

# Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

---

**Wednesday 8 February 2023 at 2.00 pm**

**To be held in the Town Hall,  
Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH**

**The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend**

## **Membership**

---

Councillor Julie Grocutt  
Councillor Mazher Iqbal  
Councillor Christine Gilligan  
Kubo  
Councillor Andrew Sangar  
(MBE)  
Councillor Ian Auckland  
Councillor Craig Gamble Pugh  
Councillor Dianne Hurst  
Councillor Ruth Mersereau  
Councillor Richard Shaw

---

## PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING

---

The Transport, Regeneration and Climate Change Policy Committee discusses and takes decisions on:

City Centre and Central Area Portfolio Development: Heart of the City 2; and City Centre and Central Area major developments.

Investment, Climate Change and Planning: Regeneration; Strategic Development; Sustainable City; Flood Protection; Building standards and public safety; Planning policy; and Strategic transport sustainability and infrastructure.

Meetings are chaired by the Committees Co-Chairs Councillors Grocutt and Iqbal.

A copy of the agenda and reports is available on the Council's website at [www.sheffield.gov.uk](http://www.sheffield.gov.uk) . You may not be allowed to see some reports because they contain confidential information. These items are usually marked \* on the agenda. Members of the public have the right to ask questions or submit petitions to Policy Committee meetings and recording is allowed under the direction of the Chair. Please see the [Transport, Regeneration and Climate Change Policy Committee webpage](#) or contact Democratic Services for further information regarding public questions and petitions and details of the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at council meetings.

Policy Committee meetings are normally open to the public but sometimes the Committee may have to discuss an item in private. If this happens, you will be asked to leave. Any private items are normally left until last on the agenda.

Meetings of the Policy Committee have to be held as physical meetings. If you would like to attend the meeting, please report to an Attendant in the Foyer at the Town Hall where you will be directed to the meeting room. However, it would be appreciated if you could register to attend, in advance of the meeting, by emailing [committee@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:committee@sheffield.gov.uk), as this will assist with the management of attendance at the meeting. The meeting rooms in the Town Hall have a limited capacity. We are unable to guarantee entrance to the meeting room for observers, as priority will be given to registered speakers and those that have registered to attend.

Alternatively, you can observe the meeting remotely by clicking on the 'view the webcast' link provided on the meeting page of the [website](#).

If you wish to attend a meeting and ask a question or present a petition, you must submit the question/petition in writing by 9.00 a.m. at least 2 clear working days in advance of the date of the meeting, by email to the following address: [committee@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:committee@sheffield.gov.uk).

In order to ensure safe access and to protect all attendees, you will be recommended to wear a face covering (unless you have an exemption) at all times within the venue. Please do not attend the meeting if you have COVID-19 symptoms.

It is also recommended that you undertake a Covid-19 Rapid Lateral Flow Test within two days of the meeting.

If you require any further information please email [committee@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:committee@sheffield.gov.uk).

---

## FACILITIES

---

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in meeting rooms. Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

---

**TRANSPORT, REGENERATION AND CLIMATE POLICY COMMITTEE AGENDA  
8 FEBRUARY 2023**

**Order of Business**

---

- 1. Welcome and Housekeeping**  
The Chair to welcome attendees to the meeting and outline basic housekeeping and fire safety arrangements.
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Exclusion of Press and Public**  
To identify items where resolutions may be moved to exclude the press and public
- 4. Declarations of Interest** (Pages 7 - 10)  
Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting
- 5. Minutes of Previous Meeting** (Pages 11 - 24)  
To approve the minutes of the last meeting of the Committee held on 15<sup>th</sup> December 2022.
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**  
To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public
- 7. Work Programme** (Pages 25 - 52)  
Report of the Interim Director of Legal and Governance.

**Formal Decisions**

- 8. Revenue Budget Monitoring Report - Month 8** (Pages 53 - 62)  
Report of Executive Director, Resources
- 9. Parkhill Parking Scheme** (Pages 63 - 142)  
Report of the Executive Director, City Futures.
- 10. Introduction to Sheffield's City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS)** (Pages 143 - 156)  
Report of the Executive Director, City Futures.
- 11. East Bank Road Active Travel Project: Approval to proceed through design and delivery** (Pages 157 - 186)  
Report of the Executive Director, City Futures.
- 12. Future High Street Fund Update** (Pages 187 - 214)  
Report of the Executive Director, City Futures.

**NOTE: The next meeting of Transport, Regeneration  
and Climate Policy Committee will be held on Thursday  
16 March 2023 at 2.00 pm**

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

---

If you are present at a meeting of the Council, of its Policy Committees, or of any committee, sub-committee, joint committee, or joint sub-committee of the authority, and you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest** (DPI) relating to any business that will be considered at the meeting, you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

You **must**:

- leave the room (in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct)
- make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of any DPI at any meeting at which you are present at which an item of business which affects or relates to the subject matter of that interest is under consideration, at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.
- declare it to the meeting and notify the Council's Monitoring Officer within 28 days, if the DPI is not already registered.

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your **disclosable pecuniary interests** under the new national rules. You have a pecuniary interest if you, or your spouse or civil partner, have a pecuniary interest.

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner undertakes.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period\* in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

\*The relevant period is the 12 months ending on the day when you tell the Monitoring Officer about your disclosable pecuniary interests.

- Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority –
  - under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
  - which has not been fully discharged.

- Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.
- Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) –
  - the landlord is your council or authority; and
  - the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -
  - (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
  - (b) either -
    - the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
    - if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

If you attend a meeting at which any item of business is to be considered and you are aware that you have a **personal interest** in the matter which does not amount to a DPI, you must make verbal declaration of the existence and nature of that interest at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. You should leave the room if your continued presence is incompatible with the 7 Principles of Public Life (selflessness; integrity; objectivity; accountability; openness; honesty; and leadership).

You have a personal interest where –

- a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing (including interests in land and easements over land) of you or a member of your family or a person or an organisation with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the Council Tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the Authority's administrative area, or
- it relates to or is likely to affect any of the interests that are defined as DPIs but are in respect of a member of your family (other than a partner) or a person with whom you have a close association.



Guidance on declarations of interest, incorporating regulations published by the Government in relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, has been circulated to you previously.

You should identify any potential interest you may have relating to business to be considered at the meeting. This will help you and anyone that you ask for advice to fully consider all the circumstances before deciding what action you should take.

In certain circumstances the Council may grant a **dispensation** to permit a Member to take part in the business of the Authority even if the member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest relating to that business.

To obtain a dispensation, you must write to the Monitoring Officer at least 48 hours before the meeting in question, explaining why a dispensation is sought and desirable, and specifying the period of time for which it is sought. The Monitoring Officer may consult with the Independent Person or the Council's Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from David Hollis, Interim Director of Legal and Governance by emailing [david.hollis@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:david.hollis@sheffield.gov.uk).

This page is intentionally left blank

Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

Meeting held 15 December 2022

**PRESENT:** Councillors Julie Grocutt (Co-Chair), Christine Gilligan Kubo (Deputy Chair), Andrew Sangar (Group Spokesperson), Ian Auckland, Dianne Hurst, Ruth Mersereau, Richard Shaw and Minesh Parekh (Substitute Member)

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Craig Gamble-Pugh and Mazher Iqbal. Councillor Minesh Parekh attended as a substitute member.

**2. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

2.1 Item 8 on the agenda (item 7 in the minutes) included exempt appendices that were not available to the public and press because they contained exempt information as described in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended. If members of the committee wished to discuss the information contained in the exempt appendices, members of the public and press would be kindly asked to leave the meeting at that point and the webcast halted.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 Councillors Richard Shaw, Ian Auckland, Andrew Sangar and Ruth Mersereau declared personal interests in the 20mph Traffic Regulation Order items on the agenda, due to these falling within the boundary of their respective wards.

**4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1 **RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the Extraordinary Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee held on the 3<sup>rd</sup> November 2022, were agreed as a correct record and the minutes of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee held on the 24<sup>th</sup> November 2022, were agreed as a correct record, subject to an amendment to the presenting petitioners name in regard to the Swift Bricks petition from Ms Nicola Gilbert to Ms Flora Jeferazade.

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

5.1 The Policy Committee received no petitions and one question from a member of the public.

Question from John Chapman

'does the committee agree that the delivery of the Connecting Sheffield schemes should be sped up to help people travel cheaply by walking, cycling and by public transport in the cost living crisis or should the council continue to squander the

approx £50m funding it has already won from government for these schemes?'

The Chair advised that the Council, and this Committee remained committed to the programme outlined through the Connecting Sheffield proposals. This included the Transforming Cities Fund application, the Active Travel Fund, the day-to-day Local Transport Funding but most recently the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement. It was highlighted that delivering schemes of this scale, during a period of significant change, had not been easy. There had been wider forces at play within the construction industry which had ultimately slowed down delivery, but the council were working its best through the aftermath of these seismic deviations .

Providing access to, and enabling Active Travel and public transport use was at the cornerstone of the transport policy. The needs sustainable and inclusive travel options, both for access to core social amenities but also to get people to work, education and effectively plan for the future. The council were working with funders, to which the council were not alone, to identify options for acceleration, whilst also critiquing in great detail our own practises, to ensure further delay was minimised.

## **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 was 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 was a live document and Members input to it was invaluable. Sections 2.1 in the report; References from Council and petitions were noted.

Members raised concerns of the number of items that needed to be allocated to meetings and that more meetings may be required to get through the work load.

It was advised that a work programming session would take place in January 2023 to go through the items and prioritise. This would be an opportunity to bring items forward and discuss the budget setting item. The chair asked that anything needing discussion at this session would be added to a list held by Sarah Hyde in Democratic Services.

A suggestion was made around including another column in the work programme to show external deadlines.

## **6.2 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:-**

1. That the Committee's work programme, as set out in Appendix 1 be agreed, including any additions and amendments identified in Part 1;

2. That consideration be given to the further additions or adjustments to the work programme presented at Part 2 of Appendix 1;
3. That Members give consideration to any further issues to be explored by officers for inclusion in Part 2 of Appendix 1 of the next work programme report, for potential addition to the work programme; and
4. that the referrals from Council and Local Area Committees (petition and resolutions) detailed in Section 2 of the report be noted and the proposed responses set out be agreed.

## **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.

Progress on delivery of the scheme was set out in a previous report to the committee on 24<sup>th</sup> November 2022.

Following questions from members, it was confirmed that the recent walk about of the site was helpful for members and the report was much clearer than the previous report in November.

It was confirmed that only the development pot of money would be used for the project, and this was fixed. Additional reassurances were given to members that there would be an ongoing dialogue with the current tenants and that meetings were being held with various groups regarding the project. It was confirmed that meetings of the Castlegate Partnership Group were happening and the next one was due to meet in January. Members confirmed they were happy to move forward with the proposals following the reassurances from officers.

- 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 DLUHC 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.

Following member questions, it was confirmed that officers would find out what the limitations were on visitor parking permits.

- 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 15<sup>th</sup> June 2022.

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

Officers advised that the feasibility study was still on course to be received by early 2023.

It was advised that officers were happy to discuss the priority in areas with members and discussions would take place in the new year with LAC chairs around the use of local CIL funding.

**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 15<sup>th</sup> 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.

The committee were advised that additional funding was not available through the scheme for any additional capacity to enforce the double yellow lines.

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).

It was advised that there was no national criteria of how part-time 20mph speed limits outside schools were put in place and Sheffield used an in-house formula as not all core cities had the schemes. Members felt that prioritising the need of the schools instead of having a scheme in each LAC area would be preferred. A suggestion was made about a change in policy to the speed limit on residential roads. Officers advised that they would feed in the suggestion to the Road Safety Plan.

Members recognised the rationale, but if the council was looking at preventing loss of life or injury, then it would need to prioritise the need and check the weighing against the statistics.

- 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 (1) 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.

This page is intentionally left blank





## Report to Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee

8<sup>th</sup> February 2023

---

**Report of:** David Hollis, Interim Director of Legal and Governance

---

**Subject:** Committee Work Programme – Transport, Regeneration and Climate

---

**Author of Report:** Sarah Hyde, Democratic Services Team Manager

---

### Summary:

The Committee's Work Programme is attached at **Appendix 1** for the Committee's consideration and discussion. This aims 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.

Any changes since the Committee's last meeting, including any new items, have been made in consultation with the Chair, and the document is always considered at the regular pre-meetings to which all Group Spokespersons are invited.

The following potential sources of new items are included in this report, where applicable:

- Questions and petitions from the public, including those referred from Council
- References from Council or other committees (statements formally sent for this committee's attention)
- A list of issues, each with a short summary, which have been identified by the Committee or officers as potential items but which have not yet been scheduled (See **Appendix 1**)

The Work Programme will remain a live document and will be brought to each Committee meeting.

---

## Recommendations:

1. That the Committee's work programme, as set out in **Appendix 1** be agreed, including any additions and amendments identified in **Part 1**;
2. That consideration be given to the further additions or adjustments to the work programme presented at **Part 2 of Appendix 1**;
3. That Members give consideration to any further issues to be explored by officers for inclusion in **Part 2 of Appendix 1** of the next work programme report, for potential addition to the work programme; and
4. that the referrals from Council and Local Area Committees (petition and resolutions) detailed in **Section 2** of the report be noted and the proposed responses set out be agreed.

**Background Papers: None**

**Category of Report: OPEN**

---

---

## COMMITTEE WORK PROGRAMME

### 1.0 Prioritisation

1.1 For practical reasons this committee has a limited amount of time each year in which to conduct its formal business. The Committee will need to prioritise firmly in order that formal meetings are used primarily for business requiring formal decisions, or which for other reasons it is felt must be conducted in a formal setting.

1.2 In order to ensure that prioritisation is effectively done, on the basis of evidence and informed advice, Members should usually avoid adding items to the work programme which do not already appear:

- In the draft work programme in **Appendix 1** due to the discretion of the chair; or
- within the body of this report accompanied by a suitable amount of information.

### 2.0 References from Council or other Committees

2.1 Any references sent to this Committee by Council, including any public questions, petitions and motions, or other committees since the last meeting are listed here, with commentary and a proposed course of action, as appropriate:

Issue	<b>Policy on speed on rural roads</b>
Referred from	North East LAC – 18 <sup>th</sup> January 2023

Details	Stannington councillors have been contacted requesting a reduction of the speed limit on Rails Road. They believe it raises wider questions about approaches to speed on rural roads
Comments/ Action Proposed	that 'TRC policy committee requests that the issue should be referred to Kate Martin as Executive Director for City Futures'.

Issue	<b>Policy on residents parking schemes</b>
Referred from	North East LAC – 18 <sup>th</sup> January 2023
Details	East Ecclesfield councillors have been contacted by residents of Smith Street, Chapeltown requesting a residents parking scheme. A survey has shown a very high level of support however Members have been told no residents schemes are possible outside of the city centre
Comments/ Action Proposed	that 'TRC policy committee requests that the issue should be referred to Kate Martin as Executive Director for City Futures'.

### 3.0 Member engagement, learning and policy development outside of Committee

3.1 Subject to the capacity and availability of councillors and officers, there are a range of ways in which Members can explore subjects, monitor information and develop their ideas about forthcoming decisions outside of formal meetings. Appendix 2 is an example 'menu' of some of the ways this could be done. It is entirely appropriate that member development, exploration and policy development should in many cases take place in a private setting, to allow members to learn and formulate a position in a neutral space before bringing the issue into the public domain at a formal meeting.

3.2 Training & Skills Development - Induction programme for this committee.

Title	Description & Format	Date
Local Plan Overview	Background and future work programme etc. – this will need more than one session.	3.00-5.00pm on 31 Aug 2022 4.00-5.00pm, 15 <sup>th</sup> Sept 2022
Regeneration and City Development Overview	Presentation giving overview of background and future work programme – this will need more than one session. Also, likely to be more full committee update briefings on a semi regular basis of specific activities and initiatives e.g. Heart of the City, Castlegate, Attercliffe, West Bar, City Centre Living,	TBC

	Fargate, Future High Street Fund, Stocksbridge Towns Fund	
Levelling Up Activity	Presentation giving overview of background and future work programme – this will need more than one session. Also, likely to be more full committee update briefings on a semi regular basis.	TBC
City Centre Strategic Vision	Presentation giving overview of background to City Centre Vision and future work programme	TBC
Transport Overview	An overview of key Sheffield, Regional and National issues and policy influencing Transport and our local priorities and programmes	June 2022
Flood and Water Overview	An overview of key Sheffield, Regional and National issues and policy influencing Flood and Water and our local priorities and programmes	June 2022
Climate Change Overview	An overview of key Sheffield, Regional and National issues and policy influencing our approach to Net Zero following the adoption of the 10 Point Plan	June 2022
Climate Change	Formal Elected Member training	TBC
Funding Landscape	Familiarisation with Directorates Funding and potential external sources of funding	June 2022

## Appendix 1 – Work Programme

### Part 1: Proposed additions and amendments to the work programme since the last meeting:

Item	Proposed Date	Note
<b>NEW</b>		
Part-time advisory 20mph speed limits outside schools	<b>Update report due 16<sup>th</sup> March 2023</b>	Further update report requested on the Introduction of a programme of part-time advisory 20mph speed limits outside schools. This was requested at the meeting on 15 <sup>th</sup> December 2022.
Introduction to Sheffield’s City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS)	<b>8<sup>th</sup> February 2023</b>	To provide members with a formal oversight of programme proposals, to approve progression to the next stages of delivery of the CRSTS programme and to provide delegation of decisions to enable work at pace.
East Bank Road Active Travel Project: Approval to proceed through design and delivery	<b>8<sup>th</sup> February 2023</b>	To provide members with a formal oversight of the East Bank Road project, to approve progression to the next stages of delivery and to provide confirmation of decisions to enable work at pace.
Green Parking Permit Removal	<b>16<sup>th</sup> March 2023</b>	Following the government’s commitment to ending the sale of new petrol and diesel cars in the UK by 2030, and a historic increase in the registration of plug-in vehicles, it is an appropriate time to consider the removal of the council’s free Green Parking Permits.
Future for the provision of electric vehicle charging points	<b>16<sup>th</sup> March 2023</b>	It is proposed that the council procure an external provider to work with to deliver EV charging infrastructure in the City through a commercial agreement. The proposal provides opportunity to support the development of a larger, more commercially sustainable network of public electric vehicle chargepoints for residents, businesses and visitors to the City.
<b>AMENDMENTS</b>		
LTP/RSF programme 23/24	<b>16<sup>th</sup> March 2023</b>	Move from February to March meeting as per T.F-S
SCR Innovation Corridor project	<b>Autumn 2023</b>	Move from February to Autumn meeting as per T.F-S
Connecting Sheffield Cross City Bus FBC approval	<b>Autumn</b>	Move from February to Autumn as per T.F-S
Kelham Parking Scheme	<b>16<sup>th</sup> March 2023</b>	Move from February to March meeting as per T.F-S

EATF Legacy Projects: Division Street	<b>16<sup>th</sup> March 2023</b>	Move from February to March meeting as per T.F-S
Connect Darnall Feasibility Study	<b>Removed from February 2023</b>	Submission of the business case to DfT will be taken through the existing delegation to the Executive Director of City Futures

## Part 2: List of other potential items not yet included in the work programme

Issues that have recently been identified by the Committee, its Chair or officers as potential items but have not yet been added to the proposed work programme. If a Councillor raises an idea in a meeting and the committee agrees under recommendation 3 that this should be explored, it will appear either in the work programme or in this section of the report at the committee's next meeting, at the discretion of the Chair.

<b>Topic</b>	<b>Decarbonising Sheffield - Mine Energy - Collaboration with Bochum - Heat Networks</b>
<b>Description</b>	Presentation at committee
<b>Lead Officer/s</b>	
<b>Item suggested by</b>	Councillor Julie Grocutt/Mazher Iqbal
<b>Type of item</b>	<i>Presentation</i>
<b>Prior member engagement/ development required</b> <i>(with reference to options in Appendix 2)</i>	
<b>Public Participation/ Engagement approach</b> <i>(with reference to toolkit in Appendix 3)</i>	To be discussed at Work programme session 18 <sup>th</sup> January 2023
<b>Lead Officer Commentary/Proposed Action(s)</b>	

**Part 3: Agenda Items for Forthcoming Meetings**

Meeting 5	8 <sup>th</sup> Feb 2023	Time 2pm					
Topic	Description	Lead Officer/s	Type of item <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision</li> <li>Referral to decision-maker</li> <li>Pre-decision (policy development)</li> <li>Post-decision (service performance/ monitoring)</li> </ul>	(re: decisions) Prior member engagement/ development required (with reference to options in Appendix 1)	(re: decisions) Public Participation/ Engagement approach (with reference to toolkit in Appendix 2)	Final decision-maker (& date) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Cttee</li> <li>Another Cttee (eg S&amp;R)</li> <li>Full Council</li> <li>Officer</li> </ul>	Internal Deadlines (i.e. funding deadlines, submission deadline etc)
Budget monitoring and outturn - Month 8.	Monitoring item	Jane Wilby/Tony Kirkham	Decision			This committee	
Parkhill Parking Scheme	Results of the consultation on the parking scheme and recommendations on how to proceed.	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Matt Reynolds	Decision	TBC	Public engagement a key part of the report.	This Committee	
Future High Street Fund Update	To update Committee on the delivery of the Future High Streets Fund	Matt Hayman	Decision	Briefings with both the Transport, Regeneration & Climate Committee and the Finance Sub-Committee.	Extensive consultation undertaken throughout 2019 and 2020 in partnership with the University of Sheffield. Officers continue to meet with retailers, businesses, landowners and wider	This Committee and another	

					stakeholders to keep them updated.		
East Bank Road Active Travel Project: Approval to proceed through design and delivery	<p>The purpose of this report is to provide the context for a recommendation to progress with the development of the East Bank Road Active Travel Project, subject to agreement from the DfT to a revised project end date. The scheme has an estimated cost of £1.89 million wholly funded by the Department for Transport (DfT), from Tranche 3 of the Active Travel Fund (ATF) via a capital grant. The funding will be used to design and deliver the East Bank Road Active Travel Project, including community consultation.</p> <p>The East Bank Road Active Travel Project is part of the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) Active Travel Implementation Plan</p>	Matt Reynolds/Tom Finnegan-Smith	Decision	The relevant Chair was briefed prior to submission alongside informal engagement with local members. This included outlining the high-level proposals as part of the bid to the Department for Transport (DfT). The bid was submitted through the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) in accordance with their governance process.	<p>Public engagement is essential to the success of schemes within the programme, with the detail to be agreed with the Council's Communications and Engagement team.</p> <p>It is envisaged that the following consultation routes will be followed:</p> <p>Issue-focused workshops with attendees from multiple backgrounds including the Residents, local businesses, public transport operators, Schools,</p>	This Committee	



	(ATIP) and will become a critical extension to the communities just south of the City Centre, connecting with and beyond the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route, to the Grey to Green project, wider Transforming Cities Fund programme, and the City's transformational Connecting Sheffield Programme.				<p>stakeholders and internal departments.</p> <p>Creative use of online engagement channels with translation services and written hard copies.</p> <p>Co-design events on specific challenges such as the Cycle Forum for connected routes)</p>		
Introduction to Sheffield's City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS)	To provide the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee with information on proposals for £135m for schemes in Sheffield, outlined as part of the £570m allocated to South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) following City Region Sustainable	Matt Reynolds/Tom Finnegan-Smith	Decision	At the development stage of the SYMCA (previously SCR) bid to the CRSTS fund the Leader and relevant Executive Member were briefed prior to submission through a report and presentation	Public engagement is essential to the success of schemes within the programme, with the detail to be agreed with the Council's Communications and Engagement team and linking into the Local	This Committee	

	<p>Transport Settlement (CRSTS) submission.</p> <p>The report will confirm the schemes that have been prioritised for investment and provide indicative deliverables, as well as alignment with policy objectives and strategic fit, outcome expectations, funding, risk and deliverability.</p> <p>The CRSTS programme of works is large and complex and aims to provide a stepped change in sustainable travel by delivery of targeted interventions.</p> <p>The report will also recommend the use of CRTSTS funding to cover the increased cost of delivery on the Transforming Cities Fund, Housing Zone North scheme. The programmes have a shared goal to stimulate the economy by</p>			<p>to CMT. This included outlining the high-level proposals as part of the bid to the Department for Transport (DfT) and the alignment to the current Transforming Cities Fund proposals.</p> <p>As the programme has progressed, engagement with local members and the Local Area Committee Teams has taken place on schemes which have been able to accelerate (A61 Chesterfield Road and A61 Penistone Road). This has included walkthroughs, workshops and updates on business case development.</p>	<p>Area Committee engagement channels as much as possible.</p> <p>It is envisaged that the following consultation routes will be followed:</p> <p>Issue-focused workshops with stakeholders from multiple backgrounds including residents, local businesses, public transport operators, schools, other relevant groups and organisations and relevant internal SCC departments.</p> <p>Creative use of online engagement</p>		
--	---	--	--	--	---	--	--

	<p>improving sustainable transport infrastructure; balancing finances within both programmes will maximise the benefits which can be achieved by both.</p> <p><b>Due to inflation and construction price fluctuations arising from wider economic conditions it should be noted that the current programme will be subject to potential change. Should this be required, the TRCPC will be presented with appropriate update reports.</b></p>			<p>The bid was submitted through the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) in accordance with their governance process.</p>	<p>channels with translation services and written hard copies as required</p> <p>Co-design events on specific challenges such as the bus operators for hotspot identification, Cycle Forum for connected routes and local interest groups/amenities</p>		
<p>Standing items</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Public Questions/ Petitions</i></li> <li>• <i>Work Programme</i></li> <li>• <i>[any other committee-specific standing items eg finance or service monitoring]</i></li> </ul>						

Meeting 6	16 <sup>th</sup> March 2023	Time					
Topic	Description	Lead Officer/s	Type of item <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decision</li> <li>Referral to decision-maker</li> <li>Pre-decision (policy development)</li> <li>Post-decision (service performance/ monitoring)</li> </ul>	(re: decisions) Prior member engagement/ development required (with reference to options in Appendix 1)	(re: decisions) Public Participation/ Engagement approach (with reference to toolkit in Appendix 2)	Final decision-maker (& date) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This Cttee</li> <li>Another Cttee (eg S&amp;R)</li> <li>Full Council</li> <li>Officer</li> </ul>	Internal Deadlines (i.e. funding deadlines, submission deadline etc)
Budget monitoring and outturn - Month 9.	Monitoring item	Jane Wilby/Tony Kirkham	Decision			This committee	
Heart of the City	Update on progress of Heart of the City	Tammy Whitaker/Neil Jones	Post decision	TBC	TBC	TBC	
Sheaf Valley Masterplan	Update on the Sheaf Valley Masterplan	Tammy Whitaker/Neil Jones	Post decision	TBC	TBC	TBC	
Mitigate overspends and Income Generation	Develop and implement plans to mitigate overspends and deliver stalled saving plans to bring forecast outturn back in line with budget, and discuss opportunities for income generation.	Wil Stewart					
LTP/RSF programme 23/24 update	Update on 23/34 programme	Tom Finnegan-Smith/Matt Reynolds	Decision			This Committee	

Kelham Parking Scheme	Results of the consultation on the parking scheme and recommendations on how to proceed.	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Matt Reynolds	Decision			This Committee	
Report objections to the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order for Broomhill Shopping Precinct	To report details of the consultation response to the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order for the Broomhill Shopping Precinct, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response	Matt Reynolds	Decision	<p>Ward Members have been involved in the scheme since inception and have been kept updated of the scheme throughout its various stages. Various Cabinet Members and Executive Members (and their deputies) have also been briefed throughout.</p> <p>The report will be taken to TRC briefing(s) prior to publication.</p>	<p>Public calls for evidence through the statutory Experimental Traffic Order Procedure. This included on street notices, Royal Mail letter drops to a wide range of local businesses and Residents Issue-focused workshops with attendees from multiple backgrounds including the Broomhill Neighbourhood Plan and Broomhill Business Alliance Creative use of online engagement</p>	This Committee	

					channels through use of Citizen Space for surveying.		
EATF Legacy Projects: Division Street	Report on aspects of the Emergency Active Travel projects that are still in place following consultation through the current experimental trial closures.	Tom Finnegan-Smith/Matt Reynolds	Decision	Briefings	Results of public engagement a key part of the report	This Committee	
Green parking permit removal	Following the government's commitment to ending the sale of new petrol and diesel cars in the UK by 2030, and a historic increase in the registration of plug-in vehicles, it is an appropriate time to consider the removal of the council's free Green Parking Permits.	Matt Reynolds/Tom Finnegan-Smith	Decision	On the 21 <sup>st</sup> September 2022 a report was brought to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee where a number of short term actions were agreed to progress the delivery of public electric vehicle charging infrastructure in Sheffield. This included the action to bring		This committee	

				forward measures to phase out / remove exemptions from parking tariffs for electric vehicles / vehicles that are charging.			
Future for the provision of electric vehicle charging points	<p>It is proposed that the council procure an external provider to work with to deliver EV charging infrastructure in the City through a commercial agreement.</p> <p>The proposal provides opportunity to support the development of a larger, more commercially sustainable network of public electric vehicle chargepoints for residents, businesses and visitors to the City.</p>	Matt Reynolds/Tom Finnegan- Smith	Decision	This report follows on from action contained within the Transport and Regeneration Committee report, <i>Electric Vehicle Public Charging Infrastructure Update and Short-Term Action Plan, 21<sup>st</sup> September 2022</i> , to develop a procurement proposal for a commercial partner(s) to work with Sheffield City Council to deliver EV charging	Increasing the number of public charging points for electric cars was a popular 'other' suggestion during the consultation carried out in relation to the Clean Air Zone, where in addition to the high cost of electric vehicles, the lack of electric vehicle charging points was highlighted as a key barrier to investing in cleaner vehicles.	This Committee	

				infrastructure through a concession agreement.			
Standing items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Public Questions/ Petitions</i></li> <li>• <i>Work Programme</i></li> <li>• <i>[any other committee-specific standing items eg finance or service monitoring]</i></li> </ul>						

Meeting 1							
June 2023		Time					
Topic	Description	Lead Officer/s	Type of item	<i>(re: decisions)</i> <b>Prior member engagement/ development required</b> <i>(with reference to options in Appendix 1)</i>	<i>(re: decisions)</i> <b>Public Participation/ Engagement approach</b> <i>(with reference to toolkit in Appendix 2)</i>	<b>Final decision-maker (&amp; date)</b>	<b>Internal Deadlines</b> (i.e. funding deadlines, submission deadline etc)
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Decision</i></li> <li>• <i>Referral to decision-maker</i></li> <li>• <i>Pre-decision (policy development)</i></li> <li>• <i>Post-decision (service performance/ monitoring)</i></li> </ul>			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This Cttee</li> <li>• Another Cttee (eg S&amp;R)</li> <li>• Full Council</li> <li>• Officer</li> </ul>	
Budget monitoring and outturn - Month ?.	Monitoring item	Jane Wilby/Tony Kirkham	Decision			This committee	



SCR Innovation Corridor project	Update on the project to address the network constraints associated with M1 J34 and Lower Don Valley.	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Matt Reynolds	Decision			This Committee	
Task and Finish Group Update Report	To update the committee on progress of the task and finish group	Mark Whitworth	Monitoring			This Committee	
Standing items	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Public Questions/ Petitions</i></li> <li>• <i>Work Programme</i></li> <li>• <i>[any other committee-specific standing items eg finance or service monitoring]</i></li> </ul>						

Items which the committee have agreed to add to an agenda, but for which no date is yet set.

Topic	Description	Lead Officer/s	<b>Type of item</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Decision</li> <li>• Referral to decision-maker</li> <li>• Pre-decision (policy development)</li> <li>• Post-decision (service performance/ monitoring)</li> </ul>	<i>(re: decisions)</i> <b>Prior member engagement/ development required</b> <i>(with reference to options in Appendix 1)</i>	<i>(re: decisions)</i> <b>Public Participation/ Engagement approach</b> <i>(with reference to toolkit in Appendix 2)</i>	<b>Final decision-maker (&amp; date)</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This Cttee</li> <li>• Another Cttee (eg S&amp;R)</li> <li>• Full Council</li> <li>• Officer</li> </ul>	<b>Internal Deadlines</b> (i.e. funding deadlines, submission deadline etc)
REC Report Response	To respond to the REC Report	Kate Martin/Wil Stewart					Expected March 2023
Decarbonising Sheffield - Mine Energy - Collaboration with Bochum - Heat Networks	Presentation at committee	Mark Whitworth	Presentation				Date to be confirmed.
Connecting Sheffield Cross City Bus FBC approval	Submission of FBC to SYMCA fir approval and release of funding to implement	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Matt Reynolds	Decision			This committee	Expected end of 2023/24
UDV Phase 2 Flood Defence Project	On SYMCA Priority Flood Programme, Submission of CBC to Environment Agency for Flood Risk grant.	Tom Finnegan-Smith/Matt Reynolds	Decision		Needs consultation early 2023		<b>Expected Sept 2023</b>

Monitoring of the 10 Point Plan	Referral from CCED Transitional Committee: The Committee should monitor the One Year Plan commitment to “Set out our Pathway to Net Zero and take immediate steps to reduce carbon emissions in Sheffield” including setting out the 10-point plan tackle the climate emergency in Sheffield and work with people, partners and businesses to develop and deliver the actions needed to deliver the 10-point plan.	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Mark Whitworth	Post decision and Policy development	Facilitated policy development workshops	TBC	TBC	Expected June 23
Sheaf & Porter Flood Defence Project OBC (Summer 2023)	On SYMCA Priority Flood Programme. Potentially contentious options of parkland flood storage including Endcliffe	Tom Finnegan-Smith / James Mead	Pre-decision policy development	Facilitated policy development workshops	TBC		Strategy and Resources Expected June/July 23

	<p>park and Beauchief Golf Course, consultation in advance of OBC will be required. To be scoped Summer 2022, likely to need to brief committee late 2022?</p>						
<p>Blackburn Brook, Ecclesfield/Whitley Brook Flood improvement works OBC (Spring 2023)</p>	<p>On SYMCA Priority Flood Programme. OBC for works around flood risk areas in Ecclesfield, Whitley Land, Ecclesfield Park. Collaboration with Parks over improvements to park, potential habitat and amenity benefits. Highway works to culverts. Partnership funding: Flood Risk Grant, SCC, Environment, Highway benefits. Strategic Mandate likely to be required</p>	<p>Tom Finnegan-Smith / James Mead</p>	<p>Pre-decision</p>	<p>Facilitated policy development workshops</p>	<p>TBC</p>		<p>Strategy and Resources Expected Autumn 23</p>

UDV Phase 1, Loxley, "adoption" of Flood Defences (Early 2023)	On completion of Loxley scheme we will inherit a number of flood walls in the public highway, these will need to be integrated into Amey's contracts	Tom Finnegan-Smith / James Mead	Referral to decision maker	TBC	TBC		To be confirmed if this needs a committee decision
Connecting Sheffield South West Bus Corridors	Acceptance of funding to develop the Full Business Case (FBC) Next step is Member & this Committee briefings during Nov, to lead into TRO ad.	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Matt Reynolds	TBC	Briefings June 23	N/A further public engagement will form part of the FBC development stage		Strategy and Resources
Kelham Neepsend Submission of FBC to SYMCA	To be incorporated into report due in Feb 23 Final July 23	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Matt Reynolds	Decision	Briefings	TBC		
Sheaf Valley Cycle Route	Presenting the final scheme proposals, Final scheme proposals are to follow on from TRO ad.	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Matt Reynolds	TBC	TBC	TBC		Expected June 23
Sheffield Road Safety Action Plan	New action plan in response to the refreshed SY Safer	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Matt Reynolds	TBC	TBC	TBC		Expected June 23

	Roads Strategy. Timetable 2023						
Play streets review	Review of the trial of play streets and recommendation on future application	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Peter Vickers	TBC	TBC	TBC		
Darnall Mini Holland	Project status update and programme development	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Matt Reynolds	TBC	TBC	TBC		Expected March 24
Housing Growth: key investment and policy decisions - TBD	A range of Housing Growth related reports will be developed. It is to be determined whether these will be considered by the Housing Thematic Committee	Kerry Bollington	TBC	TBC	TBC		TBC
Bidding, acceptance and spending approval of external funds	During the year the Directorate will seek out or be approached to bid for regeneration funding often with short timescales for submission. We will need clarity from the committee how we	Tammy Whitaker / Tom Finnegan-Smith	TBC	TBC	TBC		Need to determine with the committee. - delegated authority to submit funding within agreed policy / strategic framework (where matching funding outside of the

	will manage this, within timescales that do not align with Committees.						portfolios budget is not required) - priority areas to pursue for funding - Agree a process to ensure timely decisions can be made where needed between committee meetings where funding timescales dictate
Barkers Pool Building	Decision on future of site	Tammy Whitaker	Referral to decision Maker	Written briefing	TBC		Strategy and resources Committee
City Centre Strategic Vision- Priority Framework Areas and masterplans	To approve draft masterplans and delivery strategies for Priority Framework areas and Catalyst sites  Will form part of the Local Plan consultation.	Tammy Whitaker/ Michael Johnson	Decision	Committee Briefing	TBC – possible wider stakeholder group engagement rather than full public consultation post committee ratification of draft and approach		This committee Expected Summer 23 potentially July
Active Travel N/bourhoods – Crookes/Walkley.	Recommendations on the final scheme for implementation after the ETRO.	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Matt Reynolds					Expected July 2023

Active Travel N/bourhoods – Nether Edge	Recommendations on the final scheme for implementation after the ETRO.	Tom Finnegan-Smith / Matt Reynolds					Expected July 2023
Mitigate overspends and Income Generation	Develop and implement plans to mitigate overspends and deliver stalled saving plans to bring forecast outturn back in line with budget, and discuss opportunities for income generation.						Feb committee
<b>ACTIONS FROM REFERRALS</b>							
Speed Limit on Rails Road and Bingley Lane	This request has been sent from an individual to the transport team for consideration. Subsequent to an initial sift which suggested no further action, this item has been raised through the LAC to which this has been considered by	Referral from Cllr Julie Grocutt	<b>ACTION</b> – This will be looked into again by the Transport Planning and Infrastructure Service, there is a possibility of commissioning a speed survey to help quantify the level of speeding. This will determine if any further action is	Agreed at TRC – 15 <sup>th</sup> Dec 2022.			



	<p>Local Ward Members. The proposal to not promote a change in speed in speed limit but to install signage has been considered to which Ward Members have not agreed, owing to other locations in the area being potentially more suitable.</p>		<p>required beyond the initial assessment.</p>				
--	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

## **Appendix 2 – Menu of options for member engagement, learning and development prior to formal Committee consideration**

Members should give early consideration to the degree of pre-work needed before an item appears on a formal agenda.

All agenda items will anyway be supported by the following:

- Discussion well in advance as part of the work programme item at Pre-agenda meetings. These take place in advance of each formal meeting, before the agenda is published and they consider the full work programme, not just the immediate forthcoming meeting. They include the Chair, Vice Chair and all Group Spokespersons from the committee, with officers
- Discussion and, where required, briefing by officers at pre-committee meetings in advance of each formal meeting, after the agenda is published. These include the Chair, Vice Chair and all Group Spokespersons from the committee, with officers.
- Work Programming items on each formal agenda, as part of an annual and ongoing work programming exercise
- Full officer report on a public agenda, with time for a public discussion in committee
- Officer meetings with Chair & VC as representatives of the committee, to consider addition to the draft work programme, and later to inform the overall development of the issue and report, for the committee's consideration.

The following are examples of some of the optional ways in which the committee may wish to ensure that they are sufficiently engaged and informed prior to taking a public decision on a matter. In all cases the presumption is that these will take place in private, however some meetings could happen in public or eg be reported to the public committee at a later date.

These options are presented in approximately ascending order of the amount of resources needed to deliver them. Members must prioritise carefully, in consultation with officers, which items require what degree of involvement and information in advance of committee meetings, in order that this can be delivered within the officer capacity available.

The majority of items cannot be subject to the more involved options on this list, for reasons of officer capacity.

- Written briefing for the committee or all members (email)
- All-member newsletter (email)
- Requests for information from specific outside bodies etc.
- All-committee briefings (private or, in exceptional cases, in-committee)
- All-member briefing (virtual meeting)
- Facilitated policy development workshop (potential to invite external experts / public, see appendix 2)
- Site visits (including to services of the council)
- Task and Finish group (one at a time, one per cttee)

Furthermore, a range of public participation and engagement options are available to inform Councillors, see appendix 3.

## **Appendix 3 – Public engagement and participation toolkit**

### **Public Engagement Toolkit**

On 23 March 2022 Full Council agreed the following:

A toolkit to be developed for each committee to use when considering its 'menu of options' for ensuring the voice of the public has been central to their policy development work. Building on the developing advice from communities and Involve, committees should make sure they have a clear purpose for engagement; actively support diverse communities to engage; match methods to the audience and use a range of methods; build on what's worked and existing intelligence (SCC and elsewhere); and be very clear to participants on the impact that engagement will have.

The list below builds on the experiences of Scrutiny Committees and latterly the Transitional Committees and will continue to develop. The toolkit includes (but is not be limited to):

- a. Public calls for evidence
- b. Issue-focused workshops with attendees from multiple backgrounds (sometimes known as 'hackathons') led by committees
- c. Creative use of online engagement channels
- d. Working with VCF networks (eg including the Sheffield Equality Partnership) to seek views of communities
- e. Co-design events on specific challenges or to support policy development
- f. Citizens assembly style activities
- g. Stakeholder reference groups (standing or one-off)
- h. Committee / small group visits to services
- i. Formal and informal discussion groups
- j. Facilitated communities of interest around each committee (eg a mailing list of self-identified stakeholders and interested parties with regular information about forthcoming decisions and requests for contributions or volunteers for temporary co-option)
- k. Facility for medium-term or issue-by-issue co-option from outside the Council onto Committees or Task and Finish Groups. Co-optees of this sort at Policy Committees would be non-voting.

This public engagement toolkit is intended to be a quick 'how-to' guide for Members and officers to use when undertaking participatory activity through committees.

It will provide an overview of the options available, including the above list, and cover:

- How to focus on purpose and who we are trying to reach
- When to use and when not to use different methods
- How to plan well and be clear to citizens what impact their voice will have
- How to manage costs, timescales, scale.

**There is an expectation that Members and Officers will be giving strong consideration to the public participation and engagement options for each item on a committee's work programme, with reference to the above list a-k.**



## Report to Policy Committee

**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** Tony Kirkham,  
Director of Finance and Commercial Services

**Tel:** +44 114 474 1438

**Report of:** *Tony Kirkham*  
**Report to:** *Transport, Regeneration & Climate Committee*  
**Date of Decision:** *8<sup>th</sup> February 2023*  
**Subject:** *Month 8 Budget Monitoring*

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? ( <i>Insert reference number</i> )				
Has appropriate consultation taken place?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has a Climate Impact Assessment (CIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-				
<i>"The (<b>report/appendix</b>) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (<b>insert relevant paragraph number</b>) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)."</i>				

### Purpose of Report:

*This report brings the Committee up to date with the Council's financial position as at Month 8 2022/23*

### Recommendations:

#### The Committee is recommended to:

- Note the Council's financial position as at the end of November 2022 (month 8).

### Background Papers:

[2022/23 Revenue Budget](#)

**Lead Officer to complete: -**

1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.	Finance: <i>Tony Kirkham, Interim Director of Finance and Commercial Services</i>
		Legal: <i>Sarah Bennett, Assistant Director, Legal and Governance</i>
		Equalities & Consultation: <i>James Henderson, Director of Policy, Performance and Communications</i>
		Climate: n/a
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>		
2	<b>SLB member who approved submission:</b>	<i>Tony Kirkham</i>
3	<b>Committee Chair consulted:</b>	<i>Cllr Bryan Lodge</i>
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Committee by the EMT member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> <i>Tony Kirkham</i> <i>Jane Wilby</i>		<b>Job Title:</b> <i>Interim Director of Finance and Commercial Services</i> <i>Head of Accounting</i>
<b>Date:</b> 24 <sup>th</sup> January 2023		

## 1. PROPOSAL

1.1 This report sets out the 2022/23 Month 8 financial monitoring position for the Council and each of the Policy Committees.

### 1.2 Council Portfolio Month 8 2022/23

1.2.1 The Council is forecasting a £17.1m overspend against the 2022/23 budget as at month 8.

Full Year £m	M8		M8	M7	Movement
	Outturn	Budget	Variance	Variance	
Corporate	(470.9)	(468.4)	(2.5)	(1.5)	(1.0)
City Futures	47.0	47.3	(0.3)	0.2	(0.5)
Operational Services	114.0	114.4	(0.4)	(0.2)	(0.2)
People	316.3	298.8	17.5	17.4	0.1
Policy, Performance Comms	3.5	2.9	0.6	0.5	0.1
Resources	7.2	5.0	2.2	2.3	(0.1)
<b>Total</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>18.7</b>	<b>(1.6)</b>

1.2.2 This overspend is due to a combination of agreed Budget Implementation Plans (“BIPs”) not being fully implemented and ongoing cost / demand pressures that are partially offset by one-off savings.

Full Year Variance £m	One-off	BIPs	Trend	Total Variance
Corporate	0.0	0.0	(2.5)	(2.5)
City Futures	(0.1)	0.0	(0.2)	(0.3)
Operational Services	(6.3)	3.1	2.9	(0.3)
People	0.2	15.5	1.8	17.5
Policy, Performance Comms	(0.1)	0.3	0.3	0.5
Resources	(0.7)	1.8	1.1	2.2
<b>Total</b>	<b>(7.0)</b>	<b>20.7</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>17.1</b>

1.2.3 In 2021/22, the Council set aside £70m of reserves to manage the financial risks associated with delivering a balanced budget position. In 21/22, the council overspent by £19.8m which was drawn from this pool, a further £15m was used to balance the 22/23 budget and current forecast overspend at M8 is set to be £17.1m leaving a remaining risk allocation of £18.2m

M8	£m	
<b>Allocated reserves</b>	<b>70.0</b>	
21/22 Budget overspend	19.8	
22/23 Base budget committed	15.0	
22/23 BIP shortfall	20.6	
22/23 pressures	3.4	
22/23 in year mitigations	(7.0)	} (£17.1m overspend @ M8)
Reserves used @ M8	51.8	
<b>Remaining reserves</b>	<b>18.2</b>	

### 1.3 Committee Financial Position

#### 1.3.1 Overall Position - £17.1m overspend at Month 8

<b>There is a £11.6m overspend in the Adult Health and Social Care Committee and a £6.6m overspend in the Education, Children and Families Committee</b>	<b>Full Year Forecast £m @ Month 8</b>	<b>Outturn</b>	<b>Budget</b>	<b>Variance</b>
	Adult Health & Social Care	165.2	153.6	11.6
	Education, Children & Families	136.6	130.0	6.6
	Housing	8.2	8.7	(0.5)
	Transport, Regeneration & Climate	41.5	42.0	(0.5)
	Economic Development & Skills	11.6	11.7	(0.1)
	Waste & Street Scene	54.6	54.9	(0.3)
	Communities Parks and Leisure	45.7	46.2	(0.5)
	Strategy & Resources	(446.3)	(447.1)	0.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>17.1</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>17.1</b>

<b>Most of the full year forecast overspend is attributable to shortfalls in Budget Implementation Plans (BIPs) delivery</b>	<b>Variance Analysis £m @ Month 8</b>	<b>One-off</b>	<b>BIPs</b>	<b>Trend</b>	<b>Total Variance</b>
	Adult Health & Social Care	(0.4)	9.4	2.6	11.6
	Education, Children & Families	1.1	6.0	(0.6)	6.5
	Housing	0.0	0.0	(0.5)	(0.5)
	Transport, Regen & Climate	(2.1)	2.1	(0.6)	(0.5)
	Economic Dev't & Skills	(0.1)	0.0	0.0	(0.1)
	Waste & Street Scene	(3.3)	0.4	2.6	(0.4)
	Communities Parks & Leisure	(1.2)	0.4	0.3	(0.5)
	Strategy & Resources	(1.0)	2.3	(0.4)	0.9
	<b>Total</b>	<b>(7.0)</b>	<b>20.6</b>	<b>3.4</b>	<b>17.1</b>

**£7.0m of one-off savings are mitigating part of the ongoing overspend**

Contributions from provisions for energy and waste inflation mitigate the in-year impact of rising baseline costs. These are one-off contributions that will not help our position in 23/24 as the trend continues.

The government's Autumn Statement only gives us protection on the energy price cap on current rates until the end of the financial year. There has been a drop in wholesale prices recently, forecasters expect this to result in a fall in prices by Q3 2023 but are still likely to remain higher than pre-pandemic levels.

<b>Balancing the 22/23 budget was only possible with £53m of BIPs, £32m are reported as deliverable in year</b>	<b>Budget Savings Delivery Forecast @M8 £m</b>	<b>Total Savings 22/23</b>	<b>Deliverable in year</b>	<b>FY Variance</b>
	<b>Portfolio</b>			
	People	37.7	22.3	15.4
	Operational Services	7.1	4.0	3.1
	PPC	1.2	0.9	0.3
	Resources	6.7	4.9	1.8
	<b>Total</b>	<b>52.7</b>	<b>32.1</b>	<b>20.6</b>

**Focus must be on delivering BIPs in 22/23 and preventing the**

Of the £32m BIPs forecast as being deliverable, £10m are rated red, which indicates considerable risk that these will not be delivered in full which would increase the existing forecast overspend.



<b>budget gap from widening</b>	Of the £20.6m savings that are forecast to be undelivered this year, some can be delivered next financial year. It is estimated that £12m of this year's undelivered savings will still be unachievable in 23/24.
<b>Adult Health and Social Care are forecast to overspend by £11.6m</b>	<p>The high cost of packages of care put in place during covid has increased our baseline costs into 22/23. Work is underway as part of an investment plan with additional resource to tackle the underlying issues although recruitment issues are impacting our ability to deliver.</p> <p>The committee position was fairly stable from M7 to M8; purchasing budgets in Older People's and Physical Disabilities improved whereas Learning Disabilities expenditure continues to rise, this month increasing by a further £350k.</p>
<b>Education, Children and Families are forecast to overspend by £6.6m</b>	<p>Forecast under-delivery of budget implementation plans in the service are the main cause of overspends; plans to reduce staffing and increase income from Health are looking unlikely and the residential children's home strategy looks unlikely to deliver financial benefits.</p> <p>The committee's financial position declined in M8 by £0.2m from M7 mainly due to a reduction to the Aldine House income by a further £0.5m due to delays in a management appointment in the service that has limited capacity in the setting. There has also been an adverse movement in Special Educational Needs transport of £0.5m. Improvements in staffing forecasts across the service have partly offset these larger overspends.</p>

#### 1.4.5 **Transport, Regeneration & Climate Committee - underspend of £0.5m at Month 8**

The Transport, Regeneration & Climate Committee is forecast to underspend by £0.5m.	Full Year Forecast £m @ Month 8	Outturn	Budget	Variance
	<b>Streetscene &amp; Regulation</b> <i>(Clean Air Zone)</i>	0.1	0.0	0.1
	<b>Inclusive Growth &amp; Development</b> <i>(Capital Delivery; Director of Inclusive Growth; Property and Regeneration)</i>	0.4	0.4	0.0
	<b>Planning, Investment &amp; Sustainability</b> <i>(Planning Services; ITA Levy; Transport and Infrastructure)</i>	41.0	41.6	(0.6)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>(0.5)</b>

The planned Clean Air Zone saving of £2.1m has been offset by use of a specific reserve in 22-23.	Variance Analysis £m @ Month 8	One-off	BIPs	Trend
	Streetscene & Regulation	(2.1)	2.1	0.1
	Inclusive Growth & Devt	0.0	0.0	0.0
	Planning, Investment & Sustain	0.0	0.0	(0.6)
	<b>Total</b>	<b>(2.1)</b>	<b>2.1</b>	<b>(0.5)</b>

The planned Clean Air Zone saving of £2.1m has been offset by use of a one-off specific reserve. However, this pressure requires a sustainable mitigation be identified for future years.

Operating spend assumed to be met from income forecast from the introduction of the charging Clean Air Zone remains a risk given potential slippage in the programme following continued dialogue with central government.

<b>The impact of the proposed pay offer creates an extra £0.1m pressure to the committee</b>	The pay award of £1,925 flat rate per employee was paid to employees in M8, including backpay, unwinding the provision made into forecasts in M4. The award impacted the Committee by £0.1m.
--	--

The below table gives a more detailed breakdown of the Committee's net £42m budget:

Service	FY budget	FY Outturn - Income	FY Outturn - Expend	Total FY Outturn	Total FY Variance
CLEAN AIR ZONE	0.0	(0.0)	0.1	0.1	0.1
<b>STREETSCENE &amp; REGULATION Total</b>	<b>0.0</b>	<b>(0.0)</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.1</b>	<b>0.1</b>
CAPITAL DELIVERY SERVICE	0.0	(6.6)	6.6	(0.0)	(0.0)
DIR INCLUSIVE GROWTH	0.1	(0.0)	0.1	0.1	(0.0)
PROPERTY REGENERATION	0.3	(1.1)	1.4	0.3	0.0
<b>INCLUSIVE GROWTH &amp; DEV Total</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>(7.7)</b>	<b>8.1</b>	<b>0.4</b>	<b>(0.0)</b>
DIR OF PLANNING INVEST & SUS	0.1		0.1	0.1	(0.0)
PLANNING SERVICES	3.1	(3.6)	6.9	3.3	0.2
PRECEPTS AND LEVIES	23.3		23.3	23.3	(0.0)

SUSTAINABILITY & INVESTMENT		0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0
TRANSPORT & INFRASTRUCTURE	15.0	4.8	9.4	14.2	(0.8)
<b>PLANNING, INVEST &amp; SUSTAIN Total</b>	<b>41.6</b>	<b>1.2</b>	<b>39.8</b>	<b>41.0</b>	<b>(0.6)</b>
<b>TOTAL COMMITTEE</b>	<b>42.0</b>	<b>(6.5)</b>	<b>48.0</b>	<b>41.5</b>	<b>(0.5)</b>

**The underspend reflects vacancies and higher Highway Network activity**

Contributory factors in the underspend are vacancies within Planning & Transport and extra income from higher than planned Highway Network Management activity which is often difficult to predict.

