

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

POLICY COMMITTEE DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Thursday 15 December 2022 by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.

Item No

7. LEVELLING UP FUND - UPDATE CASTLEGATE

7.1 The committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that provided a progress update on the successful Gateway to Sheffield Round 1 Levelling Up Fund bid and set out recommendations to enable delivery of the three projects outlined in the Gateway to Sheffield Bid.

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

- a) Agrees that the resources identified in the Gateway to Sheffield LUF bid for the creation of development plots will be used in the first instance to make good two buildings on the Castle Site;
- b) Notes the exempt appendix 1 and 2 and authorise Officers to seek formal approval from the Department for Levelling Up Homes and Communities to relocate an element of the project to the Castle Site.

7.3 Reasons for Decision

7.3.1 The recommendations enable best use of the resources identified for development plots within the LUF funding allocation, ensure all project outputs are delivered and that LUF investment in the Castle Site is enhanced.

7.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

7.4.1 Do nothing

If the Council decided not to include the two buildings as development plots there is a risk that they would be left to deteriorate further and become an increasing blight on the Castle Site and Exchange Street. There is a risk that this will detract from the investment made on the remainder of the site.

7.4.2 Do More

Whilst there is no more funding available from DLUHC, one consideration would be to ask DHLUC to vire more of the funds allocated to the Gateway to Sheffield Project to do more than undertake initial repair of the buildings. However, this would be detrimental to other elements and the delivery of outputs for the project.

Additional applications for funding could be made but these would take time to secure and may jeopardise delivery of LUF scheme, project and outputs.

7.4.3 Chosen Option

The proposals in the report are considered to be the minimum required to ensure that the Gateway to Sheffield project can deliver the outputs required for the Levelling Up Fund as agreed with Government

8. **CAR/PERMIT-FREE DEVELOPMENT: PARKING PERMIT POLICY**

8.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that recommended approval of a policy confirming that residents of designated car/permit-free developments would not be eligible for residents' parking permits or business parking permits (for businesses registered at the car/permit-free address) in the local area. This was to be applied to all car/permit-free developments, both existing and future, where there is a relevant condition or directive on the planning permission.

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

a) Approves the *Car/Permit-Free Development Parking Permit Policy* that residents of properties which are designated as car/permit-free developments will not be issued with residents parking permits or business parking permits (for businesses registered at the car/permit-free address) in the local area, to be applied equally regardless of how the car/permit-free nature of the development was detailed in the planning permission (i.e. by condition and/or directive), aligning with the intention of the City Council as Local Planning Authority when the approval of planning permission was granted.

b) Notes that the text of the *Car/Permit-Free Development Parking Permit Policy*:

“Residents of developments designated as car/permit-free developments will not be issued with resident parking permits or business parking permits (for businesses registered at the car/permit-free address) in the local area where there is a permit scheme in place. Residents may be eligible for other types of parking permit (carer, visitor, Blue Badge) in the usual way according to the relevant criteria.”

8.3 **Reasons for Decision**

8.3.1 The proposed policy supports the refusal of parking permits for developments which have been assessed and designated as car/permit-free and is considered to strengthen how decisions in respect of issuing parking permits are made in the city.

8.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

8.4.1 The alternative option considered was to continue without formalising the position. This was felt to be unreasonable because the current position relied upon the planning decision without having any formalised policy in respect of refusing permits on the basis of developments being designated as car/permit-free.

9. **LOCAL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD TRANSPORT COMPLIMENTARY PROGRAMME AND ROAD SAFETY FUND PROGRAMMES - 22/23 DELIVERY UPDATE**

9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that updated on the delivery of the Local and Neighbourhood Transport Complimentary (formerly known as the Local Transport Plan) and Road Safety Fund capital programmes, as approved by committee on 15th June 2022.

It also seeks approval to proceed with taking variations within the programme through the Councils capital approval process.

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

- i. Notes progress on the Local and Neighbourhood Transport Complimentary (formally known as the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Block) and Road Safety Fund programmes, as approved by committee on 15th June 2022;
- ii. Approves the variations within the 2022/23 programmes (highlighted in section 1.11 and Appendix A), noting the individual projects will still need to go through the Councils capital process – to be approved by the Strategy and Resources committee
- iii. Notes the increase in spend profiled in 2023/24

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

9.3.1 The proposed LaNTP and RSF programmes balances the availability of funding sources with local and national policy to give a clear focus for the 2022/23

financial year, with an opportunity for changes to be considered by Committee that could be made in future years of the current 5-year programme. The proposed programme is extensive and ambitious which comes with its own challenges. The programme utilises internal and external funding sources and staff resources to deliver change to the transport system, considering environmental, economic and societal needs.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 'Do nothing' has been considered but is not considered appropriate as this would result in projects not being delivered. Both the LaNTP and the RSF programmes would not be introduced and the opportunity for economic, environmental and societal benefits will be missed.

9.4.2 It would also be possible to consider a different balance between types of schemes as part of the programme. However, it was felt that the proposed programme achieves a good balance of economic, environmental and societal benefits to the communities and businesses in Sheffield.

10. **DOUBLE YELLOW LINES 22/23 PROGRAMME**

10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City futures describing the measures to restrict inappropriate parking at three locations across the city through the introduction of double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) parking restrictions.

