

A new group has been created to look at a long term partnership solution this includes partners from SYP , BTP , Sheffield BID and other external bodies such as the Universities.

- 4.10 Question from Claire Mappin, in respect of "Event Central" 20-26 Fargate. Claire was unable to attend and will be provided with a written response.
- 4.11 Questions from Emily Griffiths, in respect of decision making, engagement and school street pilots. Emily was unable to attend and will be provided with a written response.
- 4.12 Question from Nasar Raoof, GMB, Branch Secretary, with responsibility to represent Taxi Drivers in the region:

Members are going through a tsunami of debt, due to Covid 19 pandemic, increases in bills and fuel prices. Pre lock down the cost of vehicles was nowhere near the market value for new and used vehicles now. Part used vehicles are now 15-20k and new over 25k. Paying that as a working-class Taxi Driver is very hard, so are now urging Sheffield City Council to reconsider the financial support it is giving, or alternatively, follow Greater Manchester, putting investment into incentives and consult the trade. Due to lock down and measures such as cycle lanes and working from home, have reduced emissions. Red areas are now coming into amber or green, so we would ask for a new assessment to be done and for now a pause on clean air zones, until a better assessment can be made. They are spending a lot of time doing benefits and hardship claims for drivers. Would urge the Council to follow suit like Andy Burnham has done in Greater Manchester, tell the Government to dig deep in terms of support and put the initiative on hold for 2-3 years. Stand in support of a community that has helped the community during the pandemic.

The Chair stated that the question was submitted after the deadline for this committee, so a detailed response isn't available immediately. He stated that the cost of living crisis is impacting everyone. This Council is formally signed up to the CAZ. Government are due to sign this off in the next 7-10 days. I can give a commitment today to ask Officers to take on board the comments made. Officers confirmed that a decision had been taken on 12/10/21 that led to the submission of our final business case and we are expecting the Government's decision soon.

The Chair identified that financial assistance is key, and options should be considered. The Committee needs to be furnished with the up to date figures with regard to air pollution. Officers indicated that the Council had been seeking approval from government to make changes to financial support for replacement vehicles. Funding of £20.4m has currently been awarded. Should this be successful, a further £8m stretch fund can be drawn down if required. It was noted that a Members briefing was to be set up and a meeting with Taxi drivers

GMB representatives was to be set up. The Chair stated that a written response would be provided.

5. TRANSPORT, REGENERATION AND CLIMATE POLICY COMMITTEE OVERVIEW

- 5.1 A presentation providing an initial overview of the service area for the new committee was introduced by Kate Martin, Executive Director, City Futures.

The presentation covered the role, scope and remit of the Committee. The slides cover the service areas and policy issues the Committee covers. She stressed the transformational nature of the services covered, sitting within the City Futures portfolio.

The presentation covered the following policy areas:

Regeneration and Property Services

- City Centre Vision and Heart of the City
- Physical regeneration of other areas of the City
- Levelling up funding
- Stocksbridge town centre

Planning and Local Plan

- Future sustainable development
- Design standards
- Protection of Green spaces and Heritage
- Land for new homes and jobs

Strategic Transport and Infrastructure

- Connecting Sheffield
- City Region Sustainable Transport
- Economic and Environmental issues
- Net zero
- Managing flood and water

Members received and noted the details of the presentation and thanked officers for the detailed information. With regards to the next steps on the Local Plan it was stated that, prior to the decision making stage, there would be an internal process of sharing details of draft sites, before wider public consultation. The outcomes of the Active Travel Phase 3 bid was discussed and it was stated that a briefing with members could be arranged on this issue.

6. WORK PROGRAMME

- 6.1 The Committee received a report containing the Committee's Work Programme for consideration and discussion. The aim of the Work Programme is to show all known, substantive agenda items for forthcoming meetings of the Committee, to

enable this committee, other committees, officers, partners and the public to plan their work with and for the Committee. It was highlighted that this is a live document and Members input to it was invaluable. Sections 3-5 in the report; References from Council and petitions were noted.

It was noted that Members would consider the content of the Work programme in detail over the summer, before the next meeting. Members referred to the Sheaf Valley cycle route scheme proposals and it was noted that there will potentially be a need to bring this issue forward for a decision urgently to ensure that the scheme can move forward for delivery. It was also stated that Community Infrastructure Levy was an issue that this Committee may wish to consider as part of its Work Programme.

6.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:-

1. agrees the Committee's Work Programme as set out in Appendix 3; and
2. agrees to give consideration to any further issues to be explored by officers for inclusion in the next work programme report, for potential additions and adjustments to the work programme.