## **2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?**

- 2.1 The recommendations in this report are that each Policy Committee undertakes any work required to both balance their 2022/23 budget and prepare for the 2023/24 budget.

## **3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?**

- 3.1 There has been no consultation on this report, however, it is anticipated that the budget process itself will involve significant consultation as the Policy Committees develop their budget proposals

## **4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION**

### 4.1 Equality Implications

- 4.1.1 There are no direct equality implications arising from this report. It is expected that individual Committees will use equality impact analyses as a basis for the development of their budget proposals in due course.

### 4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

- 4.2.1 There are no direct financial implications from this report.

### 4.3 Legal Implications

- 4.3.1 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.

- 4.3.2 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.

- 4.3.3 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.

### 4.4 Climate Implications

- 4.4.1 There are no direct climate implications arising from this report. It is expected that individual Committees will consider climate implications as they develop their budget proposals in due course.

### 4.4 Other Implications

4.4.1 No direct implication

**5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

5.1 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.

**6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1 This paper is to bring the committee up to date with the Council's current financial position as at Month 8 2022/23.

This page is intentionally left blank



## Report to Policy Committee

**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** *Lisa Blakemore, Senior Transport Planner*

**Tel:** 01142 057486

**Report of:** *Executive Director of City Futures*

**Report to:** *Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee*

**Date of Decision:** *8<sup>th</sup> February 2023*

**Subject:** *Report objections to the Traffic Regulation Order for Park Hill Parking Zone.*

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? 1361				
Has appropriate consultation taken place?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has a Climate Impact Assessment (CIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-				
<p><i>“The (<b>report/appendix</b>) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (<b>insert relevant paragraph number</b>) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).”</i></p>				

### Purpose of Report:

To report details of the consultation response to proposals to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone in Park Hill, report the receipt of objections to the Traffic Regulation Order and set out the Council’s response and recommendations.

## **Recommendations:**

It is recommended that the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee:

- Note that a smaller parking scheme than that which was advertised is proposed to be implemented. The amended scheme is shown in Appendix C;
- Consider the objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order with particular regard to how they relate to the smaller area shown in Appendix C;
- Having considered the objections, decide to make the Traffic Regulation Order (as amended) in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- Approve the implementation of the proposed Controlled Parking Zone in Park Hill; and
- Note that the Council's Traffic Regulations team will inform all consultation respondents accordingly.
- Write to all properties within the boundary of the initial larger consultation area to inform them of the recommendations to implement a smaller scheme.
- Note that a review of the scheme boundary will be carried out after around 12 months of the approved scheme being active

Note that the recommendations being implemented are subject to funding being identified.

## **Background Papers:**

**Appendix A:** Proposed larger scheme boundary (as advertised)

**Appendix B:** Consultation leaflet & letter extending consultation period

**Appendix C:** Recommended smaller scheme boundary

**Appendix D:** Full list of consultation responses

**Appendix E:** Consultation responses from reduced area recommended by report



Lead Officer to complete:		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.	Finance: Kerry Darlow
		Legal: Richard Cannon
		Equalities & Consultation: <i>Ed Sexton</i>
		Climate: Jessica Rick
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>		
2	<b>SLB member who approved submission:</b>	<i>Kate Martin</i>
3	<b>Committee Chair consulted:</b>	<i>Mazher Iqbal and Julie Grocutt</i>
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Committee by the SLB member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> <i>David Whitley</i>	<b>Job Title:</b> <i>Transport Schemes Manager</i>
	<b>Date:</b> 25.01.2022	

## 1. PROPOSAL

- 1.1 There are high demands on the available parking spaces in many areas of the city.
- 1.2 The Council has previously implemented several Controlled Parking Zones (CPZs), mainly in the area immediately around the city centre as well as in the district shopping centre at Hillsborough. These were areas which suffered from the effects of high levels of unrestricted commuter parking. It was originally envisaged that these parking schemes would form a complete ring around the city centre and be used as appropriate in district centres too.

- 1.3 In line with the City Council's Transport Strategy 2019 to 2035, there is a priority action of 'Introducing a programme of new Controlled Parking Zones, with the priority being uncontrolled areas adjacent the city centre'. Managing the supply of spaces by restriction or price is a method of demand management commonly employed by local authorities.
- 1.4 High levels of parking can also restrict the access for service vehicles and emergency services, as well as parking for business customers and visitors, along with adverse impacts on local amenity.
- 1.5 This report details the consultation response to the introduction of this CPZ, reports the receipt of objections and sets out the Council's response.

The advertised CPZ boundary is shown in **Appendix A**  
The recommended CPZ boundary is shown in **Appendix C**

- 1.6 A smaller scheme boundary than that which was originally advertised is proposed to be implemented. If the recommendations in this report are approved, the Council will write to all residents within the initial consultation boundary to inform them of the decision made. Information about the smaller scheme will be included, but the Council will make it clear that this is not a further consultation exercise. The aim is to have this letter distributed within 2 weeks of the committee meeting and decision.
- 1.7 If approved, the detailed design of the scheme will be started soon after the decision and pay and display machines will be ordered. Pay and display machines currently have a delivery time of at least 4 months. There is the possibility that the scheme can be constructed in Autumn 2023.
- 1.8 Coates Street is not within the new smaller proposed parking scheme boundary. The Council's officers have been asked by local members to look at how users of the park library can be assisted so as to be able to park close to the building. It is therefore intended that a stand-alone proposal for a scheme introducing some limited waiting parking (2 hours maximum stay) be advanced to statutory consultation in the Spring, as this restriction will require a new Traffic Regulation Order to be advertised. No decision is being sought from members on this scheme at this stage.
- 1.9 As part of the consultation for the Park Hill CPZ, Farm Bank Road was included in the proposal as having shared use pay and display/ permit holders only parking bays along it. This is the proposal which members are recommended to approve in this report. It is considered that there may be merit in amending the proposed parking restrictions on Farm Bank Road so that they would operate in a similar way to those currently proposed on

Castle Croft Drive, which is also a cul-de-sac. It is intended that 'Permit Holders Only' restrictions are to be introduced here using signs only at the entry onto the street. Bay markings will not be installed. Introducing a similar 'Permit Holders Only' restriction at the entry onto Farm Bank Road would maximise the potential parking capacity on this short cul-de-sac. This will require a new Traffic Regulation Order to be advertised and consulted on. It is intended that this will be progressed in the Spring if the Park Hill CPZ is approved. The Council will make a decision as to whether permit holder only bays will be implemented instead of the shared use bays once the advertisement/consultation of the new TRO has been carried out - no decision is being sought from members on the bays being for permit holders only at this stage.

## **2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?**

- 2.1 Traffic congestion, and all of the associated adverse environmental, social and safety consequences arising from it, is an issue in all major cities, and it is tackled through a variety of means.
- 2.2 The availability of parking is an important factor in congestion and demand management. An International Parking Institute study indicated that at busy times as much as 30% of traffic in urban areas is seeking a parking space. (International Parking Institute (IPI) 2012 Emerging Trends in Parking Study).
- 2.3 Availability of parking is an increasing concern to motorists, as noted in the RAC's annual motoring report.
- 2.4 There was a sharp increase in concern about the availability of parking in 2016 - 14% of motorists say this is a top-four concern as opposed to just 8% in 2015. In 2020, the figure increased to 15%, despite the fact that more people have been working from home during the Coronavirus pandemic. In 2022 this figure was 12%.
- 2.5 Local authorities can have positive influences on congestion by:
- Influencing travel mode choice (i.e. encouraging drivers to use more sustainable travel modes, like walking, cycling and public transport for at least some trips), and encouraging the reduction in a need to travel; and
  - Ensure that the availability and cost of parking is managed effectively so that local resident and business needs are considered and commuter parking is controlled.

Studies indicate that managing the availability of parking and its price can have a positive effect on travel behaviour

- 2.6 *“Much research has demonstrated the importance of parking costs to travel choices although the extent of the impact may vary. A combination of parking charges and reducing or restricting parking availability is likely to be most effective in encouraging behavioural change.” (Parking Measures and Research Review, TRL, 2010).*
- 2.7 Some people, particularly businesses, may perceive that the imposition of parking charges or increasing them could have a negative effect on business. Research suggests otherwise.
- 2.8 A parking research review commissioned by the London Councils and carried out by The Means in 2012 (a place making consultancy which studied all relevant research carried out on parking) concluded that a well-structured and managed parking system with appropriate charges could be beneficial to businesses in urban centres.
- 2.9 The RAC Foundation track the Transport Price Index<sup>1</sup> over a rolling 10 year period using data from the Office for National Statistics. Figures indicate that over the last 10 years to Dec 2022 that whilst the cost of motoring has increased by 39% the cost of bus travel continues to rise by a far higher rate at 89% and rail travel costs increased by 33%.
- 2.10 The disparity in the relative increases in the cost of transport do not encourage people to move from private car use to public transport. Whilst there has been a significant disruption to travel patterns over the last few years as a result of Covid 19 and associated lockdown periods, a number of corridors in the city are experiencing traffic volumes at or above the pre-pandemic levels. This is at the same time that the return to public transport has continued to be affected with patronage levels close to c.80% of pre-pandemic levels.
- 2.11 A continued reliance on private car trips inevitably means pressure on the available parking spaces. One of the ways in which the Council has been managing traffic levels is via the introduction of area-wide parking schemes. These have been mainly in the areas immediately surrounding the city centre, such as Broomhill, Broomhall, Crookesmoor etc with the original intention being to form a ring of controlled parking zones surrounding the city centre. One has also been introduced in the district shopping centre at Hillsborough.
- 2.12 In the early to mid 2010s, Members requested that there would be a pause in development of any new parking schemes. This has meant that the circle of parking schemes around the city centre is incomplete, concentrating demand for free all-day parking in the

---

<sup>1</sup> <https://www.racfoundation.org/data/cost-of-transport-index>

remaining unrestricted areas, including Park Hill as outlined SCCs' 2018 Parking Strategy.

- 2.13 The management of parking through the introduction of parking restrictions and use of parking permits contributes to the management of traffic in the city.
- 2.14 Traffic management through parking restrictions and their enforcement also enables the Council to help deliver its Vision for "Reliable and clean journeys for everyone in a flourishing Sheffield" as articulated through SCC's 2019 to 2035 Transport Strategy.
- 2.15 This scheme represents a step towards the delivery of the Transport Strategy, namely the introduction of a new CPZ in an uncontrolled area adjacent the city centre.

### **3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?**

- 3.1.1 Due to the large area of the proposed Parkhill CPZ and the number of large plans that would need to be sent to each household, it was decided that a postcard would be sent to all residents with key information on such as scheme operating times and permits costs. A copy is in appendix B to this report.
- 3.1.2 The post card directed people to a website containing relevant information on the proposals, and 2 community buildings as well as Howden House to be able to view the plans in full. The Council did also offer to print and deliver plans for individual households who were struggling to view the plans by any other means. Many people took the Council up on this offer.
- 3.1.3 The statutory legal consultation began on the 10<sup>th</sup> March 2022 and was scheduled for conclusion on the 7<sup>th</sup> April. The Council sent a further letter to residents on 12<sup>th</sup> April with more information about the consultation process and also advising that the consultation period had been extended until 22<sup>nd</sup> April to allow more people to have their say. In the interests of allowing as many people to contribute their comments as possible, comments received after the 22<sup>nd</sup> April have also been accepted and are presented for consideration in this report.
- 3.1.4 The Council asked that respondents use the Citizen Space webpage to register their views on the scheme so that specific questions could be answered to better inform the Council's knowledge of the area and potential parking issues (or lack thereof). The public were also provided with an email address for

people to ask further queries about the scheme and some residents used this method to register their comments.

- 3.1.5 In line with statutory obligations, street notices were also placed on all affected streets and a newspaper article in the Sheffield Telegraph advertised the proposed order. The Council considered it expedient that, in this instance only and as part of its process for proposing the Traffic Regulation Order, Ward Members were emailed details of the proposal 2 weeks in advance of residents receiving their letters (in case they had any comments).
- 3.1.6 There has also been extensive Member engagement on this scheme prior to the consultation starting. Monthly meetings were held to discuss the scope of the scheme so as to ensure that the Council was consulting on proposals that members were comfortable with. The Council also engaged members with its consultation package to ensure that they were happy with the method chosen and there were no gaps in the people that were reached.
- 3.1.7 The Council has a legal responsibility to comply with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure)(England and Wales) Regulations 1996. This states that "*An objection [to the making of a Traffic Regulation Order] shall be made in writing*".
- 3.1.8 The Traffic Order advertisements stated that objections could be made in writing, by email, or via the council's Consultation Hub webpage ([sheffield.citizenspace.com](http://sheffield.citizenspace.com)).
- 3.1.9 The Regulations stipulate that "*Any person may object to the making of an order by [...] the end of the period of 21 days beginning with the date on which the order making authority [publicises the order].*" However, comments and objections received after the closing date were added to the collation of responses and duly considered.
- 3.2 Consultation Responses
- 3.2.1 There are 3971 properties (business and residential) within the larger Parkhill boundary that was originally consulted on. There have been 1088 responses to the consultation of the larger scheme via our Citizen Space webpage. 183 of these were support, 905 were objections.
- 3.2.2 260 people sent in emails. Many of these said that they had completed the citizen space survey but wanted to ask questions about the scheme or offer extra comments.
- 3.2.3 This report recommends the implementation of a smaller sized parking scheme than was originally advertised. The reasons for this reduction in size are covered in the rest of this report. As

regards to that smaller area, there have been 317 responses received on the Citizen Space survey, of these, 107 were supporting the scheme, 210 were objecting to the scheme.

The concerns of the objectors can be broken down into several main categories, namely:

- Cost (wanting free permits or at least for first car)
- Not being necessary;
- Wont stop commuters
- No guarantee of space
- Moves the issue
- Zone too large
- Harmful to business
- Reduced number of parking spaces

3.2.4 Officers have replied to all respondents that emailed the inbox asking for further information or clarification on the proposals.

3.2.5 A petition with 2145 signatures was also received on 1<sup>st</sup> June 2022

3.2.6 Appendix D is a full list of the responses received from the citizen space website. Below is a summary of the comments received, including those concerns expresses in emails/ letters received.

.

### 3.3 **Cost**

3.3.1 This was the main reason that the objections were made. Many residents commented that residents shouldn't have to pay or at least the first permit should be free.

3.3.2 Unfortunately, we cannot make permits free as the revenue received is required so as meet the costs of the administration and enforcement of the scheme. The permit costs are in line with our other CPZs (Highfield etc) rather than the higher City Centre tariffs.

3.3.3 The Council's Transport Strategy and its Clean Air Strategy make it clear that it will use parking to manage demand and encourage the use of more sustainable modes of transport such as walking, cycling and public Transport and to incentivise lower emission forms of travel.

3.3.4 The current Secretary of State's Guidance on enforcing parking restrictions is that the aim should be for the scheme to be self-financing as soon as practicable. This means that in order to cover the cost of implementing and enforcing the CPZ, the Council must charge for parking during controlled hours. The Secretary of State will not expect either national or local taxpayers to meet any deficit.

- 3.3.5 In common with other highway authorities, the Council applies a fixed tariff that does not distinguish between a person's ability to afford the charges. Whilst this means that parking in the CPZ during its operational periods would be proportionally less affordable to those on low income, it would be disproportionate in terms of cost to the Council and complexity to operate any other method (e.g. a means-based cost).
- 3.3.6 Parking provisions for disabled badge holders was mentioned in the comments, and the lack of disabled bays proposed within the scheme. Drivers with blue badges can park in parking bays within the proposed CPZ without time limit or cost and without the need to purchase a parking permit.
- 3.3.7 The permit prices for this scheme are proposed to be in line with other Controlled Parking Zones (Highfield etc) rather than higher City Centre permit prices. The pay and display tariff is proposed to be the same as in the City Centre.

#### **Need to pay for visitors**

- 3.4 Many respondents were concerned about visitors to their properties. If visitors are parking during scheme operating hours (Mon-Fri 8am-6.30pm), they will need to pay and display if parking in one of the bays. An alternative option would be for the resident to purchase a book of "visitor" permits. These are interchangeable between vehicles during the day so even if a visitor is only parked for an hour, that permit can be used for another visitor on that same day if needed. They also work out better value for money than if a visitor had to pay the pay and display tariff.
- 3.4.1
- 3.4.2 If a visitor parks outside the scheme operating times, no charge, time limit or permit is required.
- 3.4.3 If a visitor has a blue badge, they can park within bays in the proposed CPZ free of charge, without time limit or a permit.

#### **Harmful to businesses**

- 3.5.1 As our population gets bigger and we are seeing more and more cars on our roads, CPZs make parking easier for residents and businesses, and protect against future parking pressures.
- 3.5.2 The proposed restrictions will influence commuter parking and other long-stay parking through the charges that will apply, so there are more parking spaces for businesses and local residents - and it's more convenient for visitors and for tradespeople and deliveries.
- 3.5.3 Having a permit does not guarantee a parking space outside a business, but it should make it easier. To make sure that this



works fairly, all CPZs are enforced by uniformed Civil Enforcement Officers (CEOs).

3.5.4 Some people, particularly businesses, may perceive that the imposition of parking charges or increasing them could have a negative effect on business. Research suggests otherwise. A 2017 report to Transport & Sustainability Committee on Non-City Centre Parking Developments outlined the following:

A parking research review, commissioned by the London Councils and carried out by The Means, a placemaking consultancy, which studied all relevant research carried out on parking, concluded that a well-structured and managed parking system with appropriate charges could be beneficial to businesses:

*“The limited research into the impacts of parking on the local economy suggest that there are no adverse impacts of a well-managed parking scheme on the local economy (COST Action 342 2005). Research carried out in The Netherlands even suggests that a well-structured parking system, could even be beneficial to town centres. If set appropriately, parking charges results in a higher turnover of visitors and therefore potentially higher retail turnover.”*

The Means concluded that Parking was not the most influential factor for motorists in deciding whether to visit a shopping destination:

*“Parking is often perceived as important to town centre business in attracting customers. The Means own survey data demonstrates this as does the RAC Foundation and British Retail Consortium Report from 2006. However, the evidence from studies focusing on shopper surveys suggests that other factors may be much more influential in the choice of shopping location. Some of the most frequently quoted are the mix of retail and environmental improvements or creating a pleasant atmosphere in which to shop.”*

Here there is also an irony: congestion is one of the factors that are often cited as making an urban centre location unattractive, yet retailers still perceive parking as being one of the main reasons for lack of footfall. Well managed parking that reduces the need for searching could be one way to improve the attractiveness of town centre. At the same time, reducing congestion makes it easier for those on foot to access town centres. (The Relevance of Parking in the Success of Urban Centres, The Means, 2012).

3.5.5 This supports the introduction of CPZs as being beneficial to businesses,

### 3.6 **Fairness**

3.6.1 Many residents responded that the scheme was unfair.

As outlined in the previous responses above:

- Our population is getting bigger, and we are seeing more and more cars on our roads, CPZs make parking easier for residents and businesses to access local services, and

protect against future parking pressures. This is in accordance with the Council's duties, particularly in respect of highway network management, which the Council is required to discharge in a fair and proportionate way for the benefit of all highway users (including pedestrians) by implementing and enforcing restrictions pursuant to those duties wherever it is deemed expedient across the breadth of the highway network it manages;

- In common with other highway authorities, the Council applies a fixed tariff that does not distinguish between a person's ability to afford the charges; and
- The Council has carried out a consultation so as to ensure that it is exercising its powers with the benefit of having considered the views expressed, offering fairness by enabling those affected to contribute. This has resulted in amendments to the proposed scheme, including a reduction in its size.

### 3.7 **Not being necessary**

3.7.1 There were many residents that said the scheme is unnecessary as there are currently no parking issues to resolve or that the parking issue is created by residents so a parking scheme wouldn't make any difference.

3.7.2 Residents' permits are limited to 2 per household so the introduction of a scheme will help to free up parking where properties have multiple cars parked on the street.

3.7.3 The reasons why it was considered necessary to propose a CPZ for Park Hill are set out in section 2 of this report. The scheme was originally proposed to cover a larger area. The Council recognised that post-covid parking surveys should be carried out, as the data that the Council had been using was pre-covid and, with the shift in working patterns and more people working from home, it needed to be working with the most up to date data possible. There was a definite change in the occupancy of certain roads within the proposed area and this is one of the reasons that the Council is now proposing a much smaller area than originally advertised. It also reflects that the Council is choosing to exercise its powers in a proportionate way while still having regard to its duties.

### 3.8 **Lack of safe and suitable alternatives**

3.8.1 Streets will be safer because CPZs designate where it's safe to park and where it's not, creating better visibility at junctions. There will also be better access for emergency and utility vehicles and other large vehicles like rubbish and recycling lorries and delivery or removals vans. CPZs also reduce inconsiderate parking, create more space for residents; a more attractive, safer street; and easier access.

### 3.9 **Reduced number of parking spaces**

3.9.1 In total, the parking capacity in the area will be reduced from around 804 spaces to around 540. When formal parking bays are marked out, they need to be a standard size to account for all sizes of vehicles. Some of the 804 spaces currently available are not appropriate parking spaces. When the Council introduces a parking scheme, and where it is deemed necessary, it also installs double yellow lines to protect driveways, junctions and also ensure the safe passage of pedestrians, cyclists and vehicles through the scheme.

### 3.10 **Area too large**

3.10.1 Several people commented on the area included in the parking scheme being too large. The original proposal was based on previous experience from other parking schemes implemented by the Council – parking typically displaces from areas where there are new parking restrictions to areas where they aren't any. By including a larger area in its proposals, the Council was intending to protect residents from this displacement of parking.

3.10.2 The proposed scheme has now been made much smaller and although we expect parking to displace from the restricted area, it is difficult to predict how many displaced vehicles there will be and where these will move to (depending where their final destination is).

### 3.11 **Won't stop commuters**

3.11.1 Many residents commented that the scheme will not stop commuters from parking in the area. The pay and display costs will be in line with all council owned City Centre car parks. It is expected that commuters willing to pay this tariff will likely prefer to park in the City Centre closer to their destination as it is considered likely that they are parking in the Park Hill area owing to it currently being free and unrestricted. Or, due to the cost of parking, commuters may consider alternative and more sustainable options for their journeys.

### 3.12 **Wrong scheme operating times**

3.12.1 Several residents commented that the scheme operating times were not helpful and would not reduce match day parking.

3.12.2 The Council's existing parking schemes have various operating days/ times to manage local parking issues. For instance, the Highfield scheme operates on a Saturday as the area suffers with Saturday match day parking. Before the Council consulted the

public on the scheme, it engaged with local members about the operating days/ times that they thought would suit local needs.

3.12.3 Local members didn't see the need for the scheme to be operational over the weekend as Bramall Lane match day parking didn't stretch as far as the scheme extents and they did not suffer from weekend City Centre shopping parking in the area. The Council agreed to take the proposed Monday-Friday operating times out to consultation based on this information and would use the consultation responses as well as updated parking surveys to inform which scheme would then be recommended for implementation.

3.13 **No Guarantee of spaces/ no priority for residents**

3.13.1 Many residents commented that even with the introduction of a CPZ there wouldn't be enough parking spaces for residents despite them paying for a permit. Although the scheme does not guarantee a space, the Council's experience of introducing other CPZs indicates that the scheme does give a greater opportunity for residents to find a parking space close to their house than in uncontrolled parking conditions.

3.13.2 In line with the Council's 2018 Parking Strategy, all parking bays should be shared use/pay and display bays so there will be "no residents only" bays. However, it is expected that most commuters that park all day will not use these bays and there will be spaces available for residents.

3.14 **Moves the issue**

3.14.1 The Council has observed from the implementation of previous schemes that there is typically a displacement of parking to streets outside of a CPZ. This is why such a large area was originally proposed – in other words, so that as many streets as possible were protected from this displacement. As mentioned in paragraph 3.13, a smaller area is now proposed. It is also hoped that commuters will look to use other modes of transport if free parking isn't easily accessible close to the City Centre.

3.15 OTHER CONSULTEES

3.15.1 No response has been received from other consultees, such as South Yorkshire Police, South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service or the Yorkshire Ambulance Service, or South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive.

**4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION**

#### 4.1 Equality Implications

4.1.1 Overall, there are no significant differential, positive or negative, equalities impact from this proposal. The rollout of the Parkhill CPZ will generally have a positive impact improving traffic flow, road safety and allows users to park safely across the area. No negative equality impacts have been identified.

#### 4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

4.2.1 The revised IBC was approved in August 2022

4.2.2 The funding source for the implementation of the scheme, currently proposed as capital loan that will be repaid from surplus income generated from the scheme, is still to be confirmed through the formal financial approvals.

4.2.3 The cost of the feasibility work is £168,473 and this is broken down as follows:

- £118,500 for Transport fees which covers TRO work costs for the larger scheme as advertised, letter drop/ consultation costs, pre-covid parking surveys
- £40,000 for post covid-speed surveys
- £11,000 for other fees (CDS inclusive)

The estimated cost of the scheme as proposed is as follows:

- £75,000 pay and display machines, £2241 annually for their maintenance
- £32,000 detailed design.
- £352,707 construction
- £29,000 monitoring & surveys
- £45,000 commuted sum for the scheme's future maintenance.

4.2.4 The financial analysis of income/ expenditure shows that the scheme cost will be paid back in 2 years and 9 months which meets the requirements for funding through capital borrowing and this is how the scheme is proposed to be funded.

#### 4.3 Legal Implications

4.3.1 The Council has the power to make Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO) under section 1 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 ('the 1984 Act') which include any provision prohibiting, restricting or regulating the use of a road, or any part of the width of a road, by vehicular traffic of any class specified in the order. This includes prohibiting or restricting the waiting of vehicles so as to implement a Controlled Parking Zone, as set out in this report.

- 4.3.2 A Traffic Regulation Order may be made where it appears expedient to the Council to do so for the reasons set out in section 1 of the 1984 Act - this includes the avoidance of danger to people or traffic, for facilitating the passage on the road or any other road of any class of traffic (including pedestrians), preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs and for any of the purposes specified in paragraphs (a) to (c) of subsection (1) of section 87 of the Environment Act 1995 (air quality). The proposal in this report is considered to align with these purposes.
- 4.3.3 Part IV of the 1984 Act gives the Local Authority powers to designate parking places on a highway by order and make such provision as may appear to that authority to be necessary or expedient for regulating or restricting the use of any parking place designated by order, including via permit. These powers are proposed to be used accordingly.
- 4.3.4 Before the Council can make a TRO, it must consult with relevant bodies and publish notice of its intention in a local newspaper in accordance with the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996 as well as take such steps as it considers appropriate for ensuring that adequate publicity is given to the proposed order. This includes the display of notices on street. The Council has complied with these requirements
- 4.3.5 The Council is required to consider all duly made objections received and not withdrawn before it can proceed with making an order. Those objections are summarised and presented for consideration in this report. A full list of the objections is also appended to this report. The Council may modify an order, whether in consequence of any objections or otherwise, before it is made. The modifications described within this report are not considered to be substantial changes in the proposed order for which the Council considers it appropriate to take additional steps so as to inform those persons likely to be affected by the modifications; no new restrictions are proposed as a result of the modifications. Rather, the intended size of the proposed CPZ has been reduced.
- 4.3.6 In deciding whether to make a TRO, the Council must have regard to its duty under section 122 of the 1984 Act to secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) as well as the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway, so far as practicable while having regard to the matters specified below:
- (a) the desirability of securing and maintaining reasonable access to premises;

(b) the effect on the amenities of any locality affected and (without prejudice to the generality of this paragraph) the importance of regulating and restricting the use of roads by heavy commercial vehicles, so as to preserve or improve the amenities of the areas through which the roads run;

(bb) the strategy prepared under section 80 of the Environment Act 1995 (national air quality strategy)

(c) the importance of facilitating the passage of public service vehicles and of securing the safety and convenience of persons using or desiring to use such vehicles; and

(d) any other matters appearing to the Council to be relevant.

The proposal detailed in this report is considered to align with the objectives of the aforementioned duty.

4.3.7 The Council is under a further duty contained in section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 to manage their road network with a view to securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network, so far as may be reasonably practicable while having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives. This is called the network management duty and includes any actions the Council may take in performing that duty which contribute for securing the more efficient use of their road network or for the avoidance, elimination or reduction of road congestion (or other disruption to the movement of traffic) on their road network. It may involve the exercise of any power to regulate or co-ordinate the uses made of any road (or part of a road) in its road network. The proposals described in this report are considered to fulfil that duty.

#### 4.4 Climate Implications

4.4.1 The climate impact assessment has considered how the proposed measures impact on climate change.

4.4.2 The Council declared a Climate Emergency in February 2019 and through its 10-Point Plan for climate action is committed to being carbon neutral by 2030. The proposed Parkhill CPZ helps us to achieve this commitment, by:

- Reducing congestion and air pollution from vehicles travelling to Park Hill to park and commute;
- Discouraging short trips by car which can readily be made by other active transport modes;
- Encouraging commuters to consider more sustainable travel options for their daily journeys;
- Making it easier for residents, and their visitors and delivery drivers, to park near their homes; and

- Improving conditions for businesses, and their visitors by ensuring the availability of convenient parking, and loading/unloading space.

4.4.3 Transport is a major contributor to CO2 emissions in Sheffield and CPZ's are a small but important aspect of how we can help to make our roads safer and less congested while improving air quality.

4.4.4 The potential for reduced emissions will contribute to the overall resilience to climate change.

#### 4.5 Other Implications

4.5.1 There will be an expectation from residents and businesses that it will be easier for them to park near their homes and businesses. However, there is a risk that this will not happen which could lead to complaints or reduced service satisfaction levels.

4.5.2 Also, the introduction of the CPZ goes against the consultation outcome and there is potential for public opposition to the change.

4.5.3 Surveys to monitor the impact of the CPZ will be carried out once the scheme has been in place for several months. If the scheme is not meeting its objectives, and subject to the availability of funding, additional measures will be considered to improve the schemes outcomes.

### 5. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

5.1 Consideration was given to limited waiting, without charging (e.g. 4 hours, no return within 2 hours), with permits considered where appropriate. However, this was discounted for the following reasons:

- Enforcement of the restrictions are more resource intensive and time consuming;
- Puts pressure on existing enforcement resources as limited extra income through enforcement may not cover additional costs;
- Lack of consistency of approach with other areas of the City;
- Residents and businesses could feel that they are being charged to park in the area where visitors (and potentially commuters) may not; and



- There is anecdotal evidence from schemes around the City that suggest that people may move their vehicles part way through the day to avoid the 4-hour restrictions.

## **6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**


6.1 The proposed Park Hill controlled parking zone will:

- Improve conditions for local businesses residents by ensuring the availability of convenient parking spaces for residents, business and visitors and giving them a greater level of priority where appropriate through issuing permits;
- Improve access through the area and loading and unloading opportunities for all vehicles (especially larger ones) by removing parking at or near junctions; and
- Improve conditions for sustainable travel modes.

6.2 Specific responses to the points raised in the feedback to the consultation are addressed earlier in this report. On balance, it is considered that the Council should proceed with the implementation of the Park Hill Controlled Parking Zone in the amended form set out in Appendix C to this report as its benefits are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

6.3 It is good practice to review any highway scheme after it has been active for a period of time to ensure that it is delivering on the benefits expected. Parking behaviours are constantly changing post covid so reviewing the boundary of the scheme after around 12 months will ensure that the scheme on site is the best scheme to achieve our objectives.

## Appendix A: Advertised scheme boundary



## Appendix B: Consultation Leaflet

# PARKHILL PARKING SCHEME

**WE ARE PROPOSING TO INTRODUCE A CONTROLLED PARKING SCHEME IN YOUR AREA.  
THIS WOULD RUN MONDAY – FRIDAY BETWEEN 8AM AND 6.30PM.**

If you would like to see full plans showing the proposals, they will be available to view at:

- First Point, Howden House, Union Lane, S1 2SH
- Park Library Centre, 243 Duke Street, S2 5QP
- The Centre in the Park: Norfolk Park Heritage Centre, Guildford Avenue

Please ask for the Park Hill Parking Zone folder at the reception counter.  
There will also be 'Frequently Asked Questions' in here.

Alternatively, you can find all these documents online at <https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/home/parking/new-parking-zones>

If you are unable to access either of these and would like a personal paper copy showing proposals in your area, please email [parkingschemes@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:parkingschemes@sheffield.gov.uk)



Information about the price of main permits and pay and display tariffs are shown below.

### Proposed permit types and costs

<b>1st resident</b>	46.60 per year
<b>2nd resident</b>	93.60 per year
<b>1st business</b>	93.60 per year
<b>2nd business</b>	187.20 per year

### Proposed Pay & Display parking charges

<b>Mon - Fri</b>	8.00am - 6.30pm	£1.30 per hour £6.50 all day
------------------	-----------------	---------------------------------

### HAVE YOUR SAY!

We want to know what you think about these proposed changes - please let us know by completing the survey at <https://sheffield.citizenspace.com/place/phppz>

Alternatively, please write to **Strategic Transport, Sustainability and Infrastructure, Floor 5, Howden House, 1 Union Street, Sheffield, S1 2SW**

Sheffield City Council • [www.sheffield.gov.uk](http://www.sheffield.gov.uk)

## Letter extending consultation period

**Strategic Transport, Sustainability and Infrastructure,  
City Growth Department**

Head of Service: Tom Finnegan-Smith  
Howden House · 1 Union Street · Sheffield · S1 2SH



Date: 12<sup>th</sup> April 2022

Dear Residents

### **PARK HILL PARKING SCHEME CONSULTATION - UPDATE**

I am writing to explain a little more about the current consultation on the Park Hill Parking Scheme.

A number of people have already responded to the consultation, and due to the strong response so far and the high level of interest, to make sure that as many people as possible have an opportunity to respond we will be extending the date for responses to the consultation to **22<sup>nd</sup> April 2022**.

Our consultation questionnaire can be found at <https://sheffield.citizenpace.com/elacaofhops/> and copies of the detailed maps showing the proposed parking places and restrictions can be found on our website at <https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/home/parking/new-parking-zones>. The plans are also available at the Park library, Centre in the Park and Howden House. You can also respond by email to [parkingschemes@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:parkingschemes@sheffield.gov.uk).

We have received a number of comments from people who have questioned why their streets are included in the boundary of the parking scheme. We understand that some people have concerns about the scheme as they currently do not experience any issues parking outside their properties. It is our experience that if we do install parking restrictions on only those roads that suffer with commuter parking, there will be a displacement of parking onto roads that do not have any restrictions. This is why we are consulting on proposals that cover a wider area.

It is important that we hear from as many people as possible at this stage. Once the consultation closes on **22nd April 2022**, we will begin collating all responses and considering these carefully.

When we have completed our analysis of the responses, we will then be able to determine the next steps. Given the number of responses we have already received, and others anticipated before the closing date, this will take some time to ensure that we consider these fully.

We are planning to report the results of the consultation to the Council and to residents in early Summer 2022 along with recommendations on whether the scheme or any adaptation should be implemented.

I hope this letter reassures you that the implementation of this scheme in its current format is NOT a foregone conclusion. We will take ALL comments into consideration when deciding how to progress this scheme, if at all.

If you do have any questions, please contact us at [parkingschemes@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:parkingschemes@sheffield.gov.uk) or the contact details above. Thank you to everyone who has so far completed the consultation questionnaire.


Yours sincerely

Tom Finnegan-Smith

Head of Strategic Transport, Sustainability and Infrastructure



This page is intentionally left blank



This page is intentionally left blank



## APPENDIX D FULL LIST OF RESPONSES

Citizen space survey responses		
Street	Do you support the introduction of a controlled parking scheme in Park Hill?	Please use the space below for any further comments you may have or to add your postal address or telephone number if you wish to be updated by post or telephone. - Further comments
Norfolk Park	No/object	I agree with a parking scheme, but not the proposed parking scheme.
Norfolk Park avenue	No/object	I believe every household should have a free parking scheme, which permits for extra vehicles being charged at a higher rate.
		Remove on street all day pay and display option
Ingram Road	No/object	As the proposed parking scheme also includes pay and display options, I do not believe that this will solve the minor problems that some streets around here have with comutors parking in our area. I believe the bigger issue is the lack of parking for teachers & 6th Formers at All Saints school and the volume of houses of multiple occupation in our area, some of which have five cars for one normal sized family house. I believe they will be HUGE problems if some streets opt in to this scheme and some streets out because this will then push the problems to other streets. It should be a all or nothing situation.
Norfolk park Avenue	No/object	
City road	No/object	My address is 195 City Road. The council needs to consider how this will impact low income families, if I could not use a car I would, but with 2 children who are autistic and unsafe on public transport I have no other option but to drive to ensure their safety. Commuters affect norfolk park and Granville road for sure, but further up city road from Duke Street onwards it isn't a commuter issue.
Norfolk road	No/object	
Seabrook road	No/object	I object to these plans and believe they are being bought in by to serve no purpose than to disrupt and bring in a revenue stream for the council.
Norfolk road	No/object	I am against this scheme, having previously lived in sharrow where this scheme was implemented, it did not resolve any parking problems instead it just cost more and more in permits and vouchers with a year on year increase in these costs.
Hyde Park terrace	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	I object to these proposals as a resident in the area.
Granville Road, South Yorkshire, S	No/object	I am a resident who does not support this scheme. I have never had any problem parking/finding a space and I cannot afford a parking permit for 2 cars just to park outside my house
Castlecroft Drive	No/object	I support some aspects of the scheme. However, I believe the parking should be restricted to residents only. This will be the only way to remove commuter parking. I also believe residents should not have to buy a permit for the first vehicle. If they need an additional permit that could come with a charge. Pay and display will not reduce the commuter parking or make the roads safer. Castlecroft croft drive should double yellow lines.
Granville road	No/object	This seems to be easier a money making plan by the council. Or racism towards the taxi drivers that live locally. Itis definitely not for the benefit of the area or the residents. It also seems to be very undemocratic. For example- sinead keeps telling us it was suggested by residents for residents but refuses to give firther information. The postcard and the survey suggest different tomes- one of them has to be inaccurate. Furthermore, it will make the green space of Norfolk Park less accessible.
Glencoe Road	No/object	Some people can't afford this extra cost but really need their vehicles so I completely object to paying also having to ask visitors to pay means I may not get to see my family often
Glencoe Road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	We DO NOT need parking control we have never had an issue and have been living in the same house for over 43 years.
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	Parking permits are totally useless and does not help with parking in the community at all. I am totally against this idea and would make me leave the area
Norfolk Road	No/object	I am against the proposal. The postcard we received states mon-fri 8am - 6:30pm but on this survey it is 7 days a week 8-8:30.
S2	No/object	Which one is it then? Totally ridiculous to be giving residents false information
Norfolk Road	No/object	I never had any issues for parking I live on Seabrook Road s2
Granville road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	My mum is elderly and i pop in to check on her daily and help with any tasks that need doing.
Park hill	No/object	
Ingram Road, S2	No/object	
City road	No/object	
Seabrook road	No/object	
Ingram road	No/object	I wouldn't have a choice regarding parking however with the current cost of living crisis it is another cost we potentially cannot afford.
Norfolk road	No/object	

Ingram road	No/object	Outrageous that it's even considered to make residents pay to park in front of their own homes. We are taxed through the teeth at every opportunity already so additional costs are unreasonable.
Granville Road	No/object	
City roac	No/object	
CITY ROAD Sheffield S2 1GE	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	I don't object altogether, I understand the issues that people have parking near their homes in certain roads, and appreciate that I am very lucky to not have problems - but I have concerns that it will impact the local community in a very negative way.
Ingram Road	No/object	We would have no choice but to park on this road as we live here. We do not want to see parking zone markers on our street or parking ticket meters as this is supposed to be a Heritage area and it would go against all the reasons that we moved here. We have very elderly relatives who need to visit un-announced occasionally and we wouldn't be able to help them in an emergency if we have to mess about with parking issues for them. Also we have contractors often to maintain our houses and this matter would deter them from coming.
S2 2SD	No/object	Residents should be free for 1st car
Park Grange Croft	No/object	With the exception of South Street Kitchen in the Park Hill flats complex I'm not aware of any other businesses likely to be affected by a current lack of parking. The roads next to my home are not overly congested, they are not bus routes and traffic is not impeded by the current parking arrangement. I have no trouble finding a parking space and my friends/ family have no trouble parking.  I strongly object to the introduction of paid parking/ a paid residents permit scheme. The council state that the proposed parking zone is intended to help local residents and businesses. As a local resident I don't find it helpful to have to pay for a parking permit. This is a blatant cash grab from a council looking to exploit local residents and businesses by making us pay for something that we currently do not need to pay for.
Granville road	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	I would reluctantly continue to park on Tylney Road if the controlled parking scheme was introduced because I have to park outside my own house, but I would only be hindered by the scheme - there would be absolutely no benefit to me as a resident if the scheme was introduced.
Granville road	No/object	
Seabrook road	No/object	This is ludicrous you are going to charge me to park outside my house. Parking is not an issue here i dont understand why this is being introduced. Where will i park i cant afford a permit will the council pay for my permit. We have disabled people in my house who need a car so now we have to pay to park this necessity right outside my house
Granville Road	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	I live in this street it's a quiet residential street, most of the day it's empty. Introducing a parking scheme is just ridiculous and bring another expense at a time when family's are already struggling. The proposed zone is too big we don't get commuters all the way up here
Ingram Road	No/object	Q.27 is a misleading question, I have a car at this residence so I would have no choice to park here and pay for the scheme.  I do not want to have to pay or have difficulties for vistors or workman to park here.
Holdings Road	No/object	i work for sheffield city council as an inspector, i would be unable to do my job if i'm not able to park, as my employer does not supply parking permits. i have to park here during the day as i'm partially working from home as well. Also my mum who lives on this road receives carers 3 times a day, how is that going to work?
Norfolk Park Ave (access Donningt	No/object	
Barnes court	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	There is not a parking problem on the street we don't need this
Granville road	No/object	No not see any issues in the present parking and unsure to why this needs to be controlled. With the standard of living increasing adding additional unnecessary costs can be avoided. I have never had an issue parking my car or my house household has had no issues. So I don't this this measure needs to be placed.
Tylney Road	No/object	I would still park here as I live here. I object to being charged to park outside my own house as the prices you have suggested are too high and I would struggle to afford it as would many other residents in the area. Why charge the people who live here? Charge the commuters who park here during the day while working in town.
Norfolk Park	No/object	I don't own a car. But we have visitors every now and then driving from Leeds, Newcastle etc. It is a massive inconvenience for family and friends who can't afford to pay to park outside our home. This will isolate us even further.
Granville Road	No/object	
Beighton	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
Essex road s2 2rg	No/object	I would have no option but to pay which I think is disgusting, residents should get free permits if we live here why should we be charged for other people parking here who don't live here ?
Donnington road	No/object	
Tylney road	No/object	I chose to live here (I rent in a househare) as there was not permitted parking, I do not agree with needing permits to park outside your property where you live.  I also want to put across the difficulties people who have 6month contracts will have gaining permits.
Birley Spa	No/object	Additionally to my earlier comment  Parking on farm Road is handy for excursions into the city centre on days I'm not working, having to pay to do so will be not just for me but for alot of people a further deterrent to shopping in the city centre. I don't know of any other council in the country that is actively seeking to drive people from its heart and damage businesses within it.

Brackenfield Grove	No/object	Give permits to people working in the vicinity so they don't have to pay to go to work at unsociable times when public transport is not operating.
Granville Road	No/object	Do not make families struggle further than they already do!
Granville Road	No/object	
Seabrook road	No/object	It is ridiculous this is being proposed at a time where cost of living is through the roof , a few busy body's who get annoyed at the fact some one parks near their house is going to cause suffering and disruption to others. I have an autistic daughter and have no choice but to have a car. To have to pay to keep that car outside my own house I am livid at the prospect. I fully object to the proposal and am so unhappy that there are residents proposing such a thing. There is absolutely no issue with parking as it is.
North anston	No/object	
Woodlands	No/object	
Donnington Rd, Park	No/object	
Arbourthorne	No/object	As we work at Sheffield station we have no option but to park on Farm rd so I feel it is unfair to charge us just for doing our jobs.
St Aidan's Rise	No/object	Farm rd has no residents so it's not as if we're restricting local use of the rd. just another scheme to make cash for the council at its citizens expense I would be unable to drive to work and park my car nearby causing stress, exhaustion and the possible news to alternative employment.
Tylney Road	No/object	I think this initiative is a ridiculous money making scheme. The suggested zone to make permit only spans so far from the city centre I cannot see how the Council can justify this is due to commuters. Whilst I don't dispute this is a problem closer to town it's certainly not an issue as you move further out of the city centre.  There are lots of elderly residents nearby have you considered the impact this will have on them having visitors/carers? And on a personal level I don't see why I should have to pay to park outside my own house -or why my friends and family should have to pay to visit me in a residential area?!
Tylney Road	No/object	I hope this plan is thrown out due to strong objection. I'll be taking this to the local media online to see if we can get enough support to demonstrate Sheffield City Councils money making scheme
Tylney Road	No/object	I would probably park in the nearest non pay road. If everyone else did this it would cause chaos. Has this been thought through? If so, I want to see the options appraisals, cost benefit analyses and opportunity cost calculations?
Norfolk park avenue	No/object	
Bernard Street, Park House Room	No/object	Where I park (Old street) the problems I see are related to time restrictions where the parking spaces are meaning I can't park in the parking space because there is a time limit.
Norfolk park avenue	No/object	
Glencoe road	No/object	Why not just make parking within the city more accessible and/ or CHEAPER to stop people parking in residential areas??? You're now penalising residents making them pay for parking? Why not stop the problem at the source rather than trying to get more money out of us as residents?? Absolutely ludicrous
Ingram road	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	There is no need for parking scheme on the road as it is used only by the residents. If the scheme will go further I believe that the permit cost for a resident is too much for the year. I would like to be updated if this will go further.
Granville road	No/object	This is very shocking that we need to pay for parking outside our homes. The area which you have selected contributes to where residence live and need to park their cars outside their homes.
Seabrook Road	No/object	When people visit me they don't have any problems parking but I don't want to have to pay for visitor permits or anything like that. I'm a disabled person so my income is already limited and I'd have to become more isolated as I wouldn't be able to afford the permit to allow friends/family to help me out.
Chesterfield	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	I live on norfolk road
Holdings Road	No/object	I will continue to park outside my home but will NOT pay to do so.
STAFFORD ROAD	No/object	consider it a right and essential to park outside our own front door . My daughter aged 18 is learning to drive and is doing so for safety sake due to the high level of risk and violence against girls and women so she can be safe going around and able to easily access our home at night time and the Council despite asserting their commitment to supporting the safety of girls and women are putting in their pathway restrictions and obstacles to safety by this proposal . In respect of Disabled people i our household having access to accessible transport is essential too and charging to park outside one's own home and being picked up and dropped off is restrictive to as per this proposal . No regard is being given to our older residents or families with child re n either in what is being proposed and their access and struggles financially bringing up a family and costs therein that this proposals brings added costs to. In addition I would assert that we have had no problems on our road regarding parking but have had problems with people, crashing and including children being almost killed on the junction of Fitzwalter Road /Stafford Road and we as residents requested of the Council intervention then , all to no avail. We were told in effect that nothing would or could be done regarding this serious traffic and pedestrian risk until in effect someone gets killed and now we are having thrust at us traffic measures to generate income for the Council instead. Thus demonstrating where the Council's priorities lie in this instance . I am a lone parent on a low income and any parking charge is far too prohibitive to households like mine . In addition I question the fairness of this proposed imposition , there are numerous areas across the City where non-residents park outside residents property and I note that these areas are not being spotted for a comparable imposition. If such an imposition should be getting imposed or enforced then it should be city wide for the sake of fairness . When affluent areas and not multicultural mixed economy areas that contain low income people in these areas are having thrust at them a charge to park their vehicles outside their homes then I would welcome reviewing your proposal not until then the proposal smacks of Council profiteering . This area does not have the luxury of space to park off road either and what could happen might be that people start tearing up their green space in order to try to develop a parking space on their frontage if they have re luxury of space to do this to avoid an on-street parking charge . Front space is not a luxury for our home and on top of this such actions of tarmac on front gardens will destroy the green environment and wildlife environment and indeed constructing a parking space on one's own land in front of one's own house may not even be permitted for all we know , given the heritage status of our area too.  I consider the proposal as it's premised and posed to be a breach of residents rights and access entitlements that others Citywide are not being subjected to . It is devoid of any due regard to the Equality Act 2010 and considerations and mitigations therein and having spoken with other vulnerable protected equalities characteristic residents in the area , I will with them in a class action case , contest any moves to being this proposal to fruition for a the
Glencoe road	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	The new introduction of a parking scheme in Park Hill is an absolute disgrace and i wish for this to be overturned. I cannot comprehend the decision to make local residents pay to park their own cars outside a house that they pay to live in. At a time of financial instability and uncertainty and with the cost of living soaring in every aspect, the decision to put added pressure on to the residents of park hill is truly abhorrent. What have we done to deserve this? Council tax and road tax should cover this bill and an added extra cost should not be involved in this scheme. There is simply no justification for this scheme.

