

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

### Meeting held 20 September 2023

**PRESENT:** Councillors Ben Miskell (Chair), Christine Gilligan Kubo (Deputy Chair), Andrew Sangar (Group Spokesperson), Ian Auckland, David Barker, Craig Gamble Pugh, Ruth Mersereau, Safiya Saeed and Richard Shaw

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 No apologies for absence were received.

#### **2. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC**

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

#### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 No declarations of interest were received.

#### **4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1 The minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 19<sup>th</sup> July, 2023 were approved as a correct record.

#### **5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

5.1 The Policy Committee received four petitions from members of the public. Two members of the public did not attend to present their petitions, a written response would be provided.

The Policy Committee received a petition 'Sheffield General Cemetery'. Philip Ward and Adrian Hallam attended the meeting and presented the petition to the committee.

The petitioners explained that Sheffield General Cemetery was a popular inner-city destination for walking and recreation, as well as providing a pleasant access route for pedestrians and cyclists between the Sharrow area and Ecclesall Road and beyond. The recent improvements to the Cemetery and expected upturn in use of its facilities will lead to an increase in footfall. Members were urged to consider the future of the site.

The speed of the vehicles on Cemetery Road presented considerable risks to those attempting to cross. Crossing the road was particularly hazardous for users of the nursery in the Cemetery grounds, to older people attempting to access the bus stops and to people from the care homes in the vicinity, who might be wheelchair users. Cyclists too had difficulty crossing from Grange Road into the

main entrance.

The petitioners acknowledged the Council's criteria for determining pedestrian crossing sites including the number of collisions and costs but asked that they also consider access to amenities in this instance and whether costs could be reduced by removing beacons and only using painted lines on the road instead.

The Chair thanked the petitioner for bringing the petition and highlighted that whilst decisions taken on installing crossings were driven by the data, there was also a need to be mindful that to roll out more zebra crossings across the city a more coordinated approach nationally was needed and that means following lessons learnt in other countries.

In France for example, crossings comprised of have painted lines on roads with no beacons. They are quick and easy to install. There is no reason we shouldn't do that in order to prioritise safety for the most vulnerable road users.

The Chair confirmed that he was happy to continue to work with on this issue and the wider support for action from central Government and would also look to see what could be done about ensuring that the suggestion for a crossing near the Sheffield General Cemetery is on the Council's list of works, obviously prioritised in line with the criteria that exists across the city.

- 5.2 The Policy Committee received a petition 'The junction of Duke Street/Bernard Street/Talbot Street'. Graham Wroe attended the meeting and presented the petition to the committee.

The petitioner explained that the petition had received 228 signatures and listed a number of community amenities that were in close proximity to the junction. The junction created an obstacle for people walking, cycling and driving due to its poor layout and during rush hour there was no safe place for pedestrians to cross. He explained that the junction was so dangerous it put people off walking, especially if they were not able to move quickly and therefore the number of accidents may be low because people avoid the area. An increase in lorries and vans had been noted following the introduction of the Clean Air Zone.

The petitioner referenced a video he had made of the junction to emphasise the problems. A petition for a crossing at the same junction had previously been conducted in 2014 and since then the traffic has got much worse. The petitioner urged the members to act now to save lives at the junction.

The Chair thanked the petitioner for bringing the petition and advised that Manor Castle Councillors had been working on this issue. It was acknowledged that the Council receives a high volume of requests to install pedestrian crossings throughout the year. Limited resources meant that it was necessary to assess, score and prioritise locations.

The Chair advised that sites for the 2023/24 pedestrian improvement programme had been finalised and were already in progress. However, when it is nearing the end of each calendar year the prioritisation and selection process is initiated for the rolling annual Pedestrian Improvement Programme that is due to commence the following financial year. The top scoring sites are re-assessed to determine whether they have remained at the same score, increased or reduced in score. Any

changes that may have occurred since the request was originally received which, may affect the original assessment, such as any local building developments, changes to the highway including road layouts and any other improvement measures that may have been implemented are considered. Once the prioritisation process is complete, the highest scoring sites are then progressed under the Pedestrian Improvements Programme. The Chair was unable to confirm at that time whether this location would be prioritised for next year's programme as it has yet to be assessed and the prioritisation process for 2024/25 had not begun. However, it would remain on the city-wide list to be considered for future programmes if it was not prioritised for next year.