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

- a) Notes the representations received;
- b) Concludes that the reasons to support the proposals outweigh any unresolved objections;
- c) Approves the making of the Traffic Regulation Order, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- d) Approves the introduction of the associated double yellow lines as shown on the plans in Appendix B (Hoyland Road and Bawtry Road) and one plan from Appendix A (Southey Hill);
- e) Requests that officers inform the objectors accordingly.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 The proposed measures would address obstructive parking. This would improve

access and visibility and thereby safety for all road users. It would also achieve the removal of parking that obstructs footways and thereby improve pedestrian safety, accessibility and assist traffic flow. Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce the double yellow line restrictions be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 The only alternative was to not introduce any parking restrictions at these locations. This was not considered to be an acceptable option. The measures proposed would contribute to pedestrian safety by improving visibility at crossing points and prevent parking that blocks footways. The improvement of sight lines at junctions also contributes to vehicle safety. The removal of obstructive parking ensures accessibility for all vehicles, including emergency service vehicles
- 10.4.2 Without the introduction of the parking restrictions, outlined in the report, all road safety and accessibility issues, for both pedestrians and vehicles, would remain.
- 10.4.3 The beneficial effects of the proposed measures do not incur the penalty of having adverse effects on either the climate or the economy as there are none. No other alternatives to parking restrictions have been considered.

11. **PART-TIME ADVISORY 20MPH SPEED LIMITS OUTSIDE SCHOOLS**

- 11.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that informed Members about a proposed programme of part-time advisory 20mph speed limits outside schools using funding from the Road Safety Fund (RSF).
- 11.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:-
 - 1) welcomes the development of the programme, however it does not approve recommendations a) and b) as set out in the report.
(2 members voted in favour of approval of recommendations a) and b), 5 members voted against approval of recommendations a) and b) and 1 member abstained from the vote)
 - 2) the Committee therefore requests that officers (i) bring back a report to a future meeting with more background information on all schools in the city and other programmes of work impacting on school safety (e.g. 20mph area-wide zones, school streets etc) and (2) review the scoring mechanism, to enable the committee to make a more informed decision.

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 11.3.1 Advisory 20mph speed limits outside schools are a low-cost method of reducing speeds at the start and end of the school day in the vicinity of the school. They act to slow drivers at the time of day when vulnerable young people are walking to or

from school.

11.3.2 20mph advisory limits in these chosen locations is a cost effect way of achieving the following outcomes:

- Reduction in traffic speeds
- Improve road safety for all by reducing the number and severity of road traffic collisions
- Safer school entrances
- Promote a more pleasant local environment and encourage active journeys
- Improve air quality

11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

11.4.1 The alternative option is to do nothing and retain the existing speed limit. However, such a recommendation would run contrary to the delivery of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. This would also mean that pedestrian safety at school times 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. **HIGHFIELDS 20 MPH TRO OBJECTIONS**

12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Highfield, reports the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and sets out the Council's response.

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

- a) Approves the making of the Highfield 20mph Speed Limit Order, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- b) Approves the implementation of the Order on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage;
- c) Requests that objectors be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team.

12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

12.3.1 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.

- 12.3.2 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Highfield be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme in terms of safety and sustainability are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 12.4.1 In light of the objection's received consideration Highfield was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in. 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.

13. **DEERLANDS 20 MPH TRO OBJECTIONS**

- 13.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Deerlands, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

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

- a) Approves that the Deerlands 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- b) Notes that objectors will then be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team and the order implemented on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage.

13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 13.3.1 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.

- 13.3.2 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it was recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Deerlands be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme in terms of safety and sustainability are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 13.4.1 In light of the objections received, consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Deerlands. 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.

14. **BATEMOOR 20 MPH TRO OBJECTIONS**

- 14.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Batemoor, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

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

- a) Approves that the Batemoor 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- b) Implements the Order on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage;
- c) Requests that objectors be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team.

14.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 14.3.1 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.

- 14.3.2 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it was recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Batemoor be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme in terms of safety and sustainability are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

14.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 14.4.1 In light of the objections received, consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Batemoor. 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.

15. WATERTHORPE 20 MPH TRO OBJECTIONS

15.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Waterthorpe, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

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

- a) Approves that the Waterthorpe 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- b) Approves the implementation of the Order on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage;
- c) Request that Objectors be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team.

15.3 Reasons for Decision

15.3.1 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.

15.3.2 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it was recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Waterthorpe be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme in terms of safety and sustainability are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

15.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

15.4.1 In light of the objections received, consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Waterthorpe. 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.

16. NORTON LEES 20MPH OBJECTIONS

16.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Norton Lees, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

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

- a) Approves that the Norton Lees 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- b) Approves the implementation of the Order on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage;
- c) Requests that objectors be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team;
- d) Approves the introduction of a part time 20mph limit on Derbyshire Lane outside Mundella School.

16.3 **Reasons for Decision**

16.3.1 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.

16.3.2 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it was recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Norton Lees be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme in terms of safety and sustainability are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

16.3.3 It was also recommended that a part time, advisory 20mph speed limit be introduced on Derbyshire Lane outside Mundella School.

16.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

16.4.1 In light of the objections received, consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Norton Lees. 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.