Norfolk park	No/object	Completely disagree with the idea!
Derby	No/object	I visit my elderly parents regularly in the park hill area and I have never had issues with parking.
Manor oaks gardens	No/object	I am so angry right now! I pay my rent and council tax to be charged to park on my property is a absolute joke
Donnington Road	No/object	
city road, sheffield S2 5hf	No/object	Absolutely unnecessary
S2 area	No/object	what sort of question was 27 ....
St Aidans way	No/object	
Donnington Rd	No/object	The residents want something done about the dangerous speeding on the road. This is just insulting.
S2	No/object	
First Avenue	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Norfolk park ave	No/object	I do not agree that residents have to pay for a parking permit. There is no problem with parking on Norfolk Park Ave/Donnington Road and this will be financially damaging having to buy a permit. Also it will mean that family members will no longer be able to visit as my parents are unable to walk further distances that would be necessary if the parking zone is in place. I fully object to this scheme.
S2 1gb	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
Ridgehill Avenue S12	No/object	
Park Grange Croft	No/object	We're in one of the most deprived areas, you can't keep squeezing the poor for more and more money. It's literally not a, problem, back off.
Manor park	No/object	
Norfolk road	No/object	
Intake	No/object	
Tydney Road, S2	No/object	Question 27 is incredibly unfair to ask of residents of the area. Of course we will have to park here even if paid permits are introduced. This does not however mean that we would be happy with such an outcome.
Duke Street	No/object	I would rather pay for the private car park than give my money to Sheffield City council.
Norfolk road	No/object	
St Aidans Road, S2 2NG	No/object	
S2	No/object	It's unfair to make residents pay. If you introduce parking permits then it should be free to people who can prove they live there
Handsworth	No/object	
Broomhill	No/object	
Hackenthorpe	No/object	
Manor Top	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Donnington Road	No/object	
Park grange drive	No/object	
Hillsborough	No/object	Why does this council hate working people so much?! Not everyone can get the bus or tram to work
St Aidans Road	No/object	
Granville rd	No/object	
Hawley Street	No/object	I find controlled parking to be more of an issue than free parking. Although controlled zones seem to be disguised as aiding residents, this does the exact opposite. As someone who lives in the inner city centre zone and pays £260 a year for a parking permit, I have seen few positives to not only the cost but the controlled parking itself. Visitors are still able to park in these areas, but for a cost, making no difference to any issues with residents struggling to park. This continues to be an issue regardless, except now we are paying to have the same struggle. If a controlled zone is introduced, permit fees need to be reduced and it is a necessity that there be at least 50% of the parking spaces reserved for permit holders. This is rarely the case in areas where both permits and ticketed parking is at a high cost, purely so the council can make as much money as possible through something they advertise as an aid to the public.
Whitwell	No/object	
Ridgehill Ave	No/object	
Waterfall Close	No/object	
Stafford Road	No/object	
Hackenthorpe	No/object	
Farndale Road	No/object	
Sothall	No/object	If I couldn't park for free on Norfolk Park Road, I would work from home every day. Consequently, I wouldn't be visiting the City Centre at all therefore I wouldn't making purchases from the businesses there and the City Centre would miss out on mine, and many others, business.
ST. AIDANS ROAD,	No/object	
Darnall	No/object	
Arbourthorne	No/object	

		I would like more information about what the proposed parking scheme will look like, its street furniture and road markings. I do not object to the whole scheme I understand there are issues around the Parkhill, Norfolk Road area as well as Blagden Street, Samson Street and Coates Street, which is mainly due to a local body repair shop parking many vehicles within a TRO, this issue has been reported and no enforcement has ever been effective. Recent parking issues on Manor Oaks Road have come from the development of Parkhill with work vans and trades peoples vehicles. I currently live in a quiet cul-de-sac where all residents have off street parking and usually park the occasional work vehicle on the road. The street is block paved and open plan, with children playing safely on the street. Q, Will the street be plastered with road marking and unsightly ticket machines, and how will the implementation of this scheme change the feel of the area from a quiet family cul-de-sac to a city Centre street?
manor oaks drive	No/object	
Mosborough	No/object	
Norfolk Lodge, Park Grange Road	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	If restrictions are brought in I think one vehicle per family should be free for residents, and time limited free parking for others to allow for visitors, carers etc.
granville road sheffield s2 2rq	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	The case for the scheme needs to be made far clearer. Why is more information not provided? I do not want to end up paying to park outside my own house! How will it operate?
High Storrs	No/object	You've already demolished Sheffield city centre. No one wants to go there because all the shops have disappeared. If you do this it'll be another nail in the coffin. Sheffield will become derelict. You complained about Meadowhall when it was being built that everyone will go there, well you're not helping this now. Parking there is free which is why everyone goes there. You do this and you'll stop the few that are still going to the centre to try and keep it alive. Can no one see this in the council? Are you all just wanting to get as much money as you can regardless of whatever damage you do in the process?
Erskine Road	No/object	As an idea. If the problem is that commuters are using the residential streets to park in, introduce a combination of residents parking and 4 hour maximum parking. Plenty for those who are using the leisure facilities, but would stop people parking all day.
Granville Road	No/object	I am against this fully.
S10 5dd	No/object	Please think of the vulnerable children and adults who need visits because they are not medically stable enough to visit clinics or at risk of deterioration without specialist input
Glencoe Road	No/object	Already pay council tax and road tax. It seems unfair to have to pay more when no space is guaranteed. The proposals are unworkable, there would be too many exemptions to consider.
Granville road	No/object	I object to this proposal as it puts more of a financial burden upon people that are already struggling financially.  I also do not see an issue with parking and have never had an issue with parking on Granville road and i have been living here for 25years. Therefore i do not think there is a need for this proposal to be put in place.
Norfolk park road	No/object	
Cadeby Road, Sprotbrough, Sprotbrough	No/object	
Doncaster	No/object	Council is blood sucking ass holes who want money at any cost
Woodhouse	No/object	
Greenhill	No/object	
Rotherham	No/object	
Manor Lane	No/object	
S2	No/object	
Rydal road	No/object	It is unfair for residents to have to pay for yearly parking permits in this residential area
Middlewood	No/object	
RICHMOND	No/object	
High green	No/object	
Norfolk park	No/object	This is just creating issues unnecessarily, the people that park in this area do so mainly because there is nowhere affordable to park for work. If it was to become so that there was no free parking I'm sure people would start to look for employment elsewhere
Seabrook Road	No/object	
Thorpe hesley	No/object	I believe that putting restriction on how long people can park there would be the best option in a uni student I don't have a lot of money it just makes it more difficult to access or requires me spending money that I don't have.
Manor Oaks Court	No/object	I have no option but to park outside my home, it's like a sloped drive would I have to pay to park on that on front of my property?
Sheffield	No/object	This should not be happening
Manor park	No/object	Charging people to park is not the answer more affordable city centre parking is the solution! You are penalising home owners by charging them to purchase a permit which I may ad does not guarantee you a space outside your home just in the generic area ! Instead of building more office space simply make it More affordable to park in the city centre! Bus services are too expensive and in reliable!
St aidans	No/object	I am absolutely disgusted at these proposed plans. NO ONE should have to pay to park outside their own home, nor should their visitors pay to see them. I'm in complete disbelief that anyone would think this is OK!
Durlstone Drive	No/object	
Norton Lees	No/object	
Donnington Road	No/object	I live here and don't want to be charged to park on my street or have to secure a permit.  Donnington Road should be considered a different area from Park Hill where the parking requirements and space is different.
Gleadless	No/object	There is already restrictions for parking.
Holdings Road	No/object	I have no choice but to park on my street as I am a resident within the proposed zone.
S32	No/object	At present, where I park, there is not an issue for residents. I park around the college and the only issue I see is that that council are wanting to make more money from commuters
Wincobank	No/object	
Broomhill	No/object	
Queen Street	No/object	I use Norfolk Road to avoid driving into the already congested town centre. I've never had difficulty getting a space & think the measures will impact on traffic within the city

Ingram Road	No/object	At the end of Norfolk Road there is some disused ground on Claywood Drive that has been empty for many years and would make an ideal car park for workers to park and walk into the city centre using a permit scheme for weekly/monthly/yearly options. Just think you are penalising local residents and stopping them having family and friends to visit. Also should make payment later then 6.30pm to stop Sheffield Unitec and visiting fans parking there.
Tylney Road	No/object	I don't understand why a parking scheme has been suggested.
Donnington Road	No/object	
Handsworth	No/object	There should be an exemption for delivery drivers
Glencoe Road	No/object	The question above is pointless, as where else can residents park except at home?
Sheffield	No/object	
Eckington	No/object	
Seabrook road	No/object	
Manor Oaks	No/object	I do not park in Park Hill. It is disingenuous to class the whole area from Norfolk Park to Manor Oaks to Park Hill. In our particular area, parking issues could be fixed by painting double yellow lines.
Wincobank	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Sothall	No/object	Having worked and parked on the industrial part of Fitzwalter Road and travelling along the surrounding roads during the day for over 12yrs I don't particularly think there is such an issue that justifies parking restrictions. All of my colleagues commute from some distance and public transport links are not an easy option, due to hours of work, so it's my feeling any restrictions would just move any existing problems(if they do indeed exist) just a little further along to the edge of the proposed boundary. Please think carefully about this and may I suggest that surveys are done on each road and at various times of the day to get a true picture. If its truly a case of easing congestion then surely the first option should be No Parking restrictions at the pinch points ? Creating difficulty for employees to commute and park nearby to their industrial places of work could possibly force business owners to look to relocate away from the area. Can Sheffield Council really sustain the possible loss of income from those businesses, especially when the City Centre has so many empty shops/buildings?
Norfolk park	No/object	Unfair to make redirects pay to park where they live
Granville Road	No/object	
OUTRAM ROAD	No/object	
Ingram road	No/object	This is a crazy idea and should never be given the go ahead! If it is I will be parking and will not be paying!!!!
Tylney Road	No/object	I would only pay because I have no choice with living is this area. The scheme should not go ahead, it's only a added bill on top of everything else that's rising, and will not benefit residents parking outside there homes. There is no issues with commuters on my street. There is no difference in the amount of cars parked on it on a weekday, a weekday at 9pm or the weekend.
Holdings Road	No/object	WE WOULD HAVE TO PAY TO PARK IN PARK HILL AS WE LIVE HERE. WHY SUCH A STUPID QUESTION!!!!!!!!!!!!
Manor Oaks Drive	No/object	
Greenhill	No/object	
Kimberworth	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	
Holdings Road	No/object	We have to park here we live here.
Meersbrook	No/object	
Skye edge road	No/object	
Greenhill	No/object	Worst cost of living crisis for years and this is how our incompetent council responds. There's a time and a place for imposing measures like this. Residents will have to pay for permits in an area where many will be struggling to heat homes let alone purchase permits and faff about to accommodate visitors. Pathetic idea in such a vulnerable area.
Rotherham	No/object	
Seabrook Road, Sheffield, UK	No/object	I don't want to parking fees to park my vehicle outside my property
Park Hill flats	No/object	Norwich, south street, park hill, I strongly object to this scheme. I would have to get rid of my car as I cannot afford the ridiculous scheme.
Glencoe Place	No/object	I have answered yes to Q27 because I would have no choice, this is where I live. I have to have access to a car for my job, due to out of hours on call requirements of my role. I would not be able to give up my car, nor would I want to.
Birley Carr	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
City road	No/object	
Lodge Moor	No/object	
Hangingwater Road	No/object	Parking would be unfeasible, but I'm not sure what else I would be able to do. Perhaps give up them. The purse strings can't tighten any further and before assumptions are made, I heavily rely on my car for buying what food I can afford, accessing work and studies (which I often need to do late at night in the library due to other commitments- as a woman, I don't particularly like the sound of walking from collegiate campus to hangingwater road in the middle of the night), and being able to see my family as they are unable to make the trip to me due to other commitments. So no, I can't give up my car to help my finances, but I digress- although I shouldn't have to explain myself, I feel like it is necessary in order to be taken seriously. I look forward to hearing further about this, and hope for news that the council has reflected in the way that this would only negatively affect the communities which it promises to serve.
City road	No/object	If residents want to park in front of they're houses, they should pay for that
Springfield Road S7 2GG	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	I live here and need my car. I think it's a complete rip off asking us to pay to park on our own street. We have no issues with parking our cars on the road and it's just money grabbing for parking where you can get it. Seriously oppose this and will continue to do so. If it ain't broke don't fix it. Not broken to us. Our address is
Donnington Road	No/object	I object to paying to park outside my own house when parking isn't and never had been an issue The cost of living is escalating, the cost of fuel is increasing massively and families do not have extra cash to throw around Now Sheffield council want residents with no parking issues at all to start paying for the Privilege to park outside their homes - disgusting
Granville road	No/object	I pay council tax, Road tax etc. I don't see why I or my family when they come to visit me should pay for parking. This is totally unfair. I clearly object and so do all my neighbours

		I am wholly against this proposal. I could understand if there was a problem with parking but there isn't and I feel this is just another way for the council to get more money from us.
Seabrook Road	No/object	I cannot afford it!
Granville Road	No/object	If we need to purchase a permit, can it be one that is not tethered to a vehicle registration number so that it can be given to friends and family when they visit?
City road	No/object	
Ingram Road	No/object	The cost of living is already rising without adding unnecessary costs for parking permits! If this scheme was to make sure local residents are able to park outside their own houses the permits should be free.
St Aidans	No/object	Bus network is poor
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Norfolk Park	No/object	The consultation does not allow for all members of the local area to easily assess plans or be involved
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Base Green	No/object	
STAFFORD ROAD, S2	No/object	The survey questions are irrelevant to my address. Park Hill is much smaller than the area highlighted in your proposal, and so the questions are not aligned. There is no problem parking in Norfolk Park or the surrounding areas, nor Park Hill itself to my knowledge. As stated, this scheme is entirely unnecessary and is further proof that Sheffield City Council is focused on finding issues that don't exist and destroying the road network rather than fixing it and making it more attractive to residents and visitors. Why not focus on improving the traffic flow in the centre and REDUCING parking fees rather than expanding controlled measures?
Manor oaks road	No/object	Have no choice but to park there because I live there - at least give us free permits
Essex Road	No/object	This is not solving your problem at all, if some residents have problems with parking and the council want to help they should target commuters in some other way. This proposal is making residents pay for commuters parking.
Granville road	No/object	Absolutely disgusting making money off the working class who just about have enough to pay bills. This is completely unnecessary and a money making scheme for the council!!!!!! S22rr
Bramley Park Close	No/object	One of the few places you can park and walk into town or the station with sufficient clearways and you lot want to cock it up and get Joe public paying through the nose. Maybe some meters and residents only parking areas but the council are trying to create a problem that doesn't exist in the area. Overstay 9.30 to 4.30 on Duke Street and you get a ticket. Duke Street never overfull with cars in last 11 years.
holdings road	No/object	with the potential loss of friends and family visits i do not want this proposed permit to take place and with the stress already from cost of living rises its a charge i could do without having to worry about
rotherham	No/object	
Woodseats	No/object	I believe parking for residents should be free.
Granville Road	No/object	I don't want to have to pay to park on the road where I live. I appreciate that there are certain roads where it is difficult during the day but the scheme is far too wide reaching and will mean some people will struggle to afford to park. Although there are 3 vehicles registered to my house often there are only one or two parked at one time. The parking issues are not just during the weekdays but also in evenings when there is an event at Bramhall Lane. There are people who park on the pavements and no tickets are given out. I am not convinced that the scheme will be policed to ensure compliance. I also think it could potentially create less parking available which would increase the problem. I should be grateful if this ridiculous idea could be stopped as it is to satisfy a small number of people who are very vocal about their issues. It is a real case of a sledgehammer to crack a nut. My objections are based on cost, inconvenience, lack of ongoing support, silly times (too early and too late) as something in the middle section of the day would prevent all day parking, too widespread, less potential spaces to park and the cost if permits is high. They should be free but I would still object to the scheme if it was free
Rotherham	No/object	
Norton Park View	No/object	There is insufficient parking on All Saints School Site to accommodate parking for all All Saints and Seven Hills Staff.
Hillsbrough	No/object	Controlled parking schemes are a way of taking money from residents so they can park their cars in front of their own houses. These schemes always seem to be implemented in areas where the local population are least able to afford the prices. If the controlled parking was brought in without a fee for local residents I would support it.
Manor oaks drive	No/object	
Handsworth	No/object	
Normanton Spring Road	No/object	Why can't we have a reliable car park with a membership scheme for commuters
Lowedges	No/object	Putting these restrictions in place will limit people going to businesses in the area, such as the shops and pub on Duke Street. And there is already not enough parking at the doctors surgery so where will patients park if there are parking restrictions? People will not visit the area and businesses will suffer with the restrictions in place. If there was more affordable parking in the city, or even some free zones, there would be less trouble out of the city. These restrictions will just push more traffic, congestion and parking problems into other areas just outside the city where there is free parking but which are themselves already busy.
Hyde Park Walk	No/object	Again I don't park in Park Hill. I object to this scheme in my streets but if Park Hill want it then so be it. This is not consultation this questionnaire has completely failed to do what it needs.
WOOD ROAD	No/object	We already have to pay for car parking on site. If the car park is full, the overflow is on a poorly lit road and feels insecure. I choose to park on Norfolk Park Rd as it is nearer to work and better lit (I work at All Saints). There is already plenty of parking on this road and no residents. It seems nonsensical to extend the parking zone to this road.
Nether edge	No/object	The reason I park there is the proximity to the train station. I often need to get the early train to London so using public transport to get to the station would take much longer meaning a very early start and late return home. I am happy to pay a reasonable amount to park but the train station car park is often full and extremely expensive.
Granville Road	No/object	It is absolutely stupid to do this I don't agree with this at all
City Road	No/object	I don't think it's fair that I as a resident that I have to pay extra to park at my own house, and that my visitors have to pay too. I am a single mom and carer who desperately needs help from my family and friends and this will dramatically affect my family's life. these parking permits should be free to households who live in and on the main streets of the zones. I have given you my address for updates, thank you.
Norfolk park	No/object	I strongly disagree with the controlled parking as there will be a cost related to this for residents. I do not wish to pay for a permit for each vehicle I own.
Granville Road	No/object	

Granville Road	No/object	I disagree with this permit altogether
Donnington road	No/object	I do not want this scheme in my area.
Manor Park	No/object	
City Road	No/object	<p>I urge you to remove the no parking zone between set hours on City Road.</p> <p>If widespread introduction of affordable on street charging points was incorporated in the plan, it would be very worthwhile. I live in a terrace with no drive, so have no prospect of buying a plug-in car.</p> <p>I do not believe that City Road needs measures just because Park Hill flats/ Granville Road get busy.</p> <p>I think well controlled parking restrictions in the area, especially on South Street Park would be good at reducing the crime (drugs) that appears to go on.</p> <p>I resent that home owners need to pay for a 1st car. We did not ask for this, and the parking is of little benefit to myself. It is just an additional charge forced on those already disadvantaged by having no drive.</p>
Granville Road	No/object	
Arbourthorne rd	No/object	
Bradway	No/object	<p>I park in the Park Hill area for school. These restrictions would stop me from being able to park anywhere near school.</p> <p>I don't park on a residential street but people at my school will struggle greatly without parking opportunities. We don't have access to onsite parking. I am typically parked in the area 8am-5pm on weekdays.</p> <p>People parking here is also because of the total lack of affordable parking in the city centre. Introducing more restrictions and costs will only increase the problem.</p>
Granville road	No/object	I would like to add further I have lived on Granville road my entire 29 years of life, and I have never had any issues with parking since I have been driving. I think it is unfair that you are enforcing a permit only area on a road outside my own home, I should not have to pay to park outside my own home which my family own and all pay road tax. Please reconsider your enforcement
Seabrook Road	No/object	<p>Extremely annoyed that you're proposing a new scheme impose a fun new cost on residents while we're already dealing with upcoming huge bill increases, and rising fuel costs. I barely drive to start with, but I need my car to occasionally visit family.</p> <p>I really do not have any trouble with parking in the area and this seems like a terrible way to deal with the areas that do. If you're not giving residents free permits then this is a bad idea.</p>
Huddersfield	No/object	I only occasionally park near park hill flats. But I believe it should stay as it is and not be restricted. There is residents permit all over Sheffield. Very expensive parking in the city centre. Every year another car park is lost to building sites. Sylvester street I parked here 2018. Gone and closed for parking. Science park. Closed and building site recently. I have commuted in the tram before but it is so expensive. Make more affordable commuter car parks. More frequent /reliable trams. Or free car parks out of the city centre for commuters. I enjoy my half drive and half cycle but no doubt at some point where I park my car will cost too much or become a building site. Even hillsborough park used to be free and one year after returning from maternity leave 2012 I found it tarmacd and short stay pay and display!
City Road, S2	No/object	This scheme is crazy. It will not stop commuter parking. I also don't think that the commuters would park as far out as manor Laith road which is what my driveway backs onto.
Meadowhead	No/object	<p>It feels that this is a money making scheme that favours the privileged (those who live on Norfolk road with massive drives that won't have to pay for even one permit)</p> <p>The times are horrendous. Where is my mum meant to park when she is picking up my children for childcare. I can't expect her to pay for an hours parking for a 5 minute collection.</p> <p>This scheme will have a detrimental effect on the community - businesses, the library and other community venues will see a drop in footfall as there are nice places to go if you have to pay for parking. For example going to hillsborough library over park library.</p>
Woodseats	No/object	Making it until 8:30pm will just kill off the night time economy just as you are launching a strategy to encourage early evening usage. Making it include the college on Granville Rd will make it an extra hardship and cost for already poor students. Not proving an affordable alternative to be able to park in the city centre all day is the missing part of this scheme.
City Road	No/object	The parking scheme area has been expanded too far onto streets that are not affected like the ones who requested this proposal. A trial period should be setup on the affected streets to see if the scheme makes a positive change for the residents. If the scheme then goes ahead, permits should be made free to residents. Otherwise there is the potential that this doesn't make a change as there is no guarantee people will get a parking space or deter people away. The only change would be having to pay for something that was previously free.
Park hill road	No/object	
SEABROOK ROAD	No/object	
City Road	No/object	Though the area covered is large one road has a distinct disadvantage and that is City Road due to its bus lane. I would be interested in being contacted by phone at
Donnington road	No/object	I strenuously object to the boundaries put fwd by this scheme. I agree there are parking issues in and around park hill/ Norfolk road area near to the city centre. This is not new, and I can understand residents frustrations regards parking. I've lived in the area for 32yrs and it's always been a problem. But there are no parking issues around Donnington road where I live. My area is classed as Norfolk park. It is too far away from the city centre for it to be an issue. In essence all this amounts to is a stealth tax ( of which labour criticises the govt regularly about) on already hard pressed working families. Your boundaries have been extended to include areas where there are no issues regarding parking. I suggest you reconsider this. I have spoken to local residents on my street and there is no support for this stealth tax on Donnington road. I will, if needed provide photographic evidence supporting my objections to this proposal if the need arises.
Sunflower grove	No/object	I wouldn't want to pay to visit friends
Dryden road	No/object	
Heath End CLOSE,, Great Kingshill,	No/object	
Eckington	No/object	I have to park here for work,Train Conductor for Northern Rail.They do not have enough parking for staff and I cannot use public transport due to very early starts and finishes
Hillsborough	No/object	
Westfield	No/object	
Eckington	No/object	I have to park on Farm Road for work. I work as a Conductor for Northern Rail and they do not have enough parking for staff. I cannot use public transport due to very early starts and very late finishes. If fee's are brought in I think we should be issued free passes.
fairfax drive	No/object	
Mansfield Road	No/object	I believe this to be a money generation plan for the council, that would affect the enjoyment of many families that want to use the areas many parks and other green outdoor areas. Many families use these parks as they are close to their homes but not within walking distance. This would force people to go further afield to enjoy exercising and outdoor activities. I think those people have not been considered.



Glencoe Road	No/object	In response to question 27, where else are we going to park when we live here?
Tylney Road	No/object	We have currently no problems with parking and I don't believe it is generally a big problem in our road. Having to pay for parking just adds to our cost of living which is already increasing rapidly this year. I therefore quite strongly object to the scheme.
Belmonte Gardens	No/object	I don't see why I should have to pay to park where I live. Shouldn't residents get a free permit. Technically where I park is informal private residents but it is unclear whether I would still end up being charged.
Ingram Road S2	No/object	I am an elderly lady who is also disabled I need to park my car outside my home, I am a blue badge holder, the charges would make my life more difficult as my daughter who does a lot for me has to park outside my home too and unfortunately wouldn't be able to afford the charges, please think about the elderly residents that can't afford these charges who live in the area
Skye Edge Road	No/object	
Claywood road	No/object	I think making people pay for parking around their own home is ridiculous as my household specifically chose this area to live as we would all be able to park due to not being restricted to 2/3 parking permits
S12	No/object	
Dore	No/object	
City Rd	No/object	1. This won't solve the issue, it will move the problem further out. We are just outside the zone, parking is in high demand and moving more cars into our area will cause issues - is the plan to then widen the zone and charge even more residents? 2. This is a low income area, the poorer who can't afford a house with drive are penalised. 3. No plan for HMOs 4. We're already seeing a loss of front gardens, replaced by dried, this has a huge environmental impact (air quality, flooding, etc) 5. There are other vehicle issues that should be prioritised over this pavement parking, verge parking, speeding.
Holdings rd	No/object	I think it's unfair to expect residents to pay for permits. People should have the right to park outside their house free. They pay road tax, council tax and insurance. As if times are not difficult enough with rising prices without the worry of parking prices. Residents should get at least one permit free of charge and then perhaps need to pay for additional permits.
Handsworth	No/object	
S36 1AY	No/object	I do want to pay to see my children.
Norton lees	No/object	
58 Cross Lane, Stocksbridge	No/object	
City Road, s2 5he	No/object	If this goes ahead does this mean my family all of which have children would have to pay to park on road where i live?
Castle Croft Drive	No/object	Further to previous ideas of simply having signs at each entrance to this Estate ... as nearly EVERY household has only ONE parking place, and with the pressures of work etc. families often need 2 cars, IF Residents ONLY parking signs and with simply a 'one off' pass or passes, that residents can pay for, households are NOT further penalised for living here! and they can pay for extra 'one off' passes for their friends and family, so important always, and especially post pandemic. This would make life MUCH EASIER for everyone ... AND cost the Council LESS as not having to police, plus send out letters of penalty etc etc ... or get new books of tickets issued every year. It would also mean that if there was a special occasion like a special birthday, it would be possible for additional visitors to come with crippling the hosts financially and causing huge worry.
Wybourn	No/object	
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	Confusing scheme. Misinformation sent by council. Should not be applied as far up as donnington road
Motehall Road	No/object	I believe adding a payment charge would effect the community as people who already find it hard to manager and struggle with everyday essentials are not going to make additional payments if needed, resulting in fines and more debt, making family's even worse off.
Bolsover	No/object	Parking prices would have to low.
Sheffield	No/object	Not everyone is able to catch public transport to place of work. Parking is absolutely diabolical for trades people with tools and equipment to carry. Cannot be paying over £10 a day for parking. I've worked in town for 3 days this week and it's cost nearly £40 in parking. It is simply unfair.
Arbourthorne	No/object	
wybourn	No/object	think we pay enough road tax and i feel for the residents who live on park hill and have to pay to park there car .
hague Park hill	No/object	
Gilbert Street, Park Hill.	No/object	Residents who live on Park Hill Flats have to pay £450 yearly already to park outside their homes.
Holdings Road, Norfolk Park, S2 2F	No/object	There may be problems on the road further/s down near the train station, ie Norfolk Road, where non residents frequently leave their cars, but it is very different up here. There is no problem to fix up here. I understand that nonresident parkers could be pushed further out if there was a scheme closer to the railway station than we are up here, but I don't believe they would come as far up as here and in any case I see no need to fix a problem that does not exist.
Beighton	No/object	
City Road	No/object	
richmond	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	
Ingram Road	No/object	Residents parking makes sense but it should not cost residents extra since no additional value is being delivered by the council. Nor should there be a charge to residents for day passes for visitors. Put in pay and display by all means and use the proceeds of that to fund enforcement, instead of charging residents who have no choice where to park. We have all been through hell lately, don't add this on top.
Manor oaks Gardens	No/object	There are roads with clear parking problems but manor oaks Gardens is not one of them so as I said before I am not sure why this area has been included
Donnington Road	No/object	
Abbeydale Road	No/object	
Ingram Road	No/object	I don't understand why as residents we should be penalised for living so close to the centre. It is very expensive as second drivers or anyone else in the house hold to just park at home. Not everyone has a drive. Plus the school isn't moving so this issue will always persist with or without paid parking.
Manor park	No/object	I wouldn't be able to see my family because it would be to expensive
Robinson Rd	No/object	

Aston	No/object	Will be interested to know what the proposals are, and if charges are introduced, how much they will be. Parking is incredibly difficult in and around the town centre, and on road parking has noticeably decreased recently (there seem to be so many spaces now that have become disabled only). The regeneration, and Heart of the City schemes must be supported by ease of parking otherwise they will fail.
Holdings Rd S2 2RE	No/object	As we do not have a car, this is not super important to us. However, on our local WhatsApp group, many people have brought up a valid reasons why this would be detrimental to our neighborhood. We do not support it because we would like to be able to have visitors without the inconvenience of their having to pay. Similarly, the woman who lives next-door to us is 90 years old and has different people who come and go to care for her, including her son, who comes quite often – we feel this would be complicated and unfair for her.
Skye Edge	No/object	
Totley	No/object	
S2	No/object	
Holdings road	No/object	
Manor Oaks Gardens	No/object	
City Road	No/object	As a resident in the area how can I say that I wouldn't park here if I had to pay? I would have no choice so this is a ridiculous question. I WOULD NOT OBJECT TO COMMUTERS PAYING TO PARK IN OUR AREA BUT WHY SHOULD RESIDENTS HAVE TO PAY FOR A PERMIT WHEN WE HAVE NO CHOICE BUT TO PARK NEAR OUR HOMES??? AT LEAST THE FIRST RESIDENTS PERMIT SHOULD BE FREE.
ingram road	No/object	
Arbourthorne	No/object	
Stradbroke way	No/object	
Stanhope Road, Intake	No/object	I must admit when I initially started this survey I expected it to be about the introduction of a residents parking scheme. However, if it's the introduction of parking meters then in effect it's the same thing as the prices the council charge for parking for any length of time are prohibitive. If you want to introduce a residents parking scheme on Stanhope Road I would be fully supportive as it would be nice for me to park near my house for a change.
Holdings road	No/object	Don't think it should go as far this street
Manor Park	No/object	You keep proposing changes new builds and now parking charge to our area as if it is improving our community all you are doing is getting rid of green spaces not improving funding resources and wanting to charge for parking. You are killing our area bit by bit and because we are a soft touch. The s2 area has more new builds than any area in sheffield with no extra resource and now this - I totally object to this
Ingram road	No/object	
Holdings Road	No/object	
City Road	No/object	I strongly object to the proposal of the charged parking scheme. I have lived in the area for 20years and I have never had an issue with parking. I believe this proposed parking schemes main objective is to make money at the residents expense. With everything else going up in price, the local residents do not need to be charged for parking outside their own homes, or staff to park outside their places of work. I am all for FREE RESIDENT / BUSINESS PARKING PERMITS in parking bays and feel this is a better solution to your proposal.
Manor oaks Gardens	No/object	We own the property with a drive and of road parking what we pay ground rent for so no we not paying for parking
norfolk road	No/object	The prices are stupid. I'm not paying to park on my own road. Find a better solution than charging people to use it. Invest in the area and in better parking in the city centre so people don't park up in the area to walk into town.
Ingram road	No/object	
Wychwood Grove 3 Sothall	No/object	
Granville Road, granville road	No/object	First a couple of questions: Are the hours until 8:30pm as it says on the website or 630pm as it says on the leaflet? Can we buy more than 2 permits? Will the whole area have the option for people to pay and display? Can we still park across our own drive? I can't see the benefit of the scheme. We don't have a problem with commuters. If it is purely to reduce commuters the hours do not need to be as long and residents should be able to get as many permits as they need at a minimal cost or for free. The main roads that are affected by commuter parking may see a reduction in this but the problem is just moved elsewhere. As more people are working from home more residents have cars that don't move during the day. Even if I was to drive to work I would be home before the end of the time and so still need a permit.
Meadowhead	No/object	
Manor oaks Gardens	No/object	
Woodthorpe	No/object	I work 3 12 1/2 hour shifts per for a stroke rehab Center on Norfolk park road I find it very unfair that I'd have to pay to park to go to work I pay Road tax why should I have to put park
Mosborough	No/object	
Saunders road	No/object	Its one of the poorest areas and you are intending to charge local people ,penalise they park and riders .
S2	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	I've been a resident of Norfolk Road for over 30 years and strongly object to having to pay to park outside my own home. This scheme will also negatively impact our local community and businesses.
S66 9FR	No/object	I work for the NHS stroke rehabilitation unit. Not being able to park for free outside the unit would be yet another cost for commuters and NHS workers like myself. Public transport is not an option due to late working and early mornings, and due to the fact that I live 15 miles away and can't get their directly on just one mode of transport. Furthermore, visitors who come to see their families in the unit would also have to pay. Cost of living is rising, and this is just adding more pressure onto people.
Donnington Road	No/object	

Sheffield	No/object	Introducing paid parking around the area, will impact of the amount of cars which already park their to use services such as the college, school and NHS facility's. Many of which will be staff, resulting in staff having to also park their cars in order to commute to work. In some cases individuals commute to work and have no option but to drive, meaning they would be forced to pay the parking charges. Which long term could also impact them financially and the buildings it surrounds, which could also result in individuals having no choice but to find a different job.
Norfolk park avenue	No/object	It seems very cynical that pay and display is being put in place AND residents have to pay for permits. If this is meant to help residents then the money made from pay and display should mean residents do not need to pay. If driveways and current resident off road parking will not be protected then the scheme will cause more problems than the current occasional parking problems.
Holdings Road	No/object	7547213843
Granville road	No/object	
Seabrook Road	No/object	This feels very much like a sledgehammer to crack a nut. There are some identifiable parking problems opposite the school/college on Castle Croft Drive and Farm Bank Road, though only during pick up/drop off times, and identifiable long-term commuter parking on the streets closest to the rear of the station, specifically Norfolk Road and South Street, and to a lesser extent Stafford Street, Talbot Gardens and Talbot Place. However, on Norfolk Road, nearly all of the houses have driveways, negating the majority of the impact of this commuter parking. I fail to see why this warrants an area-wide permit parking zone, especially extending so far into Norfolk Park. The permit scheme seems to prioritise revenue generation and evidence short-term thinking. A better use of funds would perhaps be to future-proof the area, which will suffer from the difficulties of charging street-parked electric vehicles outside of dense terraced houses/flats by, instead of installing pay and display areas, installing communal park and charging areas for the local residents, or car club bays to encourage car sharing. Having said that, I would strongly support a pay and display bay (with 20 minutes free for drop off/pick up) stretching along the top of South Street, directly at the rear of the station.
Tylney Rd	No/object	I feel that if one parking space was allocated to each house on Tylney Rd, that would mean everyone could park, and there would be spaces for extra cars, where the home owners don,t have a car. This would need spaces indicated on the road and small signs, but would solve inconsiderate parking. (One car taking up two spaces) If I could be allocated a space outside the house where I have lived for over 50 years, I would gladly pay say £25 pa, BUT I will not pay just to park on my own road- if I,m lucky.
The Meads	No/object	
Park Grange Croft	No/object	Pay & Display parking for none residents is fine, but levying a charge on residents to get a permit is wrong. Permits for residents should be free
Stradbroke Drive	No/object	
Holdings road	No/object	I have to continue parking because it's my house. I should not have to pay to park outside my house. The area of the parking scheme should be centre purely around park hill, not extended to holdings road, Essex road and so on.
Granville Road	No/object	I don't think charges applied to house holders is the way forward. Instead there should be more affordable parking in the city centre. Also, the local school staff take lots of parking spaces everyday. It is the number of cars per household that is the issue.
S2 2SA	No/object	I live across from Norfolk park. I am fine with the parking arrangements. I would not wish for parking permits to be introduced. The cost of living is rapidly increasing a additional cost for parking is totally unnecessary at the present moment.
Stocksbridge	No/object	Parking permits would be beneficial for NHS/social care/carers who need to visit vulnerable people in the area, however not being eligible for one currently I can't see this being a viable option for the council.
City Road	No/object	we have rarely had a problem with parking outside our house ,the only time is due to road ,water maintenance when no parking allowed.We don't support the parking permits as we don't have an issue.The weekend when there are no time restrictions we still don't have any problem parking outside our house.
Manor Oaks Gardens	No/object	In the current financial climte with bills climbing expeditially is it fair to penalised people with even more unneceserly expense just because of the geographical location if their home
Meersbrook	No/object	
Park/Wybourn	No/object	
S8	No/object	Re continuing to park and pay. I work 12 hr shifts and these often start and finish in the dark, and I do not feel it is safe to walk distances (public transport is not an option), so I will have to pay, but if there is a time limit too I am absolutely stuck!!!! Also all this will do is move the problem slightly further out while also effecting people that do need to park in the area zoned for work!
Holdings road	No/object	I am a resident of Holdings Road and oppose the proposed scheme. I am not willing to pay an additional cost to park outside of my house. I already pay road tax and council tax and there is not an issue with parking on my road. A permit for residents should be free.
Holdings road	No/object	
Holdings Road	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	I object on the grounds that there are no parking issues at present, that it would penalise me for having short term visitors to my house, that the proposal given here contradicts the information given on the leaflet (Mon - Fri 8am-6:30pm), that any future short term tenants I may wish to let to would cause considerable bureaucratic problems, additional costs as the cost of living continues to rise, that I return from work before 6:30pm, that any future parking problems would be caused by the introduction of parking zones elsewhere, that council tax continued to rise whilst services continue to decline and that having lived in the area for many years this has never been an issue.
Glencoe Road	No/object	I am appalled at the idea for the introduction of paid parking in the Park Hill area. I strongly believe the introduction of this scheme will be of detriment to residents and visitors as well as local businesses.
Farmoor Gardens	No/object	I respectfully request that SCC stop trying to enforce parking fees for the few people who park on street and walk into the city centre.  This blanket response is not needed, is heavy handed and is to generate additional income for SCC. This is not a measure to help local residents and these roads and spaces are empty after 5:30pm on weekdays and weekends.
S5	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	I will have to look to locate else where if this is going to occur
Granville road	No/object	
S2	No/object	
Glencoe Road . Sheffield S2 2SR	No/object	I am against the proposed parking scheme
stafford road	No/object	
Buckinghamshire	No/object	thomson walk Aylesbury

Essex Road	No/object	
Buckinghamshire	No/object	The past two years have been awful all we want is to be able to visit our family and not have to worry about parking charges.
Seabrook Road	No/object	I do not park in the Park Hill area for any other reason apart from I live in the area. I object to the controlled parking scheme you are trying to thrust on to the residents of the area simply because we have the right to park on the streets outside our properties that we own without having to pay any extra for doing so. As vehicle and property owners, we already pay enough to the council, and most of the time, without any further support.
Granville Road	No/object	I personally couldn't afford an additional payment for a parking permit currently. Especially as I live in a house share with 3 others so how is it fair that some of us would have to obtain the more expensive permit after the first?
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville rd	No/object	Can i say why it just says park hill but whole of norfolk park in included. I initially thought it was just park hill. There are so many things which are misleading eg the timing and day. People will literally think just park hill and not realise that thier area is included.
Granville road	No/object	Everything else is currently being put up, tax, bills etc. and you are now thinking of making us pay to park outside my home. We are a house share of individuals that are not well paid and the permit is a ridiculous amount especially as we have four cars. I think this is ridiculous and I do not see why it is suddenly needed as there is currently no problems with parking.
S10	No/object	Just make it all free; you're only pushing the problem into the next area. If I have to walk for ten minutes longer, then so be it. You're punishing workers on low incomes with fixed hours who can't do the same.
Wybourn	No/object	You can not charge people to park out side they're own doors
Glencoe Road	No/object	Why should residents have to pay for something that has been free?
Granville road	No/object	
Ingram Road, Norfolk Park	No/object	
Donnington Road	No/object	
City Road	No/object	parking in the city center, and improved public transport links! If a parking scheme is introduced in the Park Hill area, permits should be given freely to residents as they already pay council tax. If charges must be introduced, they should be tiered based on council tax band, with significant discounts for people with disabilities and limited incomes. Additionally, if this scheme is introduced as proposed, I and many other households like mine will be forced to pave over our front garden to create a parking space. This will increase water run-off, exacerbating the already considerable flooding risk at the bottom of the hill - i.e. the town centre. Whatever money the council hopes to make off this scheme will be lost in increased flood severity due to countless more gardens being concreted over.
Holdings road	No/object	
Norfolk park	No/object	No one should have to pay to park outside their own homes - the residents need a FOC permit pass as this is totally unacceptable !!
Singleton grove	No/object	Why would I have to pay to park to visit friends and pick up friends from their house
Singleton Grove	No/object	I believe this is purely a monetary gain exercise to only benefit the sheffield city council. I visit the area regularly for caring responsibilities and have never had any difficulty parking at any time. I find it abhorrent that after what the people have gone through over the past few years the scc are again stealing from the citizens of this city
Glencoe Road	No/object	I would not like to need to pay if I was a resident.
Donnington Road	No/object	
Old Street	No/object	
talbot street	No/object	i strongly object to this parking scheme i live in this area and have family park who stop overnight some weeks . why are you even thinking of doing this? its not wanted, why are you trying to upset us all? just because 2 people have complained.
Holdings Road	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	We have no choice as we live here so we have to park here. Cost-wise for residents for one car, the proposed amount is reasonable. My concern is that the price for non-residents to park here, especially the all-day price, is incredibly cheap. The prices should be high enough to deter people from wanting to park there. £1.50 for an hour and £6.50 for all day would not be enough to deter me if I were the one having to pay. In the NCP and Q Park the all day prices are more around the £20 mark. The proposed prices will not do anything to improve the parking situation for residents. Low parking fees will still making the Park Hill area a more attractive (cheaper) option than the city centre, thereby increasing traffic and emissions in a residential area. Park Hill/Norfolk Park should be upgraded, not continue to be the communal car park for visitors/commuters to the city/station.  My other concern with a parking scheme in general would be that even more people would turn their front gardens into driveways, which is the case for a couple of houses on our road, including a house on the Conservation Area side, and it looks terrible. If more people were to do that, it would considerably change the aesthetic of the street. It already looks bad enough with quite a number of houses having paved over their front gardens. If a parking scheme is introduced, we would welcome enforcement of Conservation Area regulations with regards to changes to the front garden.
Granville Road Sheffield	No/object	
Granville Road Sheffield	No/object	
Granville Road Sheffield	No/object	
Hemsworth	No/object	8-8:30pm 7 days a week seems excessive.
St Giles Croft, Beverley,	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	I ticked yes to the above because we live here and don't have a choice. I don't think that parking meters will deter non-residents from parking here either because a lot of the extra parking is often work vans and i imagine they will just bill their employer for the parking fees. The parking in this area has not been a problem - and particularly at weekends there is lots of space. I don't believe residents should have to pay for permits to be able to park outside their homes.
Norfolk road	No/object	
Norfolk Rd	No/object	The parking in and around Norfolk Park is not so much a problem. It's what you would expect being so close to town. Speeding is much worse.
Granville Road	No/object	There are no problems with parking on Granville road or most of the area on the proposed parking scheme. Most commuters park on Norfolk Road to walk to the train station, The majority of residents on Norfolk Road have access to off street parking so I don't see the issue, I don't think there should be a permit scheme in this area because the residents mainly can't afford it, and even if one was needed it should be limited to the parts of the area with parking issues. For example the bottom of Granville road is quite busy due to the schools and colleges, but where we are at the top of is not and there is no issue with parking
S7	No/object	

Old street s2 5pr	No/object	My father is disabled so parking elsewhere wouldn't be an option for him and he wouldn't be able to afford to pay for parking everytime he comes to see me. Also my mother in law comes to stay for the weekend once a month and she has a small child and is also pregnant so she also needs to be able to park on our street and doesn't need another expense to worry about right now. If there was nowhere to park then i would totally understand and support a parking scheme but there's plenty of space so i dont think its necessary at this time.
Old Street	No/object	Although we do not own a car ourselves we are regularly visited by friends and family who if these proposed changes would effect our street (Old street) would not be able to visit as often. In light of recent times and the rise in costs for everyone I don't believe this is an acceptable change to make, I have not noticed any issue on our street with people parking and if this was an issue perhaps putting money towards making parking more affordable and accessible in the city would be a much better approach than finding another expense for people to have to pay.
St. Aidans Road	No/object	To put this scheme in place would only move the problem to areas a little further away from city centre. How do you decide where to stop the restrictions.
Sheffield	No/object	
Rotherham - have family on Hyde	No/object	
Donnington Road	No/object	Please do not make it payed parking. My elderly Grandparents who visit and others need a space to park and can't do this if it's permit.
Buxton	No/object	
City Road	No/object	Daft question really where else could we park.We live here on city road.It's hitting at pensioners having to pay.We are all not fortunate to live in suburbia with drives etc.It looks like you are hitting those poorer residents yet again.If it's because there's too many parking in the area to enable to work in town etc it's probably caused by those said suburbians .We don't have much in way of issues other than neighbours families with multiple cars.What happens with my son visiting us he will have to pay to see us?if so you may isolate families.Will blue badge holders like my wife be able to park free in those proposed charging times
City road	No/object	For more than 30 years there has never been a issue with parking...
Skye Edge Road	No/object	This is just a money making scheme from the council. If you want to reduce parking problems, have affordable parking in town. That way you will encourage businesses, and shopping. Instead of trying to (and failing to) drive people away from their cars. Just wonder if you are going to change once most cars are electric? Back to this scheme. If its to protect residential parking. Then why not allow free parking for those who live here by giving free permits for those. And just charging those who don't live here
Park Hill	No/object	Park Hill residents should not be charged to park in Park Hill. If you want to charge visitors, that's fine.
Ingram Road	No/object	We would have no option but to park outside our home as we live here and do not have off-street parking.
Glencoe Road	No/object	
Granville	No/object	
Stafford Road S2	No/object	
Castle Croft Drive	No/object	
Ingram Road	No/object	I cannot afford to pay to park outside my own home on a road for which I already struggle to pay Council Tax for. I can't afford to pay for visitors to park outside my home when they visit me. My neighbours that live one road over won't have to pay! I am disabled and travel by car to visit The Cholera Park to enjoy the healthy benefits of sitting outside. I use Norfolk Park Road to park my car to visit this park. If there are parking restrictions I will no longer be able to do this.  I will not oppose parking restrictions if I don't have to pay a fee to park my car outside my own home nor if I have to pay for my visitors to park outside my house. I will also wish to be able to park anywhere inside the proposed zone for free so I can continue to enjoy my own local community.
Duke Street	No/object	I would support the scheme for non residents . but disagree that residents who are all over 65 should have to pay .
St. Aidans Road	No/object	I have to park on the street as I do not have a driveway and I work in the essential construction industry where I must drive for my job. I am being penalised for not having a driveway and you are trying to force me to pay for this, whilst at the same time not allowing me to charge an EV on the street? You need to make up your mind, if you are forcing me for the privilege of having a job then at least give me the support to make driving as sustainable as possible. You are introducing the 'clean air zone' which we will live at the edge of, which is presumably why you are doing this, because you know the problems this will cause with redirected traffic and you are trying to profit from the change. This is a terrible idea and will not resolve any traffic issues, which must be perceived as I have never experienced or seen any parking issues in the 7 years I have lived in the area.
Handsworth	No/object	Depending on how much the parking is I would consider paying however the council extort commuters with their obscene prices
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Castle Croft drive	No/object	
Seabrook road	No/object	Question 27 is a silly question, just because you want to extort money from us doesn't mean I can give up my car  A handful of residents on one or 2 roads complaining about commuter parking has led to this ridiculous idea. I hope it is never implemented.  Cost of living, energy, fuel all squeezing us to the limit and now you want to make us pay additional to please all the rich families who live on Norfolk road.  I will make sure I use my vote wisely next time instead of voting in a council determined to make us suffer
Norfolk Road	No/object	Schemes like this just displace parking, rather than reduce them. Introducing something like this would just move all the same cars further up the hill towards the Manor
Granville Rd	No/object	If the issue is about those outside parking in residential areas, why not build a multi storey car park rather than forcing residents to pay for parking. We will now be out of pocket just buy living in the area. In your proposal we will have to pay annual fees. What happens when friends/family visit our contractors need to park outside our houses?
Holdings Road	No/object	I do not see the need for a parking zone in Park Hill.  I feel that SCC is not listening and that this is all about generating money for the Council. I already pay road tax and council tax - how much more will you try to squeeze from me. I get no benefits and fund myself.  If the zone is introduced, you will obviously be paying someone to police this and they will need a vehicle. This all costs. Also, as hourly charging is one of the proposals I assume that hourly checks will be required.
Duke Street	No/object	

Norfolk Park Avenue.	No/object	I support the scheme AS LONG AS there are caveats, such as: 1. Funds go back into local traffic-calming measures 2. Up to 2 hours free parking so ppl can visit relatives, library, park, etc 3. Profits should be auditable, and subsidise the cost of ppl having to pay to park outside their own homes.
Glencoe Road	No/object	I wouldn't have a choice as I have to have a car and its where I live. I do however think it is absolutely disgraceful making money from residents parking outside their own houses. Residents should be given at least one free permit.
Norfolk park avenue	No/object	
Park hill	No/object	I would park and not pay and not pay the fines either - hopefully my prison sentence would be another embarrassment for the council like the tree fiasco
City road	No/object	There is absolutely no use of implementing such scheme in this area.
Samuel road	No/object	I live Norfolk park not far from Guildford avenue, although I'm not in the parking zone area I'm not far away, so thinking the cars that won't now park in that area will move there cars near and create problems for other streets .
Donnington road	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	
Fitzwalter Road	No/object	Parking is not a real issue for us. You would provide a great disservice to our community through this scheme - especially those among us who are already vulnerable. Please don't isolate residents so that you can raise a few thousand pounds.  Making it harder to visit Sheffield will inevitably effect business and the cultural life of our city. Please don't ruin our city centre for a few thousand pounds!  This is a thinly veiled scheme to raise taxes surreptitiously and an attempt to force drivers to use the over-priced car parks (that are mostly empty).  Instead, represent our community by addressing our real concerns. Traffic Calming is a serious issue. Because there is no left turn from Granville Road on to Duke Street, Fitzwalter Road (a small residential street) is misused by traffic. We suffer continually from damage to our cars and the threat to our children as they try to cross the road.
Park Hill	No/object	I am a resident, I live at Crown Place I pay my Council Tax, I pay my car tax why do I have to pay outside my house?? I am a disabled person why do I have to pay to park outside my house??
Holdings Rd	No/object	NORFOLK RD seems to be the area that began this proposal. Many of the houses there have drives. As for Shrewsbury Hospital, it has long drives with locked gates that could be used for residents and visitors. Perhaps some disabled parking areas would help. Or H markings outside drives. This proposal has a monetary impact on residents who currently gave no issues. And to introduce measures only in the lower area would move the problem up the hill. I strongly object to this proposal.
PARK GRANGE CROFT	No/object	We don't have any problems with parking on Park Grange Croft. Even when football is on at Bramhall lane, it is only busy for a couple of hours. Putting in a parking charge would only make it difficult for residents and they're visitors who will have to now pay.  It seems like a money making scheme by Sheffield council with no real justification.
Tylney Road	No/object	You are making this scheme too expensive for residents - the first permit should be free, or vastly reduced, so that people can afford a pass for visitors. Pay street parking would be OK under these terms as people could still have guests. There is a huge worry for many that the cost will continue to rise and that people are being penalised while the actual issues over safety are ignored. I do think you need to rethink this as it feels like the council hasn't listened or understood the problems. Where is the 20 mile zone, or traffic calming?
Talbot Crescent	No/object	The hourly and daily charges are a lot if it was for a visitor. Rather than being charged to park on the road there should be the ability to also get visitors permits when you pay for the resident permit.
City Road	No/object	I object these proposals as it simply seems like more money-making from the council. I live in terraced housing which does not have a private driveway, therefore I have no choice but to park on the street close to my home. If these changes go ahead, this will be another household cost of of £40+ for the year, possibly even £90+ if my partner and I were to purchase separate vehicles. In a time where household costs are increasing (energy, council tax, petrol, food shopping), I think it's an absolutely awful idea to add yet another expense. I do wonder who the people are who have suggested this is a good idea - maybe people lucky enough to have their own driveways who don't like others parking around their homes, or people with the luxury of spare funds who wish to throw money at a problem in the hope that this gives them (and them alone) the entitlement to park on the road outside their house. I think much more consultation needs to be given to the residents of this area, you can't lump this entire area together when there is a very different situation on a street by street basis. For example, you can't park directly on City Road, so many residents park just behind around Granville Road - you can't lump these residents in the same pool as the houses who live closer to the train station towards Park Hill (Glencoe for example) who have private driveways. Maybe narrow the circle down tighter - closer to the train station if you really want to target commuters who might be taking advantage of the free parking - I don't see how this affects the area towards me and I certainly don't wish to pay to park my car around my house.
Norfolk road	No/object	If the scheme went ahead I think it should start at 9am and finish at 6pm
Blackwell Place	No/object	
Holdings Road	No/object	We strongly object to the proposed parking scheme.
Duke Street	No/object	My family and visit me sometimes. I think if you introduce paid parking, people would be less likely to visit me
Norwich, Pat Midgley Lane, Park H	No/object	Because it is already difficult to park on our flats car parks, due to public being able to come in and pay to park as well, especially those that are using the train station as it's way cheaper than the extortionate station car park, this will create further problems for us. All the people that currently park for free on these streets when going into town etc, will then come and use our car park because it will still be cheaper than the new charges on the street. Therefore, for us residents of the flats, who have no other option of where to park, that's anywhere close to our homes, will be pushed out. We are paying £50 per month, which is a very high charge. If you bring in these new charges we will have even less chance to park near our flats. You should put pressure on Urban Splash to give us a guaranteed designated space if we pay £50 per month. To pay this price and find other people using the car park and no room for us is not OK. I believe the new parking zone will make matters far worse for all us and there are many new flats coming in this development. I strongly oppose this on those grounds.
Glencoe road	No/object	
Castle Croft Drive	No/object	I don't park on park hill, so probs doesn't effect me.. I live on castle Croft Drive that people use to park. Again overall it isn't that bad, I wouldn't be happy if I had to pay for a yearly permit to park my own vehicle outside my own house.
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Park Hill Flats, South Street	No/object	The proposed hourly rate for the street parking is more than the hourly rate for the SIP Park Hill car park. This means that hourly people will fill up our car park because it's the cheaper option. The situation as it is, is fine and we don't see any reason to complicate things by introducing this scheme.