- 5.3 The Policy Committee received seven questions from members of the public. Three members of the public did not attend to ask their question, a written response would be provided.

#### Questions from Richard Brogden

- "Will the committee agree to drop the threat of implementing 12 hr bus lanes along both roads (Ecclesall Road, Abbeydale Road (incorporating London Road) indefinitely as a result of our patient accessibility survey."
- Will the committee define (quantitatively) what constitutes a success relating to proposed junction improvements that will be undertaken in the spring of 2024"
- "Will the committee give reassurances to our patients, and those of other dental practices (and allied health professionals) across both routes that any measures implemented will *never* compromise their access to vital services?"
- "Will the committee give reassurances that any economic impact assessment that may potentially be undertaken with any measures in the future is done in a totally impartial, and independent fashion that would involve all stakeholders across all the affected routes?"

The Chair explained that as agreed at this committee on the 19<sup>th</sup> July 2023, it was proposed to initially implement the following bus priority measures:

- Junction improvements and traffic management amendments at or near junctions along London Road, Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road bus corridors.
- Camera enforcement of existing sections of bus lanes on London Road, Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road

The detailed design of these measures will be finalised and proposed amendments to localised Traffic Regulation Orders (TROs) would be progressed pursuant to officer decisions. Statutory consultation associated with the changes would be undertaken.

Where such matters were then subject to a further decision by the Committee, recommendations would be presented for its consideration in due course.

Any implementation of these works would then be reviewed. This would be undertaken to determine if further bus priority measures were required. This may include options to amend bus lane hours of operation and the enhanced enforcement of parking and waiting restrictions.

The aim of the project was to improve bus journey time consistency and reliability along London Road, Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road. Data on journey time consistency and reliability would be provided by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority and bus operators.

The Chair advised that there were more specific journey saving benefits, but it would take more time to extract them from the business case. The benefits of the scheme would be reconfirmed at Final Business Case stage later this year. At that stage the criteria for measuring success would be published.

The aim of the scheme was to improve sustainable access for all people to facilities and services along London Road, Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, and in the city centre with enhancements to bus priority.

The main factor determining parking on both corridors was bus lane hours of operation. As agreed at this committee on the 19<sup>th</sup> July the current approach was to enforce parking in bus lanes without amendments to bus lane hours of operation. The bus lane hours of operation were 07.30 to 09.30 and 16.00 to 18.30 for the majority of bus lanes.

As mentioned previously, should the review of the traffic management changes the Council had agreed to deliver indicate that further changes were required, further consultation and engagement would be undertaken.

Any economic impact assessment potentially undertaken would be impartial. The factors determining any investigation such as the range of stakeholders to be involved would be confirmed following an agreement on the requirements for an economic impact assessment.

#### Questions from Dylan Lewis-Creser

How does the council seek to ensure that residents and visitors are directed towards the most sustainable forms of transport in the city, decreasing carbon emissions and increasing the liveability of residents through lower noise pollution, air pollution, and reclaimed space from motor vehicles?

The Chair thanked the questioner for attending and explained that the Council had a comprehensive website to assist residents and visitors to use sustainable transport options and also a web page detailing the Council's response to the climate emergency. The Council also worked closely with SYMCA to help people make good choices about how they travel across Sheffield and South Yorkshire.