7. **BUDGET MONITORING REPORT MONTH 01, 2022/23**

7.1 This report brings the Committee up to date with the Council's financial position as at Month 1 2022/23. The report also reports the proposed budget timetable for the development of the 2023/24 budget.

7.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:-

1. notes the Council's challenging financial position and the Month 1 position;
2. notes the budget timetable set out in the report including the requirement for the Committee to plan to develop budget proposals over the course of the summer;
3. notes that the Strategy and Resources Committee agreed at its 31 May 2022 meeting to "require any Policy Committee that is forecasting an overspend on their budget to develop an action plan to address the overspend in-year and ask the Finance Sub-Committee to monitor both the development of any required action plans and delivery against them"; and
4. agrees to commission work from Officers to develop and implement plans to mitigate overspends and deliver stalled savings plans to bring forecast outturn back in line with budget, and to discuss opportunities for income generation.

7.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 7.3.1 Under section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003, the Chief Finance Officer of an authority is required to report on the following matters:
- the robustness of the estimates made for the purposes of determining its budget requirement for the forthcoming year; and
 - the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves.
- 7.3.2 There is also a requirement for the authority to have regard to the report of the Chief Finance Officer when making decisions on its budget requirement and level of financial reserves.
- 7.3.3 By the law the Council must set and deliver a balanced budget, which is a financial plan based on sound assumptions which shows how income will equal spend over the short- and medium-term. This can take into account deliverable cost savings and/or local income growth strategies as well as useable reserves. However, a budget will not be balanced where it reduces reserves to unacceptably low levels and regard must be had to any report of the Chief Finance Officer on the required level of reserves under section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003, which sets obligations of adequacy on controlled reserves.

7.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 7.4.1 The Council is required to both set a balance budget and to ensure that in-year income and expenditure are balanced. No other alternatives were considered.

8. **SHEFFIELD LOCAL TRANSPORT PROGRAMME 2022/23**

- 8.1 This report outlines the proposed Local Transport Plan capital programme covering the current financial year and seeks approval to proceed with development and implementation of the proposals subject to the necessary capital programme and traffic/route management approvals being obtained.

- 8.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:-

1. approves the proposed 2022/23 Local Transport Plan capital programme and the indicative allocation as attached in Appendix A to the report, noting that the 2022/23 programme includes items already approved as part of the 2021/22 Local Transport Plan capital programme that will continue to be delivered this financial year; and

2. To the extent that reserved commissioning decisions are required in order to progress these schemes to completion, delegates authority to make those decisions to the Head of Strategic Transport, Sustainability and Infrastructure.

8.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 8.3.1 The investment in local transport schemes will ultimately help to address the ambitions of Members and deliver against the requests of the Sheffield public, without reliance on external funding opportunities or incorporating these improvements into wider major investment projects. The primary objectives of the fund are detailed below:
- 8.3.2 The expected benefits from this fund are centred primarily on the community, with improved transport connectivity increasing mobility and accessibility, creating a greater sense of safety, enhancing the environmental amenity and improving health by supporting more active travel movements. In addition, there would be fewer road traffic collisions through design and modest associated mode shift.
- 8.3.3 The proposed transport capital programme balances the availability of funding sources with local and national policy to give a clear focus for the 2022/23 financial year. The proposed programme is extensive and ambitious which comes with its own challenges. The programme takes advantage of utilising external funding sources where possible to deliver impactful change to the transport system, considering environmental, economic and societal needs.

8.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 8.4.1 'Do nothing' has been considered, but is not considered appropriate as this will result in projects not being delivered. Both the LaNTP and the Road Safety Fund programmes would be not introduced, the opportunity for economic, environmental and societal benefits would be missed.
- 8.4.2 It would also be possible to consider different schemes as part of the programme. However, it is felt that the proposed programme achieves the greatest balance of economic, environmental and societal benefits to the communities and businesses in Sheffield.

9. **DOUBLE YELLOW LINES – WOLSELEY ROAD/STAVELEY ROAD AND GLOVER ROAD/LONDON ROAD**

- 9.1 The report seeks approval for the Wolseley Road / Staveley Road and Glover Road /London Road cycle improvement schemes as shown in Appendix 'A' and 'B' of the report and seeks approval to make the associated Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's), with recommended amendments as detailed, subject to authorisation of the project through the capital gateway process.
- 9.1.1 The schemes form part of the Sheaf Valley Active travel route. The report sets out the background to the scheme, consultation comments and officer recommendations.
- 9.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:-

1. approves the Wolseley Road / Staveley Road and Glover Road /London Road cycle improvement schemes, as shown in Appendix 'A' and Appendix 'B' of the report;

2. that the associated Traffic Regulation Orders as shown are made, subject to authorisation of the project through the capital gateway process; and

3. that arrangements be made for the Members of this Committee to visit the Sheaf Valley Active travel route.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

9.3.1 To ensure the two schemes, which contribute to the overall improvements on the 'Sheaf Valley Cycle Corridor' can be constructed when the contract is awarded.