Norfolk Park Avenue, ,	No/object	First of all I do not live in Parkhill so why have you sent me this leaflet? If these proposals are intended to apply to me please let me know.  Generally speaking this is no more than a money making exercise for an incompetent local administration which takes no notice of the general public's requirements. With the current situation of increases in food, heating, lighting, petrol, etc how dare you add additional expenses to the ordinary man and woman in the street that you as a council claim to represent?
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	
Long Henry	No/object	Please don't do this. It will cause problems and not resolve anything - It's a very bad idea.
Tylney Road	No/object	I live on Tylney Road and we don't seem to have a problem with people parking on our road and then walking into town etc. The people who park here live here, albeit that some have two cars. You may not always be able to park outside your own house, but we seem to work it out. Having a permit doesn't guarantee you a parking space and so we are no better off. I am really not happy that you are even considering this proposal at this time. It is another added financial burden placed on us. The same week I received your flyer I also received notification that my Gas Bill of £1,204 per year would go from the 1st April to an estimated £2,126 and my Electric From £859 to an estimated £1,214....and possible further increases! This is not the only cost of living increase we face...there is water, petrol, council tax, food and the list goes on. My husband and I are pensioners, during Covid he was classed as 'vulnerable' and the last 2 years have been very difficult. Now we are having friends and family starting to visit and life is slowly getting back to normal. That is not going to happen if they have to pay £1.30 per hour to visit us! You might say ...but that's just Mon. to Fri. between 8am - 6.30pm.....during those time's the road is half empty because people are back at work. I can understand that there maybe a problem with street parking nearer the town but as you go further back there is not. I strongly feel this is not appropriate.
Talbot Place	No/object	
City Road	No/object	
Manor Oaks Drive	No/object	I will start a petition to ensure this is not progressed. Haven spoken to alot of locals they are against this idea. The idea is only support by one women who works for the council and she is trying to push this through.
Shrewsbury Hospital, Norfolk road	No/object	I can't park on Shrewsbury hospital estate and people visiting me can't park on the estate. My relatives would find the parking fees prohibitive and would be forced to reduce or stop their visits altogether. I am seriously concerned about the impact this will have on my own, already frail, mental health. The hospital trustees have recently introduced a rule stating that there will be no parking allowed on the site at all. I would like you to get the Shrewsbury hospital to allow daytime parking again. Please call me so i can speak directly to you
Harold Lambert Court	No/object	Where else are residents supposed to park.
Talbot Street	No/object	
Norfolk Park	No/object	
Guildford Avenue	No/object	This scheme will only push the people parking there to avoid city centre parking charges further up the estate onto neighbouring roads which are already struggling to accommodate residents vehicles, the residents of parkhill shouldn't have to pay you for permits when the problem isn't getting solved just moved further into the estate
Talbot Street	No/object	I live here so where else would you want me to park? The council has obviously lost the plot
Ingram road	No/object	I would have no choice but to have to pay for the other two cars in my house ! Don't want the charges and have never had a problem. My eldest parents both live in the "zone" and I don't feel I should have to pay to visit as do my grown up children.
Tylney road	No/object	This is disgraceful. Money for the council. This is not what the majority of residents want. They wanted speed bumps but someone on the council sees this as a money making concern.
Stafford Road	No/object	I can understand why residents have complained about parking, however my concern is that pay and display and it's prices won't deter commuters and as such not solve the problem (especially as they can still park all day rather than short stay) and that essentially it will stay the same but we are now paying for permits and the hassle of visitor booklets. I also think that the parking meters and markings will look very unattractive in the area especially as the houses are beautiful Victorian houses. Our area has many issues that I wish time and energy were being thrown at... litter, fly tipping, crime, maintenance of the parks... I can't believe that parking cars is a priority as I don't believe it will add anything to the area.
Tylney road	No/object	I could not afford to pay.
Coates Street	No/object	This would be terrible for the local business and park library. It will not be good for the value of our houses. I strongly appose this I should not have to pay to park outside my own home which I own!!! So annoyed by this action and I would NOT have bought a house in the area if I know you ere planning This! Plus it will kill the city centre what are you thinking!!!! Residents of the area DO NOT WANT THIS SCHEME!!!!
Stafford Road	No/object	Q27 - should have answer "I have no other alternative". This 'consultation' is not fit for purpose
Harwich Road	No/object	I strongly object to the proposals. They would have a significant negative impact on me. I park in the area to attend groups for my health and wellbeing, as well as my child's nursery. If I had to pay to park this would put me off attending these vital community support activities. I have no problems parking so do not see the need for such measures.
Stafford Street	No/object	I would rather find a space nearby until space becomes available outside my door. I've never had a problem parking outside my own home each night. My guests are also able to park in safe visible distance near my house.
Skye Edge Road, Sheffield S2	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	There are no problems therefore I do not wish to partake in purchasing a parking permit which seems to just be a money making scheme by the council in an already scary financial climate
Donnington Road	No/object	There are far too few parking bays for residents. At the moment residents park on both sides of Donnington Road/Norfolk Park Avenue, but the proposal shows nothing for the Norfolk Park Avenue side of the road. There are also spaces that small cars currently squeeze into that aren't on the plan, meaning even less space. This parking scheme will cause more problems for residents and not make any difference to the commuter situation, as they don't park on our street anyway. Ridiculous!
Tylney Road	No/object	It would be unacceptable to force residents of the area to pay a charge to park outside their own homes.  If the council insist on this, residents should be allocated free parking permits; therefore charging visitors and (above all else) football fans who are the main culprits in this scenario.
Ingram road	No/object	
Donnington Road, Sheffield	No/object	Hard enough to park as it is outside my own home, never mind having to pay for it! Joke!
Robinson road	No/object	You are. Not guaranteed a parking space with resident parking and have to pay

Skye Edge Road	No/object	I find it bewildering that we as a street have to find out about these proposed changes through word of mouth and not by the council themselves when it has a huge impact on us. Why are residents not being given prior warning of these supposed proposals? A lot of people can't or don't know how to access the internet and are therefore not given the right to oppose/support changes which are affecting them directly
Manor park	No/object	This is a disgrace to make money from residents when they already pay council tax and road tax not to mention income tax and national insurance which is going up on top of the cost of living I, sheffield city council should be ashamed of themselves
Old street	No/object	33 old street. Parking is no issue here. Don't introduce this.
Stafford road	No/object	Q 27 is biased for the council I live in the area pay rates and vote for councilors and Mps at present i have voted labour all my voting life All this council are doing is turning sheffield into a carpark so they can make money they are not interested in the people that vote or the communities otherwise they would be looking at what is happening around them rates going up gas /electricity going up food going up pensions frozen services being cut petrol going up disabled help being cut. Now the council are going to charge doctors/nurses /carers/ to visit people in need I am not alone give us the full facts not just yours
Tylney rd	No/object	
Norfolk Park Road	No/object	I think it would be extremely unfair to charge people to park on Norfolk Park Road when most are visiting the park or the hospital or going to college. Resident parking is not needed on this road
Stafford rd	No/object	The proposed parking scheme would not make it any easier for residents to park just expensive and congested, Difficult for visiting family, health and care workers and trades people. We would have to continue parking here as it's where we live.
Park Hill Flats	No/object	
Stafford Road	No/object	I don't agree as a resident that we should have to pay. Also I believe it will actually increase traffic in the area making it harder to park.
Norfolk Park Drive	No/object	I really don't agree with this, the cost of living is going up, its the wrong time and the wrong way. People are going to try and park on small streets like ours at Norfolk Park Drive and then I'm guessing that will be made into pay to park. I know money is tight for the council but there has to be other ways but its really scary right now wondering what this year is going to hold for us all, I just don't think this is the right time. If its to address the issue of the environment/car use then surely making public transport better, bringing it back into public control would be the first step - more buses etc, more reasonable and reliable services, then look at charging for car parking. In the past, my partner has been fined for having to park temporarily on a yellow on our own street as he had to nip back home to sort something before going back to work and that was bad enough. I hope you reconsider this proposal.
Tylney rd	No/object	Totally against this as most residents are No problem with commuters no problem speeding if council wants to do something useful sort out the junction at Stafford Rd Glencoe Rd and Fitzwalter Rd it's an accident waiting to happen I am totally against the scheme as is my husband The area chosen is not appropriate you need to visit the residents to see if commuters Park on their Rd Someone has not done their homework
Norfolk park	No/object	
rotherham	No/object	Parking restrictions are unnecessary and are just another way for the council to make money
Tylney Road	No/object	Difficulties parking outside your own home seem to be a modern day problem in every city. Charging the residents does not seem the fair way to deal with solution. For myself, struggling with all the current cost of living increases are making life financially harder and harder and then having to pay to park on my own street will just increase the burden. The proposal to charge visitors £1.50 an hour is also outrageous, which other residential areas charge this hourly rate? What if one of my adult children wish to come and stay for a few days? I feel this whole scheme is just an unfair financial on local residents
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	Residents of Norfolk Park should at least get free permits and friends and family permits. With the inflation of prices of everything at the moment it is unfair to expect residents to find the money to pay for permits to park outside their own houses
Norfolk Park avenue	No/object	
Seabrook Road	No/object	I think it's absolutely disgusting that you are planning on changing me to park outside my own home. Especially in a time when cost of living is out of control! Why not let residents have a couple of free passes at least?
City road	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	I have no choice but to continue parking here, as I am a resident in the area. If this scheme is enforced, this will not deter the majority of existing commuters who park in the area, as the cost to park for a day is still cheaper than parking in the town center.  The people who will lose out are the local residents, who will have to pay for parking and guest permits, and even then there will be no guarantee that there is a parking space for them.  Furthermore, local businesses will also lose out because customers will be put off by the charges and restrictions. We do not need this in this day and age, especially in an already poverty stricken area.  As I said in an earlier section, parking in this area has never been an issue for me and I have always found a space outside or near my house on Glencoe Road.  All in all, I am highly opposed to this scheme for the reasons outlined earlier.
Manor Lane	No/object	From collective voices, I do not know one person that has any positive feedback on this proposal. I know that my address sits outside of the area, however, I feel as the first place with free parking outside of the area, we will be heavily impacted unnecessarily.
skye edge road	No/object	if we are stopped from parking on skye edge road ,between the hours of 8am to 6-30pm,where does the council propose we park.i would be interested to know.
Castle Croft Drive	No/object	
Tylney road	No/object	
Skye Edge Road	No/object	
Parkhill	No/object	I'm a housing association resident of parkhill. With the high rents and already high hearing cost. The parking scheme is another expense I can barely afford. For me what would be a good idea is to mark the parking areas so people park with more consideration



City Road	No/object	I think this scheme is very unfair for local residents. I do not use on street parking because my house has a driveway, but most residents in the area do not. The cost of living is already rising rapidly and adding unnecessary expense to this is unacceptable. A fairer solution to the parking issues would be to have free permits for residents and some pay and display bays around the area, or to make all parking in the residential streets for residents only with free permits. As it stands I think the scheme is extremely unfair to local residents.
S2 2RD	No/object	I would like to know the reasoning for this
Skye Edge Road	No/object	After being a resident for over 30 years will no difficulty parking i strongly disagree with this decision. Being close to city road, which has controlled parking, I feel this will make parking for residents on our road extremely difficult, as the only other places to park would be Manor Laith road, half of which is also to be controlled and the other half will be a free for all between residents of city road and us. How will this help, it is a ludicrous idea, and one that I am sure all residents of Skye Edge Road will disagree with.
Farm Bank Road	No/object	Farm Bank Road has 8 houses, many have no drive or a single drive. The road is also used for parking by residents of Granville Road whose houses (and drives) back onto Farm Bank Road.  Parking is generally fine and not a problem.  I have seen the proposals. I would guess that it means around six cars can park on the street at any one time, which is not enough for the people who live here. I also don't understand why the parking is on that side of the road when the other side has fewer drives and so more space to put in bays.  If we are only going to have six bays (or fewer) I do not want this to go ahead. There would be no where for us to park and we wouldn't have parking available for visitors either.
Ingram Road	No/object	I think this is going to cause a lot of hassle and cost a lot of money for people who live in the area. We already pay council tax and now we have to pay for a parking permit and our visitors have to pay for parking? This is wrong
City Road,	No/object	I feel that the scheme would not improve the parking situation and that I would be paying for the privilege of potentially not being able to park in my residential area.
Doncaster	No/object	The area is well away from the city centre and parking restrictions are totally unnecessary. Why should anyone have to pay to park outside a house nowhere near any congestion?
coates st	No/object	
Glencoe road	No/object	
City road	No/object	I disagree with parking charges. It takes 30 minutes to walk from city road to the city centre, and if commuters are already committing to parking further away to avoid paying for parking then it is proven that parking is too expensive for people that are already working and struggling to pay - or they wouldn't include a 30 minute walk on top of their current driving travel. Also, not a lot of companies support their staff with parking charges, which means it will come directly out of commuters pockets and will be forced to pay just to get to work. The benefits of paying for parking in the city centre (if people choose se to) is convenience and short distance walking, however parking charges at a further distance do not provide any benefits for people that are employed and that are just trying to get to work. Not having parking restrictions encourages people to walk and live healthier lifestyles, and limiting this will leave people out of pocket and reduce wellbeing - ontop of the current price increase of basic living.
Granville Road, South Yorkshire	No/object	I am 82, my children and grandchildren visit me and my wife regularly. This permit scheme is a ridiculous money making scheme, there are no parking issues in 80% of the area covered by the map. This will reduce the number of visitors I get as I am bed bound and unable to visit them. Do something useful instead
Donnington Road	No/object	We don't think this scheme is necessary for Donnington Road as we don't have parking problems here. This scheme will likely make our lives more awkward and more expensive. We would have to pay to park as residents.  We do urgently need speed bumps on Donnington Road as people routinely speed down our residential street.  There also needs to be a safe way to cross Talbot Road from the bottom of Norfolk Road. Thanks.
Seabrook road	No/object	
Norfolk park	No/object	We don't have any problem on our road for parking none of us residents do. And we can't afford to pay for 2 parking tickets at the prices they are. They should get cheaper or be free for the residents that have no issues at the moment. Making money from the residents to try and solve issues that may be on the other roads doesn't seem appropriate. Making money from the pay machines should be enough
Skye edge road	No/object	
City Road	No/object	
Robinson Road	No/object	
Hyde Park Terrace	No/object	If we have permits or pay zones then my children who help care for me would have to use public transport
Stafford Rd	No/object	As a local resident I strongly object to the introduction of a controlled parking scheme. I believe this scheme will penalise rather than benefit local residents. Parking is not an issue within the proposed zone. Yes, some people park at the town end of Norfolk Rd in order to access the city but, considering our unreliable and overpriced public transport and the current cost of living crisis, I don't believe this is a bad thing.  People also park in this zone to access the fantastic parks we have in our area and I don't see why they should have to pay to do this. With people suffering financially at the moment, having parks accessible without cost is essential to the well being of people in our city.  I feel that the introduction of this parking zone is designed purely to raise money for the council, not to benefit residents or visitors to the area. I have a drive so would use that to park rather than paying to park on the road as I do at present, but not everybody in the area is so fortunate and I don't see why they should have to pay what is essentially a parking tax when times are already hard enough financially.  If you wish to make an improvement to the roads in our area, why not introduce a 20 mph speed limit on all residential streets? This would make roads safer for children (there are multiple schools, nurseries and parks within the proposed zone) and would help to reduce pollution. Reducing the speed limit and helping to enforce it by introducing speed bumps would have a positive impact, introducing a parking zone would not.  I am aware that other areas have been offered a vote on whether a parking zone should be introduced (e.g. Hunter House Rd in Hunters Bar) and believe that in the name of local democracy, this should also be the approach taken here.
Manor oaks gardens	No/object	Manor oaks gardens is not part of park hill. It is a residential estate with families & children , more Wybourn area and Parents & residents have no problems parking their cars, All the residents will find it very hard to have to pay parking permits as it's mostly low income families that live here.
Ingram Court	No/object	

St Aidans road	No/object	I would have to continue to park here as this is where I live ! This is a ridiculous idea and purely a money making scheme for the council. My road never experiences heavy parking or double parking. No commuters park here as it is not close enough to the station, college or city centre to be viable for them.
Glencoe Road	No/object	There's no benefit to me from the scheme, only cost. I'm also concerned that visiting friends and family would have to pay a quite stiff rate.
Archdale Road	No/object	
Hyde Park Terrace	No/object	
Stafford Street	No/object	
Norfolk rd	No/object	I live on Norfolk rd. I would not be happy to pay for a permit. My vehicle is too large to fit on the drive. The parking scheme proposed would not deter commuter parking and would only serve to disadvantage residents.
City Road	No/object	Please re-think the parking zones and please back off, feels like death by a thousand bills, everything's going up and the councils finding new ways to make life even harder than it already is
Skye Edge Road	No/object	
Tylney Rd	No/object	I am totally against this. I will refuse to pay what amounts to a tax for parking on my own road. It's outrageous 😡😡😡
Talbot Place	No/object	let builders and city centre commuters park on south road.
Ingram Road	No/object	I do not have any issues parking in my street and do not see the need for this scheme.
Talbot place	No/object	We as residents don't want this scene in our area can't afford it
Skye Edge Road	No/object	Please consider our communities current socio-economic circumstances, we cannot afford to pay anything further than what we are doing already - income tax, road tax, council tax, bills have increased but not pay (unless you are an MP). I already have 3 jobs, am a single parent and feel I already pay enough out. We could also ask, "Why are we being asked to do this in our area where it is already a deprived area, why not head out to Dore or Whirlow? There are lots of families who will be further disadvantaged if you do this. Please don't do it.
City Road	No/object	Answer to question 27. I dont have a choice where i park my car as i will live on the road where the permits are being proposed. I shouldn't have to pay to park my car outside of my own home. And my family members shouldn't have to pay and display to visit either.
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	No issues parking on street. I do not want parking restrictions on the back side of Norfolk park avenue as cars are parked blocking the driveway and I do not want there to be a restriction on doing this. I do not want to pay for a permit to park nor do I want pay for parking. Please do not place restrictions in the park hill area. Pleas keep me updated by email.
STAFFORD ROAD	No/object	I have no option other than to park where I live. To charge for that when people's incomes are massively impacted by current circumstances is wholly unjust.
Stafford Road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	Firstly I do not park in Park Hill which has privately controlled parking spaces. This question is totally misleading. I do wish to park around Park Centre/Library and other local community buildings without charge. Does this question ask for comments about the whole scheme. It is very ambiguous.
Stafford Road	No/object	Totally unfair, this area does not have a parking problem it has a traffic problem
Tylney Road	No/object	Money making scheme from SCC.
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Pitsmoor	No/object	I don't think it is fair that the new scheme for paying for parking is necessary. I object because i am a student living at home and having to travel to college on Granville road and going to work so, park hill and Granville road parking is important for me. The pricing of fuel has gone up significantly and now this new controlled parking is being put into place for 'residents' yet council are proposing you can park if you pay! It's unfair, the council should take into account everyone's situations.
Arbourthorne	No/object	
Stafford Road	No/object	I don't understand why this scheme is in progress. There is a much greater need for speed restrictions on side roads (Stafford, Norfolk, Fitzwalter roads for example). Many residents have signposted their desire for this through "20s plenty" placards in their gardens. Parking does not seem a problem. People do use Norfolk road to park on to go into town but most residents have their own driveways. Other roads around here are fine for parking. Please can we all have a vote, rather than Sheffield Council bringing something in that seems to me to be mostly to generate income for them, rather than benefitting local residents?
Norwich St	No/object	As a volunteer working at Park Library I am very concerned about the way this consultation has been conducted. there is only one document online, lots of people are coming in to look at the folder but not really understanding the maps - there is not much in it to help them make an informed decision about what is happening. It would be quite wrong for the council to claim either public support or opposition for this proposal based on this attempt at consultation. My decision to object is purely because I do not feel I have anywhere near enough information.
Duke Street	No/object	We are a business in the Duke Street area( Sheffield Trades and Labour Club). We have a private car park for our customers which is free, if the parking scheme goes drivers will start using our car park as a free for all to avoid paying the proposed on street parking charges.Our members will be unable to park in their own car park if this happens.
Glencoe Place	No/object	This is quite frankly a terrible idea for our cul-de-sac. I live on Glencoe Place, we have two cars, and never have any issues with parking. I know cars got pushed further up towards us but that is very much on you and the fact you didn't make the Urban Splash workmen park on site. It's annoying that you think we should pay for a permit, never allow family to park near us. With the cost of living going up this is another cost we could quite frankly do without.
Rubén's Row, S2 5JJ	No/object	I object because people who have cars already pay road tax and local businesses will suffer
NORFOLK PARK AVENUE, SHEFFIE	No/object	My partner and I live on Norfolk Park Avenue, so our only vehicle access is via Donnington Road. We are both in our sixties and need our cars for work, shopping and caring responsibilities. At the moment we have no problems parking on Donnington Road, despite living at the Granville Road end. We negotiate with our neighbours about who parks where in a friendly community. We have to park on the street, as although our house technically has a garage, this was built a long time ago and it is simply not possible to park a modern car in the garage, or to open the gate to the house when there's a car in front of the garage.
Norfolk Road	No/object	Although there is a problem with non resident parking, I don't think charging residents to park outside their houses is a good idea. It seems that a inconvenient parking is is being turned into a way of making money by the council. Cars parking on both sides of our road in combination with cars speeding is for me the real problem. It's possibly only a matter of time before someone gets injured. However the speeding problem is being ignored. A 20 mile an hour zone is the priority, not a parking zone.

City road	No/object	
St Aidens	No/object	I think it's a joke, the road I park on is nowhere near town not a single person parks here as a midway point every car on this street is a local resident putting permits/metres in place is not going to help anyone apart from your accounting department. One of the reasons the city centre retail industry is in tatters and Meadowhall and crystal peaks thrive is because of the stupid prices to park. If these permits were here to help residents every household should get a permit free of charge upon proof of car ownership and legitimacy i.e tax m.o.t insurance and proof that the person actually lives at that address. I personally have somewhere else to park just a few minutes away from my normal space what is off road so I won't be paying charges either way. I don't think it's fair on everyone else and the affects it will have on local businesses and residents for example having to pay for a day permit for a removal van if moving house or getting things delivered. Thanks you penny pinching wastes of oxygen
Lundwood Close	No/object	
Stafford Road	No/object	I wouldn't have an option as I don't have a drive with our terraced house so I would have to pay which is grossly unfair
Tylney Road	No/object	I think it's ridiculous that people who live in park hill have to pay to park outside their houses it's criminal and disgusting. If Manchester City council can issue free parking permits why can't sheffield. Sheffield city council are a bunch of thieves wanting to profit off of the people in park hill. It's disgusting. I object to this. I hope everyone else does as well. As it hurts the working class people like me and other people in the area who don't have driveways. It's disgusting.
Tylney Road	No/object	Re the above statement of whether you would park in the area, this is not really an option but a fleeting statements for people that have the properties in the area, we want to live and park on our street without being harassed by the council.
Castleton Hope Valley	No/object	As I said before introducing these scheme only has a negative impact. Traffic calming measures and a 20 mph limit would help improve speed.
Norfolk Park	No/object	This is going to make visiting and caring for my elderly parents increasing difficult
Fitzwalter Road	No/object	This scheme will have a negative impact. The general consensus is that there aren't parking problems in this area, yes there are commuters along norfolk and adjacent roads but this has never affected our ability to park on our road. Occasionally the area becomes busy with cars when a football match is on but this is outside of the proposed hours anyway - and when that does happen we can still park close to our home.  Many people won't be able to afford parking, it affects visitors and carers - e.g our parents who are pensioners do 2-3 days childcare a week and would add a financial weight for them, and with the designated bays there will actually be less room to park on the street, so parking may actually become a problem for us on this road.  It may also result in some people choosing to convert their front gardens into parking spaces which isn't good for wildlife / is unsightly so less green footprint.  People may move out of the area to avoid paying to park outside their own homes, it's a hassle, unaffordable for many, and isn't the aim to improve this area and make it more desirable?  The issues WE DO have however in this area are speeding and break-ins (on Norfolk Road). Traffic calming measures and a 20 mph limit would help improve speed and CCTV cameras on the quiet end of Norfolk Road.
City road	No/object	
Woodhouse	No/object	I have to pay to park to go to work, with already struggling to pay bills and petrol that have risen ridiculously.... now even more expenses to pay to actually go to work to earn money....
Sheffield	No/object	Would We continue to park if we had to pay...have we a choice or offer all our men wheelbarrows to carry their ladders around like generations before It's all about money in this non caring generation, perhaps soon we won't be able to afford the diesel anyway. The only people happy about this is those who gain the tax on everything...more goes to more springs to mind,
Shrewsbury Estate	No/object	
Fitzwalter Road	No/object	This proposal is an absolute outrage, yet another attempt for the council take money from those that actually need it.  Those that live in affluent areas, that have private drives or are further out of town are not effected, yet the those that aren't in such privileges positions/areas are scrutinised for their respective predicaments.  It's terrible!
Arbourthorne	No/object	
Mosborough	No/object	I feel that if public transport was reliable and frequent more people would use it. This is another way of taxing those people who are actually working & struggling to make ends meet as it is.
Fernbank Drive, Eckington	No/object	
Crookes	No/object	The charges appear largely unnecessary as the street is rarely full due to amount of crime in the area and damage to property. It will have a huge impact on nhs staff who cannot afford to pay these substantial charges to park each day. The streets are not safe for staff to walk along in the evenings or early mornings if they have to park elsewhere. It will put a huge demand on parking in other areas outside the zone. Also metered parking will give a clear indication to thieves how long the car will be left for making them even more of a target. I have strong objections to being made to pay substantial charges to park to go to work providing a public service.
Limb Lane, Dore,	No/object	
Holdings Road	No/object	A further comment is - What is this parking scheme? I thought it was to stop commuter and student parking in the area. On the card you've put through the doors it says it's Monday to Friday between 8.00 am and 6.30 pm, however on the plans on your website the how of the area is covered in Double Yellow Lines, so no parking anywhere ever!!! Shouldn't they be single yellow lines? Don't you know what you're doing? Obviously not? It's just a con to get money out of people who own their own homes in the area.  So why the Double Yellow Lines everywhere. It'll end up a ghost district where people drive through, never stop and nobody visits it's residents.

		As an older single woman living on my own, I object to the introduction of permit holder/meter parking for the following reasons.  I have friends living in areas where a similar scheme has been introduced and they report that it has made parking harder for both residents and visitors. Yellow lines reduce parking spots for everybody not just commuters. I rely on my car for work and socialising. I do not relish the thought of having to walk further on my own at night and would feel unsafe in the dark. My friends will have to pay to park outside my home when visiting me. Some of my neighbours are vulnerable and isolated and risk this isolation increasing due to parking charges. I rely on workmen for essential maintenance. They tell me they often decline jobs in areas with parking restrictions. Too much expense and hassle.  I have never had a problem parking. I worked from home during the pandemic and still do this part of the time so tend to come and go during the day. What I do have a problem with I are motorists using Stafford Road as a shortcut which inevitably causes problems with the amount of traffic. One obvious solution to this would be to make the road a cul de sac which would have the added benefit of reducing commuter parking due to access and exit being less easy. The junction with Fitzwalter Road has long been a dangerous one as motorists tend to treat it as a continuation rather than a junction requiring the usual caution and observations. I believe the residents have campaigned long and hard for something to be done about this. I myself moved from Fitzwalter Road last year where my flat had a parking space. Please reconsider the proposal as I don't want to regret my decision.
Stafford Road	No/object	
blackwell close	No/object	I really think it is a bad time to be charging residents that live here for parking permits with energy prices on a rise, along with fuel and household costs and now we have to pay parking for where we live?? Why can you not just charge the people that come to visit or use spaces to get to work? I really think this stinks this idea and its only sucking out more money from residents pockets. Can't believe your going to charge residents to park where they live.
Ingram Road	No/object	I intend to join, create or participate in any action group who are opposed to the proposed scheme. I have already registered to attend the Sheffield East Local Area Committee public meeting 23/3/2022
Meadow Bank Ave	No/object	We are working for NHS and given the crime rate and attacks in the area fell strongly that parking should be provided close to where we work. It would hugely impact on staff if they needed to pay for parking and potentially put hard working NHS staff in danger. Please consider giving either parking permits to NHS or not charging the staff.
Skye Edge Road	No/object	This scheme is misleading saying it is for Park Hill, the scheme covers most of Norfolk Park and areas where people don't park to commute into the city centre. There is no guarantee by implementing this scheme that residents will be able to park, if anything it will make the situation worse as there will be less spaces overall. Targeting the wider Norfolk Park area is a clear money making scheme and will do very little to ease parking or congestion. Ludicrous!
Ingram Road	No/object	STOP CALLING ALL THE AREA PARKHILL WHEN YOURE ACTUALLY EXPECTING TO ISSUE PERMITS BEYOND PARK HILL
Hyde Park Walk, S25LX	No/object	
Holdings roads	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	I would have to continue to park in this area if I was unable to park on my drive as I have no alternative. I object to these changes because I do not feel they are necessary in this area and it feels like they would only penalise residents who live here; the only road I have observed having lots of cars parked on it is the bottom of Norfolk Road and the majority of these houses have drives on which residents can park their cars. Even on match days I do not notice that many cars are parked on the streets. It is difficult not to think that these proposals are solely a money-making scheme by the council as I am unable to see the benefit for the majority of residents.
Granville Road	No/object	Have to park outside my house where else can I go. To pay to park outside my own home is not fair. Paid for my house now pay to park outside. We have no problem with parking on our road. I park on holdings road as my house is corner house
Rotherham	No/object	
Bard Street	No/object	I live on Bard Street, and I understand that people do park in the car park to commute to the centre and this sometimes causes issues for residents to park. However, there are always spaces and I do not see why residents are now going to have to pay to park where they live. Permits should be issued to residents for free, we pay enough council tax (which is already increased yearly with many people not receiving pay rises to cover the difference) already and with the price of bills and fuel increasing immensely why are you proposing another financial outgoing for residents? Additionally, why is the price for a second vehicle double that of for the first vehicle? It is not unusual for a couple to have a car each. I'm sure the council will earn enough money from issuing fines and from people paying for parking to cover the costs of enforcement officers etc. this cost should not be put on residents of Park Hill.
Holdings Road	No/object	
Park hill holdings road	No/object	I see the issue with commuters as they tend to clog up streets with no concern but to get in to work and out without paying. This is a issue for some residents on some roads. It seems unfair though that us residents have to pay for their bad habits. Why not give residents one street permit FOC and then charge others. This seems to be a fairer option.
Ingram Road	No/object	As for question 26, I do in part support some control but not at the cost of residents as they are not causing the issue! I don't have a car myself, but visitors to my house (my brother and my friends) do. I do not want them to have to pay to visit me.
Donnington Road	No/object	We all believe it is essential that appropriate provision be made for the following to park conveniently: all medical & social services, e.g. paramedics, district nurses, social workers, etc.
City Road	No/object	
City Road	No/object	
Stafford Road	No/object	I strongly object to this proposed scheme. I am a full time carer and this scheme will be very negative for my family and the surrounding area.
Holdings road	No/object	
Fitzwalter Road	No/object	I feel that appropriate parking should be provided for the community resources like the Sheffield College, the Railway station, Town Centre as well as smaller projects like the community centres, library and post office so that people accessing these do not need to park on the residential roadside. Local greener alternatives to commuting by car need to really be encouraged to make park and ride, public transport, electric car charging parks, electric taxis all really efficient and affordable so as to decrease car usage rather than encourage it. I understand that where people are elderly, immobile or have young children etc they do need thier individual transport and need to be able to park near where they live. I do not want a street with extra street furniture of ticket machines and prohibitive notices. Currently my family do not generally have a problem parking nearby when they visit; having less bays and having to pay to visit parents and grandparents seems very unfair and currently unnecessary.
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	question 27 gives no option for residents on the streets affected who have no choice on where to park.
Park Grange Croft	No/object	I strongly appose the new parking scheme . if all the derelict garages were removed there would be ample parking for everyone
Holdings road	No/object	
Holdings road	No/object	

		I wouldn't be able to afford to pay for parking but I need to be able to drive to get back to macclesfield to look after my parents at a moments notice, so i cant afford to sell my car.
City Road	No/object	Incredibly disappointed by this proposed scheme.
Woodseats	No/object	I would get a permit if needed and I am not totally against it but thinking of a lot of residents, this is an additional expense when costs are rising. There are a mix of young professionals but also some lower earner residents for whom this could be too costly. The Town Edge Garage would struggle. Although they use up parking spaces, they do feel part of the community and it could have a big impact on them. We have been lucky however, and quite unique in the courtyard where we have controlled parking ourselves but introducing these measures elsewhere could force the problem onto us. It might also be safer for residents, preventing unknown visitors/vehicles (although I doubt the drug dealers care about double yellow lines and permit parking! I wondered if the increase in home working has eased the initial problems that some streets flagged up to trigger this consultation?
holdings road	No/object	I don't know why Holdings Road has been included in this parking scheme. It is not necessary to extend it this far. I object to having to pay to park outside my own house when there is not a problem. My elderly disabled mother lives with me now (she is 99)- we park outside the house and never have problems. I object to the scheme.
Shrewsbury Hospital (Almshouses)	No/object	If the scheme was introduced, we would have no choice but to pay. My wife is a blue badge holder, and we are concerned about accessibility of spaces for her. Shrewsbury Hospital only has access from one side, so a parking scheme might cause longer walks, reducing accessibility for us. Shrewsbury Hospital is home to many vulnerable adults with varied access needs, and we are concerned that the parking scheme will provide additional barriers to them for participating in life in the community. Furthermore, accessing permits online is a barrier to us - we have had assistance at Park Library to use this online feedback form, as we could not access online services ourselves.
Manor Oaks Gardens	No/object	
City Rd	No/object	I object to the extension of the proposed restriction times, not needed. I observe City Rd traffic and there is no obvious increase in volume of traffic from what it is now. So why change the times?  It is proposed to have double yellows on both sides of Stafford Rd which is where I have to park my car because of the restrictions on City Rd so as an older resident I am not sure whether I will be able to park close to my home. I would like to see some spaces on one side which currently works perfectly well. I also object to paying for a permit when I wont be able to park near my home.
City Rd	No/object	
woodseats	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	It's fine to charge non-residents but residents of these streets should NOT be forced to pay for a permit to park on their own street. I would suggest that each house in the zone gets no more than 2 parking permits free (one for each adult spouse/partner) and anyone else has to pay for a permit or metered parking. Absolutely shocking to consider having to pay to park outside my own property. You could even make the permit only valid for the street you live on, but I cannot fathom having to pay to park at my own house.
Beech Hill NHS Rehabilitation Cent	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	Scrap this scheme please.
Norfolk Road,, Norfolk Road	No/object	I would have to park in Park Hill as I live there I object to having to pay to park in front of my own house. The new scheme restricts the number of parking spaces available as there would be double yellow lines preventing us from parking in front of our own house.
Norfolk Road, Norfolk Road	No/object	We have complained before about the number of cars parking on Norfolk Road and the difficulties of driving down the road during the working day, when there is only one car width - so some solution would be very welcome. However, allowing non-residents to pay for all-day parking would probably not deter anyone and therefore not change the situation. It would be better to have maybe a 3-hour limit or much better as in other parts of the city some parking areas designated for permit holders only. It seems contradictory to get residents (if this is meant to be helpful to us) to pay for a permit and not guarantee a spot. I would be happy to pay for a permit if this were the case. We have a pull-in in front of our house, which people do not usually block so we can use the pull-in and allow a visitor to park on the road in front of that. Were there to be yellow lines across our pull-in, this would prevent us parking there or allowing visitors to do so - therefore counter-productive - making the situation even worse. In addition, the installation of pay and display machines, double yellow lines and (to some extent) parking signs would visually pollute our conservation area,
seabrook Road, seabrook Road, se	No/object	Included in the area Manor Lane outside Manor Lodge school should be included. There needs to be double yellow outside the school to prevent parking.  People park on the path , reducing the amount of space people have to walk up and down. Manor Lane has turned into a 1 lane road. The road is becoming very congested and dangerous
Norfolk Park Road	No/object	Staff have raised serious concerns about not being able to afford to pay for parking and that this will strongly influence their choice to work at SPARC. We already have challenges with staff recruitment and retention here and ability to park close to the unit is a major factor for staff working here. Some of our staff are on low income and the cost of parking would reduce their daily pay The NHS is facing unprecedented challenges with staff leaving the profession so inability to park, feeling unsafe commuting further or extra costs is just another blow to staff morale and feeling valued and will create a risk to our service of not being able to staff it adequately
Norfolk Park	No/object	I would have to keep parking and end up paying because I live there!!! I work from home most days so my car is outside my house. There is zero problem with people parking here and walking into town - this is just a money making exercise from the council

		resources on what would be a catastrophe for the area. Reasons as follows...
		<p>1. Whilst I understand a few roads in the area do have a parking issue (Norfolk Rd being one), looking at the area suggested for this scheme, the majority of the roads in the Norfolk Park area do not have parking issues. I hope the level of objection to these plans from other residents will demonstrate this. I would question what reasons the proposed parking zone includes roads past Glencoe Rd, let alone up to St Aidan's Rd? I worry it is partly due to what minimum coverage would be needed to make this scheme financially viable for the council? This scheme should not be implemented at the expense of the majority of residents to satisfy the needs of a few residents nor for the purpose of adding an additional income stream for the council.</p> <p>2. It would unfairly tax residents for parking on their own street, targeting one of Sheffield's less affluent areas. If we were to demographically compare the S2 area with for example S10 which has several parking permit zones in place, the average household in S2 earns around half of those in S10 (£27,560 vs £52,520) and unemployment rates are more than x3 higher (10.5% vs 3.3%). The S2 area also performs significantly worse in these figures compared to S7 and S11 where parking permit zones have also been implemented. Quite simply the average household in this area does not have the disposable income that these other areas do and would be hit much harder were this proposal to go ahead. And this would be on top of the cost of living crisis we're all struggling with and will likely continue to under this Conservative government. (demographic data source - <a href="https://www.postcodearea.co.uk/postaltowns/sheffield/s2/">https://www.postcodearea.co.uk/postaltowns/sheffield/s2/</a>)</p> <p>3. It will damage the existing local businesses, discouraging customers from visiting the area and adding further costs to the business with the need for permits, and this being after the awful impact that Covid has had. It will also discourage further businesses from wanting to invest in the area, something that is very much needed.</p> <p>4. It will reduce the total parking spaces available causing further issues. This is not a simple case of permits means residents are guaranteed a parking space outside their own home, the restrictions suggested in this proposal will have knock on effects which I believe will worsen the parking situation. Having lived on City Road in the past, most of the residents with cars have to park on side roads (e.g. Fitzwalter Rd, Essex Rd) to avoid the restricted parking times as it's an urban clearway. There will simply be no space for everyone if bays are added. Having more recently moved to Ingram Road I can tell you there is no problem with parking here, even on football match days. Unfortunately, the worry of this proposal has already led to my next door neighbours moving to another neighbourhood. Residents with driveways are currently able to park in front of their drive if they have more than one car, if this parking scheme were to go ahead that would no longer be an option for them due to the addition of yellow lines in front of their driveway.</p>
Ingram Road	No/object	
glencoe road	No/object	I don't think it is fair as there are no shops or local needs that require this service- it's seems to be cashing in on the fact that the builders parked nearby when doing up park hill flats - this was a temporary problem and the problem does not exist now. I have never had problems parking my 2 cars on the road.
Tylney road	No/object	
Holdings Rd	No/object	
Fitzwalter road	No/object	
Manor oaks gardens	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	27 is a leading question. I live here so of course I would be forced to pay against my will.
Park Hill	No/object	
Nether edge	No/object	
St. Aidan's Road	No/object	For a start I don't live on Parkhill. I live in Norfolk Park. Don't want to have pay for people visiting my home. Speeding motorists are a problem. I have never had any problems parking outside my home.
Park Grange Croft	No/object	I understand the need for a parking scheme but worry about what it will mean for residents. We already have permit based parking and there is currently no information provided as to whether we would have to pay for new permits under this scheme. If we did I would object strongly to the scheme.
Donnington Road S2	No/object	Thanks this is madness and something we strongly object to as residential residents where there are no issues The issues will become apparent if you go ahead with the calming proposal on Donnington Road Holdings Road
Ingram Road	No/object	
Donnington Road	No/object	The idea of traffic calming in a residential area where there is no traffic issues is ridiculous To suggest spreading the measures all the way across Granville Road will stop people parking further up the area has no logic. If this is the mindset then where will you stop ?? Manor Top and beyond??
Glencoe road	No/object	I have friends and family that come in. Visit that they will no longer be able to come to my house because they will be afraid they will get a fine .The parking it used to be free and it was good ! now there is just another thing to pay for
Holdings Road	No/object	
Castle Croft Drive	No/object	The scheme doesn't benefit me because the restrictions are only at certain times of the day when I am at work.
Granville Road	No/object	This scheme will only be worth implementing if it applies to match days too. This really disrupts the road we live on.
Park Hill flats	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
S2 2UD	No/object	
Ingram Road	No/object	I would have to continue to park in Park Hill, however due to our house not having a drive, we would have to compete with other residents/visitors/commuters/carers etc for on street parking spaces. At the moment, while occasionally spaces are rare, people are friendly about it and you rarely have to walk more than a couple of minutes to/from your car. With fewer spaces available in the general area, this could change. Rising rent and energy prices don't make it particularly easy at the moment, and having to pay for parking without a guaranteed space makes it even worse.
talbot Place,	No/object	
Blackwell court	No/object	I should not have to pay to park outside my own house when I live there and pay my rent.
Tylney Road	No/object	we don't want this scheme, you are taking away the only spaces available to us, we don't have a drive and cannot afford this extra cost. I know what you are saying about displacement of parking but you haven't even tried. There are some areas closer to town that do suffer with commuters but I don't see them travelling this far up. You have to try first and see, not just presume. We are a sizeable walk to town and I do not see people parking this far.  I feel like you just want to make money off us which at this time is irresponsible.

Seabrook Road	No/object	
City Road	No/object	I don't think residents should have to pay only commuters.
MANOR OAKS CLOSE	No/object	
MANOR OAKS CLOSE	No/object	
Cecil Road	No/object	Not able to afford paying for 13 hours over 3 or 4 days a week... might as well not work...especially when cars are vandalised on road aswell
Donnington Road	No/object	My husband & I are both disabled, and need parking space outside our house.
Granville road	No/object	
Hyde Park Walk	No/object	
Holdings Road	No/object	
Holdings Road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	Weekday parking means i am unable to use my car during periods of peak rail station/town centre uses for free parking due to its proximity to both uses.Other residents without off street spaces..to find on street parking (my property has retained its front garden and is one of only a couple without off street car parking).the proposal across the front ofxx Norfolk Road is far reduced on its current length between the existing disabled on-street parking bay for property no xx and the H-bar driveway marking at property number xx which has adequately protected the associated turning vehicle movements for as long as it has been installed.there is no purpose with the current proposal and an objection is raised unless satisfactory revised nil-detriment on-street arrangements with the double yellow line restriction to commence at a distance consistent with the extent of existing white H bar road markings across thexx frontage.thanks..
Silverdale rd	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	The proposed parking scheme does nothing to alleviate the problem of parking on both sides of Norfolk Road. Therefore, the scheme fails to address the safe access of vehicles onto Norfolk Road from private driveways, or the speed of vehicles along Norfolk Road.  The parking bay outside combined with the parking bay on the other side of the road will continue to prevent vehicles safely turning right out of our shared driveway onto Norfolk Road.  Norfolk Road is a historic conservation area that will be spoilt by parking meters and associated signage.  Some parking restrictions are necessary to improve safety on Norfolk Road. However, I am opposed to a paid for parking scheme that further prevents access to the City centre, the local parks and amphitheater. I believe this parking scheme will add to the damage done to the economic prosperity of the City centre and particularly the retail sector by the Council's excessive parking charges. These type of parking charges only push people to shop at Meadowhall rather than the City centre. (I write as someone who is privileged to live close to the City Centre, has little need of street parking, and is not involved in retail.)
Manor Lane	No/object	It is a really poor idea. The council should be finding ways to encourage public transport or active travel, not penalising people to pay to park at their own homes.  I'm also concerned people may park on Manor Lane which is just outside the boundary. There is already congestion due to the school, the extra cars would make it more dangerous.
Tylney Road Sheffield S2 2RX	No/object	
Manor Oaks Drive	No/object	It is not clear whether this will include private spaces? If it does then I would completely disagree with the proposals. It really doesn't seem to me like there is an issue with parking here that has ever caused me any problems.
Ingram Road	No/object	
Alney Place	No/object	
Upper Wortley Road	No/object	
Bishops Walk, Kiveton Park, Kiveton Park	No/object	If you pay for parking permit you expect to be guaranteed a parking space. Who in their right mind would pay to park if there were no spaces ?
Skye Edge Road	No/object	Would have been nice if we had more information about this posted through our door to inform us of this. The little a4 notices tied to lamposts are very difficult to read and when i have spoke to m neighbours. No one knew this was happening.
City Road	No/object	Please do not apply the scheme on the street at the back of my house (Stafford road). We have been using the on street parking there without any problem so far. If things are good and no problem at all, please do not try to fix it at additional costs. I think the problems are only with the streets near the train station (i.e. Norfolk park road), you should only apply the scheme there if the residents there support it. I don't think you should apply a blanket scheme like the current one. Thus I oppose the scheme. Thank you for listening.
Park Hill Gardens, Swallownest	No/object	The cost of living is rocketing, fuel costs are extortionate and the added costs of parking fees would seriously raise the question of whether it is feasible to continue in my current role at that place of work.
Barnsley	No/object	Your FAQ document says that we have to pay for permits because we are benefitting from the proposed parking scheme.....that nobody has asked for.  The revenue from the scheme is to fund the running of the scheme that nobody wants.  Is it the council's policy to now charge its residents for absolutely everything?  What's next, oxygen tax?  Any chance this can be ditched, along with the chief executive who as you know is on leave on full pay?
Stafford Road	No/object	I strongly object to this scheme. Can we please explore ways of creating off road parking for residents who don't have any before implementing this heavy handed approach? For properties within the proposed boundary that have no driveway, parking permits would have a negative effect on their value. How will this be addressed? There is no mention of cost. This comes at an incredibly bad time considering the cost of living crisis we are all going through. I also think this is a scenario that offers no way back once implemented. How are we to safeguard permit prices or how they are distributed once we take this route?
Holdings Road	No/object	I would have to pay as I am a resident.
Convamore Rd, Grimsby	No/object	
St Aidans Road	No/object	I am 85 years old and rely on family and friends to visit me and have regular visitors on weekdays and weekends and would strongly object to them having to pay to park in order to visit me. I would also be interested to find out which roads in particular you consider are currently affected by commuters and whether you would be banning parking on them or just charging them to park there. They have to park somewhere and if it is just a charge you are making them pay then they may still park there and cause the same problem, but the residents will also have to pay and still not be able to park outside their property! Also, other residents in other areas not affected like me will also then have to pay for a permit when there is no issue regarding parking!

Holdings Road	No/object	Do no introduce this scheme. Parking in this area is an absolute non-issue. Find another way to raise your funds.
S2	No/object	
Manor	No/object	
Ingram Road	No/object	
Stepney Street	No/object	
fitzwalter road	No/object	
Hyde Tameside	No/object	I think it is wrong to charge local residents and there visitors to pay to park on their road where they live, this is just another tax when the cost of living is already high. By making this a permit parking area we may not be able to visitor our relative as much and my not be able to pop in and see her. If you need to make the area permit parking so commutes don't park around there, then issue free parking permits for residents and there visitors. Anybody else whom parks in the area make them pay per hour.
City Road	No/object	If the charges are bought into place, people that cannot park further own city road are likely to park further up by my home residence (564) that is just outside of the new permit scheme area, making parking even worse than it currently is
Sussex Road	No/object	
Richmond	No/object	
City Road	No/object	
Stephen race Hyde Park walk	No/object	
skye edge avenue, Skye edge	No/object	
skye edge	No/object	i think this is just a money making con by the local council. and its a total disgrace.
Bard Street	No/object	Absolutely ridiculous notion. All that will happen is that you will drive further economy out of the city centre when it is already on its knees due to absurdly high rents and pressures due to covid. You are simply trying to make more money. If this was truly due to resident parking, you would issue residents with permits
Holdings Road,	No/object	This is unnecessary, the cost of living is going up. And all the council does is find new ways to get money out of alot of struggling people, this is disgusting. If its not broken don't fix it! We don't have parking issues on holdings road, Essex or Donnington Road.
Pearson Place	No/object	The provision for parking in the centre of Sheffield is inadequate and what is available is privately run and expensive, and such I park further away form the centre of town and walk into the centre. I would prefer to use public transport however the timetable for busses is prohibitive and the traffic is such that my supposed 45 minuet travel time is often 1hour 30mins with a young family my ability to return home promptly is required therefore I am forced to use a car against my preference. Combined with the need to return people to the city centre for the local economy adding cost and time to the commuter especially at a time with increased cost everywhere else this proposed permitting is uncalled-for and not needed.
Hyde park walk	No/object	I don't agree with the parking scheme as I don't see why I should have to pay for parking outside my own home when we have no problem with parking anyway ?
Skye edge avenue	No/object	
City Road	No/object	I live on City Road, we have just spent £4,000 renovating the front of our property to allow a car to park on the drive. However, under the plans, our friends and family would have to pay to park outside our house to visit. This is outrageous. Furthermore, under the current plan, the road outside 33 City Road would have a parking place subject to a parking charge except for permit holders, Monday - Friday, 8am - 6:30pm. So someone could legally park outside my house, blocking my driveway!
Bard Street	No/object	This scheme is a poor attempt at fixing an invented problem in order to increase revenue and we see through it.
Stannington	No/object	Make more spaces - don't monetise the few we have left
Norfolk Park Road	No/object	
S2 2sj	No/object	
City Road	No/object	
skye edge avenue	No/object	
Gleadless Valley	No/object	The cost mentioned is very high per hour and will stop our daytime Community Centre users from using the centre in the future therefore unable to access community facilities/activities/groups. Perhaps you could have a reduced 1 to 2hour cost but keep the full day time cost high to prevent commuters into the city centre using the parking spaces.
Crown Place	No/object	I absolutely and most strongly reject any form off restricted parking in my cul-de sac I live at 15 crow place, Sheffield S25QE I and my wife and family are quiet happy to leave parking as it stands today. before you make any decision I would like a vote on what happens in my name.
Skye Edge Avenue	No/object	
Donnington Road	No/object	I do not understand why we need to have a controlled parking scheme, we are not classed as Park Hill do not know why we are part of this. What I find hard to accept is that we already pay road tax which allows us to park on the road so why would it be considered to be fair and right to have to pay once again to park on the road we live on. The issues on this road are around it being used as a cut through to Granville road and we are subjected to cars racing up and down this road having no consideration for the safety of residents living on here, this is more of a problem.
Belmonte Gardens	No/object	Q27 is invidious. Residents would have no choice, but a Yes answer could be taken as approval for the scheme. I am therefore reluctant to answer it. Making it impossible to move on without an answer is unhelpful.
Rotherham	No/object	
Elm Avenue, Poulton-le-Fylde, Bla	No/object	family live at Duke Street, Sheffield, S25QL who also object to the introduction of new parking restrictions. I'm more than happy to be kept in touch regarding this issue. Thank you for your attention.
Tylney Road	No/object	



		This is the same response on question 9  Would like to say, that we disagree with this scheme has my mum has Dementia and there are frequent visits by family and carers to my mums address for her well being etc.  We feel this scheme is untenable and would impact on my mums health. also think this is just a money making scheme on your part. Mum has lived here for over 30 years and this just asking my mum to pay for someone to park on her road this absolutely unforgivable.
Holdings Road	No/object	
Farm Bank Road	No/object	
Stafford Rd	No/object	I do not support the parking scheme. It is completely unnecessary & unfair to residents & visitors. There is no issue parking at present!  Do not introduce this. It is wrong.
Blackwell Close	No/object	
Farm Bank Road	No/object	
Shrewsbury Hospital	No/object	Does your proposed scheme have a financial motive?  The soon to be implemented CAZ for the centre of Sheffield will I imagine reduce the demand for and therefore revenue from parking in the centre. By extending the charging area under your Parkhill and other schemes do you hope to recoup that lost revenue?  Is this why your proposed parking scheme, has not considered a solely residents only parking scheme? A residents parking only scheme (with permission badges for visitors), a low cost and simple solution adopted by other authorities to combat city centre users clogging up neighbouring residential areas.  The CAZ scheme will undoubtedly exacerbate the parking situation in the area immediately above the railway station and extend non-residential parkers into other areas further up City Road and Granville Road. Does this explain why the Parkhill scheme includes areas which at present don't have a particular parking problem?
Leadmill Point	No/object	
samson street	No/object	samson works samson house samson street s2 5qs
Samson Street ( work base)	No/object	
Park Hill Flats	No/object	
Holdings Road	No/object	
blagden street	No/object	
Sheffield	No/object	
blagden street	No/object	
Dalmore Road, Carter Knowle	No/object	I can't see anyone on Holdings Rd agreeing to this...My mum is 86 and she is very upset about these proposals. I do my bit to be 'green' I recycle and have a 100% electric vehicle. My mum doesn't have a car but has four children who visit her regularly. She doesn't want them being inconvenienced! She also doesn't mind people parking outside her house.
Tylney Road	No/object	I think this proposal is disgusting, why should residents like myself who have lived here for over 20 years have to pay to park in front of their own houses. It's criminal. I OBJECT. The people who propose this wouldn't like having a dirty parking meter in front of their house. Most people have more than 2 cars in their household, what do we do with that??? £90 for a second permit that will probably go up is criminal and I hope sheffield city council crumbled if this happens. First energy bills council tax it's embarrassing. You bunch of money grabbers.
City Road	No/object	
Manor Oaks Drive	No/object	The area I live in has never had any issues with parking as everyone has a two car drive. The only money that would be made from the meters would be family and friends of residents. That would not be a significant amount of money and likely would take multiple years to recoup the costs of inputting the infrastructure necessary to set up the scheme. This is without taking into account the resources necessary to police the area. As for the surrounding areas such as City Road and Norfolk Park Road ect, this does nothing to solve the issue of residents being able to park. To present an example, if person A parks on City Road and pays for parking. When Person B, a resident who has paid for their permit comes home from work later that day the parking space is still being used. As for the clean air zone increasing the amount of cars being parked in these areas due to people not wanting to drive into the city centre. Private vehicles are exempt from the clean air charge so this is a moot point. Research into the demographic of the residents and people who work in the local businesses. You will find that this is a historically deprived area with a lack of opportunity. People who are already going to be massively impacted by the imminent rise in fuel prices. So introducing paid parking and parking permits would only contribute to the current cost of living crisis. To present alternative solutions. You could subsidise the cost of the private parking already available in Sheffield City Centre as its knowingly under utilised. You could look into the areas where people drive into the City Centre and introduce park and ride in these areas. Alongside this you could improve the current public transport such as extending the tram and increasing bus services.
Holdings Road	No/object	The real reasons behind this guise of limited parking is to extort money from residents and our visitors to line SCCs pockets, the cost of living is going through the roof and charging people to park outside their own homes is an absolute joke. I don't know of anyone, residents or visitors, that can actually see the benefit of this proposal?! Shame on you SCC if this goes ahead.
holdings road	No/object	
Park Hill	No/object	Please stop saying that this is wanted by the residents, there is nothing to be gained by us, this is obviously pushed by certain interests and not by those living and/or working here. You are trying to frame this as a solution to an imaginary "issue", no change is needed, leave everything as it is - free for everyone to use.  Also the questions jumped from 9. to 26. I felt like you don't want me to answer the questions, since I am against the "scheme".
DUKE STREET	No/object	We live in a house share where 3 out of 4 of us commute to work by car. There is no alternative to travel via public transport to our work places so we require room to park. Age 21-30 year olds are already alienated due to high property prices, meaning, we cannot afford to live in our own houses and have to share a property through renting because of the current economical climate. I feel the parking scheme is another way of extraditing young professionals and forcing us further and further away from cities. The current scheme only allows for 2 car park spaces due to the 'lack' of spaces available. However without per determined spaces, you can allow many more cars to park in the area. I know there are many shared houses with commuting young professionals in this area. In already financially stressful times are you really going to force us to choose who gets to commute to work and who has to move out?
blagden street	No/object	WE HAVE 2 GARGES ON OUR ROAD AN EVEN WITH THE CARS THEY HAVE WE DONT HAVE A PROBLEM WITH PARKING AND THIS HAS BEEN THE CASE FOR MANY MANY YEARS I THINK THIS IS A VERY BAD IDEA AN WILL ADD TO ANY PROBLEMS AND NOT SOLVE THEM.