Questions from Zak Viney

1. Sheffield City Council has supposedly declared a climate emergency, of which we know that domestically, our biggest emitting sector is transport, accounting for a quarter of the UK's total emissions, the majority of these emissions coming from motor transport. How the council expect to work towards its decarbonisation goals without active investment and implementation of sustainable transport alternatives, encouraged by schemes such as the Walkley and Crookes AtN and Sheaf Valley Cycle Route?
2. Sheffield City Council bought in a Clean Air Zone in February 2023. Whilst this measure is progressive in addressing toxic air in the city, which causes hundreds of premature deaths annually - how does the council expect to encourage modal shift, required to clean our air, without active investment and delivery of schemes such as the Walkley and Crookes AtN and Sheaf Valley Cycle Route?

The Chair explained that some of the questions related to items on the agenda for the meeting and the questioner was welcome to stay and listen to those.

Analysis had shown that transport accounts for 26% of Sheffield's carbon emissions, the third highest sector after Industry and Housing. The Council recently set out how it intends to address and reduce these emissions in The Way We Travel decarbonisation Routemap chapter, which was approved by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Change Policy Committee on the 19<sup>th</sup> July this year.

This document sets out the challenge, vision for change and some of the activity the Council is undertaking between now and 2025 to accelerate the transition to Net Zero travel, including activity around increasing active travel, improving public transport, consolidating freight and decarbonising vehicles.

The Chair advised that encouraging and enabling the uptake of walking and cycling were important parts of Sheffield City Council's overall ambitions for improving the air we breathe, addressing the congestion on our streets and reducing carbon emissions from transport. To achieve this, and to ensure that people in Sheffield see walking and cycling as a realistic and preferred choice, our infrastructure for active travel would need to improve.

The Council would soon be developing a Sheffield Active Travel Plan that sets out the cycling and walking networks that Sheffield needs to deliver to support sustainable growth, at both a strategic corridor level but also local community level. This would form the basis of a programme of future infrastructure that the Council would proactively seek to deliver, using suitable funding opportunities including, but not limited to those from Department for Transport, Active Travel England and SYMCA.

Questions from Marion Gerson

Thank you, Chair, for getting Council Officers to make the most up to date figures for pollution monitoring available. As I had expected, these show that the Nitrogen dioxide measurements for the Abbeydale Road pinch point had increased substantially. Outside Butterworth Cycles it went from 33 in 2021 to 41 in 2022. That's a 24% increase caused by the closures. At the Carter Knowle junction it went from 32 to 39, a 22% increase. These increases were the result of just half a year of Archer Lane and Little London Road being closed, with the resultant congestion, so we can reasonably assume that a whole year's measurements would have been even higher.

The report from officers on the closure of Archer Lane states as a benefit that it resulted in a 3% drop in vehicle movements within the Active Travel Neighbourhood. (This is debatable since the major drop in traffic was the result of 1200 fewer vehicles accessing the Abbeydale pinchpoint from the suburbs further south, and many of their drivers are likely to have chosen alternative routes into town such as Ecclesall Road.)

But respondents to the survey questionnaire particularly cited increased travel times, extended queuing and increased fuel use for their concerns over the closure of Archer Lane. That is what was being measured on Abbeydale Road. If half of vehicle movements in the affected area had an average increase in queuing time of, say, 40% this would greatly outweigh a possible 3% drop in numbers of vehicles.

Where, then, is the benefit of the Active Travel Neighbourhood to our efforts to reduce pollution and carbon emissions?

The Chair thanked the questioner for attending to ask their question and noted that much of the information he was going to provide was very technical and therefore he had taken advice from officers. As highlighted in the report to policy committee for the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route and Nether Edge Active Travel Neighbourhood is it not possible to make any conclusions about either of the schemes' impacts on air quality along Abbeydale Rd or elsewhere. This is because the air quality measurements the Council take using simple diffusion tubes are only reliable enough to provide long term trends in terms of changes in Nitrogen Dioxide concentrations over at least 2-3 years. Given that both schemes were introduced nearly halfway through 2022, and included a period of COVID lockdown restrictions there was no way of showing the impact the schemes may have had based on 2022 data. For these reasons data must be treated with a level of caution and any conclusions be equally cautiously considered.