9.3.2 Officers have considered alternative options involving representatives from 'Cycle Sheffield' and the previous Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport and on balance consider the proposals to be the best solutions to achieve the predicted benefits, maximising the benefits to the overall improvements to a key cycling route to and from the City Centre.

9.3.3 Officers have carried out a consultation with statutory consultees and frontages, making changes to parking and loading restrictions where possible.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 Glover Road / London Road

The existing Glover Road bollard closure is regularly blocked by parked vehicles, to the extent where it is difficult to find a way through for cyclists approaching from either direction without dismounting. Access to and from the crossing area on London Road is also regularly blocked by vehicles parking on the corner of Glover Road and London Road. The solution promoted provides further waiting restrictions in and around these key locations but also provides a planter arrangement for the closure to motor vehicles which should allow the passage of cyclists even if the promoted additional waiting restrictions are blocked by vehicles.

An alternative option could be to provide a much larger closure, for example from the junction with London Road, to tackle some of the current issues, however officers have tried to balance the preferred option described above with the retention of some space for loading and parking. The revised scheme following discussions with local residents also provides some alternative parking to offset spaces lost around the new closure.

Promoting a different route away from Glover Road is not feasible given that this provides the most direct and relatively traffic free corridor to and from the City Centre, away from the busy London Road / Chesterfield Road corridor which is, and will continue to be promoted as a key bus route. The route to and from London Road / Staveley Road along Glover Road is already popular with cyclists. These improvements (as part of a wider corridor scheme) aim to attract further cyclists in future.

9.4.2 Staveley Road / Wolseley Road

Two further options were considered to improve the junction of Staveley Road and

Wolseley Road for cyclists and discussed with the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, Council Officers and Cycle Sheffield representatives, held in early 2020.

Alternative Option 1

This option provided an off-line segregated crossing for both cyclists and pedestrians. Although this proposal provided a high-quality crossing facility, there was difficulty in providing a facility on the desire line without completely closing both the north side and south side of Staveley Road, which when considering existing closures and one-way systems in the area would be very difficult. The layout did propose to change access so that vehicles could only enter the South side from Wolseley Road and come out on to Wolseley Road from the northern side, however it was thought to be likely that this system would be abused by drivers and there were also questions in the meeting whether the crossing facility which was still off the desire line would be used.

Alternative Option 2

This option provided a kerb build out on the south side to narrow the crossing distance for pedestrians and cyclists. While this would be an improvement over the existing crossroads layout, at peak times and in queuing conditions it would still provide significant delay for cyclists at this location.

9.4.3 Preferred Option

Following an evaluation of the three options, all attendees of the meeting agreed that a solution which maintained a direct route through the junction using the low traffic 'on carriageway' roads on approach would be preferred. To give cyclists greater priority over the existing give way junction, the crossroads would be signalised, incorporating detection on both approaches to give priority over vehicles on Wolseley Road. A buildout would be incorporated into the layout to further narrow the crossing distance, improve visibility for crossing pedestrians and reduce speeds on Wolseley Road.

10. 20MPH SPEED LIMIT SCHEME IN CROSSPOOL

10.1 To report details of the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Crosspool, report the receipt of objections to the Traffic Regulation Order and set out the Council's response.

10.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:-

1. agrees to make the Crosspool 20mph Speed Limit Orders as advertised, Speed Limit Order as amended in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

2. Inform objectors accordingly;

3. Introduce the proposed 20mph speed limits as advertised; and

4. Introduce part time, advisory, 20mph speed limits on part of Lydgate Lane.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 The adoption of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy established the principle of introducing sign-only 20mph speed limits in all suitable residential areas. Reducing the speed of traffic in residential areas should, in the long term, reduce the number and severity of collisions, reduce the fear of accidents, encourage sustainable modes of travel and contribute towards the creation of a more pleasant, cohesive environment.
- 10.3.2 the former Executive Member made it clear that 20mph speed limits should continue to be introduced in residential areas in accordance with the City's 20mph Speed Limit Strategy as funds allow.
- 10.3.3 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Crosspool be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme in terms of safety or sustainability are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.
- 10.3.4 It is also recommended that a part time, advisory 20mph speed limit be introduced on Lydgate Lane outside Lydgate Primary school for the same reasons.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 In light of the objection's received consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Crosspool. However, such a recommendation would run contrary to the delivery of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. This would also mean that pedestrian and cyclist safety would not be improved, and this would be detrimental to the Council's Active Travel ambition and vision of Safer streets in our city.