City Road	No/object	it would put family and friends off visiting us if they had to pay to park. council need to make parking in the city centre cheaper as many other cities do. then that would get rid of the street parking issue that council are creating just another way of council making money unfortunately.
South Street, Park Hill	No/object	<p>Our parking problems around Park Hill are in relation to free on-street availability during working hours (9am - 5pm). Our staff cannot afford to pay for private parking due to the unaffordable tariffs in place, nor can the small business we run afford the very limited on-site parking for staff who commute.</p> <p>Our business is based at Park Hill and as this becomes more populated, we believe residents and business employees around the site and connected roads should be prioritised and not penalised with further costs. Attention also needs to be paid towards future of Park Hill flats. The proposed zoning plans will negatively impact the area - making it harder to live, work and visit the flats that will hopefully become a destination for the people of Sheffield. Urban Splash + Sheffield Council have a vested interest in this area and shouldn't be adding further charges to residents who cannot afford permits via zoning. Two further sections of the Park Hill flats are still pre-development and accounting for future people and vehicles needs careful consideration, nearer the time. These zoning plans are in our opinion two or three years too early.</p> <p>I would also like to add that many workers, residents and visitors rely on their cars as a means of supporting their careers and their families, and adding further costs and stresses at such a difficult time for many people already battling rising council tax, interest rates, fuel costs, and general living costs would be unreasonable.</p> <p>I would support a scheme that allows for residents and businesses to park in close proximity to Park Hill for free. Heavily restricting on-street parking during day hours would be short-sighted and damaging for local businesses, local residents, community feeling and city centre footfall. Charges for access and visitors in the future needs careful consideration, but only once Park Hill is fully occupied.</p>
Crookes	No/object	<p>I can currently park on Duke street for free between 9:30am and 4:30pm.</p> <p>I cannot afford private parking due to the high tariffs and availability at Park Hill, and the even higher tariffs in the City Centre.</p> <p>Local bus services are unreliable and unaffordable.</p> <p>In my opinion, adding further parking costs at such a difficult time (rising council tax, fuel and energy costs etc) would be unreasonable.</p> <p>If further costs are introduced, I like many others, will need to return to working from home. Or have to find work outside the City. This is damaging to businesses in the City Centre, lowering an already low footfall. I try to spend my lunch in local cafe's and businesses in the city, and support like this would end.</p>
Cloonmoore Drive	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	<p>There is no daytime parking issue in this area. There is always available parking in the daytime and has been the case for the 5 years I have lived here. There is an issue with parking in the evening after 7.30pm when residents return home from work but this proposal will not address this and I would not describe this as a serious issue. This is because several residents have more than 1 car.</p> <p>The proposal is disproportionate to the problem and risks creating issues and tensions between residents which do not now exist. It's a completely misguided proposal. It's also another added cost in times of economic hardship.</p>
glencoe road	No/object	
Hillsbrough	No/object	
Howard Street	No/object	
Colwick Way	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
The Pavement, Duke Street	No/object	
Chesterfield	No/object	
Walkley	No/object	
robinson road	No/object	
Park Grange Drive	No/object	
Hunters Bar	No/object	
Duke Street	No/object	I live at Crown Place, I pay my council tax, I pay my road tax, I pay car insurance why do I have to pay fir my car outside my house? Plus I am disabled with a blue badge I live at Park Hill if I left my badge in my car overnight my car would have its windows smashed. I strongly object to the scheme I know it's a money making effort for the Council but I cannot afford this surely we cannot afford this especially with Gas, Electricity, Council Tax and water bills.
Eyre Crescent	No/object	There are not enough spaces as it is, this scheme will not deter commuters from parking as it is still a convenient location and the alternative city centre car parks are absolutely extortionate! This scheme will massively reduce the amount of spaces and make it a nightmare for residents and employees of local businesses to be able to park near their home/workplace.
Aldam Croft	No/object	
Leadbeater Road, Gleadless	No/object	
Totley	No/object	
NG11 8NY	No/object	
Derbyshire Dale's	No/object	It's not fair on residents or visitors
Heeley	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	
Farnborough, Hampshire	No/object	This is unfair revenue raising. Objectionable

Wilmslow	No/object	
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	This scheme covers 65 roads and is not needed in the size
duke street	No/object	I will sell the properties that I own and leave Sheffield as did two of my friends when you (dispite objections) put a similar scheme in the Lancing Road area. There is NO NEED for parking restrictions in this area. It is just another MONEY MAKING SCAM from the s****y Council.
Glencoe Road	No/object	I have to park in park hill. If this became a paid situation it is essentially akin to the council just specifically upping my council tax again. This is incredibly hard to hear in this time of rising cost of living and lower financial power. Please do not do this. There are no parking problems. My address is 29 Glencoe Road, and I am telling you this plan creates more problems than it solves. And that I do not believe it has the interests of this local community at its heart.
Langdon street	No/object	
Norton Lees	No/object	As stated previously. This will simply move any potential parking problem elsewhere - the council should look at alternatives to provide more access to parking for residents, the nearby student community, & for commuters, there is plenty of unused space in and around town that could be repurposed for this use.
Abbeydale Road	No/object	I have friends and family that I visit in the area and I've rarely had any issues parking. The public transport links from where I live to the area are very poor and expensive, so driving is the only real option. I'm obviously frustrated that as a result of these proposed changes I'll incur additional costs as a visitor, however far worse than that, the cost of a residence permit seems massively disproportionate per individual compared to potential administrative costs and it appears to me to be based on nothing more than profiteering on your part, which really is disgusting given the current cost of living crisis. This is an additional financial burden you're placing on these residents, who may already be struggling, for something that isn't that much of an issue.
Duke Street	No/object	As a resident of Duke Street, Park Hill, I would like to formally objectify to the new parking scheme that will come into effect soon. I have friends and family who visit regularly and as a single resident on a relatively low income, with the rising costs of living, I can't envisage another cost on top, just so that people can visit, or when I eventually can afford to buy my own car - another initial cost.
Hartland Avenue, Sothall	No/object	
Bard Street	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	I do support the scheme, but not in this form. I don't see why there need be double yellows over drives? there doesn't appear to be enough spaces? There's only one in front of our house and we have one car and my partners Amey works van.
Park Hill	No/object	
St Aidans rd	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	Residents who have lived in the area for many many years should not have to pay at meters or for parking permits to park outside their own homes, it is another money making scheme from the council many areas are controlled zones now in sheffield and its making it very difficult for people to park making it very frustrating
robinson road	No/object	
Skye edge	No/object	
Duke Street	No/object	
Dovercourt Road	No/object	
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	The above is a required response but it doesn't make sense. I do not park in Park Hill. I park on my drive - which has not been an option. I would continue to park on my drive.
City rd trading estate	No/object	Concerned will have to pay to visit local post office and library and convenience store and this is a poor area with with an elderly population and low income jobs . Will local shops lose passing trade and close ? What safeguards are they that permits and prices won't increase each year as have in other areas. Will carers on duty have to pay and workmen ?
City Road	No/object	
City Road	No/object	
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	By introducing double yellow lines on our local roads you are making it more difficult for residents to park. When this was first raised the idea was to stop commuters parking, not make it more difficult for residents. Generally this is a poorer area of Sheffield and a lot of residents will struggle to pay for the passes they will need to buy.
Tylney Road	No/object	As there has been no issue with parking in the past, I would suggest this is a money grab from the council...what legitimate reason would they have that would improve my experience as a resident???
Tylney Road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	Complete money grab by the council.
Tylney street	No/object	With all the other increases thus would add to the burden. Not a good time to introduce these measures.
Tylney road	No/object	
Park Grange Croft	No/object	
Holdings Road, Sheffield	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
robinson road	No/object	

Donnington Road	No/object	This should be renamed Park Hill and Norfolk Park as it is very misleading. People will think they are competing a survey about parking at the Park Hill flats and don't realise how big the area is and contains about 65 Streets.
Ingram road	No/object	I Strongly object to the parking scheme.
Walkley	No/object	Adding pay and display to the parking in this area will deter people from visiting the area. If it was permit holders only friend and family could still visit without there being a cost associated (using permits from those they are visiting)  A more targeted approach which identifies the specific issues on various roads and looks to solve these would be far better than a blanket approach of controlled parking, as this may not solve the various specific problems across this wide area. One size fits all is definitely not the right answer.
City rd	No/object	
Norfolk park road	No/object	I would have to pay if my private car park was full. I shouldn't have to pay to park my car outside my own property
St. Aidans Road	No/object	Believe this scheme has not been thought out properly and have still not received official notification of the scheme. I believe this is unacceptable as quite a few of our neighbors had no idea this scheme was being considered. It's a disgrace.
Park hill	No/object	Please don't implement the scheme. It's not fair on us residents!
Granville road	No/object	I'm totally against the scheme. I don't want my friends or family paying to come and visit me
Glencoe Road	No/object	I would struggle very much financially if the parking charges were introduced as the cost of living and fuel is already so high
Warley road	No/object	
City road	No/object	
Manor Park	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	I should not pay to park outside my own house. It's not fair for homeowners to pay outside there own home.
city road	No/object	I do NOT allow SCC to devalue my home with the new purposed permit scheme.
Granville road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
city road	No/object	
Littledale	No/object	Do not agree that people have to pay to park outside their own houses. Aswell as visitors or trades people. This is diabolical.
Granville Road	No/object	
Park hill	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Stafford Road	No/object	The scheme could result in the Trust which has run the church building for over 20 years losing tenants and users which would impact on the revenue meaning it would no longer be a going concern and would have to fold. This would significantly impact on the health and well-being of many people who make use of the building for activities and services. For some groups who pay a more commercial rental like slimming world, paid parking would reduce the numbers of people attending our site as they could have the same cost elsewhere which would make these groups unviable to run and would potentially lose further commercial revenue.  For many who attend the specialist support groups and day care services, this scheme would impact on them greatly as a number are disabled and require parking nearby. Should they be unable to park; not only from being unable to afford it, but due to the reduction in parking areas, this would have a significant impact on there health, mental health, and increase the risk of them becoming lonely and isolated.
St aidens	No/object	
Beeches Drive	No/object	
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	People cannot afford to pay to park outside their own home
Norfolk Park	No/object	
Manor Castle	No/object	unfairly taxes residents for parking in their own street - restricts residents and/or their guests from parking across their own driveways - reduces the amount of parking currently available (with fewer parking bays than houses) - damages local businesses (due to no or pricey parking for customers) - makes residents' visitors, carers & tradespeople pay for parking - makes our residential streets look like a carpark (with double yellow lines, pay-and-display meters, and street signs everywhere) - wastes taxpayers' money - is likely to lower property values
Stafford road	No/object	We do not want this! Stop this now!
Beighton	No/object	I have no choice as I have to take my son to his day centre and pick him up later
Eyre Crescent	No/object	This is a ridiculous idea, and from what I've seen there is very little support for this. Cancel it and stop wasting our time and money.
Blackwell Place	No/object	I am in favour of any measures which reduce car use and encourage public transport use, which this scheme may do, and I am conscious that it has been proposed to address the parking problems which some residents of Norfolk Park may have. My concern with the scheme relates to charging for and restricting visitors parking. There is a high percentage of elderly residents in Blackwell Place, Court and Close in purpose built or accessibly retirement flats, many of whom rely on daily visits from family and/or carers. A number of my neighbours also rely daily on family for childcare. Restricting and charging for visitors parking permits, and then requiring pay and display on subsequent visits, may prevent or impede this help, as the resident or family has to pay for the care, or carers (and family) may squeeze their visit into under 20 minutes to park for free, also restricting care. I appreciate the council may have measures in place to deal with these circumstances, such as carers permits, however this does not cover family and trying to apply for exceptions or extensions to the number of visitors parking permits is unnecessary hassle, and possibly unaffordable, for the residents and their family.

		<p>I have a number of objections to the proposal put forward in this scheme and how it has been communicated which will impact its introduction and has led to a lack of awareness and understanding of its impact upon people and the wider community. I understand why this proposal has been brought forward by the council but it is ill conceived. I have lived in two different regions outside of Sheffield which have had parking schemes and I am not against them in general but this scheme is full of contradictory and objectional proposals.</p> <p>The charging of residents for a permit they require, charging a resident for a visitor permit to a resident and charging people who visit the area to access the city is unlikely to reduce the amount of parking in the area when the price of the parking is less than facilities offered in town. All this will do is charge a resident for the pleasure of the ongoing status quo. I have lived in an area where a resident parking permit was free for one vehicle to a household and where there was an annual payment at a considerably cheaper cost than that proposed. This had impact as the area was resident parking only. The proposal will not deter many visitors who use the area for access to work and the city centre as it is cheaper than alternatives in public transport and parking. This scheme will just cost residents more money at a time when the cost of living is already having major consequences but not make any impact on their ability to park.</p> <p>It will impact residents who rely on carers who visit to support with childcare but also with elderly residents who rely upon support that is provided by family and friends. The communication of the need and cost for a visitor's permit has been poorly communicated and left many who do not have a car but rely on visitors to support them unaware of the impact of the scheme upon receiving the support they need. For this reason the communication of the proposal needs to be completed again as you have not provided people with the relevant information to make an informed decision on actions that will impact their wellbeing.</p> <p>The proposal shows little foresight to the need to move electric cars and the changes that are needed within infrastructure to support that move. There are options and changes that could be made to support this change by making certain bays electric charging points and only allow such cars to park in that area. This could be a source of income for the council.</p>
Blackwell Place	No/object	The scheme will impact local businesses and services including the GP's in the area.
farm bank road	No/object	you will be forcing the problem into further areas and adding additional pressure to people who are already struggling. find the money else where to line your pockets.
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	I believe the proposed measures for Norfolk Park we're for traffic calming or something similar not a money making scheme of pay to park which encourages further vehicle activity on the streets which is totally a polar opposite as to what the resident expectations are which is residents safety and well being.
Seabrook Road	No/object	I need the car to commute to work at times as a health care professional. We have relatives that visit and support my mother but also support my father who lives 5-10 minutes away and it is a struggle to park at times.
Park Hill Flats	No/object	My concern about the parking scheme is that those of us who live in Park Hill flats will not be eligible and that this will put even more pressure and stress on us in terms of parking as more people will want to park around the flats if they cannot park on the surrounding roads. There are more and more people moving to the area and less and less places to park. There is a wider problem with public transport becoming more expensive and less reliable meaning more and more people are wanting to drive and park near the city centre which makes it harder and harder for residents living in the Park Hill area. I would like to see a more comprehensive solution to the transport problems and the crime problems meaning vehicles are not secure. There is also insufficient secure parking for motorbikes and bicycles and so people are discouraged from having and using these and instead use cars,
Duke Street	No/object	My family also object on the changes a
Norfolk rd	No/object	The parking is fine and I don't want permits introduced.
Seabrook rd, Norfolk park	No/object	<p>My primary response to receiving notification of this proposed plan was one of disgust that yet again the council is looking to exploit the residence it is responsible for, for financial gain without providing services that we so readily require, time and time again we have seen as residence of this city how the council has, bowed to this government's cuts ensured that cost is passed onto the tax payer, along with costly and poorly considered contracts that there seems little accountability for.</p> <p>I categorically state my opposition to this proposed scheme, not seeing it as any solution to the parking issue experienced by the few streets surrounding the station and Park Hill and being able to see other solutions available that the council have not considered (not surprisingly). The proposed implementation of this scheme will, I believe, will be creating more issues that this solves, and it will be the residence that have to deal with these issues and will not be assisted or helped by you the council.</p> <p>Why have you applied the scheme to such a large area when only a few streets are really affected? How can you justify this amount? This again makes me think that it is more about revenue generation rather than any form of real parking management. And if your response is: if we do only apply it to those affected streets it will just displace it to surrounding streets, then that proves in its very logic that it is not a viable solution, and must be reconsidered, displacement is not a solution providing facility is</p> <p>It must be considered that on the inequality of this proposed scheme most of the affected streets have residence have off street parking (Drive ways) but there is a large proportion of affected addresses my self-included that do not have a property with the means to have a drive way and our only option is to be obliged to pay for parking outside our own property when we already pay both road tax on the vehicle and sizable council tax, please remember that those with off road parking are commonly on the lower income brackets and can ill afford extra cost or expenditure.</p> <p>The proposed scheme appears inapplicable to our road, Seabrook, Ingram and Tyne roads are mostly residence, and any form of parking issues are in the evenings and is easily solved by residence communicating and working together, to accommodate each other. And it would appear the solving of this perceived issue creates more issues that we the residence must deal with while the council make a sizable income that residence have no guarantee that where that money will be sent or utilised.</p> <p>On that point of where these funds would be used and how they would be spent? What assurances of guarantee do the residence have of this sizable income would be used, reinvested back in the area to further improve our streets and quality of life? Or more likely signed off to a subcontracted company to manage the scheme and further siphon off public money into private pockets. I would propose that consultation with all residence on how this money could be used and spent in the local area, if you ever get it past the robust resistance to this scheme.</p> <p>I doubt the council have considered the personal effect of this scheme of some of the residence, for me it's the concern about friends and family visiting (from other parts of the country) and then having to pay for parking in the duration of the visit. What about service and trades working at people's homes, it is already near impossible to get a tradesman to work on your property let alone having to absorb the cost of their parking on top of trades bills. Has it been considered that those in the community that require care and support? Remembering they are usually elderly and on lower incomes, are</p>
Norfolk Park Drive	No/object	With regard to question 27 there needs to be another option ... I'd have to as I live here!
st. aidans road	No/object	I think the parking scheme is ridiculous. I live near the tram stop and college and the people parking in the area for work/education does not effect me getting a space for my car at all. Any parking charging scheme will effect my friends and family visiting me, paying for parking and the limit on time. The cost also feels like an additional tax that I really can't afford.
Glencoe Road	No/object	<p>I object to the proposal as I never have a problem parking on my street. I do not have access to off road parking and have to park on the street outside my house. Should the scheme go ahead with less spaces this could mean my road becomes busy with no where for me or my wife to park our cars.</p> <p>With regards to question #27, I find this very frustrating, as as a local resident OF COURSE "Yes" I would continue to park in Park Hill... as I will have no choice! Selecting "No" would be a lie and "Don't know" doesn't even make sense in this scenario really... so "Yes, with great reluctance" would be the correct answer.</p> <p>I feel very strongly about (against) this proposed scheme, as as already noted I have personally encountered zero parking issues over a period of more than 6 years in the neighbourhood. This may not be the case for all local streets, but I walk and drive through them daily and with a handful of exceptions I see absolutely no need for any such proposal. Parking is NOT an issue across the vast, vast majority of the proposed "zone".</p>
Glencoe Road	No/object	I don't see why it has to be chargeable.
Glencoe Road	No/object	The scheme as proposed will reduce the amount of parking available

Donnington Road	No/object	Re question 27 I would not pay to park in the Park Hill area at all as a resident not as a commuter.
Norfolk Park	No/object	
Stafford Road	No/object	I am a resident and am against parking restrictions being introduced. I am on a small income, am a father of two and with rising energy and fuel bills this will be another increase I cannot afford. I have no garage, so need to park on the street, and this appears just to be revenue-raising and unfairly punishes residents of Park Hill.
Manor Oaks Gardens	No/object	
Tylney Road	No/object	I'd like to reiterate that I strongly object to the introduction of the scheme on our road and the surrounding roads Ingram, Seabrook and Stafford Road. As we have no issues with parking the introduction of a parking scheme that would require us to pay - particularly for two cars and potentially visitor permits - would be a real strain on our young families budget without bringing us any benefits. We rely on regular support from our family as well as have friends from our home ed circle visiting us for educational meet ups - many travelling to us via car. None ever having any issue parking near us. In conclusion, it would be a paid scheme that introduces issues with parking for us!
NORFOLK PARK AVENUE	No/object	
Blackwell Place	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	WE WILL NOT BE PAYING A PENNY! towards this extortionate plan, if it is implemented the charges will be deducted from my road and council tax! This is a product of Sheffield city councils balls up of the town centre, pointless one way streets / no parking zones / bus and taxi only lanes / blocking streets off for no reason (Devonshire street) I'm sure people who need mobility vehicles to get out and about must love you for that, half of the city centre is now inaccessible to them. It's because of these dimwitted decisions by the council that the city centre is dying. Then again I guess some over paid, under worked somebody has to justify their job.  Where do you expect people who work in town to park without paying extortionate parking charges?. You've chased them out of town into our areas and now want to charge us for parking outside our own homes and your cock ups, no thanks!
Norfolk Road	No/object	I am very angry about the proposed parking scheme we are an elderly couple who no longer drive and not very mobile. We rely on family and close friends to visit and provide some much needed close interaction especially with our young grandchildren, niece's and nephew's. The majority of our family and friends live outside of the proposed parking scheme. I would feel very guilty knowing that they would have to pay for parking everytime they visited. I wouldn't like to burden them with extra costs at a time when household bills and food prices are rising. I feel this parking scheme is a very bad thing to happen in my area.  I also feel the parking scheme will also affect the amount of people who visit Norfolk park for some much needed long walks/relaxation and well-being.  I feel very sad about this parking scheme and is making me very anxious.  Please reject this parking scheme.
Ingram Road, Sheffield S2	No/object	The following concerns are related to my objections of the scheme:  - on my road (Ingram Road) parking is never a problem. I use my car currently for work (commuter to Huddersfield) and as a flexible/hybrid worker, I often leave and return home at various times within the day and never struggle to park my car.  - the proposed pay and display meters and requirement of a permit concern me. I am concerned how this would impact the decisions of friends and family about visiting me. I am even more concerned for elderly/vulnerable people in the area and the detrimental effect that family/friends decision to not visit because of fees would have on their health and well-being.  -i am wondering whether possible barriers to this scheme working have been considered, from a behavioural science perspective. I am thinking about my own experience and my own motivation to avoid spending money at parking meters, I.E pushing the problem of parking (where this exists - as mentioned it is not a problem for me on my road) to another area, making parking meters obsolete here - particularly since this area is residential, and in the immediate vicinity there are no shops/bars other local amenities unlike other parts of the city where people may pay (I.e sharrowvale/Hillsborough)  -I was thinking of getting an electric car, having read about the installation of street based chargers being trialled in some areas in the country, as somebody with no driveway, I was hoping this could have been a possibility in Sheffield at some point in attempts at creating a greener city with reduced emissions. The installation of parking meters, to me does not seem to support efforts or reflect motivations for the council to reduce emissions.
S12	No/object	Our daughter moved to the area last year as she wanted to be close to the city centre. She has nowhere to make off-street parking and needs a car for her job. The restrictions will affect her property value. The restrictions will simply move the problem somewhere else. Why not look at encouraging parking closer or in the city centre and or develop Park and ride schemes .and improve Public transport. These proposals will add to the difficulties of people wanting to visit the city centre.
Gleadless	No/object	As stated previously not sure why permits are being introduced. I like to visit my family without the worry of getting a parking ticket.
Gleadless	No/object	None
Granville Road,	No/object	
Oak Lodge road	No/object	I work at a local Business - Countrywide Grounds maintenance , Located on Fitzwalter road.  I currently work 3 - 4 days Per week, The parking scheme being introduced in the area will cause an issue for me parking at work, Not just for me but for the other staff members at my workplace.  I am unable to take public transport to work as i do not live locally to park hill, and also start and finish times there is not transport available from where i live other than to drive.  If i am unable to park when i get to work im unsure what situation this leaves me in, As i only work part time it is not possible to financially support paying for permit or paying for parking further away from my place of work,
Foxhill	No/object	Park on fitzwalter road for work

norfolk park	No/object	<p>I object to the parking scheme as it would make parking near my workplace near impossible.</p> <p>I work unsociable hours which can mean starting work between 4am and 7am in the morning or working through the night until lunchtime on essential gritting works during the winter months.</p> <p>due to the nature of the business i do need to use my vehicle for work purposes which means public transport is not feasible</p> <p>There are no current problems with parking on fitzwalter road , All staff members can park on the estate and this still allows for parking for business customers also.</p> <p>All business owners are courteous to each other</p> <p>It also needs to be taken into account that businesses on this estate need to allow also for customer parking.</p>
14 Belmonte Gardens	No/object	<p>Details should be given as to how residents like me Living in Belmonte Gardens, can apply for visitor permits for essential trades people attending to essential maintenance work/ deliveries. Visitor permits for Medical Assistants &amp; Friends visiting me.</p> <p>If construction work is taking place how do I apply for a permit to place a skip placed in this layby.</p> <p>That is all for now</p> <p>Mr Hemantha Wijeyesekera</p>
fitzwalter road	No/object	<p>I work at a local business on fitzwalter road , and have done so for many years. I dont have issues parking at my workplace,</p> <p>I work unsociable hours which mean the being able to park close by to work is a priority for my safety.</p> <p>I do essential works accross schools and care facilities</p> <p>Local businesses will suffer immensely if this parking scheme was brought in.</p>
fitzwalter road	No/object	
Glencoe Road, Glencoe Road	No/object	<p>question above not relevant as I live here so I would park here. would not want to pay obviously . I strongly object to the introduction of a scheme that will seemingly only benefit a very few people at the end of Norfolk Road as far as I can see and punish the majority.</p>
St Aidans Rd	No/object	
Park Grange Croft SHEFFIELD	No/object	
Fitzwalter Road, Sheffield, S2 2SP	No/object	<p>Myself and 300 members will be against the parking restrictions and will do everything in our power to fight it.</p> <p>If parking permits are introduced in the proposed zone Parkhill Estate residents will be unduly affected. There are too few street spaces; as we cannot park on the majority of Duke St. during the peak hours and potentially won't be eligible for a resident's permit on other zonal roads. Which road would Parkhill residents be able to park on?</p> <p>There is a clear disparity between the annual cost of a parking permit through the proposed Parking Zone circa. £47 to £94 per annum for residents in the wider area; versus the cost of parking as a resident at either of the two carparks at Parkhill Estate circa. £600-750 per annum, which does not guarantee a space to Parkhill residents either (which is absurd).</p> <p>I would hope the Council will give consideration to this specific issue during the parking zone consultation. As this scheme could potentially leave present and 'future' Parkhill Estate residents even less options to park within a reasonable walking distance of their home. With the future development of the estate this problem will increase.</p>
Parkhill, Gilbert, South St.	No/object	
Norfolk Park Avenue	No/object	<p>I don't think Donnington Road should be included in the parking scheme as commuters do not use this road for parking at present. M</p>
Glencoe Road	No/object	<p>I expect I would have to carry on parking here as I live here. An alternative would be to move. I would not appreciate having to pay for parking outside my house. It would appear to be a penalty and tax for living in this location.</p>
Stafford Road	No/object	
Glencoe Road	No/object	
essex road	No/object	<p>I am a resident i dont have any other option but to park here.</p>
SSEX ROAD S2 2RG	No/object	<p>I have no option but to park on the street as I am a resident of Essex Road.</p>
Norfolk road	No/object	
Hyde Park Terrace	No/object	<p>On our street you propose to remove 28 parking spaces and replace with double yellow lines. This will only make our problem worse This includes putting double yellows along all our garages, which have a car parking pad in front of them for parking purposes anyway. Many of my neighbours are elderly and have carers multiple times per day too and this would reduce where they can park.</p>
Glencoe Rd	No/object	

GRANVILLE ROAD	No/object	While I believe the parking scheme is beneficial to deter the non-residents occupying as many spaces, I believe introduced paid permits for each household's cars is unnecessary. As I'm sure you can appreciate, we are currently experiencing a cost of living crisis with petrol and energy prices exceeding past records, for example. Many residents will be placed under significant financial strain from this already, therefore I believe it unjust to expect the additional costs of permits. I myself live in a rented household, and part of the decision to move into this property was the available parking, and no need for a permit. After the painful few years of complete isolation and reduced social contact due to covid that we all experienced, I believe most people are encouraging more visits from friends and family than ever. With the introduction of this scheme, this will also impact visitors, which is greatly unfair. I believe each house should be entitled to free permits, and visitor permits also. By the council placing fees associated with this scheme, it is clearly not just for the benefit of the residents, who may still not be able to park outside their homes, in spite of the permit. I appreciate the opportunity to share my views, but this scheme must be reconsidered.
Talbot place	No/object	
Wybourn	No/object	This extends far further than just park hill. There are small businesses outside of the city centre which will be affected, such a salon CT nails. It also extends on to manor oaks area which isn't even park hill and where there is abundant parking at any time of the day!
Manor Oaks Drive	No/object	As we own the parking bays attached to our house, we wouldn't be paying to park our cars.
Ingram road	No/object	
Skye edge road	No/object	
Stafford Road	No/object	My answer to 27 is not that I would want to pay or would be happy paying. I live here, I would have no choice but to pay.
Dovercourt Road	No/object	I never think it's good to charge residents to park outside their own house. Where I live we do get people who live on city road park on my street but they have been respectful for the most part and don't park like idiots with massive gaps in between. As a resident would I have to pay a parking permit? That wouldn't be fair
Norfolk Park	No/object	This scheme is a joke all you are doing is causing parking problems on other roads, you will also make it difficult for people who live on some of these roads to park near their homes xx you have totally ignored the areas on Norfolk Park which are residents only parking, which are blocked every day by people parking and getting on the tram, or taking their kids to School and picking them up! Council are good at creating problems, but obviously no good at problem solving!
Manor Oaks Gardens	No/object	
Essex Road	No/object	With reference to question 27 I would still park in Park Hill as I live there.
Park Hill, pat Midgley Lane	No/object	I do not support the scheme - the street parking is always sufficient in the area behind park hill and does not seem to require being paid for. it is an unnecessary cost when costs of living are already increasing
Tylney Road	No/object	I think the proposal of the parking scheme to such a large area is ridiculous. I'm sure you'll have many objections to read through with many people saying the same thing. There is no issue with parking on Tylney Road or the surrounding streets. Apart from this, the idea to then charge residents for a permit is insulting. At a time when the cost of living is the highest its ever been, you are proposing to take more money off people just to park outside there own house. I have 3 dependencies and am the only person who works in the family, quite simply any cost is a cost I'm unwilling to pay. If you would like to issue all residents with free permits, then charge people who work in the city, that might be a better that wouldn't get as much objection. As for making the city cleaner and greener, I haven't seen any vision to promote electric vehicles or increase the number of charging stations in and around the city. This is overall a very poorly thought out plan that could potentially cripple people who are already struggling on a day to day basis.
Granville road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
city road	No/object	hi as not having a driveway or parking on the main road where we live is bad enough also having a child in a wheelchair is a extra challenge but we get by, but the introduction of this new proposed parking will make it even more difficult with extra costs added to tighter budget and the impact on the people that come to see us to service his equipment a more challenging task when the problem with parking not a problem in this area, i know the problem with parking closer to town near park hill and norfolk road and further down granville road near the school is slight problem but should but up to the residents on the affected roads to either vote to have it without imposing it on the rest of the other who don't .
Talbot Place	No/object	The cost of living is high enough. Council Tax is high enough. Charing for parking permits is an absolute disgrace and doesn't help the local community one bit. If you do this you will break down the community.
S13	No/object	Listen to the residents. Make suitable parking for the construction workers so our streets can be clear for our children to play in and our own cars parked outside our own houses where we can assess them for emergencies.
Stafford Street	No/object	I object to defacing unmarked streets with paint and street furniture. I object to allowing tradespersons to park at will using vouchers. I object to using residents to generate money for the council. I object to users of the pharmacies, GP, public library and Salvation Army to have to pay to park. I object to residents money to be used to issue penalties
Granville road	No/object	
Talbot Gardens	No/object	I wish for there to be a free residents permit.
Holdings Road	No/object	We have a large van and no drive on which to park it. We have two severely disabled children who are both wheelchair users. We need to park outside our own property in any way that makes their and our life as easy as possible. Introducing permit parking will cause us stress due to additional cost and worry regarding whether we will still be able to park if other drivers can pay to park outside our own house. We also have many visits from NHS staff, physios, occupational therapists etc. Paid parking will make it very difficult for them to visit our property. This is an unnecessary scheme that will reduce property value, create financial difficulty for residents and increase stress during already difficult times where soaring costs are everywhere.
S2 3bf	No/object	
Stafford road	No/object	It will stop people, families visiting eachother
Charnock	No/object	I appreciate that some areas may benefit from controlled parking but to include Norfolk Park Road and not Manor Lane seems ridiculous.
All Saints Catholic High School & S	No/object	
St. Aidans Road	No/object	Myself and all of our neighbours thoroughly reject this proposal.



Norfolk Rd	No/object	We have 3 children in wheelchairs and park our wheelchair adapted vehicle outside our home. We wouldn't park elsewhere and push our kids home. Whatever restrictions you decide to implement We would still need to do what we do. Our children are in end of life and we have many health professionals visit us often as well as social care professions. This will cost us such a lot in parking permits. We actually really like our street where the road surfaces are good and the heritage lights are nice. This will spoil it covering it with paint for parking bays.
Strouts Way	No/object	
Bassett Road	No/object	It's not fair to family members visiting family!
Stafford Road	No/object	
BASSETT ROAD	No/object	Introducing a parking scheme is nothing more than exploiting the residents when the cost of living is at an all time high! Talk about kicking people when their down!!!
Norfolk rd	Yes	
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	It worries me that this consultation covers such a large area. I am concerned that people further up Granville Road, who don't have the same issues as us, may object. Dinnington Road is one example. It's too far up for people to use it as a car park like we suffer, but they could stop us getting what we desperately need.
Seabrook Road	Yes	
ingram road, s2	Yes	As residents we need to park outside our house. I feel the cost of the permit for residents is too high. What benefit do we get for paying? I assumed residents would have a free permit, but I think it should be at least less than £20.
Norwich Park Hill	Yes	
City road	Yes	I wish the local resident have a parking permit
South Street, Sheffield	Yes	
Stafford Road	Yes	This scheme ignores the much more important environmental and safety aspects, eg 20mph zone is needed for all this area NOW, there should be parking charge and residents concessions for electric vehicles, this should incorporate plans for more charging points and car share parking.  Sheffield is becoming one of the weakest cities in the whole country environmentally - the council says they don't have the power to act but there are so many easy wins like the above.
Old Street	Yes	I would like a condition of the scheme to be that the student accommodation is not allowed to have parking permits. There are a huge amount of flats in the Pinnacles and if each one of them was allowed a vehicle there would simply be nowhere for residents to park in our area.
Castlebeck Drive sheffield	Yes	
Old Street	Yes	I would pay g go or a permit to park on my road if it actually secured me a space
Hyde Park Terrace	Yes	
norfolk road	Yes	
glencoe lace	Yes	unfair on residents unable to park
Castle Croft drive	Yes	I have a drive therefore I would not have to pay, however I wouldn't ask my family to pay either. In no world is it right to require your visitors to your home to have to pay to park up when they visit. But yes, people who are NOT residents or visitors to the residents should have to pay, our estate is not a free car park. No point even trying to get round our estate or Granville road when there's a football match on at bramall lane or if it's school opening/closing time. It's limiting when we can actual leave our homes safely. Not to mention the abuse and snide looks you get off of school parents who block off the entrance to the estate when you try and squeeze your car through the small gap that is left. I Would not wish anyone on the estate to require the emergency services but in peak parking or pick up/drop off times it's near impossible to be able to get an emergency vehicle safely through. That being said, kier who built our homes was obviously aware of the parking issues that may arise from the location of the estate and still made areas of the estate only able to fit one car down despite being a 2 way system on a blind bend. If any of us needed the fire brigade at peak times then we would be screwed quite frankly. As for the council profiting off of using our estate as a paid for car park that's also ridiculous. Allow for only residents and their visitors to park and the safety issues would be solved. But being honest, who's going to man the permits? I highly doubt the council will employ someone to check every car has paid to park, and the general public know this so the problem will remain a problem while ever the general public are allowed to park here.
Talbot Street	Yes	If we had to pay there would be no other choice as we live in this area.
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	The Castle Croft Drive community has been asking for a resident parking scheme to be put in place since 2015 and were very surprised the council had not made this an original condition of the planning consent for the estate. Many of the residents have been in contact with the council over the years including a large number of meetings held in the Town Hall with councillors and Terry Fox. We are glad that this is finally happening and the daily misery of speeding / badly parked cars and cars parked on the pavement blocking pram users will finally come to an end.
Norfolk Park, Beeches Bank	Yes	There are signs in Norfolk Park stating street parking on Beeches Bank please remove this as it only results in residents private allocated parking being abused
Ingram Road	Yes	Think it is wrong for family members and friends that come to visit us and will have to pay it will stop them coming and when you are elderly and or ill you need people around you
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	I would continue to park here because it is my home. I totally support restrictions on parking. I would prefer it if it was permit only and not pay and display in my road. If introduced it needs properly enforcing. I think this fits with the wider environmental impact by reducing non residents from driving into the city.
Hyde Park terrace	Yes	I'm in favour of restrictions but feel residents should be allowed parking permits to enable them to park near their homes. The first two permits per house should be free, with replacements/extras charged a small fee.
Park hill- Robinson road	Yes	I would support parking controls to be in place Mon-Fri 8:00am- 6:30pm. Parking controls beyond those times feel unnecessary as the I feel the majority of the problem with parking is caused by people parking to access the town centre or train station during the day on weekdays. I feel that extending parking restrictions past 6:30pm on a week day or at any time on a weekend would penalise residents who may have people come visit them via car.
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	I don't believe residents or visitors of residents should have to pay, but I do believe the introduction of some kind of pay/permit for parking would make it safer for residents
Granville road	Yes	I don't think residents should have to pay for their place as this penalises them.
Sheffield	Yes	Disabled drivers must be allocated specific parking spaces
NORWICH, SOUTH STREET, PARK HILL	Yes	It would need to be affordable for residents and residents should be able to have visitor passes. If there was more provision for cycling and cycle parking then there would be less cars.
Park Hill flats	Yes	
Castle croft drive	Yes	
Park hill	Yes	
S11 9FY	Yes	Cars are often damaged due to street crime. As parking officers patrol the streets, when parking restrictions are in place, this will reduce this The charges need to be reasonable. Some 'residents only parking' needs to be in place too. Building just 2 storey car parks would be helpful!
Park Hill	Yes	
South Street, Park Hill	Yes	There has been an unacceptable rise in inconsiderate and dangerous parking, including pavement parking. The introduction of the controlled area scheme (if properly policed) is welcome
Fitzwalter Road	Yes	The increased number of vehicles in getting more problematic in our area. I would be happy to pay to alleviate this. I do have concerns that the scheme covers a wide area and objections from residents living further from town may prevent it going forward so I hope that there is a process for adjustments to the scheme to ensure that it can go ahead in the areas most affected.
Cricket Inn road	Yes	
Parkhill flats	Yes	we need more parking for residents in the area with the huge number of flats
PARK GRANGE CROFT	Yes	
Crown Place, S2	Yes	
Norfolk Road,	Yes	The above doesn't apply to me as I have a driveway so wouldn't have to pay. I resent having to pay to park in other parts of the city, near the centre, yet other people come to Park and park for free, filling up the whole street, and surrounding streets.
Crosspool	Yes	To support the residents, parking should be prioritised for them.

		As I said, each household should get a free permit. You don't make people in Sheffield with a drive pay to park, so why is it any different for people living in flats?
Long Henry - Phase 2 - Park Hill	Yes	And the parking restrictions on Dukes Street need to be removed. They make absolutely no sense to restrict parking for an hour in the morning and 1'm the evening. There is never rush hour on that road at anytime, so I cannot see what that is there. It is just inconvenience for the sake of inconvenience
Talbot Place	Yes	A controlled parking scheme is required, however I do not believe charging the residents surrounding park hill is a correct solution. At the very least the council should react to park hill contractors using the residential parking around park hill.
Holdings Road	Yes	
Castle croft drive	Yes	I live on castle croft drive, I would like to see permit holder only parking to be implemented.
Tylney road	Yes	Support it 5 days a week as the leaflet received in the post says, potentially Saturdays too as often get lots of football parking nearby. However do not support this to be 7 days a week and wish to know why the survey has different proposal to the information sent to residents.
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	Designate left side of South St & Stafford Rd in front of Park Hill as paid parking Designate Norfolk Rd from Clay wood park to end at Granville Rd as residents parking The scheme should end around 6:30pm as most commuters gone home by then Residents should pay for 1 pass & have 1 free extra pass for visitors
Norfolk Road	Yes	
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
Long Henry, South Street, Park Hill	Yes	Bring in a Workplace Parking Levy, and ban pavement parking in the city centre. Create Low Traffic Neighbourhoods around Park Hill and Norfolk Park.
Hague, South Street, Park Hill	Yes	
Norfolk Road	Yes	
Norfolk Road	Yes	Q 27 not relevant to us... we live here and park in our drive.
Broomhill	Yes	
Glencoe Road	Yes	This can't happen soon enough for me, please push through ASAP.
Old Street	Yes	My issue would be that if you only had to pay for parking Monday - Friday then it wouldn't stop our issues with students as they're also here many weekends or after the time of 6:30pm (as it says on the leaflet). I think it may be better to make our road completely private parking and give the option of permits to the residents on our street, that way it would stop students parking on our road and would allow employees (who work in town) pay for parking if they park here.
Castle croft Drive	Yes	Cheap or free parking is needed close to library and post office. Perhaps free parking for upto 20 mins at Post Office and 2 hours outside library or library have free visitors permits to hand to those using library facilities . Parking on Granville road at junction with castle croft drive needs to be restricted to improve visibility when turning out of Castle Croft Drive
Park Grange Croft	Yes	
Park Grange Croft	Yes	
Ingram Road	Yes	The parking scheme, if fairly implemented on ALL Park Hill roads, will make access to my land easier and increase the value of my home which has private off road parking, so I would generally support this.  I fear however enforcement will mostly impact residents who already park legally and considerately, while little will be done to enforce against those parked inconsiderably on the pavement / causing dangerous obstruction.  Continued selective / partial enforcement, will only increase the abuse of obstruction and abuse of pavements.
Gleadless	Yes	
Castlecroft Croft Drive	Yes	I live in this area and would like it to be a safe place to walk on the pavements, as well as a safe place to drive and park. There are currently too many vehicles who park in this area for the full day. The pavement cannot be used by people in a wheelchair or a pushchair.
Castlecroft drive	Yes	
Castlecroft	Yes	
Castlecroft	Yes	
Woodville Street	Yes	
Hillsborough	Yes	
Norfolk Road, 76	Yes	
Manor Oaks Gardens	Yes	
Castle croft drive	Yes	
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	I strongly support the proposed parking scheme - besides improving my quality of life and reducing the risks of blocking the street for emergency vehicles etc., it could be a source of revenue for the Council as there are a large number of drivers shamelessly violating road rules when they park here rather than pay for parking for Sheffield College, the station, etc.
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	I think the permits must be affordable as in my household we are 3 young professionals who all have the travel for work. If the costs of the permits were high then we would have to take this into account when renewing our tenancy.
Granville road	Yes	As a local resident I would be more than happy to pay a permit fee to park near to where I live. This is a fantastic idea, please bring it in as soon as possible
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	If a permit system is not introduced in this area things will only potentially get worse once the Clean Air Zone comes into effect. After the Clean Air Zone is established it is feasible that a wider selection of vehicles will be charged for entering which will encourage polluting vehicle owners to try to park on the periphery of the zone. This is likely to happen immediately that the Clean Air Zone comes into effect, taxi drivers that would otherwise be charged for entering the zone will be encouraged to park/pick up/drop off on the periphery of the zone.
CASTLE CROFT DRIVE	Yes	
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	The proposed days and times of the parking restrictions will not necessarily help castle Croft drive with all the parking issues caused by non residents. Between Monday and Friday, there are non residents freely parking their cars to go to work/college but also frequently, there are football events taking place on evenings and weekends which also disrupt Castle Croft Drive. I would happily pay for a permit if the council made sure during events special parking restrictions were in place to prevent people using our private road as a free car park. We do pay a maintenance fee for the upkeep of the road so it would be better all round to have restrictions all the time or between 8am - 8pm, 7 days a week.
Shrewsbury Hospital S22SU	Yes	
Park Hill	Yes	
Bard Street	Yes	I actually think the parking should be 7 days a week 24/7 as parking on a weekend is as bad as through the week. There are times when emergency services would not be able to access the street due to the parking.
Glencoe Road	Yes	I strongly support your proposal to introduce a controlled parking scheme around Park Hill. I anticipate this will help deter people who use this residential area as a car park for the city centre, rail station and college because it is currently free. This in turn will make for a more pleasant and less-polluted and -congested environment because it will reduce the volume of traffic travelling into and around the area. I am pleased you are proposing to include my Road, Glencoe Road, and a good range of roads from the city centre up to Skye Edge, to dissuade people simple parking nearby. I understand I would need to pay for a resident permit, but feel this is a reasonable cost to incur for the benefit the scheme should provide. I'd also like to know some more information and/or make suggestions for the scheme, including:  * Is there a facility for guest/visitor permits to be available for family or friends visiting residents within the scheme boundary other than simply paying the £6.50? I have family who live outside of Sheffield but within a controlled parking zone and they are able to buy visitor parking permits when we visit at a lower cost than buying pay & display tickets. * The scheme runs onto Manor Laith Road, but seems to end a short way up. Could this boundary be extended to cover the entrance onto Park Rifles allotment site? Drivers parking on this road often park over the entrance to the site, which makes it difficult for plot-holders to access the site.  Thank you for your work to propose this parking scheme.

		<p>The priority should be reducing visitor parking</p> <p>I am not sure that charging people to park without restrictions around certain times and areas will address the current congestion</p> <p>The congestion got worse when the council restricted parking in the city centre which i agree with but havent invested enough in alternative travel.</p> <p>Will revenue from restricted parking be used to fund public transport?</p>
Norfolk rd	Yes	.
Norfolk park drive	Yes	I would be very annoyed if I had to pay to park by my own front door if the resident car park was full, when people from other areas can pay for a permit to park on our very limited drive. It doesn't seem right
Talbot Gardens	Yes	
Bard street	Yes	If the parking permit is introduced it will be ineffective if not policed by wardens
Donnington Road	Yes	<p>The main issue on Donnington Road/Norfolk Park Avenue is speeding cars, but for residents at our end of the road, parking is also an issue that affects us regularly.</p> <p>I have recently applied for a dropped kerb extension so our double driveway can be used effectively by 2 cars. I hope this won't be affected if the parking scheme is introduced? I'm a little concerned that if the parking bays are marked before the dropped kerb is authorised/implemented, the new bays might obstruct our access.</p>
Talbot St	Yes	<p>All my family live away if they come to visit it is extremely difficult for them to park any where round here.</p> <p>I think parking permits are needed. The amount of litter these non residents leave behind is appalling.</p> <p>Does this mean that at weekends my neighbours won't have the right to park in their designated spot? I'm a little confused on all this?</p>
Norwich, Park Hill	Yes	<p>Leaflet in post indicated residents permits of £46.80 a year.</p> <p>Happy to support this charge if it means spaces are available. Concerns about unavailability persisting. Permit wont guarantee space?</p>
Castle croft drive	Yes	I don't feel as though residents should have to pay to park outside their house. We already pay a large amount of council tax and with the rising cost of living I think this is really unfair. Each resident should be issued with two permits.
Norfolk Rd	Yes	I think it would have helped to have more details of the scheme made available before conducting this survey as i do not feel that there is adequate information with which to allow people to make an informed decision.
Tylney Road	Yes	
Norwich, Park Hill	Yes	
Ingram Road	Yes	
SEABROOK ROAD	Yes	<p>Understand the idea, bit expensive for visitors/trades people ?</p> <p>Could start the free parking a little earlier ?, say 5.30 if the aim is to just discourage commuter parking, they will mostly be all day parkers who will already have paid the £6.50.</p> <p>Bit concerned that the managed areas will be set out as such to reduce the actual street parking, especially for those lucky enough to be able to afford a house large enough to accommodate a driveway, and therefore avoid all costs. British std turning circles for accessing driveways are very generous.</p> <p>Not much detail on your web page on the actual specifics just an outline of the area, there must be more, to enable a more informed response to this consultation.</p>
Shrewsbury Road	Yes	Do you have a review process to see if your plan actually worked ?
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	No issues parking on street. I do not want parking restrictions on the back side of Norfolk park avenue as cars are parked blocking the driveway and I do not want there to be a restriction on doing this. I do not want to pay for a permit to park nor do I
Park Grange Croft	Yes	Will residents be able to buy books of Visitors permits as in other parking schemes in City. I can not see any reference to visitors permits in the Draft Traffic Regulation order. I see this as essential, particularly for residents who do not have their own vehicle and rely on carers/relatives and friends. It is not reasonable to have to pay the Pay and Display rates to visit a resident.
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
Granville Road	Yes	<p>We are a car-free household, so are not affected by this directly.</p> <p>For this scheme to be fair: Households should be issued with one free permit - for them or visitors. These should be non-transferable.</p> <p>Although I support this scheme, as it may discourage car ownership, I am concerned that it would lead more people to convert their front gardens to parking space. This leads to loss of pockets of green space and higher risk of flooding.</p>
Castle Croft Drive, Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
Norfolk Road	Yes	
Glencoe Road	Yes	I do not own a car
Norfolk Road,	Yes	<p>I live at 76 Norfolk Road and have had a detailed look at the plan. At the moment as cars park on both sides of Norfolk Road I often cannot turn east out of my drive towards Fitzwalter Road, or back in from Fitzwalter Road. The particular problem is that cars park so close to the dropped curve, often overhanging the white H lines, meaning that the turning circle is impinged on. I also use a trailer making the problem worse.</p> <p>The parking space as shown on the new plans, on the east to the exit of my drive is currently showing as approx 7.5 Meters, not enough for two cars according to normal planning. I would request that the space be reduced to 5M, ie, suitable for a single car and be moved east towards Fitzwalter Road, away from my drive entrance so that I can then manoeuvre to/from the east as mentioned above.</p>
Swallownest	Yes	Park Hill area needs to have some sort of control, but I strongly object to have to pay to visit and look after my elderly relative because of inconsiderate commuters parking up for free then going to work in the city centre.
Talbot Place	Yes	<p>What are the arrangements for tradespeople working on properties? e.g. if a resident needs a builder, plumber etc. at short notice do they need to buy a parking ticket?</p> <p>Would the green parking permit allow parking free of charge?</p> <p>I think a higher parking price is needed for non residents, as £6.50 a day seems low and may encourage commuters to continue to park and ride.</p>
Glencoe Road	Yes	
Donnington Road	Yes	
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
Blackwell close	Yes	
Stafford st	Yes	Give park hill residents own parking not to use our street
Smallage Lane	Yes	
Stafford road	Yes	Ultimately to solve the parking issue the transport infrastructure in sheffield needs an overhaul. Cheap buses, a better overall transport infrastructure and cheaper parking (in particular for businesses) to decrease the pressure on parking in the inner city residential areas. Carers should be exempt from the new parking charges so people with caring needs or carers themselves do not inadvertently incur a stealth tax.
Crown Place	Yes	
Granville Road	Yes	
Norfolk Road	Yes	I've just given a detailed response in the car parking section, so I won't repeat myself.
Manor Oaks Road	Yes	<p>Please restrict this proposal to the immediate area surrounding this area, otherwise it will fail. It's too wide, as it stands, I know because I volunteer at Park library, and many people are coming in to read the book. They tell us they are against it, and why. I've no wish to see them penalised, when the problem is ours.</p> <p>I am all for permits in the neighbour hood and would happily pay</p>
Norfolk Road	Yes	I've lived in the Hunters Bar and Ranmoor areas of Sheffield all have double yellow or parking permits, as a now resident of Norfolk Park I can't understand why this is not yet put into to practice. I do have a drive but I feel sorry for all neighbouring residents that have to put up with inconsiderate parking, I would like to see more done around the cholera monument to discourage the gangs of youth smoking marijuana in their cars, it's very intimidating.
Long Henry, South Street, Park Hill	Yes	

Long Henry, South Street, Park Hill	Yes	Reduce the speed limit on Duke Street to stop people flying up and down it
Norwich, Pat Midgley Lane	Yes	
NORFOLK ROAD	Yes	
Shrewsbury Hospital, Norfolk rd	Yes	
Granville Road	Yes	
Norwich, Park Hill	Yes	I already pay for parking at park hill for the secure car park so this will help improve the area around park hill.
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	I don't want to pay to park on my own drive, but would be happy to pay for visitors passes.
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	If I needed to participate in a paid or temporary ticket scheme for family and visitor parking (such as scheme at Broomhill) I would be happy to do so as current parking issues on the road cause danger and obstruction.
South Street	Yes	I think the emphasis should be on making it easy for residents to park (possibly by minimising the annual permit charge) whilst discouraging the commuters (by increasing the daily rate).
Norfolk Road	Yes	We local residents have been used as a free car park for many years. Most areas of the city, with this problem, have controlled parking schemes, so we need one too. It will help to convince commuters and shoppers to use public transport and reduce CO2 emissions, and the air pollution in our area, which is high.
		In principle I support a scheme that allows residents and their visitors to be able to park easily and safely near to their properties. But what I would say is:  * I'm not convinced how much commuter parking is taking place on either Hyde Park Walk or Terrace. More residents have vehicles and work vehicles and 2nd cars etc. In that sense it feels like the residents/visitors will now be charged but won't get any of the benefits of the scheme. It's being grouped with much busier main roads that clearly have a commuter parking problem and that seems a little unfair. A ban on work vehicles might help as they take up a lot of room and could possibly be left at work premises overnight instead? For example there is a large SCC works transit van regularly parked overnight and other similar vehicles with company logos.  * As caring for somebody essentially saves the local authority resources in more than one sense, I would object to having to pay to park whilst I was providing that service. Yes we would visit our relative in any case but not every day of the week as we do in order to provide the care she requires. I'd also like to see the proposed times changed to earlier on in the evening as we tend to call in on our way in from work at 4:30pm and most commuters would not benefit from free parking that late in the day I am sure?  * The cost of the scheme would impact heavily on whether my relative would support a scheme or not. The information online mentions that road tax and council tax pay for many things and what the cost of the scheme would cover but the bottom line is that this area is occupied by low income households who have previously never had to pay to park their vehicles. There is a cost of living crisis ongoing and the recent budget announcements have done nothing to abate those problems. Adding another burden to the residents' pockets seems ridiculous and when they can't pay for the scheme and inevitably pick up a fine that they then can't pay, the local authority have paid to implement the scheme, paid to enforce the scheme, paid to invoice for fines and paid to chase debt that they will never recover. Isn't it then the residents of the entire city that will pay? My relative would rather see her council tax pay to care adequately for older people, for the police to clean up the drug dealing issues that are rife in that area or for somebody to enforce the shoddy housing associations that are clearly all about the profit, despite apparently not being so.  * Would the scheme impact on deliveries/tradespeople? I think I read online that they would have to apply for a pass? Would there be a cost to that? Would that cost potentially be passed onto the residents again?  * If residents have care staff visiting their properties several times per day, would there be a cost to those staff/companies and would that be passed onto individuals' care bills?
Not in Sheffield	Yes	
Broad street	Yes	
Fitzwalter Road	Yes	
Castle croft drive	Yes	
Crown Place	Yes	the only objection I have is why should I have to pay a charge when I already have just received 2022 Council Tax Charges with a 5% increase on 2021. this feels like another Tax if I have to pay to park outside my own home
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	As a long term resident I would want a free permit as I really need to use my car for work but with rising living costs I am scared about more bills to pay.
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
Glencoe Road	Yes	I hope you will accept the views of those who do not currently use the parking, because parking still impacts us in our daily lives immensely. With the exception of those with mobility problems and those without the means to do so, I believe people should pay to park cars in the street, and I would hope that the revenue would be ploughed directly into cheap and reliable public transport in and around the city. I wish to also add that I am currently taking driving lessons and intend to buy a car in the next year. I do not, however, believe that I have an inherent right to store that private asset on public land for free. Filling our streets with increasingly large cars and trucks has an impact on everyone, and as an able bodied person, I expect to pay to park in the street, and to have parking rules rigorously enforced. I hope that pavement parking will soon be made illegal and the dignity of human beings (not cars) trying to move in our communities is held as the highest priority when making future planning decisions.
Castle Croft drive	Yes	
Castle croft drive	Yes	
S10 2dh	Yes	
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
CITY ROAD	Yes	I have put "yes" in response to question 26, - although it really should be "Maybe" - this form gives no option for this. I have a number of concerns and questions: 1. I have a particular concern about the inclusion of a different issue within this consultation about a controlled parking scheme. We currently can't park outside our home 8-9.30am, 4.30-6.30pm Mon-Fri. The plans change this to 7.30-9.30am and 4-6.30pm. This clearly makes parking close to our home more difficult. For example, we regularly leave the vehicle in City Road overnight on a Sunday, to move it at 8am on a Monday morning, which fits our schedule. To change this to 7.30am means we would need to move our vehicle the night before onto a neighbouring street - adding to the parking issues already there. 2. Single use visitor permits - are they for a specific vehicle, or could we as residents buy a pack, and then use them to different visitors on different occasions? 3. There are a number of houses in multiple occupation on City Road. How many parking permits would a House in Multiple Occupation have? For example, the house next to us has 5 double rooms, self contained. Would it have up to 2 for the entire house or up to 2 per room (ie 10)? It is worth noting that we raised the question of parking when the development was seeking planning permission, and parking at that point (last year) was not seen as a problem 4. The planning proposal does not mention the introduction of a clean air zone in the city centre. My concern is that this will impact our area, and those who wish to avoid paying the city centre charge for a vehicle will use the option of a pay and display parking space in our area - thereby reducing the number of available spaces for local residents. I think if there is to be a parking scheme, it should be for residents and their visitors, and not provide an option for people from outside the area to drive and park on local streets. 5. I am concerned that residents are expected to pay for permits. This is one of the less wealthy parts of Sheffield, and the additional parking costs for the residents will add to existing financial difficulties for people. The residents here are being asked to pay for the problems caused by those from wealthier suburbs wanting to park in our streets, who currently park to avoid expensive parking charges in the city centre.  Following on from above, I think investment into a good public transport system is crucial. I would like to see the provision of significantly more park and ride car parks on the outskirts of the city, with trams and buses to and from the city centre (reliable, frequent, clean, comfortable, and free or minimal cost) would encourage people to behave differently. As well as resolving parking issues, we would have cleaner air, and reduction in the use of petrol and diesel - better for our neighbourhood and the planet!