As traffic volumes continued to rise following the easing of travel restrictions in 2021, so too could we expect NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations to rise. Indeed, city-wide there had been an average increase in NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations of nearly 16% across all diffusion tubes between 2021 and 2022. Some areas of the city, not connected to either of these schemes, had seen average increases of NO<sub>2</sub> concentrations of as high as 28% between 2021 and 2022. Traffic congestions along Abbeydale Rd and Ecclesall Rd was not new but continued to rise towards pre-pandemic levels as was the case city-wide.

Traffic count data indicated that vehicle movements across junctions have changed as a result of the schemes. This had resulted in some increases in vehicle counts, on certain roads and at certain times of the day including Abbeydale Rd/ Broadfield Rd / Sheldon Road. Equally, however, data also showed decreases in traffic count data at other arms of this junction and at other locations along Abbeydale Rd.

Given that transport is a significant contributor to poor air quality in towns and cities, and accounts for around 26% of carbon emissions in Sheffield, it is vital to take steps to reduce overall emissions from motorised vehicles over the long-term and provide real opportunities for people to make more local journeys by active and sustainable means.

## **6. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

- 6.1 A schedule of questions to the Chair, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated. Supplementary questions, under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4, were asked and were answered by the Chair.

## **7. WORK PROGRAMME**

- 7.1.1 The Committee considered a report of the Director of Policy and Democratic Engagement on the Committee's Work Programme detailing 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.
- 7.1.2 A member asked a question regarding a scheme at Rails Road and whether this had been held up due to work being carried out by the Governance Committee. The Chair advised that he would provide a written response to this query.
- 7.1.3 The Director of Investment, Climate Change and Planning informed the committee that a work programme briefing session would take place in October 2023. This was in response to requests for more items on the work programme to have expected committee dates indicated for them.

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

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.

**7.3 Reasons for Decision**

7.3.1 To give the committee members an opportunity to consider the direction of the work programme, align it with their key priorities and create a manageable workload for the committee.

**7.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

7.4.1 None

**8. 2023/24 Q1 BUDGET MONITORING**

8.1 The committee considered a report from the Director of Finance and Commercial Services that brought them up to date with the Council's outturn position for Q1 2023/24 General Fund revenue position.

8.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee note the updated information and management actions provided by this report on the Q1 2023/24 Revenue Budget Outturn as described in this report.

**8.3 Reasons for Decision**

8.3.1 To record formally changes to the Revenue Budget.

**8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

**9. ROTHER VALLEY PARKING SCHEME**

9.1.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures detailing the consultation response to proposals to introduce a parking scheme near Rother Valley Country Park on Rother Valley Way, Meadow Gate Avenue and Owlthorpe Greenway.

9.1.2 The concerns of members regarding parking on footways was noted and officers advised that proactive enforcement would be put in place to maintain safety around junctions and the scheme would be reviewed after its implementation.

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

1. Consider the objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the Rother Valley Parking scheme.
2. Having regard to those objections, approve the making of the Traffic Regulation Order as amended and in accordance with the Road Traffic



Regulation Act 1984.

3. Note that all respondents will then be informed accordingly.
4. Approve the implementation of the amended Rother Valley Parking scheme, subject to authorisation of the project through the capital gateway process.
5. Authorise officers to progress the formal revocation of those elements of the ETO which were not implemented.

### 9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

9.3.1 The scheme will prevent parking in unsuitable places, such as pavements and provide a pedestrian refuge. This will result in a safer more pleasant environment for residents, pedestrians, and cyclists.

9.3.2 Improvements to Rother Valley Way car park will be included to make this more attractive to use and some on street parking opportunities will be available as alternatives for busy times.

9.3.3 The introduction of a formalised on-street parking scheme will improve access to the Rother Valley Country Park. This will encourage use of the country park for outdoor activities such as walking and cycling which will improve health and wellbeing.