11. **20MPH SPEED LIMIT SCHEME IN WOODSEATS**

- 11.1 To report details of the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Woodseats, report the receipt of objections and set out the Council's response
- 11.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:-
1. agrees to make the Woodseats 20mph Speed Limit Orders as advertised, Speed Limit Order as amended in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
 2. Inform objectors accordingly;
 3. Introduce the proposed 20mph speed limits; and
 4. Introduce part time, advisory, 20mph speed limits on part of Chesterfield Road

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 11.3.1 The adoption of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy established the principle of introducing sign-only 20mph speed limits in all suitable residential areas. Reducing the speed of traffic in residential areas should, in the long term, reduce the number and severity of collisions, reduce the fear of accidents, encourage sustainable modes of travel and contribute towards the creation of a more pleasant, cohesive environment
- 11.3.2 The former Executive Member has made it clear that 20mph speed limits should continue to be introduced in residential areas in accordance with the City's 20mph Speed Limit Strategy as funds allow.
- 11.3.3 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Woodseats be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme in terms of safety or sustainability are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.
- 11.3.4 It is also recommended that a part time, advisory 20mph speed limit be introduced on Chesterfield Road outside Woodseats Primary school for the same reasons.

11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 11.4.1 In light of the objections received consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Woodseats. However, such a recommendation would run contrary to the delivery of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. This would also mean that pedestrian and cyclist safety would not be improved, and this would be detrimental to the Council's Active Travel ambition and vision of Safer streets in our city.

12. **APPROVAL OF THE HUMBER RIVER BASIN DISTRICT FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN**

- 12.1 Sheffield City Council is a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and flood Risk Management Authority (RMA) as described in the Flood Risk Regulations 2009. These regulations require the RMAs to identify nationally significant flood risk areas (FRAs) and to prepare Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs) for the FRAs that they identify. These plans are required to be reviewed on a 5-year cycle.

The latest FRMPs have been prepared by the Environment Agency working in partnership with LLFAs across England. The draft plans were published online in autumn 2021 and a public consultation was held from 22 October 2021 to 21 January 2022. Following broad support for the plans it has been agreed to publish the final plan in line with the draft document without changes.

Ahead of publication of the final plans in autumn 2022 the Environment Agency has requested that all LLFAs acknowledge our responsibility in writing for our part in the FRMPs and confirm we have internal approval for publication of certain information provided to the Environment Agency.

The report outlines how approval of the FRMP as proposed is to the benefit of the City of Sheffield and will fulfil our responsibilities under the Flood Risk Regulations

2009 in the preparation of an appropriate plan.

12.2 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:-

1. acknowledges the Council's responsibility in writing, as requested by the Environment Agency, for our part, as Lead Local Flood Authority, in the Humber River Basin Flood Risk Management Plan; and

2. notes that this will fulfil our responsibilities under the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 to identify nationally significant Flood Risk Areas (FRAs) and to prepare Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs) for the FRAs that they identify.

12.3 Reasons for Decision

12.3.1 The Flood Risk Regulations 2009 require the Flood Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) to identify nationally significant flood risk areas (FRAs) and to prepare Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs) for the FRAs that they identify. These plans are required to be reviewed on a 5-year cycle

12.3.2 The Environment Agency, given its strategic oversight of flood risk across England, has led on the production of the latest FRMPs. Sheffield City Council, in common with our fellow Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs), have worked with the Environment Agency in preparing these plans. Ahead of their publication of the finalised plans the Environment Agency has requested that all LLFAs acknowledge our responsibility in writing for our part in the FRMPs and confirm we internal approval for publication of certain information provided to the Environment Agency.

12.3.3 Sheffield City Council approval of the Humber River Basin FRMP confirms our ongoing commitment to deliver our flood programme and acknowledges our statutory responsibilities but does not place any direct addition duties or burdens on us in itself.

12.3.4 Were we not to endorse this plan, as prepared in partnership with the Environment Agency, we would be required by the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 to prepare our own. Significant revenue and resources would be required to produce our own independent FRMP. This would result in delays and an additional unbudgeted cost.

12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

12.4.1 No reasonable alternative exists, we are being asked to endorse the plan already prepared in partnership and consulted on. FRMPs are a statutory requirement.

12.4.2 If we were not to sign up to the Regional Plan as prepared in partnership with the Environment Agency, then we would be required to prepare our own Sheffield specific FRMP from scratch. This would have significant resource implications and a significant unbudgeted revenue cost.