City Road	Yes	<p>I broadly welcome the scheme but have a number of concerns:</p> <p>1) Currently the urban clearway operates 8:00 -9:30 &amp;16:30 to 18:30. Mon to Fri. The plans show this is changing to 7:30-9:30-16:00-18:30. There is nothing to indicate why this is changing. Our part of B6070 City Road below Granville Rd has much less traffic than other roads such as Abbeydale Rd which has the extended urban clearway times. This extended time will adversely affect my household I formally object to this part of the proposal. The proposed change to urban clearway times should be subject to a separate consultation not part of the parking scheme.</p> <p>2) It is not clear if the £16.25 for 25 single use visitor permits is in addition to being able to purchase a 2nd permit. This must be the case otherwise it would prevent family &amp; friends from parking.</p> <p>3) There is reference to trades people being able to obtain temporary permits. This would need to be easy &amp; quick to do as repair companies need to attend quickly for urgent repairs eg heating breakdowns</p> <p>4) Many properties are HIMO properties with 5 or more single tenants. Could 5 tenants and their partners buy a permit up to 10 per property needed.</p>
City Road	Yes	<p>I would prefer it to be controlled parking in my area as it would encourage residents to park on their own property. It may also lead to some people reducing the amount of cars that they have which would be better for the environment.</p> <p>I think that the money raised from the permits/fines should be used to install EV charging stations in the parking bays created in the controlled areas.</p>
Granville Road	Yes	
Norfolk Park Avenue	Yes	<p>Vehicles often park on Donnington Road on both sides of the road, and too close to driveways. (My address is Norfolk Park Avenue, but vehicle access is via Donnington Road.) My parents, in particular, often have problems turning into my driveway when they visit, because of the cars parked on both sides of the road, making the remaining carriageway space very narrow. My parents have a Volvo estate, so a large car, but not exceptionally large. I would strongly support the introduction of parking controls to reduce problem parking.</p> <p>In addition, I would very much welcome a 20mph speedlimit on Donnington Road, and enforcement of the no right turn/no left turn signs at the top (south) end. Cars are always ignoring these signs, using Donnington Road as a cut through, and I have nearly had two crashes at that junction because of cars turning the wrong way at the top.</p>
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	<p>I would not expect to pay to park on my own drive.</p> <p>Making Castle Croft a pay for parking zone may reduce the number of people parking, as long as the number of slots for 'visitor' parking were reduced significantly and 'policing' were in place and strictly enforced.</p>
Farm Bank Road	Yes	<p>We don't currently have a car but may do in the future. I would like to know that we will have access to a parking space should we need one. I am also concerned about the impact on visitors to our house - including those who need to park to carry out business such as cleaners and gardening services, builders etc and do not want them to be negatively impacted by not being able to easily access our house and/or having to pay to park (it's not always possible for them to park on our drive) or not be able to park across the bottom of our driveway.</p> <p>As someone who mostly walks and cycles around, I am in favour of reducing the cars parked over the pavements, which is a particular problem on some streets such as Castle Croft Drive.</p> <p>I also have some concerns about the 'street clutter' that may arise from having parking meters, signage etc that relates to the proposed changes.</p>
Norfolk Road	Yes	<p>The only thing is that I am concerned that there are no free spaces in Norfolk Road - only permit and double yellow. There should be some. I also find it difficult to understand why the second car is so much more expensive than the first - we are residents and should be able to park whatever we have.</p> <p>Why aren't all the same 42 pounds price?</p>
Fitzwalter Road	Yes	<p>Parking problems are getting worse so I'm pleased a parking scheme is being planned.</p>
Norfolk Road	Yes	<p>This is a badly constructed survey, which does not offer the ability to capture a wide range of views. On the question, where do you park your vehicle, there was no option for 'on my driveway', which many residents in Norfolk Road can benefit from. I answered question 9, and the survey then moves to question 26. Where are the other questions? This issue is a contentious one, and anyone could anticipate that there would be strong views. It seems to me that you are not capturing the positive views, or rather, not giving any platform for them to be collected. I dearly would like the roads to be clearer, less polluting, less litter [as many users of the road are careless and leave fast food litter when they take their vehicle away]. What about the views of cyclists, trying to navigate the one lane that Norfolk road becomes when the litter bin lorry is in the road? I could go on....I am afraid that this scheme will die in the water, because you will not get much more than negative views, often nastily constructed. This is a great shame. This is my second attempt at the survey; I would appreciate it if you could address some of my queries, especially with regard to the questions 10-25. At the moment there is a leaflet being posted in the area, devised by people against the scheme. Some of what it says is not true, but I am afraid that this vocal group may adversely affect any chance we have of ameliorating what is a very unsatisfactory parking situation in my residential street and those adjoining.</p>
Park Hill Flats	Yes	
Killamarsh	Yes	
Cottage Farm, Main Street, Foxhol	Yes	<p>I don't feel I should pay for parking outside my mum's house, as I said before she has lived there years and it should be a no parking zone to none residents and the residents should be allowed a free parking permit per household registered to the address to display as all times. So if another member of family visits they can use it. The parking problem as only happened because the council have put restrictions on the city centre so they park around this area and either walk into town or bus in. We should not be made to pay more to the council when they have caused the problem in the first place</p> <p>please keep me informed</p>
Norwich, South Street	Yes	<p>I worry that displaced commuters will park in the SIP managed private car park at Park Hill flats and that this will lead to difficulties for residents here getting parking places.</p>
Mum owns her own flat on Bl	Yes	<p>Mum has owned her flat for 32 years, I used to live here before I got married in 1991. It's always been free for residents to park. Will the new scheme still allow free parking for residents or in mum's case her daughters who provide care for her on a daily basis?</p>
GLENCOE ROAD	Yes	<p>I am happy for you to keep me informed via email.</p>
Park Grange Croft	Yes	<p>I would have to pay to park near my home. Not good for a woman travelling on her own.</p>
Park Hill	Yes	
Norfolk Park Avenue	Yes	<p>I can't see how causing a problem for far more people is seen as a plausible solution for far fewer people.</p> <p>As you do not enforce the parking restrictions outside the school on Manor Lane or the no right turn at the top of Donnington Road or the speed limit on said road I have grave doubts about your capability to enforce this project which many people (the MAJORITY), do not want!</p> <p>There are other ways of solving this problem, but they would not swell the coffers of Sheffield's Labour Council. I think that most people realise that this proposal is not a solution to a problem it's simply a way of taking money out of people's pockets.</p>
Ingram Road, S2	Yes	
Duke Street	Yes	<p>As I live in Park Hill, I and my visitors have no options about where to park.</p> <p>My main concern is how the parking will be controlled.</p> <p>At the moment the clearway on Duke Street is ignored every day by a handful of Park Hill flat residents, the Duke Street African food store owner/customers and the Duke Street cafe owner.</p> <p>South Street has no parking 0800-1830 Mon-Sat but has groups from an ethnic minority community meeting daily from 1600 without any restriction even though CCTV has been installed to monitor this abuse (a situation that began when the lockdown in 2020 was enforced on the majority of people but was ignored by these groups and also the police and parking authorities) If current parking restrictions are ignored and not policed then how is this massive expansion in parking restrictions going to be effective?</p>
Shrewsbury road	Yes	<p>This survey is too limited as it presumes every concerned resident has a car.</p> <p>The scope of the new scheme is too wide - affecting people who do not have a problem and whose distance from the city means they probably won't have a problem.</p> <p>People will have no less access to spaces if the parking is charged for than they do now.</p> <p>We should be working to having fewer cars in use.</p> <p>We should be installing electric rechargers at the same time as the metres are installed</p> <p>The resident parking permits are very cheap when considering how much parking costs elsewhere. People pay less for a house which doesn't have private parking than one who does and none of us have an absolute right to park for free anywhere - even in hospitals</p>

Pat Midgley Lane	Yes	
Park Grange Croft	Yes	I can support a reasonable controlled parking scheme if it is fair to residents and does not contribute to preventing people from all over spending time in the town centre - maybe some central Park and ride schemes could help and by this I mean ones close to the town centre.
Glencoe Road	Yes	Why are residents having to pay for a problem caused by others? Why not just issue 2 permits to each property requesting parking and ask them to display in vehicles then use a traffic warden to enforce? Don't bother with cluttering our roads with parking meters signage etc. It's bound to result in less available parking than we have now and is another extra cost for city residents which are not incurred by residents who live further out in the leafy suburbs. Also very difficult to answer Q26 and Q27 without you using the answers out of context. I have a car so I would still have to park it in the area no matter what you inflict on us. See above re parking scheme which would be answered yes but not the one you are proposing.
City Road	Yes	
castle Croft drive	Yes	We @ castle Croft drive face most of the issues and unable to access our drives due to people inconsiderate parking and hence need a parking permit.
Sharrow. Used to live in Norfolk p	Yes	
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
Blackwell Place - 40 flats - adjacent	Yes	Right now, my parking issues are minor. However, given the long-term city regeneration plans, I would like to bullet-proof my street Blackwell Place and create a safe and secure parking zone for me and other residents of my densely populated 40 flat zone. Ideally, I would like to eliminate the opportunistic-parking altogether.  If introducing permit parking, please make it 24/7 day and night. A permit for the proposed hours is of no value / pointless. Keep it at the same domestic rate.  My queries are as follows:  The flats 1 to 74 Blackwell Place are privately owned and each have individual private owner- led contractual repair and maintenance needs as and when they fall due. Each flat of the 4 buildings is independent to the rest.  My flat is a fixer-upper and in need of significant works - corner to corner.  How do I manage visitors / deliveries / home-help, medical care / contractors private and communal (eg. builders, plumbers, maintenance workers, cleaners, caretakers.)  When I sell up and move away, is my permit (unused part) transferable / refundable?  Where do I go for help and advice on your parking scheme? (I prefer to pay face to face for my financial security.)
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	(Thank you for the opportunity to feedback to you.)
Norfolk Road	Yes	
Norfolk Road	Yes	I have been concerned that quite a few vehicles have been broken into recently. I think that this is because non-residents are less careful about not leaving things on display in their cars. There are also lots of cars driving about trying to find spaces, which makes the streets less safe than they would be with a scheme. There are also incidences of cars speeding on Talbot Street, Shrewsbury Road, Norfolk Road and Fitzwalter Road. It would be good to introduce speed bumps to reduce this, and limit the through traffic on Fitzwalter Road and Stafford Road. An Active Travel Neighbourhood would be a good idea in this area, to co-incide with a parking scheme. Enforcement needs to be an necessary part of the new scheme.
Norfolk Road	Yes	
Granville road Sheffield	Yes	As I said previously, I Do not believe residents should pay to park outside their own homes, I do believe that people who commute into Sheffield and use the area to park for the day/work etc should have to pay to park their to maybe discourage them taking up all the spaces
Norfolk Road	Yes	If we knew we could always get in and out of the driveway due to reduced parking on the street we would only need to park one car on street. My tenants at 4 adjacent properties would be able to have residents permits as part of their contracts.
Norfolk Road	Yes	There is a lot of opposition to this from other streets but I think Norfolk Road really needs it.
Hyde park terrace	Yes	I have recently been in hospital due home today I completed my disabled bay application weeks ago so I will bring the application to howden house on Tuesday in person so hopefully can get it sorted
Castle Croft Drive	Yes	
Fitzwalter Road	Yes	
Castle Croft drive	Yes	
Castle croft drive	Yes	
Norfolk Park Avenue	Yes	Great idea!
Shrewsbury Hospital, S2	Yes	I put yes to continuing to park in Park Hill if I had to pay. This is because where I live does not allow many cars to park here overnight including mine. I find it useful at present to continue to own a car as I do some work for a charity for which a car is useful as well as other more personal reasons.  Not sure how this would work for visitors.

Where do you live?	Do you support the introduction of a controlled parking scheme in Park Hill? - Support	Please use the space below for any further comments you may have
Norfolk Park	No/object	I agree with a parking scheme, but not the proposed parking scheme. I believe every household should have a free parking scheme, which permits for extra vehicles being charged at a higher rate.
Norfolk road	No/object	
Norfolk road	No/object	I am against this scheme, having previously lived in sharrow where this scheme was implemented, it did not resolve any parking problems instead it just cost more and more in permits and vouchers with a year on year increase in these costs.
Granville road	No/object	I object to these proposals as a resident in the area.
Granville Road, South Yorkshire, South	No/object	I am a resident who does not support this scheme. I have never had any problem parking/finding a space and I cannot afford a parking permit for 2 cars just to park outside my house
Castlecroft Drive	No/object	I support some aspects of the scheme. However, I believe the parking should be restricted to residents only. This will be the only way to remove commuter parking. I also believe residents should not have to buy a permit for the first vehicle. If they need an additional permit that could come with a charge. Pay and display will not reduce the commuter parking or make the roads safer. Castlecroft croft drive should double yellow lines.
Granville road	No/object	This seems to be easier a money making plan by the council. Or racism towards the taxi drivers that live locally. It is definitely not for the benefit of the area or the residents. It also seems to be very undemocratic. For example- sinead keeps telling us it was suggested by residents for residents but refuses to give firther information. The postcard and the survey suggest different tomes- one of them has to be inaccurate. Furthermore, it will make the green space of Norfolk Park less accessible.
Granville Road	No/object	We DO NOT need parking control we have never had an issue and have been living in the same house for over 43 years.
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	Parking permits are totally useless and does not help with parking in the community at all. I am totally against this idea and would make me leave the area
Norfolk Road	No/object	I am against the proposal. The postcard we received states mon-fri 8am - 6:30pm but on this survey it is 7 days a week 8-8:30. Which one is it then? Totally ridiculous to be giving residents false information
S2	No/object	I never had any issues for parking I live on Seabrook Road s2
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	My mum is elderly and i pop in to check on her daily and help with any tasks that need doing.

Park hill	No/object	
Norfolk road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	I don't object altogether, I understand the issues that people have parking near their homes in certain roads, and appreciate that I am very lucky to not have problems - but I have concerns that it will impact the local community in a very negative way.
Park Grange Croft	No/object	<p>With the exception of South Street Kitchen in the Park Hill flats complex I'm not aware of any other businesses likely to be affected by a current lack of parking. The roads next to my home are not overly congested, they are not bus routes and traffic is not impeded by the current parking arrangement. I have no trouble finding a parking space and my friends/ family have no trouble parking.</p> <p>I strongly object to the introduction of paid parking/ a paid residents permit scheme. The council state that the proposed parking zone is intended to help local residents and businesses. As a local resident I don't find it helpful to have to pay for a parking permit. This is a blatant cash grab from a council looking to exploit local residents and businesses by making us pay for something that we currently do not need to pay for.</p>
Granville road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Barnes court	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	No not see any issues in the present parking and unsure to why this needs to be controlled. With the standard of living increasing adding additional unnecessary costs can be avoided. I have never had an issue parking my car or my house household has had no issues. So I don't this this measure needs to be placed.
Norfolk Park	No/object	I don't own a car. But we have visitors every now and then driving from Leeds, Newcastle etc. It is a massive inconvenience for family and friends who can't afford to pay to park outside our home. This will isolate us even further.
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	Do not make families struggle further than they already do!
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	This is very shocking that we need to pay for parking outside our homes. The area which you have selected contributes to where residence live and need to park their cars outside their homes.
Norfolk Road	No/object	I live on norfolk road
Norfolk park	No/object	Completely disagree with the idea!



S2 area	No/object	what sort of question was 27 ....
S2	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
Park Grange Croft	No/object	We're in one of the most deprived areas, you can't keep squeezing the poor for more and more money. It's literally not a, problem, back off.
Norfolk road	No/object	
Norfolk road	No/object	
S2	No/object	It's unfair to make residents pay. If you introduce parking permits then it should be free to people who can prove they live there
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville rd	No/object	
325 granville road sheffield s2 2rq	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	I am against this fully.
Granville road	No/object	S2 2RT I object to this proposal as it puts more of a financial burden upon people that are already struggling financially. I also do not see an issue with parking and have never had an issue with parking on Granville road and i have been living here for 25years. Therefore i do not think there is a need for this proposal to be put in place.
Norfolk park road	No/object	
S2	No/object	
Norfolk park	No/object	This is just creating issues unnecessarily, the people that park in this area do so mainly because there is nowhere affordable to park for work. If it was to become so that there was no free parking I'm sure people would start to look for employment elsewhere
Sheffield	No/object	This should not be happening
Granville Road	No/object	
Norfolk park	No/object	Unfair to make redirects pay to park where they live
Granville Road	No/object	
Park Hill flats	No/object	I strongly object to this scheme. I would have to get rid of my car as I cannot afford the ridiculous scheme.
Granville road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	I pay council tax, Road tax etc. I don't see why I or my family when they come to visit me should pay for parking. This is totally unfair. I clearly object and so do all my neighbours
Granville Road	No/object	If we need to purchase a permit, can it be one that is not tethered to a vehicle registration number so that it can be given to friends and family when they visit?

Granville Road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Norfolk Park	No/object	The consultation does not allow for all members of the local area to easily assess plans or be involved
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	Absolutely disgusting making money off the working class who just abojt have enough to pay bills. This is completely unnecessary and a money making scheme for the council!!!! S22rr
Granville Road	No/object	I don't want to have to pay to park on the road where I live. I appreciate that there are certain roads where it is difficult during the day but the scheme is far too wide reaching and will mean some people will struggle to afford to park. Although there are 3 vehicles registered to my house often there are only one or two parked at one time. The parking issues are not just during the weekdays but also in evenings when there is an event at Bramhall Lane. There are people who park on the pavements and no tickets are given out. I am not convinced that the scheme will be policed to ensure compliance. I also think it could potentially create less parking available which would increase the problem. I should be grateful if this ridiculous idea could be stopped as it is to satisfy a small number of people who are very vocal about their issues. It is a real case of a sledgehammer to crack a nut. My objections are based on cost, inconvenience, lack of ongoing support, silly times (too early and too late) as something in the middle section of the day would prevent all day parking, too widespread, less potential spaces to park and the cost if permits is high. They should be free but I would still object to the scheme of it was free
Granville Road	No/object	It is absolutely stupid to do this I don't agree with this at all
Norfolk park	No/object	I strongly disagree with the controlled parking as there will be a cost related to this for residents. I do not wish to pay for a permit for each vehicle i own.
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	I disagree with this permit altogether
288 Granville Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	I would like to add further I have lived on Granville road my entire 29 years of life, and I have never had any issues with parking since I have been driving. I think it is unfair that you are enforcing a permit only area on a road outside my own home, I should not have to pay to park outside my own home which my family own and all pay road tax. Please reconsider your enforcement
Belmonte Gardens	No/object	I don't see why I should have to pay to park where I live. Shouldn't residents get a free permit. Technically where I park is informal private residents but it is unclear whether I would still end up being charged.

Claywood road	No/object	I think making people pay for parking around their own home is ridiculous as my household specifically chose this area to live as we would all be able to park due to not being restricted to 2/3 parking permits
Castle Croft Drive	No/object	Further to previous ideas of simply having signs at each entrance to this Estate ... as nearly EVERY household has only ONE parking place, and with the pressures of work etc. families often need 2 cars, IF Residents ONLY parking signs and with simply a 'one off' pass or passes, that residents can pay for, households are NOT further penalised for living here! and they can pay for extra 'one off' passes for their friends and family, so important always, and especially post pandemic. This would make life MUCH EASIER for everyone ... AND cost the Council LESS as not having to police, plus send out letters of penalty etc etc ... or get new books of tickets issued every year. It would also mean that if there was a special occasion like a special birthday, it would be possible for additional visitors to come with crippling the hosts financially and causing huge worry.
S2	No/object	
norfolk road	No/object	The prices are stupid. I'm not paying to park on my own road. Find a better solution than charging people to use it. Invest in the area and in better parking in the city centre so people don't park up in the area to walk into town.
Granville Road, granville road	No/object	First a couple of questions: Are the hours until 8:30pm as it says on the website or 630pm as it says on the leaflet? Can we buy more than 2 permits? Will the whole area have the option for people to pay and display? Can we still park across our own drive? I can't see the benefit of the scheme. We don't have a problem with commuters. If it is purely to reduce commuters the hours do not need to be as long and residents should be able to get as many permits as they need at a minimal cost or for free. The main roads that are affected by commuter parking may see a reduction in this but the problem is just moved elsewhere. As more people are working from home more residents have cars that don't move during the day. Even if I was to drive to work I would be home before the end of the time and so still need a permit.
S2	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	I've been a resident of Norfolk Road for over 30 years and strongly object to having to pay to park outside my own home. This scheme will also negatively impact our local community and businesses.
Sheffield	No/object	Introducing paid parking around the area, will impact of the amount of cars which already park their to use services such as the college, school and NHS facility's. Many of which will be staff, resulting in staff having to also park their cars in order to commute to work. In some cases individuals commute to work and have no option but to drive, meaning they would be forced to pay the parking charges. Which long term could also impact them financially and the buildings it surrounds, which could also result in individuals having no choice but to find a different job.
Granville road	No/object	
Park Grange Croft	No/object	Pay & Display parking for none residents is fine, but levying a charge on residents to get a permit is wrong. Permits for residents should be free
Granville Road	No/object	I don't think charges applied to house holders is the way forward. Instead there should be more affordable parking in the city centre. Also, the local school staff take lots of parking spaces everyday. It is the number of cars per household that is the issue.
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	I will have to look to locate else where if this is going to occur
Granville road	No/object	
S2	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	I personally couldn't afford an additional payment for a parking permit currently. Especially as I live in a house share with 3 others so how is it fair that some of us would have to obtain the more expensive permit after the first?
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville rd	No/object	Can i say why it just says park hill but whole of norfolk park in included. I initially thought it was just park hill. There are so many things which are misleading eg the timing and day. People will literally think just park hill and not realise that thier area is included.

Granville road	No/object	Everything else is currently being put up, tax, bills etc. and you are now thinking of making us pay to park outside my home. We are a house share of individuals that are not well paid and the permit is a ridiculous amount especially as we have four cars. I think this is ridiculous and I do not see why it is suddenly needed as there is currently no problems with parking.
Granville road	No/object	
Norfolk park	No/object	No one should have to pay to park outside their own homes - the residents need a FOC permit pass as this is totally unacceptable !!
talbot street	No/object	i strongly object to this parking scheme i live in this area and have family park who stop overnight some weeks . why are you even thinking of doing this? its not wanted, why are you trying to upset us all? just because 2 people have complained.
Granville Road Sheffield	No/object	
Granville Road Sheffield	No/object	
Granville Road Sheffield	No/object	
Norfolk road	No/object	
Norfolk Rd	No/object	The parking in and around Norfolk Park is not so much a problem. It's what you would expect being so close to town. Speeding is much worse.
Granville Road	No/object	There are no problems with parking on Granville road or most of the area on the proposed parking scheme. Most commuters park on Norfolk Road to walk to the train station, The majority of residents on Norfolk Road have access to off street parking so I don't see the issue, I don't think there should be a permit scheme in this area because the residents mainly can't afford it, and even if one was needed it should be limited to the parts of the area with parking issues. For example the bottom of Granville road is quite busy due to the schools and colleges, but where we are at the top of is not and there is no issue with parking
Sheffield	No/object	
Park Hill	No/object	Park Hill residents should not be charged to park in Park Hill. If you want to charge visitors, that's fine.
Granville	No/object	
Castle Croft Drive	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Castle Croft drive	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	Schemes like this just displace parking, rather than reduce them. Introducing something like this would just move all the same cars further up the hill towards the Manor
Granville Rd	No/object	If the issue is about those outside parking in residential areas, why not build a multi storey car park rather than forcing residents to pay for parking. We will now be out of pocket just buy living in the area. In your proposal we will have to pay annual fees. What happens when friends/family visit our contractors need to park outside our houses?
Park hill	No/object	I would park and not pay and not pay the fines either - hopefully my prison sentence would be another embarrassment for the council like the tree fiasco

Fitzwalter Road	No/object	<p>Parking is not a real issue for us. You would provide a great disservice to our community through this scheme - especially those among us who are already vulnerable. Please don't isolate residents so that you can raise a few thousand pounds.</p> <p>Making it harder to visit Sheffield will inevitably effect business and the cultural life of our city. Please don't ruin our city centre for a few thousand pounds!</p> <p>This is a thinly veiled scheme to raise taxes surreptitiously and an attempt to force drivers to use the over-priced car parks (that are mostly empty).</p> <p>Instead, represent our community by addressing our real concerns. Traffic Calming is a serious issue. Because there is no left turn from Granville Road on to Duke Street, Fitzwalter Road (a small residential street) is misused by traffic. We suffer continually from damage to our cars and the threat to our children as they try to cross the road.</p>
Park Hill	No/object	<p>I am a resident, I live at Crown Place I pay my Council Tax, I pay my car tax why do I have to pay outside my house???</p> <p>I am a disabled person why do I have to pay to park outside my house??</p>
20 PARK GRANGE CROFT	No/object	<p>We don't have any problems with parking on Park Grange Croft. Even when football is on at Bramhall lane, it is only busy for a couple of hours. Putting in a parking charge would only make it difficult for residents and they're visitors who will have to now pay.</p> <p>It seems like a money making scheme by Sheffield council with no real justification.</p>
Talbot Crescent	No/object	The hourly and daily charges are a lot if it was for a visitor. Rather than being charged to park on the road there should be the ability to also get visitors permits when you pay for the resident permit.
Norfolk road	No/object	If the scheme went ahead I think it should start at 9am and finish at 6pm
Castle Croft Drive	No/object	<p>I don't park on park hill, so probs doesn't effect me.. I live on castle Croft Drive that people use to park.</p> <p>Again overall it isn't that bad, I wouldn't be happy if I had to pay for a yearly permit to park my own vehicle outside my own house.</p>
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Park Hill Flats, South Street	No/object	<p>The proposed hourly rate for the street parking is more than the hourly rate for the SIP Park Hill car park. This means that hourly people will fill up our car park because it's the cheaper option.</p> <p>The situation as it is, is fine and we don't see any reason to complicate things by introducing this scheme.</p>
Shrewsbury Hospital, Norfolk road	No/object	<p>I can't park on Shrewsbury hospital estate and people visiting me can't park on the estate.</p> <p>My relatives would find the parking fees prohibitive and would be forced to reduce or stop their visits altogether. I am seriously concerned about the impact this will have on my own, already frail, mental health.</p> <p>The hospital trustees have recently introduced a rule stating that there will be no parking allowed on the site at all.</p> <p>I would like you to get the Shrewsbury hospital to allow daytime parking again.</p>
22 Talbot Street	No/object	
Norfolk Park	No/object	
Talbot Street	No/object	<p>I live here so where else would you want me to park?</p> <p>The council has obviously lost the plot</p>
Norfolk Park Road	No/object	I think it would be extremely unfair to charge people to park on Norfolk Park Road when most are visiting the park or the hospital or going to college. Resident parking is not needed on this road
Park Hill Flats	No/object	

Norfolk Park Drive	No/object	I really don't agree with this, the cost of living is going up, its the wrong time and the wrong way. People are going to try and park on small streets like ours at Norfolk Park Drive and then I'm guessing that will be made into pay to park. I know money is tight for the council but there has to be other ways but its really scary right now wondering what this year is going to hold for us all, I just don't think this is the right time. If its to address the issue of the environment/car use then surely making public transport better, bringing it back into public control would be the first step - more buses etc, more reasonable and reliable services, then look at charging for car parking. In the past, my partner has been fined for having to park temporarily on a yellow on our own street as he had to nip back home to sort something before going back to work and that was bad enough. I hope you reconsider this proposal. Please email with updates or if not our postal address is: 20 Norfolk Park Drive S2 3QG.
Norfolk park	No/object	
Castle Croft Drive	No/object	
Parkhill	No/object	I'm a housing association resident of parkhill. With the high rents and already high hearing cost. The parking scheme is another expense I can barely afford. For me what would be a good idea is to mark the parking areas so people park with more consideration
Page 134	No/object	Farm Bank Road has 8 houses, many have no drive or a single drive. The road is also used for parking by residents of Granville Road whose houses (and drives) back onto Farm Bank Road.
		Parking is generally fine and not a problem.
Farm Bank Road	No/object	I have seen the proposals. I would guess that it means around six cars can park on the street at any one time, which is not enough for the people who live here. I also don't understand why the parking is on that side of the road when the other side has fewer drives and so more space to put in bays.  If we are only going to have six bays (or fewer) I do not want this to go ahead. There would be no where for us to park and we wouldn't have parking available for visitors either.
Granville Road, South Yorkshire	No/object	I am 82, my children and grandchildren visit me and my wife regularly. This permit scheme is a ridiculous money making scheme, there are no parking issues in 80% of the area covered by the map. This will reduce the number of visitors I get as I am bed bound and unable to visit them. Do something useful instead
Norfolk park	No/object	We don't have any problem on our road for parking none of us residents do. And we can't afford to pay for 2 parking tickets at the prices they are. They should get cheaper or be free for the residents that have no issues at the moment. Making money from the residents to try and solve issues that may be on the other roads doesn't seem appropriate. Making money from the pay machines should be enough
Norfolk rd	No/object	I live on Norfolk rd. I would not be happy to pay for a permit. My vehicle is too large to fit on the drive. The parking scheme proposed would not deter commuter parking and would only serve to disadvantage residents.
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	

Norfolk Road	No/object	<p>Although there is a problem with non resident parking, I don't think charging residents to park outside their houses is a good idea. It seems that a inconvenient parking is is being turned into a way of making money by the council.</p> <p>Cars parking on both sides of our road in combination with cars speeding is for me the real problem. It's possibly only a matter of time before someone gets injured. However the speeding problem is being ignored. A 20 mile an hour zone is the priority, not a parking zone.</p>
Norfolk Park	No/object	<p>This is going to make visiting and caring for my elderly parents increasing difficult</p>
Fitzwalter Road	No/object	<p>This scheme will have a negative impact. The general consensus is that there aren't parking problems in this area, yes there are commuters along norfolk and adjacent roads but this has never affected our ability to park on our road. Occasionally the area becomes busy with cars when a football match is on but this is outside of the proposed hours anyway - and when that does happen we can still park close to our home.</p> <p>Many people won't be able to afford parking, it affects visitors and carers - e.g our parents who are pensioners do 2-3 days childcare a week and would add a financial weight for them, and with the designated bays there will actually be less room to park on the street, so parking may actually become a problem for us on this road.</p> <p>It may also result in some people choosing to convert their front gardens into parking spaces which isn't good for wildlife / is unsightly so less green footprint.</p> <p>People may move out of the area to avoid paying to park outside their own homes, it's a hassle, unaffordable for many, and isn't the aim to improve this area and make it more desirable?</p> <p>The issues WE DO have however in this area are speeding and break-ins (on Norfolk Road). Traffic calming measures and a 20 mph limit would help improve speed and cctv cameras on the quiet end of Norfolk Road.</p>
Sheffield	No/object	<p>Would We continue to park if we had to pay...have we a choice or offer all our men wheelbarrows to carry their ladders around like generations before</p> <p>It's all about money in this non caring generation, perhaps soon we won't be able to afford the diesel anyway. The only people happy about this is those who gain the tax on everything...more goes to more springs to mind,</p>
Shrewsbury Estate	No/object	
Fitzwalter Road	No/object	<p>This proposal is an absolute outrage, yet another attempt for the council take money from those that actually need it.</p> <p>Those that live in affluent areas, that have private drives or are further out of town are not effected, yet the those that aren't in such privileges positions/areas are scrutinised for their respective predicaments.</p> <p>It's terrible!</p>
Granville Road	No/object	<p>I would have to continue to park in this area if I was unable to park on my drive as I have no alternative.</p> <p>I object to these changes because I do not feel they are necessary in this area and it feels like they would only penalise residents who live here; the only road I have observed having lots of cars parked on it is the bottom of Norfolk Road and the majority of these houses have drives on which residents can park their cars.</p> <p>Even on match days I do not notice that many cars are parked on the streets.</p> <p>It is difficult not to think that these proposals are solely a money-making scheme by the council as I am unable to see the benefit for the majority of residents.</p>
Granville Road	No/object	<p>Have to park outside my house where else can I go. To pay to park outside my own home is not fair. Paid for my house now pay to park outside.</p> <p>We have no problem with parking on our road. I park on holdings road as my house is corner house</p>

Fitzwalter Road	No/object	<p>I feel that appropriate parking should be provided for the community resources like the Sheffield College, the Railway station, Town Centre as well as smaller projects like the community centres, library and post office so that people accessing these do not need to park on the residential roadside.</p> <p>Local greener alternatives to commuting by car need to really be encouraged to make park and ride, public transport, electric car charging parks, electric taxis all really efficient and affordable so as to decrease car usage rather than encourage it.</p> <p>I understand that where people are elderly, immobile or have young children etc they do need thier individual transport and need to be able to park near where they live.</p> <p>I do not want a street with extra street furniture of ticket machines and prohibitive notices.</p> <p>Currently my family do not generally have a problem parking nearby when they visit; having less bays and having to pay to visit parents and grandparents seems very unfair and currently unnecessary.</p>
Park Grange Croft	No/object	I strongly appose the new parking scheme . if all the derelict garages were removed there would be ample parking for everyone
Shrewsbury Hospital (Almshouses)	No/object	<p>If the scheme was introduced, we would have no choice but to pay. My wife is a blue badge holder, and we are concerned about accessibility of spaces for her. Shrewsbury Hospital only has access from one side, so a parking scheme might cause longer walks, reducing accessibility for us. Shrewsbury Hospital is home to many vulnerable adults with varied access needs, and we are concerned that the parking scheme will provide additional barriers to them for participating in life in the community. Furthermore, accessing permits online is a barrier to us - we have had assistance at Park Library to use this online feedback form, as we could not access online services ourselves.</p>
Norfolk Road,, Norfolk Road	No/object	I would have to park in Park Hill as I live there I object to having to pay to park in front of my own house. The new scheme restricts the number of parking spaces available as there would be double yellow lines preventing us from parking in front of our own house.
Norfolk Road, Norfolk Road	No/object	<p>We have complained before about the number of cars parking on Norfolk Road and the difficulties of driving down the road during the working day, when there is only one car width - so some solution would be very welcome. However, allowing non-residents to pay for all-day parking would probably not deter anyone and therefore not change the situation. It would be better to have maybe a 3-hour limit or much better as in other parts of the city some parking areas designated for permit holders only. It seems contradictory to get residents (if this is meant to be helpful to us) to pay for a permit and not guarantee a spot. I would be happy to pay for a permit if this were the case.</p> <p>We have a pull-in in front of our house, which people do not usually block so we can use the pull-in and allow a visitor to park on the road in front of that. Were there to be yellow lines across our pull-in, this would prevent us parking there or allowing visitors to do so - therefore counter-productive - making the situation even worse.</p> <p>In addition, the installation of pay and display machines, double yellow lines and (to some extent) parking signs would visually pollute our conservation area,</p>
Norfolk Park Road	No/object	<p>Staff have raised serious concerns about not being able to afford to pay for parking and that this will strongly influence their choice to work at SPARC. We already have challenges with staff recruitment and retention here and ability to park close to the unit is a major factor for staff working here. Some of our staff are on low income and the cost of parking would reduce their daily pay</p> <p>The NHS is facing unprecedented challenges with staff leaving the profession so inability to park, feeling unsafe commuting further or extra costs is just another blow to staff morale and feeling valued and will create a risk to our service of not being able to staff it adequately</p>
Norfolk Park	No/object	I would have to keep parking and end up paying because I live there!!! I work from home most days so my car is outside my house. There is zero problem with people parking here and walking into town - this is just a money making exercise from the council



Fitzwalter road	No/object	
Park Hill	No/object	
Park Grange Croft	No/object	I understand the need for a parking scheme but worry about what it will mean for residents. We already have permit based parking and there is currently no information provided as to whether we would have to pay for new permits under this scheme. If we did I would object strongly to the scheme.
Castle Croft Drive	No/object	The scheme doesn't benefit me because the restrictions are only at certain times of the day when I am at work.
Granville Road	No/object	This scheme will only be worth implementing if it applies to match days too. This really disrupts the road we live on.
Park Hill flats	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	Weekday parking means i am unable to use my car during periods of peak rail station/town centre uses for free parking due to its proximity to both uses. Other residents without off street spaces..to find on street parking (my property has retained its front garden and is one of only a couple without off street car parking).the proposal across the front of xx Norfolk Road is far reduced on its current length between the existing disabled on-street parking bay for property noxx and the H-bar driveway marking at property number xx which has adequately protected the associated turning vehicle movements for as long as it has been installed.there is no purpose with the current proposal and an objection is raised unless satisfactory revised nil-detriment on-street arrangements with the double yellow line restriction to commence at a distance consistent with the extent of existing white H bar road markings across the
Norfolk Road	No/object	The proposed parking scheme does nothing to alleviate the problem of parking on both sides of Norfolk Road. Therefore, the scheme fails to address the safe access of vehicles onto Norfolk Road from private driveways, or the speed of vehicles along Norfolk Road.  The parking bay outside 44a,b,c combined with the parking bay on the other side of the road will continue to prevent vehicles safely turning right out of our shared driveway onto Norfolk Road.  Norfolk Road is a historic conservation area that will be spoilt by parking meters and associated signage.  Some parking restrictions are necessary to improve safety on Norfolk Road. However, I am opposed to a paid for parking scheme that further prevents access to the City centre, the local parks and amphitheater. I believe this parking scheme will add to the damage done to the economic prosperity of the City centre and particularly the retail sector by the Council's excessive parking charges. These type of parking charges only push people to shop at Meadowhall rather than the City centre. (I write as someone who is privileged to live close to the City Centre, has little need of street parking, and is not involved in retail.)
S2	No/object	
103 fitzwalter road	No/object	
Norfolk Park Road	No/object	
Belmonte Gardens	No/object	Q27 is invidious. Residents would have no choice, but a Yes answer could be taken as approval for the scheme. I am therefore reluctant to answer it. Making it impossible to move on without an answer is unhelpful.

Farm Bank Road	No/object	
Farm Bank Road	No/object	
Chaplains House Shrewsbury Hospital	No/object	<p>Does your proposed scheme have a financial motive?</p> <p>The soon to be implemented CAZ for the centre of Sheffield will I imagine reduce the demand for and therefore revenue from parking in the centre. By extending the charging area under your Parkhill and other schemes do you hope to recoup that lost revenue?</p> <p>Is this why your proposed parking scheme, has not considered a solely residents only parking scheme? A residents parking only scheme (with permission badges for visitors), a low cost and simple solution adopted by other authorities to combat city centre users clogging up neighbouring residential areas.</p> <p>The CAZ scheme will undoubtedly exacerbate the parking situation in the area immediately above the railway station and extend non-residential parkers into other areas further up City Road and Granville Road. Does this explain why the Parkhill scheme includes areas which at present don't have a particular parking problem?</p> <p>Chaplains House Shrewsbury Hospital Norfolk Road Sheffield S22SU</p>
Park Hill Flats	No/object	
Park Hill	No/object	<p>Please stop saying that this is wanted by the residents, there is nothing to be gained by us, this is obviously pushed by certain interests and not by those living and/or working here. You are trying to frame this as a solution to an imaginary "issue", no change is needed, leave everything as it is - free for everyone to use.</p> <p>Also the questions jumped from 9. to 26. I felt like you don't want me to answer the questions, since I am against the "scheme".</p>

		<p>Our parking problems around Park Hill are in relation to free on-street availability during working hours (9am - 5pm). Our staff cannot afford to pay for private parking due to the unaffordable tariffs in place, nor can the small business we run afford the very limited on-site parking for staff who commute.</p> <p>Our business is based at Park Hill and as this becomes more populated, we believe residents and business employees around the site and connected roads should be prioritised and not penalised with further costs. Attention also needs to be paid towards future of Park Hill flats. The proposed zoning plans will negatively impact the area - making it harder to live, work and visit the flats that will hopefully become a destination for the people of Sheffield. Urban Splash + Sheffield Council have a vested interest in this area and shouldn't be adding further charges to residents who cannot afford permits via zoning. Two further sections of the Park Hill flats are still pre-development and accounting for future people and vehicles needs careful consideration, nearer the time. These zoning plans are in our opinion two or three years too early.</p> <p>I would also like to add that many workers, residents and visitors rely on their cars as a means of supporting their careers and their families, and adding further costs and stresses at such a difficult time for many people already battling rising council tax, interest rates, fuel costs, and general living costs would be unreasonable.</p> <p>I would support a scheme that allows for residents and businesses to park in close proximity to Park Hill for free. Heavily restricting on-street parking during day hours would be short-sighted and damaging for local businesses, local residents, community feeling and city centre footfall. Charges for access and visitors in the future needs careful consideration, but only once Park Hill is fully occupied.</p>
South Street, Park Hill	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	I do support the scheme, but not in this form. I don't see why there need be double yellows over drives? there doesn't appear to be enough spaces? There's only one in front of our house and we have one car and my partners Amey works van.
Park Hill	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	Residents who have lived in the area for many many years should not have to pay at meters or for parking permits to park outside their own homes, it is another money making scheme from the council many areas are controlled zones now in sheffield and its making it very difficult for people to park making it very frustrating
Norfolk Road	No/object	Complete money grab by the council.
Park Grange Croft	No/object	
Norfolk Road	No/object	
Norfolk park road	No/object	I would have to pay if my private car park was full. I shouldn't have to pay to park my car outside my own property
Park hill	No/object	Please don't implement the scheme. It's not fair on us residents!
Granville road	No/object	I'm totally against the scheme. I don't want my friends or family paying to come and visit me

Granville road	No/object	I should not pay to park outside my own house. It's not fair for homeowners to pay outside there own home. I do NOT allow SCC to devalue my home with the new purposed permit scheme.
Granville road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Park hill	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Norfolk Park	No/object	
farm bank road	No/object	you will be forcing the problem into further areas and adding additional pressure to people who are already struggling. find the money else where to line your pockets.
Park Hill Flats	No/object	My concern about the parking scheme is that those of us who live in Park Hill flats will not be eligible and that this will put even more pressure and stress on us in terms of parking as more people will want to park around the flats if they cannot park on the surrounding roads. There are more and more people moving to the area and less and less places to park. There is a wider problem with public transport becoming more expensive and less reliable meaning more and more people are wanting to drive and park near the city centre which makes it harder and harder for residents living in the Park Hill area. I would like to see a more comprehensive solution to the transport problems and the crime problems meaning vehicles are not secure. There is also insufficient secure parking for motorbikes and bicycles and so people are discouraged from having and using these and instead use cars,
Norfolk rd	No/object	The parking is fine and I don't want permits introduced.
Norfolk Park Drive	No/object	With regard to question 27 there needs to be another option ... I'd have to as I live here!  I think the parking scheme is ridiculous. I live near the tram stop and college and the people parking in the area for work/education does not effect me getting a space for my car at all. Any parking charging scheme will effect my friends and family visiting me, paying for parking and the limit on time. The cost also feels like an additional tax that I really can't afford.
Norfolk Park	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	WE WILL NOT BE PAYING A PENNY! towards this extornionate plan, if it is implemeted the charges will be deducted from my road and council tax! This is a product of Sheffield city councils balls up of the town centre, pointless one way streets / no parking zones / bus and taxi only lanes / blocking streets off for no reason (Devonshire street) I'm sure people who need mobility vehicles to get out and about must love you for that, half of the city centre is now inaccessible to them. It's because of these dimwitted decisions by the council that the city centre is dying. Then again I guess some over paid, under worked somebody has to jusitfy their job.  Where do you expect people who work in town to park without paying extortionate parking charges?. You've chased them out of town into our areas and now want to charge us for parking outside our own homes and your cock ups, no thanks!

		<p>I am very angry about the proposed parking scheme we are an elderly couple who no longer drive and not very mobile. We rely on family and close friends to visit and provide some much needed close interaction especially with our young grandchildren, niece's and nephew's. The majority of our family and friends live outside of the proposed parking scheme. I would feel very guilty knowing that they would have to pay for parking everytime they visited. I wouldn't like to burden them with extra costs at a time when household bills and food prices are rising. I feel this parking scheme is a very bad thing to happen in my area.</p> <p>I also feel the parking scheme will also affect the amount of people who visit Norfolk park for some much needed long walks/relaxation and well-being.</p> <p>I feel very sad about this parking scheme and is making me very anxious.</p>
Norfolk Road	No/object	Please reject this parking scheme.
Granville Road,	No/object	
		<p>I object to the parking scheme as it would make parking near my workplace near impossible.</p> <p>I work unsociable hours which can mean starting work between 4am and 7am in the morning or working through the night until lunchtime on essential gritting works during the winter months.</p> <p>due to the nature of the business i do need to use my vehicle for work purposes which means public transport is not fees able</p> <p>There are no current problems with parking on fitzwalter road , All staff members can park on the estate and this still allows for parking for business customers also.</p> <p>All business owners are courteous to each other</p>
norfolk park	No/object	It also needs to be taken into account that businesses on this estate need to allow also for customer parking.
		<p>Details should be given as to how residents like me Living in Belmonte Gardens, can apply for visitor permits for essential trades people attending to essential maintenance work/ deliveries. Visitor permits for Medical Assistants &amp; Friends visiting me.</p> <p>If construction work is taking place how do I apply for a permit to place a skip placed in this layby.</p>
Belmonte Gardens	No/object	
		<p>I work at a local business on fitzwalter road , and have done so for many years. I dont have issues parking at my workplace,</p> <p>I work unsociable hours which mean the being able to park close by to work is a priority for my safety.</p> <p>I do essential works accross schools and care facilities</p>
fitzwalter road	No/object	Local businesses will suffer immensely if this parking scheme was brought in.
fitzwalter road	No/object	
Park Grange Croft SHEFFIELD	No/object	
Fitzwalter Road, Sheffield, S2 2SP	No/object	Myself and 300 members will be against the parking restrictions and will do everything in our power to fight it.

		<p>If parking permits are introduced in the proposed zone Parkhill Estate residents will be unduly affected. There are too few street spaces; as we cannot park on the majority of Duke St. during the peak hours and potentially won't be eligible for a resident's permit on other zonal roads. Which road would Parkhill residents be able to park on?</p> <p>There is a clear disparity between the annual cost of a parking permit through the proposed Parking Zone circa. £47 to £94 per annum for residents in the wider area; versus the cost of parking as a resident at either of the two carparks at Parkhill Estate circa. £600-750 per annum, which does not guarantee a space to Parkhill residents either (which is absurd).</p> <p>I would hope the Council will give consideration to this specific issue during the parking zone consultation. As this scheme could potentially leave present and 'future' Parkhill Estate residents even less options to park within a reasonable walking distance of their home. With the future development of the estate this problem will increase.</p>
Parkhill, Gilbert, South St.	No/object	
Norfolk road	No/object	
GRANVILLE ROAD	No/object	<p>While I believe the parking scheme is beneficial to deter the non-residents occupying as many spaces, I believe introduced paid permits for each household's cars is unnecessary. As I'm sure you can appreciate, we are currently experiencing a cost of living crisis with petrol and energy prices exceeding past records, for example. Many residents will be placed under significant financial strain from this already, therefore I believe it unjust to expect the additional costs of permits. I myself live in a rented household, and part of the decision to move into this property was the available parking, and no need for a permit. After the painful few years of complete isolation and reduced social contact due to covid that we all experienced, I believe most people are encouraging more visits from friends and family than ever. With the introduction of this scheme, this will also impact visitors, which is greatly unfair. I believe each house should be entitled to free permits, and visitor permits also. By the council placing fees associated with this scheme, it is clearly not just for the benefit of the residents, who may still not be able to park outside their homes, in spite of the permit. I appreciate the opportunity to share my views, but this scheme must be reconsidered.</p>
Norfolk Park	No/object	<p>This scheme is a joke all you are doing is causing parking problems on other roads, you will also make it difficult for people who live on some of these roads to park near their homes xx you have totally ignored the areas on Norfolk Park which are residents only parking, which are blocked every day by people parking and getting on the tram, or taking their kids to School and picking them up! Council are good at creating problems, but obviously no good at problem solving!</p>
Granville road	No/object	
Granville Road	No/object	
Granville road	No/object	
Norfolk Rd	No/object	<p>We have 3 children in wheelchairs and park our wheelchair adapted vehicle outside our home. We wouldn't park elsewhere and push our kids home. Whatever restrictions you decide to implement We would still need to do what we do. Our children are in end of life and we have many health professionals visit us often as well as social care professions. This will cost us such a lot in parking permits.</p> <p>We actually really like our street where the road surfaces are good and the heritage lights are nice. This will spoil it covering it with paint for parking bays.</p>



## Report to Policy Committee

**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** David Whitley,  
Transport Schemes Manager

**Tel:** 0114 205 3804

**Report of:** Kate Martin, Executive Director of City Futures  
**Report to:** *Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee*  
**Date of Decision:** *8<sup>th</sup> February 2023*  
**Subject:** City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? INSERT				
Has appropriate consultation taken place?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has a Climate Impact Assessment (CIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

### Purpose of Report:

The report provides information to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Change Policy Committee (TRCPC) on the proposals for £135m for schemes in Sheffield, outlined as part of the £570m allocated to South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) following the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS) submission.