9.3.4 The scheme will improve road safety for all pedestrians including those with impaired mobility, cyclists, and drivers to reduce the risk of future collisions.

9.3.5 Having considered the aforementioned benefits alongside the response from the public and other consultees, it is recommended that the TROs be made with the amendments set out in paragraphs 3.13 – 3.15 as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme are deemed to outweigh the concerns raised.

9.3.6 It is therefore recommended that Committee:

- Consider the objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation Orders associated with the Rother Valley Parking scheme;
- Having regard to those objections, approve the making of the Traffic Regulation Order, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- Note that all respondents will then be informed accordingly;
- Approve the implementation of the amended Rother Valley Parking scheme, subject to authorisation of the project through the capital gateway process.

### 9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 The current proposal would see the introduction of a series of waiting restrictions with suitable gaps for on street parking. These gaps are not proposed to be restricted by time or charge at the present time. An alternative was considered during the development of the scheme to include time restrictions or a charging regime on these gaps to ensure more opportunities for parking by creating a turnover of the spaces. However, this was not considered appropriate at the present time due to the wish to encourage drivers to use the space available, considerations about drivers seeking unrestricted parking instead in the residential

streets, enforcement practicalities and to encourage visitors to Rother Valley Park to use the car park and these gaps in the first instance.

- 9.4.2 As outlined above in paragraphs 3.13 – 3.15 the scheme has been revised in light of comments from statutory consultees and public comments during the initial development from Autumn 2022. Changes made following initial engagement and recent consultation include a reduction in proposed waiting restrictions to provide more gaps at the request of residents, addition of traffic calming on Rother Valley Way, provision of new footways on Rother Valley Way and potential improvements to the condition and visibility of the car park.

## **10. REPORT OBJECTIONS TO THE EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER FOR THE SHEAF VALLEY CYCLE ROUTE**

- 10.1.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures setting out an analysis of the effect of an 18-month Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) used to implement specific interventions on the highway as part of the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route. The ETO and interventions were implemented in May 2022, with the ETO due to expire in November 2023.

- 10.1.2 The report included the results of formal consultation, receipt of objections, along with feedback received pre and post formal consultation. The consultation sought the views of residents, visitors to the area, businesses, local groups, institutions, and statutory groups. Further monitoring and evaluation of the scheme had been carried out to help quantify the outcomes of the scheme.

- 10.1.3 Members asked questions about the materials used initially to enforce the road closures that were later replaced with concrete blocks. Assurances were sought that lessons had been learnt following the vandalism of the original structures and that officers would look for a way to make the concrete blocks more aesthetically pleasing. It was agreed that the appearance was a key consideration, hence the use of planters in the first instance and that the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) would be approached for funding.

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

- Consider the objections to interventions delivered through the ETO, in terms of how they relate to the wider scheme, its overall aims and objectives and how they tie-in with wider Sheffield City Council strategies and policy.
- Consider the wider monitoring and evaluation of the scheme including current and potential future outcomes of the interventions delivered.
- Having considered the objections and outcomes of the scheme, approve the implementation of the SVCR in its entirety. In other words, agree that all interventions associated with the ETO should be made permanent.
- Note that the Council's Traffic Regulations team will inform all consultation respondents accordingly.
- Note that if recommendation to implement interventions on a permanent

basis is approved, officers will write to all properties within the boundary of the initial larger consultation area to inform them. Information about the 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 recommendations being taken forward.

- Authorise officers to progress the formal revocation of those elements of the ETO which were not implemented

### 10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 A truly multi-modal transport network that is built to a high standard, offers inclusive economic, social and environmental opportunities and benefits to everyone, regardless of their age, gender, ethnicity or background. Furthermore, safer, cleaner and lower traffic routes can make the city a better place to live, work, learn and play.

### 10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 Focusing solely on the interventions associated with the ETO, there are three main approaches to consider:

- Make all interventions permanent.
- Remove all interventions and return the highway to its former state.
- Make some interventions permanent and remove others.