The report will confirm the schemes that have been prioritised for investment and provide indicative proposals as well as alignment with policy objectives and strategic fit, outcome expectations, funding, risk and deliverability.

The CRSTS programme of works is large and complex and aims to provide a stepped change in sustainable travel by delivery of targeted interventions.

Due to inflation and construction price fluctuations arising from wider economic conditions it should be noted that the current programme will be subject to potential change. Should this be required, the TRCPC will be presented with appropriate update reports.

The outline CRSTS programme was approved as part of the bid submission process though the SYMCA Governance procedure, with the main schemes in Sheffield identified below;

- **Active Travel** - £20m for high quality cycle and walking networks, including a northern community package (including Northern General Hospital link) (£15m), cross city centre links (£5m)

- **Public Transport** – £39m for A61 Chesterfield Road (£11m), Upper Don Valley area (£15m) and Northern Communities to City Centre (£13m).
- **LaNTCP Block** – £18m to continue our ‘business as usual’ smaller scale transport schemes and support the transport elements of the Local Area Committee plans.
- **Mass Transit renewal (Supertram Contribution)** - £51m for the most immediate renewals of the tram network.
- **Transforming Cities Fund scheme completion** – £7m, a specific allocation was included in the CRSTS submission for the completion of Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) schemes; £5m of this funding is required for the Housing Zone North (HZN) project providing an active travel route linking Kelham/Neepsend to the City centre. The programmes have a shared goal to stimulate the economy by improving sustainable transport infrastructure; balancing finances within both programmes will maximise the benefits which can be achieved by both.

More detail of the schemes is included in section 1.9.

#### **Recommendations:**

*To:*

1. Approve the continuation of CRSTS scheme development detail in consultation with internal and external stakeholders,
2. Approve the current scheme allocations in section 1.9 in the programme (including £10.1m to enable the Chesterfield Road corridor to progress immediately through the SCC capital approval process)
3. Note that the £50,847,458 allocation for the tram renewal project will be delivered by SYMCA, with the value of the contribution having been agreed through the SYMCA governance process as part of the bid submission)
4. Note that SYMCA have been working with the DfT to see how to help manage CRSTS at a programme level, however, mechanisms for managing allocations between schemes are yet to be determined, including any local flexibility for this. It is proposed that any amendments to the CRSTS programme will be made through updates to this committee and SYMCA as appropriate.
5. Delegate the finalisation and submission of internal and external Business Cases for future schemes to the Head of Strategic Transport, Sustainability and Infrastructure in consultation with S151 officer and Chair(s) of TRCPC
6. Note that relevant projects will be submitted through the Council’s Capital approval process, managed through Strategy and Resources Policy committee
7. Approve the utilisation of £5.044m of CRSTS funding allocated for the completion of TCF projects, to support increased costs on the Transforming Cities Fund, Housing Zone North Scheme. This will be accommodated within the CRSTS programme.



## **Background Papers:**

Department for Transport (1 April 2022), Letter from the secretary of state for transport to the South Yorkshire Mayor, City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement Allocation for South Yorkshire. [CRSTS funding settlement letter for South Yorkshire, 1 April 2022 \(publishing.service.gov.uk\)](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1095632/Grant_Shapps_-_Oliver_Coppard_SYMCA_CRSTS_Delivery_Plan_redacted_accessible.pdf)

*Accessed on 17<sup>th</sup> August 2022*

Department for Transport (29 July 2022), Letter from the secretary of state for transport to the South Yorkshire Mayor, Finalised City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement for South Yorkshire.

[https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment\\_data/file/1095632/Grant\\_Shapps -](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1095632/Grant_Shapps_-_Oliver_Coppard_SYMCA_CRSTS_Delivery_Plan_redacted_accessible.pdf)

[\\_Oliver Coppard SYMCA CRSTS Delivery Plan redacted accessible.pdf](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1095632/Grant_Shapps_-_Oliver_Coppard_SYMCA_CRSTS_Delivery_Plan_redacted_accessible.pdf)

*Accessed 17 August 2022*

Department for Transport (29 July 2022), City Region Sustainable Transport Settlements: Annex A - Confirmed delivery plans and funding allocations,

[CRSTS Delivery Plans for City Regions -  
with retained schemes description additions.ods](https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/1095632/Grant_Shapps_-_Oliver_Coppard_SYMCA_CRSTS_Delivery_Plan_redacted_accessible.pdf)

*Accessed on 17 August 2022*

<b>Lead Officer to complete:-</b>		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.	Finance and Commercial: Damian Watkinson, Finance Manager <b>27<sup>th</sup> January 2023</b>
		Legal: Richard Cannon, Legal Services <b>27<sup>th</sup> January 2023</b>
		Equalities & Consultation: Ed Sexton Senior Equalities and Engagement Officer <b>25<sup>th</sup> January 2023</b>
		Climate: Jessica Rick <b>25<sup>th</sup> January</b>
	<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>	
2	<b>EMT member who approved submission:</b>	Kate Martin Executive Director of City Futures
3	<b>Committee Chair consulted:</b>	<i>Councillor Julie Grocutt, Deputy Leader of the Council and Co-Chair Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee</i>  <i>Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Co-Chair Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee</i>
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Committee by the EMT member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> Matthew Reynolds	<b>Job Title:</b> Transport Planning and Infrastructure Manager
	<b>Date:</b> 8 <sup>th</sup> February 2023	

## 1. PROPOSAL

### Background

- 1.1. The City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement (CRSTS) is the next instalment of major transport capital investment from the Department for Transport (DfT). Funding arrangements will follow the existing financial protocols, with the assurance and approval being primarily controlled by South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA).
- 1.2. The DfT has however decided to maintain control of some schemes with the regional programme, retaining the approval of these outside of the SYMCA process. Although none of these schemes have Sheffield City Council as the project sponsor, the inclusion of the Mass Transit (Supertram) project means that this project will be reliant on direct DfT approval. All engagement with the DfT on this project will be by SYMCA, although the City council will remain on the project team.
- 1.3. Scheme funding within the programme will be allocated to Local Authorities based on the submission of businesses cases, following the HM Treasury Green Book appraisal process to ensure value for money and alignment to South Yorkshire's strategic priorities.
- 1.4. In a letter sent by the Secretary of State for Transport, the DfT has confirmed that SYMCA will receive a total of £570m of capital investment for the region. The delivery period is for the next 5 years, with funding profiles outlined until the 2026/27 financial year, with spend expected to be completed by March 2027.
- 1.5. Funding is allocated at a programme level between the schemes included in the SYMCA's Delivery Plan which is referenced by the DfT in their funding letter. The City council's share of funding is approximately £135m

### The Programme

- 1.6. The eligible scheme criteria for CRSTS outlined that all submissions must follow the principles of the Levelling Up agenda, with transport as an enabler for economic transformation with a clear emphasis on sustainability. The bid guidance emphasised the need for bus priority schemes, high-quality cycling and walking infrastructure and local schemes for accident reduction and accessibility.
- 1.7. The following bullet points highlight the criteria of what the DfT were expecting to see in the SYMCA's bid:
  - **Investment in improving sustainable transport prioritised** – Public transport and active travel are the areas most in need of levelling up. Bids must show that they will further the objectives of the national bus and cycling and walking strategies, including ambitious bus and cycling priority measures.

- **Local road projects must also deliver or improve cycling and walking infrastructure** and include bus priority measures, unless it can be shown that there is little or no need to do so.
- Bids must propose a programme of investments that **reduce carbon and particulates**.
- **Modal shift plans are also strongly required:** proposals should show how they will encourage people to switch from cars to active travel and public transport.
- **Congestion and pollution measures will also be assessed positively;** proposals should show how they will tackle traffic congestion, promote the use of public transport and improve air quality.
- **Strength of the Strategic Case** - in some circumstances, such as adapting infrastructure to meet accessibility standards, proposals may not offer value for money but will be driven by a compelling strategic case.

1.8. The above points link strongly to the SYMCAs transport strategy and the City Council's Transport strategy (2019) too. The following actions are included in the City Council Transport strategy:

- **Securing the tram system:**
  - *'We will support.... the refurbishment and security of the existing Supertram system as part of the Department for Transport's Local Large Major Schemes programme (now included in CRSTS).*
- **Bus:**
  - *We will introduce additional bus priority, including new bus lanes on existing key bus routes, to not only protect buses from congestion but also to proactively improve bus journey times. This will help to cut operating costs and enable the provision of new and improved bus services. Other priority measures will include traffic signal control improvements, realigned to proactively speed up buses, rather than merely bringing late running buses back to timetable.*
  - *The 'mass transit' section of the strategy named the following corridors for exploration for 'high speed and high quality' mass transit routes:*
    - *The Upper Don Valley – with possible routes from Sheffield to Stannington, Wisewood, Stocksbridge and Grenoside;*
    - *From Chapeltown and High Green to Sheffield via Meadowhall, Northern General Hospital and/or Hillsborough;*
    - *Meadowhead to City (to support a potential park & ride site near Meadowhead Roundabout);*

- **Active Travel**

- *Sheffield will prioritise improvements in the areas where there is greatest opportunity for ordinary members of the public to cycle short trips into the city centre and where this would be instead of making car trips. The first priority will be the areas connecting the city centre with and suburbs in the Broomhill, Highfield, Sharrow and Nether Edge areas; development work on later priorities will continue in parallel.*
- *We will develop cycling proposals with local communities to serve not only the city's transport needs, but also the aspirations and needs of the city's people, including its disadvantaged communities. This will help us understand where best to provide for cycling in a manner that works for local people, meets objectives and is not unduly led by existing interests and so better supports congestion relief, accessibility and health outcomes.*
- *We will continue a programme of pedestrian accessibility improvements, providing improved footways and crossings to address local issues, in particular to improve access to local services and public transport.*

#### The Schemes, Approval and Delivery

- 1.9. The following are programmes of work in Sheffield currently included within the CRSTS programme;

##### **Active Travel Northern Communities (£16m)**

A series of scalable active travel network improvements connecting Sheffield City Centre with the Northern General Hospital (NGH), and onward to the surrounding communities. The project will seek to integrate with the bus corridors to provide a sustainable transport route to NGH and improved local access to district centres as well as strategic connections into the City and areas of high employment opportunities.

##### **Bus Priority – Northern Communities (£13m)**

A scalable bus improvement project which envisages to deliver bus priority along the A6135 corridor from Sheffield City Centre to northern communities of Chapeltown, Ecclesfield and Firth Park via the Northern General Hospital. The scheme will include the investigation of the major junctions on the route. There will also be an opportunity to improve connecting infrastructure such as bus stops, waiting restrictions and other traffic management opportunities which positively present themselves through consultation.

##### **Bus Priority – Upper Don Valley (£15m)**

A scalable bus improvement project which envisages to deliver bus priority along the A61 corridor from Sheffield City Centre to northern communities including Stannington, Wisewood and Grenoside. The scheme will include the investigation of the major junctions on Penistone Road and Halifax Road. There will also be an opportunity to improve connecting infrastructure such as bus stops, waiting restrictions and other

traffic management opportunities which positively present themselves through consultation.

**A61 Chesterfield Road – (£11m)**

A scalable bus improvement project which envisages to deliver bus priority along the A61 corridor from Meadowhead roundabout in the South to Sheffield city centre in the north, including development of park & ride options. There is limited highway space for major intervention, although pedestrian crossing points at key locations and bus priority improvements (bus lane operation and enforcement) will be considered on Chesterfield Rd to the junction with Broadfield Rd. There will also be an opportunity to improve connecting infrastructure such as bus stops, waiting restrictions and other traffic management opportunities which positively present themselves through consultation.

**Active Travel Cross City Connections (£5m)**

A series of scalable active travel network improvements which will plug the gaps within the City Centre to radial cycle links, maximise connections with existing schemes and consider options to connect other key destinations within the city centre.

**Local and Neighbourhood Transport and Complimentary Programme (formerly known as the Local Transport Plan/LTP (£18m – over five years)**

A broad range of the smaller scale interventions to provide efficiency and effectiveness across the network, but also delivering localised investments within communities to open up the network to all users and encourage sustainable access to leisure, facilities and employment. Works include accident saving schemes, signal upgrades, junction improvements, congestion/network management, accessibility improvements, local air quality improvement and active travel enhancements.

**Contribution to the Mass Transit renewal project (led by the SYMCA) (£51m)**

Total project funding around £102m secured to date with scope including replacement of tram slab, rails, points and strengthening of key structures and improvement of turnback facilities, refurbishment and/or replacement of vehicles.

**Transforming Cities Fund scheme completion (£7m)**

It is proposed to use £5m for the Housing Zone North active travel scheme linking Kelham/Neepsend to the City Centre via West Bar. The Final Business Case (FBC) for this scheme has been submitted to the SYMCA and the funding is required to cover unprecedented rates of inflation in construction materials experienced during the project's pricing/pre-construction phase.

- 1.10. The CRSTS programme will run from April 2022 and March 2027. In order to meet this deadline, early development of the business case, option identification, engagement and construction/design market testing has begun using £2.89m revenue funding from the SYMCA. This revenue funding is the subject of a separate report that is expected to be considered at Strategy and Resources Policy Committee in February too.
- 1.11. Although the above schemes were included within the SYMCAs CRSTS programme, each scheme will still require the development of a Strategic Outline, Outline and Full Business Case – and be subject to both SCC and SYMCA ‘gateway’ assurance and approval processes. This route will allow both the Council and SYMCA to validate the strategic rationale, value for money, financing, procurement, and management of the projects through each approval stage. The Council’s Capital Gateway Process (managed through Strategy and Resources Policy committee) provides the internal approval process for individual projects. In order to enable us to work at pace, this committee is being asked to delegate the finalisation and submission of internal and external Business Cases for schemes to the Head of Strategic Transport and Infrastructure in consultation with S151 officer and Chair(s) of TRCPC.
- 1.12. A Strategic Outline Business Case (SOBC) has already been completed for the A61 Chesterfield Road scheme and is currently within the SYMCAs assurance and approval process.
- 1.13. It is expected that further development funding will be available from SYMCA upon successful completion of each ‘gateway’ approval.

#### SYMCA Programme

- 1.14. In addition to each of the constituent Local Authority allocations through the CRSTS £570m, the SYMCA have retained a share of this funding for the completion of projects related to Transport Authority functions. These are spread out across the Local Authorities and will be developed and approved by the SYMCA. This includes a £51m contribution to the Mass transit renewal project.

#### Engagement and Consultation

- 1.15. Public engagement is essential to the success of schemes within the programme, with the detail to be agreed with the Council’s Communications and Engagement team and linking into the Local Area Committee engagement channels as much as possible.
- 1.16. Issue-focussed workshops will be held with stakeholders from multiple backgrounds including residents, local businesses, public transport operators, schools, other relevant groups and organisations and relevant internal SCC departments.

- 1.17. Online engagement channels, including the Council's social media channels, will be used to promote the programme of works and increase public awareness.
- 1.18. TRCPC co-chairs, Ward Members and Local Area Committee Members will continue to be engaged and updated at key milestones and decision points, including 'gateways'.

## **2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?**

- 2.1. The City council and SYMCA have promoted this programme to support the development of infrastructure investment projects that support decarbonisation of the transport system to tackle climate change along with promoting growth and tackling inequalities.
- 2.2. In accordance with the recommendations, implementing the programme contributes towards the delivery of the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy 2018-2040 and the Council's Transport Strategy (March 2019).
- 2.3. The proposal aligns with Council priorities:
  - "Strong Economy" (supporting organisations in informed decisions on future fleet investments)
  - "Better Health and Wellbeing"
- 2.4. The strategic objectives for the programme include;
  - Improved access to centres using public transport by improving bus priority infrastructure.
  - Encouragement of more travel by active modes (walking and cycling) and public transport (tram and bus).
  - Improvement of journey times and reliability for all modes on the Inner Ring Road.
- 2.5. The programme supports the emerging Local Plan as well as the supporting the Central Area Strategy, aligned to discussions that are taking place with the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. The programme also aligns strongly to Sheffield City Region Strategic Economic Plan.

## **3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?**

- 3.1 At the development stage of the SYMCA bid, the Leader and relevant Executive Member were briefed prior to submission through a report and presentation to CMT. This included outlining the high-level proposals as part of the bid to the DfT and the alignment to the current Transforming Cities Fund programme.



- 3.2 As the programme has progressed, engagement with local members and the Local Area Committee Teams has taken place on schemes which have been able to accelerate (A61 Chesterfield Road and A61 Penistone Road). This has included walkthroughs, workshops and updates on business case development and has included attendance by public transport operators too.
- 3.1. Schemes within the CRSTS programme are currently at a very early stage. In developing the project OBCs and FBCs, consultation with landowners, businesses and the Chamber of Commerce, residents, interest groups, transport operators and disability groups will take place. This engagement will allow scheme design to take into account any concerns raised.
- 3.2. The project-specific communication plans will ensure that the different stages of engagement and communications activity remain aligned to the wider corporate position and make reference to all related project development in the area. Wider transport behaviour change messaging is being developed through the Connecting Sheffield brand and the CRSTS programme will complement other investment in active travel and public transport.

#### **4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION**

##### **4.1. Equality Implications**

- 4.1.1. Improved infrastructure for public transport and active travel will provide a more accessible and continuous network for public transport, pedestrians and cycles between key centres. The scheme will provide priority for buses over cars and therefore increase the reliability of bus services and reduce the journey times to destinations in the local and wider area. These impacts are particularly important to more vulnerable socio-demographic groups who are less likely to own a private vehicle and rely on alternative modes to access services.
- 4.1.2. In broad terms, the initiatives covered by this report contribute towards addressing key causes and indicators of inequality. These include economic wellbeing (e.g. through accessible and prioritised travel-to-work); health & wellbeing (e.g. through active travel and reduced exposure to the effects of congestion and pollution).
- 4.1.3. A programme-level Equality Impact Assessment will be undertaken in due course. EIAs covering individual schemes will also be undertaken as required.

## 4.2. Financial and Commercial Implications

- 4.2.1. The CRSTS programme will be delivered through a capital grant provided from DfT, administered and assured by SYMCA to SCC for the delivery of the projects within the programme. Up to £2.9m revenue is also being provided as a grant by SYMCA to the City council to design and deliver the first gateway outputs of the transport schemes identified within the SYMCA CRSTS business case submission to the DfT. The acceptance of this revenue grant is subject to a separate report to the Strategy and Resources Policy committee, expected to be in February 2023.
- 4.2.2. As per the Financial Regulations, any grant offer will need s151 sign off and claims to be signed off by a Senior Finance Manager.
- 4.2.3. Each project within the programme will then be required to go through the City councils capital gateway process, managed through Strategy and Resources / Finance sub committee.
- 4.2.4. In May 2022, the SYMCA approved a recommendation that enables the City council to vary project allocations within the TCF programme to help manage any future cost increases on specific projects within the programme. SYMCA have been working with the DfT to see how to help manage CRSTS at a programme level, however, mechanisms for managing allocations between schemes are yet to be determined, including any local flexibility for this. Should these decisions be required in the future, it is proposed that they will be made through updates to this committee.
- 4.2.5. It should be noted that the £5m required to deliver the increased costs of the Transforming Cities Fund Housing Zone North Scheme leaves only £2m within the original allocation to support increased costs on the remaining TCF schemes. This is the first Transforming Cities Fund scheme to be tested by the market in the post COVID/Ukraine environment. If similar cost increases from original estimates are realised across the remainder of the TCF programme this will require either additional funding or re-scoping of projects within the TCF programme. It is proposed that any decisions required on how to manage these pressures will be made through updates to this committee
- 4.2.6. Significant investment in the highways infrastructure of this nature will generate a revenue maintenance liability. While the details of these will not be known until individual schemes are designed, the funding of these costs will need to be considered.

#### 4.3. Legal Implications

- 4.3.1. The Council is under a number of duties relevant to traffic management and to which the proposals carried forward under the proposed CRSTS programme may be said to apply. For example, the Transport Act 2000 ('the 2000 Act') places a duty on local authorities to develop policies which will create a safe, efficient, integrated, and economic transport system that meets the needs of persons living or working within the city. The 2000 Act also imposes a duty on local authorities to carry out their functions to implement those policies and, in doing so, secure a more efficient use of their road network, or to avoid, eliminate or reduce road congestion (or other disruption to the movement of traffic) on their road network. This would include where a scheme delivers on the Council's existing Transport Strategy and the Local Transport Plan for South Yorkshire.
- 4.3.2. The Council is also under a duty contained in section 16 of the Traffic Management Act 2004 ('the 2004 Act') to manage its road network with a view to securing the expeditious movement of traffic on the authority's road network, so far as may be reasonably practicable while having regard to their other obligations, policies and objectives. This is called the network management duty and includes any actions the Council may take in performing that duty which contribute for securing the more efficient use of their road network or for the avoidance, elimination or reduction of road congestion (or other disruption to the movement of traffic) on their road network. Where required, the specific legal considerations for individual schemes within the CRSTS programme will be set out for the relevant decision maker in reports on those schemes in due course – including the specific powers intended to be exercised in each case.
- 4.3.3. The Council will comply the Public Contracts Regulations 2015 and the Council's contract procedure rules and all applicable legislation when tendering for any services, goods or works as part of the development and delivery of the CRSTS Programme.
- 4.3.4. If the capital grants to deliver the schemes are accepted, the Council will enter into an agreement to the terms and conditions with SYMCA. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions could enable SYMCA or DfT to cease making payments or reduce, withdraw, suspend or recover all or part of the grant.

#### 4.4. Climate Implications

- 4.4.1. The CRSTS programme is expected to have an overall beneficial impact on the environment as a driver of this investment is to create infrastructure to encourage sustainable forms of travel though increases in people walking and cycling. Although there will be significant short-term impacts in construction and materials use, these will be balanced by long-term modeshift towards active travel modes.

- 4.4.2. Scheme specific Climate Impact Assessments are being developed as each scheme progresses through the capital gateway process.

## **5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 5.1. 'Do nothing' has been considered, but is not considered appropriate as this is likely to result in:
- Increased congestion and negative impact on journey times and journey time reliability, as take-up of sustainable travel choices would be considerably slower than with the project
  - Failure to promote the sustainability to the Supertram network;
  - Reduced facilities for public transport, pedestrians and cyclists, failing to encourage more active and sustainable travel choices.
  - No identified funding to cover the increased costs of the Transforming Cities Fund: Housing Zone North project
  - Increased carbon emissions on key routes as traffic levels continue to grow.
  - Wider social and environmental benefits not being realised

## **6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1. The City council's City Region Sustainable Travel Settlement identified the wider strategic benefit in delivering a package of sustainable travel improvements to key routes in the City. This will improve connections between the city centre and local centres by public transport, cycling and walking, along with a key contribution to the renewal of the Supertram network. This is line with the City councils transport strategy too.
- 6.2. Recognising the strategic importance of sustainable travel, the City council also submitted the programme through the SYMCAs CRSTS programme in line with the DfT's ask. The recommendations in this report are the next step in the project delivery process.
- 6.3. Entry to the CRSTS programme requires rigorous assessment and compliance with established SYMCA processes and procedures in the assessment of options. The requirements are understood and are well known to the Council, with previous schemes having been subject to SYMCA requirements and progressing successfully.



## Officer Decision Report

**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** *David Whitley, Transport Schemes Manager*

**Tel:** 0114 205 3804

**Report to:** *Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee*

**Date of Decision:** *8<sup>th</sup> February 2023*

**Subject:** *East Bank Road Active Travel Project: Approval to proceed through design and delivery.*

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? (1278)				
Has appropriate consultation taken place?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Has a Climate Impact Assessment (CIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-				
<p><i>"The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)."</i></p>				

### Purpose of Report:

The purpose of this report is to provide the context for a recommendation to progress with the development of the East Bank Road Active Travel Project, subject to agreement from the DfT to a revised project end date. The scheme has an estimated cost of £1.89 million wholly funded by the Department for Transport (DfT), from Tranche 3 of the Active Travel Fund (ATF) via a capital grant. The funding will be used to design and deliver the East Bank Road Active Travel Project, including community consultation.

The East Bank Road Active Travel Project is part of the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) Active Travel Implementation Plan (ATIP) and will become a critical extension to the communities just south of the City Centre, connecting with and beyond the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route, to the Grey to Green project, wider Transforming Cities Fund programme, and the City's transformational Connecting Sheffield Programme.

### Recommendations:

It is recommended that the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee:

- Approve the continuation of scheme development detail in consultation with internal and external stakeholders funded from the scheme development within the Road Safety Fund until confirmation of funding deadline for the ATF3 programme.
- Subject to agreement from the DfT to a revised project end date, approve the submission of the project through the Councils Capital approval process (managed through Strategy and Resources committee) as well as the SYMCA assurance process to access the funding

**Background Papers:**

- Appendix A: Project Concept Design;
- Appendix B: Equality Impact Assessment;
- Appendix C: Climate Impact Assessment; and
- Appendix D: Project Mandate.

Lead Officer to complete:-		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.	Finance: Damien Watkinson
		Legal: Richard Cannon
		Equalities & Consultation: Ed Sexton, 24 <sup>th</sup> January 2023
		Climate: Jessica Rick, 23 <sup>rd</sup> January 2023
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>		
2	<b>SLB member who approved submission:</b>	<i>Kate Martin, Executive Director, City Futures</i>
3	<b>Relevant Policy Committee</b>	<i>Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee</i>
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Decision Maker by the SLB member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> <i>David Whitley</i>	<b>Job Title:</b> <i>Transport Schemes Manager</i>
	<b>Date: 8<sup>th</sup> February 2023</b>	

**1. PROPOSAL**

- 1.1 Following the Covid-19 lockdown in early 2020, the Department for Transport (DfT) made funding available through the Emergency Active

- Travel Fund (EATF) to provide temporary infrastructure to aid social distancing.
- 1.2 The Tranche 1 EATF enabled the City Council to introduce measures (mainly in the City centre) including footpath widening, pedestrianisation, road closures, rerouting of bus routes and temporary cycle lanes. It also funded a trial of a low-traffic neighbourhood in Kelham, which has subsequently been made permanent.
  - 1.3 The DfT announced a second tranche of funding for similar types of interventions known as the Active Travel Fund (ATF). The fund was renamed with the removal of the word 'emergency' due to a shifting emphasis to high-quality projects, rather than projects delivered at pace.
  - 1.4 In Tranche 2, the City Council, in partnership with SYMCA Authorities, was allocated £3.18 million to fund the following projects:
    - Nether Edge and Crookes - Active Neighbourhoods;
    - City Centre Cycle Hub; and
    - Sheaf Valley Route (Phase 1 - Sheaf Quay to Norton Hammer) - Active Travel scheme.
  - 1.5 The City Council, in partnership with SYMCA Authorities have since been successful in a bid for Tranche 3 of the ATF with an award of £2.59 million which includes £1.89 million for the delivery of the East Bank Road Active Travel Project.
  - 1.6 Active Travel England (ATE), the government's executive agency responsible for improving the standards of cycling and walking infrastructure in England, is now overseeing this funding.
  - 1.7 The scheme will be assured through SYMCA's assurance process and developed and delivered in conjunction with ATE.
  - 1.8 The grant award letter stated that '*Funding must wherever possible be committed by the end of the 2022/23 financial year, and schemes delivered as soon as reasonably possible thereafter, but where this is not possible authorities should discuss options with the Department's/ATE officials*'. However, several issues have delayed the project. These have included accessing more specialist skills and wider resource constraints, but delays in the grant award have compounded them. Other options have been explored within the private sector, but these too have been limited. There have also been some unexpected circumstances affecting other funded projects with tighter delivery dates that have taken priority. A Change Control Request has been submitted to DfT by SCC to amend the project timeline to December 2024. This request is awaiting approval. Without this approval, the scheme is unlikely to progress quickly.
  - 1.9 The East Bank Road Active Travel Project is part of the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) ATIP and will become a critical

extension to the communities just south of the City Centre, connecting with and beyond the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route, to the Grey to Green project, wider Transforming Cities Fund programme, and the City's transformational Connecting Sheffield Programme.

- 1.10 Like all Connecting Sheffield schemes, the design of the route will follow the most recent Government guidance for active travel schemes, using the fundamental changes to highway design as outlined in Gear Change and LTN 1/20. The Concept design, including route specifics and design principles are attached in Appendix A.
- 1.11 The East Bank Road Active Travel Project is also being developed alongside revenue activity which helps support the behavioural change initiatives for active travel, including cycle training, school streets and targeted bike hire projects.
- 1.12 The project is therefore not just about cyclists, it's also about pedestrians and access to public transport too and project plans to include several new crossing points.
- 1.13 Further work is required to firm up the detail of these proposals and additional reports and updates will be brought through the appropriate governance for decision as the projects progress.

## **2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?**

2.1 The ATF capital grant fund will be used to turn the East Bank Road Active Travel Project concept into an operational one that can deliver against the Council's strategic aims:

### **2.1.1 The One Year Plan:**

- Climate Change, Economy and Development:
  - Taking immediate steps to reduce carbon emissions, and tackling harmful pollution and making the air we breathe safer:
    - The projects are aimed at targeted investment in new and improved cycling and walking routes to support a modal shift from car to more sustainable transport methods.
  - Supporting Sheffield businesses to recover and grow, regenerating our high streets, establishing thriving city and local centres and maximising opportunities for arts and cultural activities in all parts of the city to support economic recovery:
    - Active travel routes facilitate access to services, amenities and job opportunities for everyone. By supporting access to key retail and leisure locations, active travel routes provide a platform for further development which can help the economy grow. It also allows pre-existing business located within the region to grow their business through access to labour and wider market opportunities.

### **2.1.2 Transport Strategy:**



- The Council’s Transport Strategy aims to create improved, sustainable, and safe transport networks for Sheffield. It is recognised that potential development can be constrained by poor transport infrastructure, which can subsequently result in access and connectivity issues. Improved connectivity is therefore a necessity to facilitate economic growth in Sheffield in a sustainable and inclusive way:
  - The East Bank Road Active Travel Project will support the Transport Strategy through enhancing transport infrastructure that makes it easier for people to travel between places of work, home or study using sustainable modes of transport, thereby reducing congestion and supporting our city’s economic growth.

### 2.1.3 Emerging Local Plan:

- The Sheffield Plan will be the city’s new local plan and will guide development in the city until 2038. Sheffield’s overarching Vision set out in the Issues and Options document Plan is that “In 2038 Sheffield will be a fair, inclusive and environmentally sustainable city. It will be playing a nationally significant economic role at the heart its region, with thriving neighbourhoods and communities, and have a distinct urban and rural identity.”
  - The East Bank Road Active Travel project supports the emerging Local Plan Issues and Options document and plays a meaningful role in achieving a successful transition to becoming a zero-carbon clean and sustainable city, tackling poverty, improving health and reducing inequality; contributing to inclusive economic success and creating an attractive place where all can thrive regardless of background.

2.2 The East Bank Road Active Travel Project supports both the SYMCA Transport Strategy and South Yorkshire Strategic Economy Plan (SEP), as well as helping to achieve a number of the conditional outcomes regarding reduced car use and decreasing harmful greenhouse gases whilst promoting greater active travel trips.

## 3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

3.1 The East Bank Road Active Travel Project is named within the SYMCA ATIP and Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). The Active Travel Consultation Plan is published on the SYMCA website and the SYMCA continue to work with communities across the region to identify active travel needs. The ATIP was based on online map-based public involvement and the 2040 plan mapped to over 94% of these comments.

3.2 At the project development and delivery level, a full programme of consultation and engagement will be undertaken as more detailed proposals are developed.

## 4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

### 4.1 Equality Implications

4.1.1 In order to fulfil our Public Sector Equalities Duty, an equality assessment needs be undertaken which takes into account the impact that the East Bank Road Active Travel Project might have on the protected characteristics as defined in the Equality Act 2010.

4.1.2 The City Councils Equality Impact Assessment process is designed to ensure that due regard is given to all three aims of the general Equalities Duty, as follows:

- Eliminate unlawful discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct prohibited by the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it; and
- Foster good relations between people who share a protected characteristic and people who do not share it.

4.1.3 The East Bank Road Active Travel Project is being developed to improve the quality of life of all our residents, regardless of their protected characteristics, by helping to improve accessibility to employment and essential services provide a reliable public transport alternative, and to deliver a more connected active travel network to enable a greater number of people to incorporate physical activity into their daily lives.

4.1.4 An initial Equality Impact Assessment (EqIA) screening assessment has been carried out. The outcome at this stage suggests that the project is unlikely to result in any negative impact on any of the protected characteristics identified in the Equalities Act 2010. A copy of the Equality Impact Assessment screening form is attached in Appendix B.

4.1.5 Consultation with the community, interest groups, businesses, and stakeholders will be undertaken as the proposals are developed. We aim to have good representation, reflective of the local community. The EIA will be reviewed and updated following analysis of the consultation.

### 4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

4.2.1 A capital grant of £1.89 million is being provided from DfT, administered by Active Travel England (ATE) and assured by SYMCA to SCC for the delivery of the East Bank Road Active Travel project.

4.2.3 The grant award letter stated that '*Funding must wherever possible be committed by the end of the 2022/23 financial year, and schemes delivered as soon as reasonably possible thereafter, but where this is not possible*

*authorities should discuss options with the Department's/ATE officials'. A Change Control Request has been submitted to DfT by SCC to amend the project timeline to December 2024. This request is awaiting approval.*

- 4.2.3 Subject to approval to an extension on the delivery date from DfT this funding will be used to design and deliver the East Bank Road Active Travel Project. The City council is not required to provide a revenue contribution for scheme development or delivery activities at this stage.
- 4.2.4 There has been around £22,000 of development funding spent on the project to date, with a further £3,000 committed. Should the ATF3 change control not be approved, this will be paid for using the scheme development element of the RSF programme.
- 4.2.5 The cost of any commuted sum (payable for the longer term maintenance of projects that add (or make changes) to the highway) would be funded through the discretionary transport capital programme. Recommendations of any changes to project allocations within this programme will be presented to this Board.

#### 4.3 Procurement

- 4.3.1 All public sector procurement is governed by and must be compliant with UK National Law. In addition, all procurement in SCC must comply with its own Procurement Policy, and internal regulations known as 'Contracts Standing Orders' (CSOs).
- 4.3.2 Contracts Standing Orders requirements will apply in full to the procurement of services, goods or works utilising grants. All grant monies must be treated in the same way as any other Council monies and any requirement to purchase/acquire services, goods or works must go via a competitive process, comply with the Local Government Transparency Code 2015 and clause 19 of the Grant Agreement

#### 4.3 Legal Implications

- 4.3.1 The Transport Act 2000 (amended) places a duty on the Council to develop policies which will create a safe, integrated, efficient and economic transport system that meets the needs of persons living or working within the city. The 2000 Act also imposes a duty on the Council to carry out its functions so as to implement those policies and, in doing so, secure a more efficient use of their road network, or to avoid, eliminate or reduce road congestion (or other disruption to the movement of traffic) on their road network. The continuation of the development of schemes intended to fulfil these objectives is considered to comply with the aforementioned duty.
- 4.3.2 The Council has the powers under Part V of the Highways Act 1980 and the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to implement the improvements likely to be progressed. These implications will be assessed as the projects are

developed and taken through the Council's decision making process as appropriate.

4.3.4 The procurement of any goods, works or services by the Council must be undertaken in accordance with all relevant provisions of the Council's Constitution (including its Contracts Standing Orders) and all applicable Procurement Rules (Public Contracts Regulations 2015) as part of the development and delivery of the East Bank Road Active Travel Project.

4.3.5 If the capital grant is accepted, the Council will enter into an agreement including terms and conditions with SYMCA. Failure to comply with the terms and conditions could enable SYMCA or DfT to cease making payments or reduce, withdraw, suspend or recover all or part of the grant.

#### 4.4 Climate Implications

4.4.1 The East Bank Road Active Travel Project is expected to have a beneficial impact on the environment as a driver of this investment is to create infrastructure to encourage sustainable forms of travel through increases in people walking and cycling. A copy of the Climate Impact Assessment (CIA) screening form is attached in Appendix C.

4.4.2 This CIA will be reviewed and updated as the project progresses.

#### 4.5 Other Implications

4.5.1 None identified at this stage but will be detailed in the business cases as the scheme is developed.

### **5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

5.1 Not moving forward with the project will mean that the take-up of sustainable travel choices would be considerably slower than with the project, it will also mean we are unable to provide safe and reliable sustainable routes for many residents travelling to employment and to local facilities.

5.2 This would result in a delay to the Transport Strategy outcomes, along with no contribution to the one-year plan.

5.3 The benefits that will result from the enhancement of sustainable travel provision, such as reduced car usage and increased economic activity, would not be felt under this alternative option, or would be felt some time in the future, and therefore their benefit would be significantly diminished. Similarly, not moving forward with the project now would mean that the wider social and environmental benefits would not be realised.

### **6. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

6.1 It is recommended that the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy

Committee, subject to approval to an extension on the delivery date from DfT:

- Approve the continuation of scheme development detail in consultation with internal and external stakeholders; and
- Subject to agreement from the DfT to a revised project end date, approve the submission of the project through the Councils Capital approval process, managed through Strategy and Resources committee

6.2 The East Bank Road Active Travel Project is part of the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) ATIP and the delivery is key to maintaining accessibility to key employment sites and local facilities along with the wider city for the communities just south of the City Centre. This will be achieved through access to safe, sustainable modes by connecting with and beyond the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route, to the Grey to Green project, wider Transforming Cities Fund programme, and the City's transformational Connecting Sheffield Programme.

This page is intentionally left blank



# Introduction

---

The East Bank Road Cycle Route has been developed as part of the important next steps of the City's transformational Connecting Sheffield Programme. Like all Connecting Sheffield schemes, the design of the route will follow the most recent Government guidance for active travel schemes, using the fundamental changes to highway design as outlined in Gear Change and LTN 1/20.

On a regional and local level, the East Bank Road Cycle Scheme is part of the Sheffield City Region Active Travel Implementation Plan and will become a critical extension to the communities just south of the City Centre, connecting with and beyond the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route, the Grey to Green project and wider Transforming Cities Fund programme.

The East Bank Road Cycle Route has also been developed alongside revenue activity which helps support the behavioural change initiatives for active travel, including cycle training, school streets and secure cycle storage at Sheffield Midland Station.

Given the constrained nature of the highway, the City continues to make important steps towards active travel implementation through interventions like road space reallocation and modal filters. As mentioned previously, all the schemes undergo Junction Assessment Tool analysis, are as straight and direct as possible and segregation is applied in locations where vehicles flows are high or have a mix traffic that is likely to be a barrier of use.


The East Bank Road Cycle Route is not just about cyclists, its also about pedestrians and access to bus stops. The scheme plans to include several new crossing points and introduce Low Traffic Neighbourhood type interventions to support walking to school, to the shops, to work and the promotion of all movement that doesn't rely on the private car.

In addition to the above, there is significant housing growth planned further southwards, growing industrial areas and major educational institutions along this route. By providing this link to the correct high standard, a real growth in cycle and walking is expected.

## Active Travel Fund 2 – City Centre to Heeley/East Bank Road

An active travel route enhancement to connect into the communities of Heeley, Arbourthorne, Gleadless Valley and more. The route will feed into the proposed Sheaf Valley Cycle Route (ATF1) and onward to a number of TCF proposals. There are also major employment sites and educational institutions in the area, as well as connecting into the Sheffield Midland Railway Station. The route that has been identified is largely free from bus movements to avoid conflict with heavier vehicles.




Proposed interventions are illustrative only and subject to business case approval, detailed design, costings, topographical survey results and RSA







# Specific Route Information

Location	Issue
	<p><b>Queens Road (A61)</b> – one of the main strategic routes into the City for public transport. Crossing provision only on two arms. Limited space for additional infrastructure. Solution to remodel junction and simply/control movements. May need to segregate on Duchess Road to tie into Farm Road</p>
	<p><b>East Road</b> – a complex arrangement of turning movements and over supply of turning lanes. Opportunity to rationalise car movements to create a by pass segregated cycle link up the hill (southbound). Traffic flow is high and fast, with mix of heavy traffic. The East Bank Road link is also used for commuter parking.</p>
	<p><b>Daresbury Road</b> - Another complex junction which is poor for pedestrian connectivity. Realistically funding may run out as part of the ATF scheme but future schemes would need to consider the mechanics of how this junction works. This is an important link into the wider community.</p>

This page is intentionally left blank

## PART A Introductory Information

**Proposal name** Active Travel Fund 3: East Bank Road (Sheaf Valley Extension)

### **Brief aim(s) of the proposal and the outcome(s) you want to achieve**

The East Bank Road Active Travel Scheme is part of the Sheffield City Region Active Travel Implementation Plan and will become a critical extension to the communities just south of the City Centre, connecting with and beyond the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route, to the Grey to Green project, wider Transforming Cities Fund programme, and the City's transformational Connecting Sheffield Programme.

Road transport is already the single biggest contributor to poor air quality, responsible for some 80% of harmful roadside nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) concentrations. The Cabinet Office has estimated that motorised road transport costs English urban areas between £38 to £49 billion a year, as a result of excess delays, accidents, physical inactivity, air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and noise.

The overarching Vision for Transport in the region is to put pedestrians and cyclists at the centre of all transport plans and increase the levels of walking and cycling by 21% and 350% respectively, by 2040.

Improvements and changes are needed to achieve SCC, MCA, and Government spending objectives and strategies, address the challenges, and deliver the future vision.

The East Bank Road Active Travel Scheme is therefore not just about cyclists, it's also about pedestrians and access to bus stops, and will deliver significant improvements to active infrastructure along Farm Road/East Bank Road between Granville Square and Daresbury Road Junction, with a spur onto Duchess Road. The route covers a distance of around 4km (2.5mils).

The scheme plans to include several new crossing points and introduce Low Traffic Neighbourhood type interventions to support walking to school, to the shops, to work and the promotion of all movement that doesn't rely on the private car.

The route is a mix of classified unnumbered and unclassified roads which are locally important and connect into the communities Heeley, Arbourthorne, Meersbrook, Gleadless Valley, and more.

The area contains major employment sites and educational institutions including Sheffield College and connects to Sheffield Midland Railway Station. The route identified in this scheme is largely free from bus movements to avoid conflict with heavier vehicles.

This project is geared to enable travel by sustainable modes and could replace some shorter-distance journeys by car thereby reducing travel demand.

The consequential benefits of increased walking and cycling are wide reaching, and include:

- Enhanced personal well-being;
- Improved physical and mental health;
- Reduced traffic congestion; and
- Improved air quality and reduced carbon footprint from cutting down on car use.

**Proposal type**

- Budget       Non Budget

**If Budget, is it Entered on Q Tier?**

- Yes       No

If yes what is the Q Tier reference

**Year of proposal (s)**

- |                             |                             |  |  |                             |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|
| <input type="radio"/> 22/23 | <input type="radio"/> 23/24 | <input checked="" type="radio"/> 24/25 | <input checked="" type="radio"/> 25/26 | <input type="radio"/> other |
|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|--|--|-----------------------------|

**Decision Type**

- Coop Exec
- Committee (Transport, Regeneration and Climate Change)
- Leader
- Individual Coop Exec Member
- Executive Director/Director
- Officer Decisions (Non-Key)
- Council (e.g., Budget and Housing Revenue Account)
- Regulatory Committees (e.g. Licensing Committee)

**Lead Committee Member**

**Lead Director for Proposal**

**Person filling in this EIA form**

**EIA start date**

**Equality Lead Officer**

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Adele Robinson     | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Ed Sexton |
| <input type="radio"/> Annemarie Johnston | <input type="radio"/> Louise Nunn          |
| <input type="radio"/> Bashir Khan        | <input type="radio"/> Beverley Law         |

**Lead Equality Objective ([see for detail](#))**

- |   |   |  |   |
|---|---|--|---|
| <input type="radio"/> Understanding Communities | <input type="radio"/> Workforce Diversity | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Leading the city in celebrating & promoting inclusion | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Break the cycle and improve life chances |
|---|---|--|---|

## Portfolio, Service and Team

Is this Cross-Portfolio

Yes

No

Portfolio/s

City Futures

Is the EIA joint with another organisation (e.g. NHS)?

Yes

No

Please specify

### Consultation

Is consultation required? (Read the guidance in relation to this area)

Yes

No

If consultation is not required, please state why

If consultation has already been carried out, please provide details of the results with equalities analysis

Are Staff who may be affected by these proposals aware of them?

Yes

No

Are Customers who may be affected by these proposals aware of them?

Yes

No

If you have said no to either please say why

The project is currently at Initial Business Case stage and therefore no consultation has yet been undertaken.

Consultation with the community, interest groups, businesses, and stakeholders will be undertaken as the proposals are developed. We aim to ensure that there is a good representation, reflective of the community.

This Equality Impact Assessment will be reviewed and updated following public consultation.

## Initial Impact

Under the [Public Sector Equality Duty](#) we have to pay due regard to the need to:

- eliminate discrimination, harassment and victimisation
- advance equality of opportunity
- foster good relations

For a range of people who share protected characteristics, more information is available on the [Council website](#) including the [Community Knowledge Profiles](#).

## Identify Impacts

Identify which characteristic the proposal has an impact on tick all that apply

<input checked="" type="radio"/> Health	<input type="radio"/> Transgender
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Age	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Carers
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Disability	<input type="radio"/> Voluntary/Community & Faith Sectors
<input type="radio"/> Pregnancy/Maternity	<input type="radio"/> Cohesion
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Race	<input type="radio"/> Partners
<input type="radio"/> Religion/Belief	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Poverty & Financial Inclusion
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Sex	<input type="radio"/> Armed Forces
<input type="radio"/> Sexual Orientation	<input type="radio"/> Other

### Cumulative Impact

Does the Proposal have a cumulative impact?

- Yes       No

<input checked="" type="radio"/> Year on Year	<input type="radio"/> Across a Community of Identity/Interest
<input checked="" type="radio"/> Geographical Area	<input type="radio"/> Other

*If yes, details of impact*

Cumulative impact along with other active travel projects.

Local Area Committee Area(s) impacted

- All       Specific

*If Specific, name of Local Committee Area(s) impacted*

East, South and Central LACs

## Initial Impact Overview

### Based on the information about the proposal what will the overall equality impact?

A broad initial screening exercise has been undertaken to assess whether or not it is necessary to carry out a Full Impact Assessment.

The screening considers the individual groups with protected characteristics and how the cycling and walking trails project may affect them. A 'score' has been assigned to each of the relevant groups. Provisional scoring criteria used is set out below:

- A **Major Positive** or **Major Negative** score would be given where the project is likely to have a disproportionate effect on large numbers of the relevant group;
- A **Minor Positive** or **Minor Negative** score has been given where the project is likely to affect small numbers of the relevant groups; and
- A **Neutral** score has been given where there is no clear relationship between the project and the relevant group.

The impact area of the East Bank Road Active Travel scheme has been set around assessing an initiative that is aimed at reducing demand for different motorised modes over relatively short distances. Therefore, the underpinning analysis has focussed on a sub-area that reflects the catchment area of the scheme proposals. The sub-area is broadly based on a 30 min cycling isochrone with the Wards intersecting the isochrone being used to represent the demographic characteristics, namely:

- Park and Arbourthorne;
- City;
- Manor Castle;
- Gleadless Valley; and
- Nether Edge and Sharrow

The screening is shown below.

Characteristic	Impact Level	Reasoning
Health (health inequalities)	Minor Positive	<p>New research shows that the construction of safe walking and cycling routes can improve population health and reduce health inequalities<sup>1</sup>.</p> <p>The research by MRC Epidemiology Unit &amp; Centre for Diet and Activity Research (CEDAR) at the University of Cambridge and the Centre for Public Health &amp; Wellbeing at the University of the West of England was published in the Journal of Transport and Health.</p> <p>The findings are very clear that creating new walking and cycling routes or improving existing routes will support physical activity in groups for which exercise can fall below the recommended levels.</p> <p>This includes supporting physical activity among older people, people living in deprived</p>

<sup>1</sup> A natural experimental study of new walking and cycling infrastructure across the United Kingdom: The Connect2 programme (March 2021).

		<p>areas and people living with a disability or long-term illness.</p> <p>This research is important because it spells out the role that walking and cycling can play in responding to Covid-19 and in addressing the wider 'levelling-up' agenda.</p> <p>The recent landmark reports by the Institute of Health Equity ('The Marmot Review – ten years on' and 'The Covid-19 Marmot Review', both commissioned by the Health Foundation) spell out how walking and cycling can help address both health inequalities and pandemic response.</p> <p>On walking and cycling, the reports outline the following: "The provision of policies for equitable active travel such as cycling and walking is highly important ... to reduce health inequalities; ...active travel improves physical health and mental health as a result of the physical activity".</p> <p>The scheme provides cycling improvements for all users which will help support improvements in health and aid a reduction in health inequalities.</p>															
<p><b>Age</b> (a person belonging to a particular age or range of ages)</p>	<p>Minor Positive</p>	<p>The following table shows the breakdown of ages across both the catchment area, and the wider Sheffield area.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Age Group</th> <th>Catchment Area</th> <th>Sheffield</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>0-15</td> <td>16.0%</td> <td>18.2%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>16-24</td> <td>26.0%</td> <td>16.7%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>25-64</td> <td>47.2%</td> <td>49.6%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>65+</td> <td>10.8%</td> <td>15.5%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Census 2011</p> <p>It can be seen from the table above that there are some differences in the proportion of the age groups based on location, namely:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The proportion of children (0-15) is slightly lower than across Sheffield as a whole;</li> <li>• The proportion of younger people (16-24) within the catchment area is significantly higher than across the wider Sheffield area;</li> <li>• The proportion of people of working age (25-64) is slightly lower in than across Sheffield as a whole; and</li> <li>• The proportion of older people (65+) is lower in the catchment area than across the wider Sheffield area.</li> </ul> <p>This data indicates that there is a younger population in the catchment area around the scheme, whose needs should be considered.</p> <p>Younger people (16-24 yrs.) are also less likely to drive<sup>2</sup> and are more likely to cycle<sup>3</sup> regularly than all other age groups than other older age groups.</p>	Age Group	Catchment Area	Sheffield	0-15	16.0%	18.2%	16-24	26.0%	16.7%	25-64	47.2%	49.6%	65+	10.8%	15.5%
Age Group	Catchment Area	Sheffield															
0-15	16.0%	18.2%															
16-24	26.0%	16.7%															
25-64	47.2%	49.6%															
65+	10.8%	15.5%															



		Enhancing cycling and walking facilities, and the provision of additional formal crossing facilities will provide safer spaces for people to cycle by providing segregation from vehicles. These proposals are likely to have a positive impact on all users, irrespective of age, but overall, it is likely that the benefits will be felt more by younger people than older people.									
<b>Disability</b> (covers various impairments that effect a person's ability to carry out normal day-to-day tasks)	Minor Positive	<p>The following table shows the breakdown of activity limitation due to long term health problems or disability across both the catchment area, and the wider Sheffield area.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Limitation</th> <th>Catchment Area</th> <th>Sheffield</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Day-to-day activities limited</td> <td>16.5%</td> <td>18.8%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Day-to-day activities not limited</td> <td>83.5%</td> <td>81.2%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Census 2011</p> <p>It can be seen from the table above that the proportion of individuals living in the catchment area suffering with a long-term health problem or disability that limits their day-to-day activities is slightly lower than in the wider Sheffield area.</p> <p>This highlights that there is unlikely to be a disproportionate impact relative to the wider Sheffield area, but those with disabilities or long-term health conditions can face numerous barriers relating to travel. This could include specific travel requirements, limited mobility (related to Non-Motorised User routes), difficulty walking longer distances to access travel, or difficulties accessing public transport.</p> <p>There are also issues around accessibility with the fear of not being able to navigate busy, cluttered and visually oriented environments a major barrier for disabled people to participate in normal life<sup>4</sup>.</p> <p>The scheme will provide active travel improvements for all users including disabled people. Providing segregated provision away from vehicles, will have positive impacts on disabled people by providing them the infrastructure to walk, wheel, or cycle safely.</p> <p>Also see Health section.</p>	Limitation	Catchment Area	Sheffield	Day-to-day activities limited	16.5%	18.8%	Day-to-day activities not limited	83.5%	81.2%
	Limitation	Catchment Area	Sheffield								
Day-to-day activities limited	16.5%	18.8%									
Day-to-day activities not limited	83.5%	81.2%									
<b>Pregnancy/Maternity</b> (a person being pregnant or on maternity leave in the employment context)	Neutral	The proposals are not expected to have any specific impact on the pregnancy and maternity group. Issues relating to sex are considered under that user group.									
<b>Race</b> (includes ethnicity, nationality, and colour)	Minor Positive	<p>The following table shows the Black or Minority Ethnic profile in comparison to the Sheffield wide average.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Profile</th> <th>Catchment Area</th> <th>Sheffield</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>BAME</td> <td>26.0%</td> <td>16.3%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Census 2011</p> <p>It can be seen from the table above that the catchment area has a high Black or Minority Ethnic profile in comparison to the Sheffield wide average.</p>	Profile	Catchment Area	Sheffield	BAME	26.0%	16.3%			
	Profile	Catchment Area	Sheffield								
BAME	26.0%	16.3%									

		<p>This high BAME profile needs to be considered.</p> <p>Sustrans' 2019 Bike Life survey<sup>5</sup> found that more people from ethnic minority groups want to start cycling more than any other group. However, people from ethnic minority groups currently cycle less than White people and whilst safety is a significant barrier, people from ethnic minority groups experience other barriers far more than other people (e.g. lack of cycling skills and a feeling of not belonging).</p> <p>The delivery of well-planned cycling and walking provision in the area can help create a more equal and fairer society by providing a viable means of travel for all members of society, regardless of ethnic group.</p>									
<b>Religion/Belief</b> (any religion/belief, including a lack of religion/belief)	Neutral	The proposals are not expected to have any specific impact on the Religion/Belief group maternity group. Issues relating to race are considered under that user group.									
<b>Sex</b> (applies to men and women of any age)	Minor Positive	<p>The following table shows the breakdown of gender across both the catchment area, and the wider Sheffield area.</p> <table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th>Sex</th> <th>Catchment Area</th> <th>Sheffield</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Male</td> <td>50.9%</td> <td>49.3%</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Female</td> <td>49.1%</td> <td>50.7%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>Census 2011</p> <p>It can be seen from the table above that the gender split of individuals living in the catchment area is relatively consistent with the wider Sheffield area.</p> <p>Walking and cycling statistics collected by DfT<sup>6</sup> outlines the following key headlines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In 2020, women on average made 28% more walking trips than men (265 trips compared to 207 trips by men), continuing the trend seen in previous years; and</li> <li>In 2020, men made more than double the amount of cycle trips than women (28 trips per person compared to 13 trips per person) and cycled on average more than double the distance (127 miles per person compared to 50 miles per person).</li> </ul> <p>National research shows that safety issues are of a particular concern in relation to cycling for women, attributable in part to women having a more risk averse attitude to mixing with traffic. Segregated cycle provision, reducing conflict between cyclists and vehicles will therefore empower more women to cycle.</p>	Sex	Catchment Area	Sheffield	Male	50.9%	49.3%	Female	49.1%	50.7%
	Sex	Catchment Area	Sheffield								
Male	50.9%	49.3%									
Female	49.1%	50.7%									
<b>Sexual Orientation</b> (whether a person's sexual attraction is towards their own sex, the opposite sex or both sexes)	Neutral	The proposals are not expected to have any specific impact on Sexual Orientation.									
<b>Transgender</b> (term for people who understand or express their gender differently from what society expects of the sex they were assigned at birth)	Neutral	The proposals are not expected to have any specific impact on the Transgender group.									

<sup>5</sup> Bike Life 2019: Sustrans (July 2020).

<sup>6</sup> Walking and cycling statistics, England: 2020: DfT (September 2021).

<b>Carers</b> (people who provide care on an unpaid basis for an older or disabled adult or a disabled child)	Minor Positive	The minor positive impact of the scheme on disabled people can potentially also support unpaid carers in making it easier for them to provide the necessary support.
<b>Voluntary/Community &amp; Faith Sectors</b>	Neutral	The proposals are not expected to have any specific impact on Faith Sectors. Issues relating to race would be under that user group.
<b>Cohesion</b> (recognising, supporting and respecting diversity)	Neutral	The proposals are not expected to have any specific impact on Cohesion.
<b>Partners</b>	Neutral	The proposals are not expected to have any specific impact on Partners.
<b>Poverty &amp; Financial Inclusion</b>	Minor Positive	In their report Walking Works, 2013, Ramblers and Macmillan found that active travel addresses many of the reported barriers to people being physically active, such as lack of time, money and physical limitations. It is also accessible to those who could most benefit from being physically active, such as people on low incomes.  The scheme links the communities of Heeley, Arbourthorne, Meersbrook, Gleadless Valley to the city of Sheffield. With new developments taking place right across this route, the scheme has the potential to connect people with jobs, education, skills and training.
<b>Armed Forces</b>	Neutral	The proposals are not expected to have any specific impact on Partners.

Is a Full impact Assessment required at this stage?  Yes  No

If the impact is more than minor, in that it will impact on a particular protected characteristic you must complete a full impact assessment below.

### Action Plan and Supporting Evidence

**What actions will you take to mitigate any equality impacts identified? Please include an Action Plan with timescales**

The screening and assessment of equality impacts of the East Bank Road Cycle Scheme is unlikely to result in any negative equality impacts for any protected group. Therefore, no mitigation measures are proposed.

Consultation with the community, interest groups, businesses, and stakeholders will be undertaken as the proposals are developed. We aim to have good representation, reflective of the local community.

This EIA will be reviewed and updated following analysis of the consultation.

**Supporting Evidence** (Please detail all your evidence used to support the EIA)

The evidence used is described above within the relevant sections of the EIA.

## Sign Off – Part A (EIA Lead to complete)

**EIAs must be agreed and signed off by the Equality lead Officer in your Portfolio or corporately. Has this been signed off?**

Yes       No

Date agreed      25/10/2022

Name of EIA lead officer      Ed Sexton

**Review Date**      25/01/2023

## Climate Change Impact Assessment Summary

<b>Project/Proposal Name</b>	Active Travel Fund 3: East Bank Road (Sheaf Valley Extension)	<b>Portfolio</b>	Place
<b>Decision Type</b>	N/A	<b>Lead Member</b>	Cllrs Mazher Iqbal and Julie Grocutt
<b>One Year Plan Area</b>	Climate Change, Economy and Development	<b>Lead Officer</b>	TBC
<b>Date CIA Completed</b>	22/09/2022	<b>CIA Author</b>	David Whitley
		<b>Sign Off/Date</b>	

<b>Project Description and CIA Assessment Summary</b>	<p>The East Bank Road Active Travel Scheme is part of the Sheffield City Region Active Travel Implementation Plan and will become a critical extension to the communities just south of the City Centre, connecting with and beyond the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route, to the Grey to Green project, wider Transforming Cities Fund programme, and the City's transformational Connecting Sheffield Programme.</p> <p>Road transport is already the single biggest contributor to poor air quality, responsible for some 80% of harmful roadside nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>) concentrations<sup>3</sup>. The Cabinet Office has estimated that motorised road transport costs English urban areas between £38 to £49 billion a year, as a result of excess delays, accidents, physical inactivity, air pollution, greenhouse gas emissions and noise.</p> <p>The overarching Vision for Transport in the region is to put pedestrians and cyclists at the centre of all transport plans and increase the levels of walking and cycling by 21% and 350% respectively, by 2040.</p> <p>Improvements and changes are needed to achieve SCC, MCA, and Government spending objectives and strategies, address the challenges, and deliver the future vision.</p> <p>The East Bank Road Active Travel Scheme is therefore not just about cyclists, it's also about pedestrians and access to bus stops, and will deliver significant improvements to active infrastructure along Farm Road/East Bank Road between Granville Square and Daresbury Road Junction, with a spur onto Duchess Road. The route covers a distance of around 4km (2.5mils).</p> <p>The scheme plans to include several new crossing points and introduce Low Traffic Neighbourhood type interventions to support walking to school, to the shops, to work and the promotion of all movement that doesn't rely on the private car.</p> <p>The route is a mix of classified unnumbered and unclassified roads which are locally important and connect into the communities Heeley, Arbourthorne, Meersbrook, Gleadless Valley, and more.</p> <p>The area contains major employment sites and educational institutions including Sheffield College and connects to Sheffield Midland Railway Station. The route identified in this scheme is largely free from bus movements to avoid conflict with heavier vehicles.</p> <p>This project is geared to enable travel by sustainable modes and could replace some shorter-distance journeys by car thereby reducing travel demand.</p> <p>The consequential benefits of increased walking and cycling are wide reaching, and include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enhanced personal well-being;</li> <li>• Improved physical and mental health;</li> <li>• Reduced traffic congestion; and</li> <li>• Improved air quality and reduced carbon footprint from cutting down on car use.</li> </ul>
---	--

<b>Rapid Assessment</b>	Does the project or proposal have an impact in the following areas? Select all those that apply. Only complete the sections you have selected here in the assessment.		
<b>Buildings and Infrastructure</b>	Yes	<b>Influence</b>	Yes
<b>Transport</b>	Yes	<b>Resource Use</b>	No
<b>Energy</b>	No	<b>Waste</b>	Yes
<b>Economy</b>	Yes	<b>Nature/Land Use</b>	No
		<b>Adaptation</b>	No

This page is intentionally left blank

# PROJECT MANDATE

---

The mandate is the **first** thing to do for any potential project or theme of activity. It simply sets out the issues that need addressing and what a project or theme of activity might do to tackle the problem. A project mandate – together with a Climate Impact Assessment - must be completed and approved in order for a project to be accepted onto the Investment Pipeline within the Capital Strategy.

Projects must be on the Investment Pipeline and approved by the Policy Committee in order for them to progress through the approvals process without further recourse to the Policy Committee. Material changes in time, cost and quality will also require a further report to the relevant Policy Committee.

## Key facts

1	<b>Project name</b>	ATF3 East Bank Road Active Travel Project
2	<b>Potential indicative value(s)</b>	£1.891m
3	<b>Policy Committee</b>	Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee
	<b>Date of approval</b>	
4	<b>Programme Group</b>	Transport Programme Group
5	<b>Portfolio</b>	City Futures
6	<b>Proposed sponsor</b>	Tom Finnegan-Smith
7	<b>Proposed client</b>	David Whitley

## 1. What is the opportunity, risk or issue to be addressed? What are the proposed timescales for delivery?

*This is a proposal for an active travel scheme that is aimed at delivering significant improvements to active infrastructure along Farm Road/East Bank Road between Granville Square and Daresbury Road Junction, with a spur onto Duchess Road. The route covers a distance of around 4km (2.5mils).*

*The route is locally important and connects into the communities of Heeley, Arbourthorne, Meersbrook, Gleadless Valley, and more. It contains major employment sites and educational institutions including Sheffield College and connects to Sheffield Midland Railway Station.*

*The scheme plans to include several new crossing points and will consider introducing Low Traffic Neighbourhood type interventions to support walking to school, to the shops, to work and the promotion of all movement that doesn't rely on the private car. Depending on the results of surveys that will be undertaken, a segregated cycle route will be considered. This is likely to effect the number of free, all day, parking spaces currently available in the area.*

*This scheme is geared to enable travel by sustainable modes and could replace some shorter-distance journeys by car thereby reducing travel demand.*

*The scheme is wholly funded by the Department for Transport (DfT), from Tranche 3 of the Active Travel Fund (ATF) via a capital grant, subject to the preparation of Business Cases which meet the SYMCA Assurance Framework. The scheme is programmed to be delivered by the end of December 2024.*

## 2. Is this an existing project or theme of activity? If so, please state what has already been completed what is in progress and what remains to be completed.

*This is a new project that will become a critical extension to the communities just south of the City Centre, connecting with and beyond the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route, to the Grey to Green project, wider Transforming Cities Fund programme, and the City's transformational Connecting Sheffield Programme.*

## 3. Does this support an existing approved Plan or Strategy? Is it a statutory requirement?

*The East Bank Road Active Travel Project is part of the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) Active Travel Implementation Plan. The scheme supports the city's Transport Strategy and emerging Local Plan through the enhancement of transport infrastructure that makes it easier for people to travel between places of work, home or study using sustainable modes of transport, thereby reducing congestion and supporting our city's economic growth.*


*The scheme is also fully consistent with and support both the SYMCA Transport Strategy and South Yorkshire Strategic Economy Plan (SEP), as well as helping to achieve a number of the conditional outcomes regarding reduced car use and decreasing harmful greenhouse gases whilst promoting greater active travel trips.*

## 4. What does the project or theme of activity aim to achieve?

a	Key project objective(s)	<p>Further work is required to firm up the detail of the scheme specific objectives, but they will likely encompass the following, in line with the wider Transforming Cities Fund and Connection Sheffield Programmes:</p> <p>To better connect the areas of transport poverty with areas of opportunity in a safe and sustainable way through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved active travel connectivity that supports the communities of Heeley, Arbourthorne, Meersbrook, Gleadless Valley, and more.</li> </ul> <p>To affect a mode shift away from the private car where new opportunities are likely to see an increase in demand or where growth could be stifled through:</p>
---	--------------------------	---



		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The provision of a high-quality active travel scheme that will support the significant housing growth planned, growing industrial areas and major educational institutions along this route.</li> </ul> <p>To create a cultural shift towards making cycling and walking the natural choice for shorter journeys through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Real and perceived active travel safety improvements;</li> <li>Improved perceived quality of active travel provision;</li> <li>Addressing any severance barriers for active travel;</li> <li>Improved active travel connectivity; and</li> <li>Enhanced active travel accessibility to public transport.</li> </ul> <p>To achieve the above in ways that address current health issues and improve air quality across the City through:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Modal shift from private car to sustainable journeys leading to greater levels of physical activity.</li> </ul>
b	Key project outputs / deliverables	New and improved active travel interventions along the route, including (but not limited to) segregated cycle lanes, new crossing points, junction improvements, 'Low Traffic Neighbourhood' type interventions, and traffic signal improvements.
c	Key project outcomes	1 Improved perception of active travel provision
		2 Increased uptake of active travel modes
		3 Improved active travel connectivity
<b>5. Funding strategy</b>		
a	<b>Feasibility</b>	
	<b>Funding source(s)</b> [add rows as required]	<b>Amount £</b>
	ATF3	£85,000 to OBC
b	<b>Main project (s)</b>	
	<b>Funding source(s)</b> [add rows as required]	<b>Amount</b>
	ATF3	£1.891m (total, including £85,000 feasibility)
	Corporate Investment Fund:	NA

External grants (pls specify):	£1.891m DfT ATF3 Capital Grant to design and deliver the East Bank Road Active Travel Project. SCC is not required to provide a revenue contribution for scheme development or delivery activities at this stage.
Other:	NA
<b>6. Climate Impact Assessment</b>	
Please attach your completed Climate Impact Assessment here.	 ATF3 East Bank Road - Climate Impa



## Report to Policy Committee

**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** Matt Hayman,  
Principal Development Officer

**Tel:** 0114 2735130

**Report of:** Kate Martin, Executive Director City Futures

**Report to:** Transport, Regeneration and Climate

**Date of Decision:** 8<sup>th</sup> February 2023

**Subject:** Future High Streets Fund – Fargate and High Street Update

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? 918				
Has appropriate consultation taken place?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Has a Climate Impact Assessment (CIA) been undertaken?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-				
<p><i>“The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended).”</i></p>				

### Purpose of Report:

Sheffield’s Future High Streets Fund (FHSF) scheme is made up of three distinct interventions:

- FHSF Public Realm and Infrastructure
- FHSF Event Central
- FHSF Front Door Scheme

This paper provides a general update on all interventions of the scheme and highlights the cost increases in relation to construction of the FHSF public realm and infrastructure works at Fargate, High Street and Castle Square.

Subject to Department of Levelling Up, Housing & Communities (DLUHC) approval to a project change request and approval from the Finance Sub-Committee (or Strategy & Resources, Officers seek an agreement in principle to reduce the area scope of the public realm project in response to those cost increases and proceed to deliver works to Fargate as a first phase. The report proposes High Street and

Castle Square could then be delivered as a future Phase 2, subject to securing further capital funds. On identifying suitable funding the Phase 2 proposals will be brought to Committee for consideration.

In addition to the de-scoping and phasing proposed above, the reduced project will require additional funding. It is proposed to:

- reallocate £1.1m of FHSF funds from the Front Door Scheme to the Public Realm
- to secure an additional £4.6m of South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (Gainshare) funding.

In order to maintain programme and instruct the public realm works to commence in March 2023 the Council will be required to underwrite that £4.6m until SYMCA have approved the Full Business Case (March or June '23). This budget uplift approval will be sought from Finance Sub-Committee or Strategy & Resources Policy Committee.

FHSF Event Central is facing additional costs in relation to design development and inflation, though on a much reduced scale. This report seeks an agreement in principle to reallocate £879,564 of funds released as a result of the Getting Building Fund - 'Supporting City Centre Investment' towards the Event Central project.

Separately to the FHSF issues described above, this report also seeks an agreement in principle to vary outputs from the Getting Building Fund - 'Supporting City Centre Investment' agreement towards the enhancement works at Balm Green Garden (to a value of £100,000) as part of the Barkers Pool animation.

These GBF reallocations and amendments to the outputs for GBF will be subject to approval through a contract variation with SYMCA and revised business cases and any budget uplifts being approved by Finance Sub-Committee or Strategy and Resources Policy Committee.

**Recommendations:**

It is recommended that Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee:

- a) subject to approval by the Finance Sub-Committee or Strategy and Resources Policy Committee, agree in principle to
  - (i) the prioritisation and phasing of public realm and infrastructure works with Fargate as set out in this report;
  - (ii) submit a project change request to DLUHC under the MoU for their approval to the proposed prioritisation, phasing and scope change to the public realm and infrastructure;
  - iii) obtain DLUHC approval for a project change request before implementing the delivery of Phase 1 of Public Realm and Infrastructure, as set out in section 1.6 of this report
  - (iv) secure additional funds from SYMCA Gainshare to meet the budget shortfall on Phase 1;
  - (v) seek further capital funds to deliver Phase 2 of works to High Street and Castle Square at a future date.
- b) Agree to a recommendation being made to the Finance Sub-Committee or Strategy and Resources Policy Committee for approval to:
  - (i) implement a) (i)-(iv) above;
  - (ii) agree a budget increase as set out in section 6 of this report; and
  - (iii) underwrite the shortfall in funds to delivery Phase 1 until additional funds are secured from SYMCA Gainshare and/or alternatively for this shortfall to be met from the corporate investment funds (where SYMCA Gainshare is not achieved).
  - (iv) agree reallocation of GBF funds to FHSF Events Central, enhancement works at Balm Green Gardens and the Barkers Pool building as set out in section 3 of this report
  - (v) agree the reallocation of remaining Front Door Scheme funding to the FHSF public realm and infrastructure work as set out in section 1.4.2 of this report

**Background Papers:**

Future High Streets Fund – Fargate and High Street, Cabinet Report, 18th March 2020

Future High Streets Fund – Fargate and High Street, Cabinet Report, 17th March 2021

Form 2a – Funding Future High Streets Fund – Acceptance of MHCLG Grant, 28th April 2021

Getting Building Fund Update and Proposals – ‘Supporting City Centre Investment’, Leader Report, 18<sup>th</sup> February 2022

Lead Officer to complete:-		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.	Finance: Damian Watkinson and Mark Wassell
		Legal: Rahana Kalid
		Equalities & Consultation: Ed Sexton
		Climate: Jennifer Ricks
	<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>	
2	<b>SLB member who approved submission:</b>	Kate Martin, Executive Director City Futures
3	<b>Committee Chair consulted:</b>	Cllr Mazher Iqbal (Co-Chair), Cllr Christine Gilligan Kubo (Deputy Chair) and Cllr Andrew Sangar (Group Spokesperson)
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Committee by the SLB member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> Matt Hayman	<b>Job Title:</b> Principal Development Officer, City Regeneration & Major Projects
	<b>Date:</b> 30 <sup>th</sup> January 2023	

## 1. PROPOSAL

1.2 On the 26th December 2020 the Government announced that Sheffield Fargate and High Street was successful in securing £15.8m from the Future High Streets Fund (FHSF). On the 17th of March 2021, Cabinet delegated authority to Officers to accept the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government (now the Department of Levelling Up, Homes and Communities) funding and enter into a grant agreement subject to the grant terms being received and agreed. The grant terms and conditions in the form of a Memorandum of Understanding were reviewed by delegated Officers and accepted through an Executive Director Non-Key Decision Report on the 28th April 2021. The decision was published on the 4th May 2021.

1.3 In summary the FHSF funding is being used to deliver 3 interventions:

- FHSF Event Central - The acquisition, redesign and refurbishment of 20-26 Fargate as a community focussed cultural hub in the city.
- FHSF Front Door Scheme - Support landowners through the to open upper floor access and improve active frontage to Fargate and High Street and connecting pedestrian routes by providing grant funding for appropriate projects.
- FHSF Public Realm and Infrastructure - Enhance the public realm and infrastructure on Fargate and High Street to facilitate outdoor events, reduce crime, improve green transport connectivity, and support a resident community with improved services and waste management facilities.

An update on delivery of these interventions is provided below.

### 1.3 Event Central (20-26 Fargate) Update

1.3.1 The approved budget for the acquisition and refurbishment of a building for Event Central is £6,616,988. 20-26 Fargate was acquired by SCC in October 2021. Planning permission has been granted (Planning reference [22/01213/RG3](#)) for conversion of the building from retail to a mixed-use space for live music and performance, with café/juice bar, exhibition and flexible workspace. The latest RIBA Stage 4 cost estimate show the project to be within budget with the proposed reallocation of £879,564 GBF from an aborted purchase of another property at Fargate. However, there remains a high risk of cost increase here due to inflation rates and the general status of the construction industry. This proposed budget uplift and its impact on the benefit cost ratio of investment will be included in the project adjustment/change request submission to DLUHC.

1.3.2 The refurbishment works are now out to tender. Returns are due back in late February 2023. Refurbishment works are programmed to commence

in summer 2023 with a view to opening in the summer/autumn 2024. It is hoped that tender returns are within budget. If this is not the case a report with options will be presented to Committee for consideration.

- 1.3.3 Currently the ground floor of the building is being used to host a diverse programme of events curated by Access Space. These have included DocFest, Festival of the Mind, Black History Month and the Black Business Expo '22. These events have attracted hundreds of visitors and reaffirmed the demand for an event and exhibition space located on Fargate.
- 1.3.4 It is expected that a long-term operator and/or building manager will be selected in Spring 2023. This follows a call for expressions of interest in September this year. The proposals received are being evaluated and Committee will be updated in due course.

#### 1.4 Front Door Scheme Update

- 1.4.1 The total budget approved for the Front Door Scheme is £5.1m (approved as part of the Capital Approvals - Month 3, 2021/22). Grants totalling £2.735m have been awarded to the Medical Research Council at 33-35 Fargate (access and workspace conversion), Orchard Square (open space improvements and a residential conversion), The Montgomery Theatre (access and reconfiguration works) and the ReNew Sheffield project (small business grants for fit-out works). Officers are in advanced discussions with other landowners on Chapel Walk regarding grant assistance to bring forward new homes and commercial uses for vacant floorspace. Approval for these grants will be sought from Finance Sub-Committee on 21<sup>st</sup> February 2023.
- 1.4.2 Following these further grant awards it is proposed that the remaining 'Front Door Scheme' funding will be reallocated to the wider FHSF scheme budget to reduce the requirement for additional funding. This amounts to £1.1m to be reallocated. Approval for this reduction in scope will be sought from DLUHC by assessing the impact on the benefit cost ratio of investment and including in the project adjustment/change request submission.

#### 1.5 Public Realm and Infrastructure Works Update

- 1.5.1 Civils contractor John Sisk & Son were appointed on a design and building contract by SCC in March 2022. This was based on tender prices in Nov 2021. The approved (or estimated) budget for the works was £8.82m (based on the outline designs and the tender price of £7.2m plus SCC/Direct costs). The contractor has now completed the detailed design (RIBA Stage 4) and this has been costed at nearly £18m. The FBC cost of the scheme, at reduced area scope is £14.44m (contract price of £11.6m plus SCC/Direct costs and contingency). This price includes a number of value engineering measures and reusing existing materials (granite setts and c30% of the sandstone paving on Fargate) in the new scheme. Officers are also investigating the reuse of remaining



intact materials at Castlegate where suitable.

1.5.2 The increase is due to several factors. The design has now been fully detailed, from the outline design that was originally priced. The original contract price included a number of provisional items not costed at tender stage, such as the SUDS and the underground bin system, and a requirement to install Hostile Vehicle Mitigation (bollards and foundations) which required further intrusive surveys/works carried out before the designs could be developed and costed. Inflation and materials costs have increased significantly, and the revised quoted prices reflect that increase. The uplift also includes for a considerable client contingency and Ukraine price inflation risk contingency.

1.5.3 Based on the reduced scope the total shortfall is £5.7m.

## 1.6 Proposed Phasing of Public Realm and Infrastructure Works

1.6.1 Due to the above it is proposed to phase the works. Fargate would be prioritised given that the majority of the outputs and outcomes agreed with DLUHC are associated with the investment on Fargate through the events infrastructure and links with Event Central. High Street and Castle Square would then be delivered as a Phase 2 at a future date. The proposed Phase 1 works red line boundary is shown at Plan B. Phase 1 will also include improvements to the lighting on Chapel Walk.

1.6.2 This approach will require DLUHC approval through the submission of a project adjustment/change request, assessing the impact of the reduced scope by removing High Street and Castle Square, and the increase in budget required to deliver Phase 1 alone on the benefit cost ratio of the project. DLUHC guidance on the project adjustment process states *'Project Adjustment Requests should normally be assessed/appraised, and decision taken within 20 working days of receipt.'*

1.6.3 Whilst awaiting DLUHC approval the Council has two options:

- a. Accept the risk of commencing the Phase 1 works without formal DLUHC approval for the scope reduction. This could mean the Council is liable for all costs in the event DLUHC do not approve the changes and withhold funding or even clawback some or all of the grant funding. This scenario is deemed unlikely given the impact of inflation on projects across the country and DLUHC have issued comms to acknowledge this nationwide issue.
- b. Await formal approval from DLUHC before commencing the works and accept the risks of further cost increases associated with ongoing inflation and/or the loss of the appointed contractors, and time and cost associated with retendering the works. To mitigate the impact of this risk and given DLUHC are working to a 20 working day turnaround to consider project change requests, SCC Officers have commenced early discussions with DLUHC based on these draft proposals (making it clear that these are subject to the Council's governance processes). Thus far, DLUHC have not raised any concerns during these preliminary discussions.

- 1.6.4 This report recommends the second option i.e. that DLUHC approval for a project change is obtained before commencing works as the risks of a decision in 20 working days can be managed at this stage.
- 1.6.5 To deliver Phase 1 Fargate (as per the reduced scoping set out in this report) the Council will still require a substantial increase in budget of £5.7m, including a generous contingency allocation as described above. DLUHC have stated there is no additional funding available from FHSF. So, it is proposed that this increase is met through
- the reallocation of £1.1m from the FHSF Front Door Scheme budget.
  - an existing allocation of £3m SYMCA Gainshare (already secured through an approved Outline Business Case)
  - Officers are seeking a further £1.6m from SYMCA Gainshare (see section 2 below). This is to provide an adequate client contingency.
- 1.6.6 This approach has been endorsed by Officers at the SYMCA and, subject to approval from Committee, a full business case for a total of £4.6m Gainshare will be submitted in February '23 to the SYMCA for approval. The approval from SYMCA is expected in March or June '23 at the latest. This report is seeking an agreement in principle for the Council to underwrite these funds until this point. If SYMCA Board approval is not granted by June 2023, then the Council will be liable for this shortfall and will either need to fund these costs using its capital reserves or halt works on site to reduce this financial exposure (the latter will of course have implications with the DLUHC under the Council's funding arrangement and require a further project change request).
- 1.6.7 The proposed Phase 2 works to High Street, Castle Square, Hartshead Square, George Street and Mulberry Street are currently estimated to cost around £3m. The removal of these works from the scope of the revised DLUHC business case will be highlighted in the project adjustment/change request to DLUHC. Whilst the proposed Phase 1 and 2 can be delivered independently of each other, delivering the Phase 2 works remains essential given the importance of High St and Castle Square as a key pedestrian route linking Levelling Up Fund investment at Castlegate with Fargate and Heart of the City. The delivery of Phase 2 public realm improvements will be subject to identifying and securing future capital funds. There is potential to secure future SYMCA Gainshare and it is proposed that the High Street and Castle Square phase is considered through the Sheffield local authority Gainshare 'Place Based Plan' work to identify and prioritise projects.

## **2. SYMCA Gainshare Funding**

- 2.1 SYMCA have already approved £3m from the 21/22 allocation of Gainshare to the Future High Street Fund project through the approval of an Outline Business Case. It is proposed a further £1.6m of Gainshare is

sought from the 22/23 allocation. This report seeks an agreement in principle (through recommendation a) (iv) of this report) to submit a full business case to the SYMCA for a total of £4.6m Gainshare funding for the FHSF Phase 1 public realm works on Fargate. Sections 1.6.5 - 1.6.7 of this report sets out the position in the event SYMCA approval is not granted.

### 3. Getting Building Fund – Updated Proposals

- 3.1 In 2020 the Government announced the £900 million ‘Getting Building Fund’ (GBF). The SYMCA was allocated £33.6m for investment in local, shovel-ready infrastructure projects to stimulate jobs and support economic recovery across the country. The timescale for submitting bids was extremely tight but Sheffield was successful in being allocated £10m towards two strategic projects - Heart of the City Breathing Spaces (Pounds Park) and Parkwood. The stated deadline for expenditure was 31st March 2022. Cabinet approved £4m of this to be spent on Pounds Park in January 2021.
- 3.2 Due to difficulties with the proposed Parkwood project it was agreed following consultation with SYMCA and DLUHC that the £6m previously allocated to Parkwood be redirected to support City Centre projects. The proposal was supported by DLUHC. Given the urgency a draft ‘full business case’ based on the proposal outlined below was submitted to SYMCA in October 2021. This was done at SYMCAs request, to secure SYMCA Board approval for the reallocation and allow enough time for expenditure in the 21/22 financial year. This reallocation was formally approved on 24th January 2022 and a grant agreement for this £6m was signed between the Council and SYMCA in March 22’.
- 3.3 This was in addition to a prior approval and contract for £4m GBF for Pounds Park.
- 3.4 Following a Leader decision in Feb ‘22, a contract variation was approved by the SYMCA in June ‘22 to extend the dates for delivering the project outputs revisions to the funding allocations as shown in the table below. Subsequently, further changes to the scope of projects and funding allocations have been discussed with SYMCA. The changes are outlined in the table below with a view to seeking approval from SYMCA via a contract variation. An explanation for these changes is provided at section 3.5 to 3.8 below.

GBF Intervention	Original Funding Allocations (March '22)	Revised Funding Allocations (June '22)	Proposed Funding Allocations (February '23)
Fargate/High Street Property Interventions	£2,410,740	£879,564	£879,564

Town Hall Sq, Barkers Pool and Cambridge St Animation	£1,041,400	£1,000,000	£1,767,852
Heart of the City Shop Fronts and White Boxing	£2,547,860	£2,547,860	£1,780,008
Pounds Park	£4,000,000	£5,572,576	£5,572,576
Total Cost	£10,000,000	£10,000,000	£10,000,000

- 3.5 Delivery of the Heart of the City White-Boxing and Shop Front works, Pounds Park and elements of the Town Hall Square/Barkers Pool Animation (which included the container installation) are progressing. However, due to changes in circumstance this report seeks approval to amend the project allocations further as outlined in section 3.4 above.
- 3.6 The approved allocations included £879,564 for a property acquisition and refurbishment on Fargate with the aim of supporting the wider FHSF programme. The property identified was subsequently sold at auction to another bidder. Given the increased costs across FHSF interventions highlighted in this report it is proposed that these funds are now reallocated to FHSF to assist with delivering **Events Central**.
- 3.7 GBF funds were also allocated to projects to animate Town Hall Square, Barkers Pool and Cambridge Street. However, essential asbestos removal and the subsequent conservation listing of the Barkers Pool building have restricted the options for temporary use and/or dressing of the building. As an alternative, enhancements to **Balm Green Garden** have been identified to support the animation of Barkers Pool in the short term. It is proposed works to the value of £100,000 are delivered as part of the GBF outputs.
- 3.8 The Town Hall Square, Barkers Pool and Cambridge Street intervention also included a contribution to the **Barkers Pool building** asbestos removal works. Due to delays with the original programme for HoC2 white-boxing and shop fronts works its proposed that the GBF contribution to the asbestos works is increased to ensure expenditure for this intervention can be evidenced in full by 31<sup>st</sup> March 2023.
- 3.9 Agreement in principle is sought from Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee for the above project changes. The budget uplift for Events Central will be subject to a revised business case and Finance Sub Committee or Strategy and Resources Policy Committee approval. The project/output changes will be included in an existing contract variation awaiting signing with SYMCA. This is with a view to delivering the revised outputs this financial year. Any further slippage into

23/24 will require a new change request to SYMCA.

#### **4. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE ?**

- 4.1 The FHSF interventions will secure public and private investment in Fargate and High Street to deliver economic growth, jobs and housing by accessing, repurposing and retrofitting of vacant buildings for new residential, leisure, workspace and community uses alongside existing retail. The proposed Phase 1 works will have a striking visual impact, improving 100,000ft<sup>2</sup> of public realm/highway by removing clutter, greening, and installing digital infrastructure (full fibre, 5G and wifi6 ready), utilities and lighting to serve a year-round events programme. These interventions have the potential to attract an additional 110,000 visitors to the City Centre, and create up to 505 jobs.
- 4.2 The proposed introduction of Sustainable Urban Drainage (SuDs) as part of new high-quality public realm will contribute to climate resilience and the Councils zero carbon target of 2030.
- 4.2 The proposed Phase 2 works at High Street and Castle Square will improve 50,000ft<sup>2</sup> of public realm, increase the width of pedestrian routes where possible and introduce greening at Castle Square.
- 4.3 The interventions aim to ensure that Fargate, High Street and Castle Square compliment and align with regeneration work underway on the Heart of the City 2 development and support improved links to, and growth of digital/culture enterprise at Castlegate.

#### **5. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?**

- 5.1 Voluntary consultation has been undertaken throughout the development of this project. The Council worked with the University of Sheffield throughout 2019 to facilitate themed stakeholder workshops to discuss the future vision for Fargate and High Street. The feedback from these workshops was used to form the Strategic Case and final business case for submission to government.
- 5.2 A day long public information event was held on the 19th November 2019 and attended by over 200 people. A further exhibition was held at Moor Market on 25th November 2019. A survey was hosted on the Council's Citizen Space, seeking endorsement of the draft vision and strategic case. Feedback from these events and online survey was positive and supportive of the proposals.
- 5.3 Officers continue to meet with retailers, businesses, landowners and wider stakeholders to keep them updated. A formal stakeholder group has been formed and chaired by the BID to provide regular updates and feedback particularly throughout what is likely to be a congested period of construction across the City Centre including Fargate. In addition the Councils appointed contractor Sisk held a project information day at 20-26 Fargate in October '22. This event was well attended with the

overwhelming majority of feedback on the proposals being positive.

## 6. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

### 6.1 Equality Implications

6.1.1 There are no significant differential, positive or negative, equality implications arising from the recommendations in this report. The capital interventions, which include the acquisition of property are anticipated to be of universal positive benefit for all local people, with added benefit from the creation of a significant number of new full and part time jobs. The local socio economic and community cohesion impacts are anticipated to be particularly positive.

### 6.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

6.2.1 On 28<sup>th</sup> April 2021 SCC accepted a grant of £15.8m in respect of the Future High Streets Fund. In addition, the Council approved £5m match funding from the Corporate Investment Fund (CIF). Of this £20.8m, £8.67m is allocated to the public/realms and infrastructure works.

6.2.2 In addition to the above SYMCA have approved an Outline Business Case (OBC) for £3m Gainshare funding towards the Sheffield FHSF project. Officers are in discussion with the SYMCA to secure a further £1.5m Gainshare allocation to cover all the cost increases (and client contingency/risk allowance) on the public realm and infrastructure works highlighted above. A Full Business Case (FBC) will be submitted to SYMCA in February 2023. Due to the need to instruct the contractors and commence works asap (to meet the stated DLUHC stated funding expenditure deadline of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2024) the above amounts will need to be underwritten by SCC until the funding agreement with SYMCA is approved and signed. This is anticipated in March or June 2023. This temporary allocation of Corporate Investment Fund resources is subject to Finance Sub-Committee or Strategy and Resources Policy Committee approval.

6.2.3 The table below provides a summary of the current and proposed funding and budgets for FHSF:

APPROVED BUDGET	PUBLIC REALM	EVENTS CENTRAL	FRONT DOOR SCHEME	RENEW	Revenue Monitoring	TOTAL
	8,767,052	6,616,988	4,817,106	300,000	315,855	20,817,001
<b>FUNDING</b>						-
Future High Streets Fund	(6,448,496)	(6,616,988)	(2,451,518)	(300,000)		(15,817,002)
CIF	(2,318,556)		(2,365,589)		(315,855)	(5,000,000)
Gainshare						
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(8,767,052)</b>	<b>(6,616,988)</b>	<b>(4,817,106)</b>	<b>(300,000)</b>	<b>(315,855)</b>	<b>(20,817,002)</b>
<b>CHECK</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>(1)</b>
REVISED BUDGET	PUBLIC REALM	EVENTS CENTRAL	FRONT DOOR SCHEME	RENEW	Revenue Monitoring	TOTAL
	14,478,511	7,525,000	3,715,000	300,000	265,854	26,284,365
<b>FUNDING</b>						-
Future High Streets Fund	(6,448,496)	(6,616,988)	(2,451,518)	(300,000)		(15,817,002)
CIF	(3,470,664)		(1,263,482)		(265,854)	(5,000,000)
Gainshare	(4,559,351)	(28,448)				(4,587,799)
Fargate Purchase reallocation		(879,564)				(879,564)
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>(14,478,511)</b>	<b>(7,525,000)</b>	<b>(3,715,000)</b>	<b>(300,000)</b>	<b>(265,854)</b>	<b>(26,284,365)</b>
<b>CHECK</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>-</b>	<b>0</b>

6.2.4 It is proposed that an amended SCC business case seeking approval to increase both the public realm/infrastructure and Events Central budgets be considered for approval by Finance Sub-Committee or Strategy and Resources Policy Committee.

6.2.5 Key finance points for the Project/Grant Manager(s) to note for these revised proposals are summarised below:

- The high risk of cost increases from inflation and construction industry factors and thus the need to manage cost pressures and keep within prescribed budgets
- Proposals to reallocate any grant funding to the wider FHSF scheme budget to be confirmed with / approved by the relevant funder where the grant MOU, terms and conditions require this.
- Seeking the necessary approval to accept new grant funding offers for the project.
- Proposals to reduce / change the area / scope of the projects are in line with any funder grant terms and conditions and their requirements.
- No additional funding is available from the Future High Streets Fund and proposed new grant funding sources whilst being developed (e.g. SYMCA Gainshare) have not been finalised at this point and SCC will need to underwrite/manage these costs and risks if these grant proposals do not materialise.
- The need to ensure that there are no ongoing, unfunded project costs after completion.

### 6.3 Legal Implications

6.3.1 This report seeks agreements in principle from the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee to agree recommendations subject to approval from the finance sub-committee and/or the Strategy and Resources Committee. The impact of the proposed reduction in scope and phasing of the works will need to be fully assessed and formal approval sought from DLUHC through a change request submission. This process will assess the impact on the Benefit Cost Ratio (BCR) of the FHSF investment. The approved business case stated a BCR of 4.2 to 1 across the FHSF interventions.

6.3.2 The additional SYMCA Gainshare funds proposed will be subject to the submission and approval of a Full Business Case by SYMCA, and acceptance of the terms and conditions of any subsequent funding/contract agreement with SYMCA.

### 6.4 Climate Implications

6.4.1 The FHSF Public Realm project has sought to minimise carbon

associated with excavation and waste. Subbase and surface materials are retained or reused where possible. Where new stone is required, local suppliers have been chosen where possible, reducing carbon miles now and for replacement/maintenance in the future. The scheme itself introduces significant green areas into the city centre, reducing the urban heat island effect, and providing sustainable urban drainage to manage surface water and reduce pressure on the city's drainage network. The full Climate Impact Assessment is attached at Appendix A.

## 6.5 Tree Removal, Tree Replacements, SUDs and Planting

6.5.1 The transformation of Fargate will see 7 existing large trees remain. However, to allow for the new layout 8 of the existing trees will be removed. The timber from these trees will be donated to local schools to be used for play and learning. To replace these 15 new trees will be planted. The Fargate proposals have been presented to the 'Sheffield Street Tree Partnership' and the feedback formally addressed by the design team. This process included demonstrating the uplift in Capital Asset Value for Amenity Trees (CAVAT) with the replacement trees. The case also considered the environmental benefits of introducing sustainable urban drainage and the extensive planting proposed.

6.5.2 The information boards attached at Appendix B have been prepared and will be installed on Fargate ahead of the proposed tree removal in February 2023.

## 6.6 Cycling

6.6.1 Currently cycling on Fargate is prohibited. Given the changing dynamic of the City Centre and the alignment to other projects within the vicinity of the Future High Streets Fund project, it is proposed that on completion of the works, cycling will be permitted. However, given the high footfall on Fargate pedestrians will continue to have priority and the scheme design will reflect this within the paving and surface treatments. Cyclists will be encouraged to use the service route when travelling on Fargate to maintain the pedestrian focus on the primary walking routes and desire lines. This proposal may require some minor changes to the design of the service route prior to construction commencing.

6.6.2 Access Liaison Group have and will continue to be consulted on these design changes ahead of construction commencing.

## 7. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

7.1 Do Nothing – Value engineering has already been undertaken and is reflected in the cost estimates above. It is Officers view that even a much reduced scheme on Fargate alone within the approved budget would not deliver the transformational change consulted on and fail to achieve the outputs and outcomes approved by Government.

7.2 Do More – To deliver the full package of public realm and infrastructure



works in a single phase would require a total of c£8.7m of additional funding. It is not deemed viable to secure or underwrite this amount of funding to enable a start on site in Spring 2023. Further delay risks breaching the FHSF funding deadline of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2024, risk of construction costs increasing further, the loss of the appointed contractor with resultant reputational damage to the Council. For these reasons it is proposed that High Street and Castle Square are delivered at a future date.

## **8. REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

8.1 To ensure a first phase of transformational public realm and infrastructure works is commenced and substantially completed ahead of the DLUHC stated expenditure deadline of 31<sup>st</sup> March 2024.

Plan A FHSF Public Realm and Infrastructure Works Layout  
Plan B Proposed FHSF Public Realm and Infrastructure Works Phase 1  
Red Line

Appendix A FHSF Public Realm and Infrastructure Climate Impact Assessment  
Appendix B Tree Removal, Tree Replacement, SUDs and Planting Info Boards

This page is intentionally left blank


### Climate Change Impact Assessment Summary

<b>Project/Proposal Name</b>	FHSF Public Realm	<b>Portfolio</b>	Place
<b>Decision Type</b>	N/A	<b>Lead Member</b>	Councillor Mazher Iqbal
<b>One Year Plan Area</b>	Communities and Neighbourhoods	<b>Lead Officer</b>	Matthew Hayman
<b>Date CIA Completed</b>	10/01/23	<b>CIA Author</b>	Michelle O'Neill
		<b>Sign Off/Date</b>	10/01/23


<b>Project Description and CIA Assessment Summary</b>	<b>Project Description</b>
	<p>Project is the replacement and upgrade of the public realm on Fargate, High Street and associated historic side streets.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Removal of street clutter, greening, utilities improvements and lighting to support cultural events.</li> <li>• Continuation of Sheffield Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDS) principle in place across the city centre.</li> <li>• Introduction of a sub-terranean waste management system.</li> </ul> <p><b>CIA Assessment Summary</b></p> <p>The project is a highways/public realm construction project, so will have climate impacts in terms of waste, materials shipping and use, construction carbon and water usage.</p> <p>The FHSF Public Realm project has sought to minimise carbon associated with excavation and waste. Subbase and surface materials are retained or reused where possible. Where new stone is required, local suppliers have been chosen where possible, reducing carbon miles now and for replacement/maintenance in the future. The scheme itself introduces significant green areas into the city centre, reducing the urban heat island effect, and providing sustainable urban drainage to manage surface water and reduce pressure on the city's drainage network.</p>

<b>Rapid Assessment</b>	Does the project or proposal have an impact in the following areas? Select all those that apply. Only complete the sections you have selected here in the assessment.		
<b>Buildings and Infrastructure</b>	Yes	<b>Influence</b>	Yes
<b>Transport</b>	Yes	<b>Resource Use</b>	No
<b>Energy</b>	Yes	<b>Waste</b>	Yes
<b>Economy</b>	No	<b>Nature/Land Use</b>	Yes
		<b>Adaptation</b>	Yes

### Initial Assessment Summary



### Full Assessment Summary



<b>&gt;=27</b>	The project will increase the amount of CO2e released compared to before.
<b>21-26</b>	The project will maintain similar levels of CO2e emissions compared to before.
<b>12-20</b>	The project will achieve a moderate decrease in CO2e emissions compared to before.
<b>3-11</b>	The project will achieve a significant decrease in CO2e emissions compared to before.
<b>0-2</b>	The project can be considered to achieve net zero CO2e emissions.

This page is intentionally left blank

Initial Assessment

Category	Impact	Description of Project Impact	Score
Buildings and Infrastructure	Construction		
	Use		
	Land use in development		
Transport	Demand Reduction		
	Decarbonisation of Transport		
	Public Transport		
	Increasing Active Travel		
Energy	Decarbonisation of Fuel		
	Demand Reduction/Efficiency Improvements		
	Increasing Infrastructure for renewables generation		
Economy	Development of low carbon businesses		
	Increase in low carbon skills/training		
	Improve business sustainability		
Influence	Awareness Raising		
	Climate Leadership		
	Working with Stakeholders		
Resource Use	Water Use		
	Food and Drink		
	Products		
	Services		
Waste	Waste Reduction		
	Waste Hierarchy		
	Circular Economy		
Nature/Land Use	Biodiversity		
	Carbon Storage		
	Flood Management		
Adaptation	Exposure to climate change impacts		
	Vulnerable Groups		
	Just Transition		


10	The project will significantly increase the amount of CO2e released compared to before.
9	The project will increase the amount of CO2e released compared to before.
8	The project will maintain similar levels of CO2e emissions compared to before.
7	
6	
5	The project will achieve a moderate decrease in CO2e emissions compared to before.
4	
3	The project will achieve a significant decrease in CO2e emissions compared to before.
2	
1	
0	The project can be considered to achieve net zero CO2e emissions.
Carbon Negative	The project is actively removing CO2e from the atmosphere.



This page is intentionally left blank

Full Assessment

Category	Impact	Description of Project Impact	Mitigation Measures	Mitigated Score	Procurement Action Required?	Proposed KPI/Measure
Buildings and Infrastructure	Construction	As there will be demolition and construction (including transportation of materials) there will be a negative impact in the short term with regards to carbon.	Subbase and surface materials are retained or reused where possible. Where new stone is required, local suppliers have been chosen where possible, reducing carbon miles row and for replacement/maintenance in the future. Contractors are investigation the use of solar welfare cabins and electrical plant on site, but they are under no obligation to progress as there are no climate change requirements within SCC contracts for buildings and infrastructure, and no funds are allocated to finance this.	8		
	Use	Emissions in use are unlikely to change significantly, there will be limited additional maintenance required associated with pedestrianisation site and KVA, but this should be offset by the reduced maintenance associated with street clutter/elements to be removed and upgraded surfaces.		N/A		
	Land use in development	Resurface of existing built up area. No use of greenfield, there will be increased planted areas - see Nature/Land use section.		5		
Transport	Demand Reduction	N/A		N/A		
	Decarbonisation of Transport	N/A		N/A		
	Public Transport	N/A		N/A		
	Increasing Active Travel	Some improvement to walking facilities e.g. improved safety and accessibility. The removal of street clutter, changing the surface to a smooth walking surface and organisation of the street, limiting vehicle access to the defined servicing route, are all benefits to pedestrians. Benefits have been calculated using DfT Active Mode Toolkit, based on additional daily trips associated with events over a 20 year period. Cycle parking is provided for cyclists to arrive at the pedestrian area and dismount, while being able to lock their bikes securely.	No further mitigations specified.	3		
Energy	Decarbonisation of Fuel	The project provides event infrastructure - predominantly power, though other provisions were offered - to support events in the external events area, this replaces the current need for diesel generators to support events, reducing both carbon and noise pollution as gas electricity decarbonises.	No further mitigations specified.	4		
	Demand Reduction/Efficiency Improvements	Refurbishment of street lighting and provision of new equipment reduced the energy demand to street lighting in use.	No further mitigations specified.	4		
	Increasing Infrastructure for renewables generation	N/A		N/A		
Economy	Development of low carbon businesses	N/A		N/A		
	Reduce in low carbon skills/training	N/A		N/A		
	Improved business sustainability	N/A		N/A		
Influence	Awareness Raising	Education resources will be placed within the SUDS back to explain how the landscape mitigates climate change, and the benefits of green landscaping with at the city centre. The team is also interested in the creation of a city centre grey to green running route. This is under development, but would introduce active travel, health and potentially education benefits.	No further mitigations specified.	4		
	Climate Leadership	Sheffield Grey to Green and general SUDS approach throughout the city centre is internationally renowned. The flagship scheme builds on this success, and introduces the scheme to a busy city centre pedestrian and conservation area.	No further mitigations specified.	4		
	Working with Stakeholders	N/A		N/A		
Resource Use	Water Use	N/A		N/A		
	Food and Drink	N/A		N/A		
	Products	Refer to Buildings and Infrastructure section		N/A		
	Services	N/A		N/A		
Waste	Waste Reduction	As there will be demolition and construction (including transportation of materials) there will be a negative impact in the short term with regards to waste production.	Excavation has been minimised, with a reuse of sub base proposed and a feeding regime put in place to ensure existing surface meet standards. Excavation and replacement to be by exception.	6		
	Waste Hierarchy	As there will be demolition and construction (including transportation of materials) there will be a negative impact in the short term with regards to waste production.	Materials including sandstone and some setts will be reused on site. Again, street furniture will be reused where possible. Where materials are not reused within the scheme, opportunities to reuse materials on nearby sites will be explored. Potential reduction in depot space may pose a challenge for this proposed mitigation.	5		
	Circular Economy	N/A		N/A		
Nature/Land Use	Biodiversity	Introduction of significant areas of green-scaping in SUDS and planting areas. The site is a city centre area. Biodiversity is low. Some limited loss of trees.	Tree removal has been minimised. Where possible trees are retained. Total number of trees to be exceeded. Significant introduction of diversity through planting.	4		
	Carbon Storage	Increase in trees but likely to be minimal input on carbon storage - likely neutral impact.		N/A		
	Flood Management	The scheme itself introduces significant green areas into the city centre, reducing the urban heat island effect, and providing sustainable urban drainage to manage surface water and reduce pressure on the city's drainage network.	No further mitigations specified.	4		
Adaptation	Exposure to climate change impacts	The scheme itself introduces significant green areas into the city centre, reducing the urban heat island effect, and providing sustainable urban drainage to manage surface water and reduce pressure on the city's drainage network.	No further mitigations specified.	4		
	Vulnerable Groups			N/A		
	Just Transition			N/A		




This page is intentionally left blank




# A Fargate for the future

## Trees on Fargate and Barkers Pool


We're transforming Fargate into a social hub for the city centre using the £15.8 million Future High Streets Fund. The first phase of the project is based on Fargate & Barkers Pool. This includes the following work to the trees, some of which will be removed before bird nesting begins in early spring.




7 of the existing large trees will be kept.




8 of the existing trees will be removed. The timber from these trees will be donated to local schools to be used for play and learning.



15 new, large trees will be planted. In total, there will be 22 large trees on Fargate & Barkers Pool.



In total, there will be 9 different species of trees.



Although we don't want to cut any trees down, we are making room for a new, greener Fargate. This includes 15 new large trees, 11 smaller trees and over 80 species of shrubs, plants and flowers.

Check out Castlegate and Charter Square for similar urban tree planting.



Work begins early 2023.


This project is funded by Future High Streets Fund, Sheffield City Council and South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority.



This page is intentionally left blank.



This page is intentionally left blank



Page 213

© Crown copyright and database rights 2022 Ordnance Survey 100048957. Use of this data is subject to terms and conditions.

REV	DATE	REVISION NOTE	ORG	CHK'D	APPD
P01	04/10/22	FOR REVIEW AND COMMENT	KQua	CBer	DWar
P02	11/01/23	RED LINE BOUNDARY AMENDED	CBer	FMP	DWar

NOTES					

KEY:	
	RED LINE BOUNDARY

KEY PLAN	

DESIGNER  
Grove House  
Mansion Gate Drive  
Leeds  
LS7 4DN  
Tel: +44 (0) 113 262 0000  
Fax: +44 (0) 113 262 0737  
www.sweco.co.uk



CLIENT  
**SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL**

PROJECT TITLE <b>SHEFFIELD TRANSFORMING CITIES FUND FUTURE HIGH STREET FUND</b>			
PROJECT STAGE <b>STAGE 4</b>			
DRAWING TITLE <b>RED LINE BOUNDARY OVERVIEW</b>			
SUITABILITY <b>SUITABLE FOR INFORMATION</b>			
SHEET SIZE <b>A1</b>	SCALE <b>N/A</b>	STATUS <b>S2</b>	REVISION <b>P02</b>
DRAWING NUMBER <b>PC06163-SWE-HGN-FHSF-DR-CH-01006</b>			

This page is intentionally left blank