10.4.2 There may be some more nuanced/minor alterations to signage and lines that can be considered along some sections of the route. However, this has already taken place following early stages of consultation and there has been very little correspondence to suggest that this would make a significant difference for individuals or organisations along the route corridor.

10.4.3 Remove all interventions and return the highway to its former state.

10.4.4 This approach reintroduces through-traffic along all roads where interventions have been implemented. The increased vehicle traffic, and movements across junctions where interventions are present. This would mean that much of the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route (SVCR) is longer LTN1/20 compliant and therefore less safe, less coherent, less comfortable, less attractive, and therefore less likely to encourage modal shift away from motorised vehicle traffic to active modes. It would undermine those permanent interventions that are already in place as the route would essentially become disconnected.

10.4.5 This would be at odds with Sheffield City Council strategy and policy including transport and net zero targets. It sends a message that the speed and convenience of those travelling by private motor vehicle is a priority over the provision of infrastructure that benefits those individuals that do not have access to a car or whose choose to travel by bike or on foot. All other benefits of the scheme, as outline in section 1 of the report, would be undermined. This would lessen improved amenity and worsen the environment for walking and cycling. Ultimately, these types of funded proposals exist to support all transport users

across the entire network. With current and planned developed taking place within and near the city centre, these schemes represent a real opportunity to deal with expected increases in demand for transport without an overreliance on car dependency. Outside of the Connecting Sheffield programme, there current exists no other proposals that would address these issues.

10.4.6 Modify/remove some interventions.

10.4.7 It is not possible to make the ETO permanent while also modifying the proposal owing to restrictions on the Council's ability to do so per regulation 23 of the Local Authorities' Traffic Orders (Procedure) (England and Wales) Regulations 1996. The Council has the option of either making the implemented scheme permanent or not at all.

10.4.8 It is possible to consider the effect of potential modifications. While they are not presented to the committee as an alternative option within this report, such a proposal could be taken forward as a modification subsequent to the recommended scheme being permanently implemented (should the committee so decide). However, this would incur significant resource implications in terms of issuing an entirely new traffic order, carrying out additional public engagement and further demand on officer time.

10.4.9 Furthermore, removal of a single intervention along the SVCR has the potential to undermine the effectiveness of the entire scheme. For example, taking out the Cherry St/Shoreham St filter reintroduces increased traffic volumes along Shoreham St. This means that the route quality declines for active travel users at this location and therefore the full route becomes disconnected and less attractive for people travelling by bike or on foot.

10.4.10 The exception to this is the Hackthorne Rd/Scarsdale Rd intervention as this is not an imperative element of the scheme. However, data clearly shows that this intervention has been successful at removing significant levels of through traffic on Hackthorne Rd and adjoining residential streets

10.4.11 Little London Rd has received more public feedback than any other element of the scheme. If the modal filter was removed here, the road would effectively become less accessible for people on bike or on foot. This is particularly true where the carriageway and footway are extremely narrow (under the rail bridge). Re-opening Little London Rd to through-traffic effectively means that the SVCR would end where the walking and cycling route from Saxon Rd meets Little London Rd. The long-term vision to extend the SVCR to Dore and Totley Station and To Meadowhead, would be much more difficult to realise.

10.4.12 The overall impact of removing any of the ETO interventions is similar in nature (if not scale) to the removal of all interventions along the route as highlighted above.

**11. ACTIVE TRAVEL NEIGHBOURHOOD ETRO REVIEW: CROOKES/WALKLEY**

11.1.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures setting

out an analysis of the effect of the implementation of an 18-month Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) in Crookes, including the results of formal consultation, along with feedback received pre and post formal consultation.

- 11.1.2 The consultation sought the views of residents, visitors to the area, businesses, local groups, institutions, and statutory groups to inform a decision on whether or not the Council wished to progress towards making the changes permanent or not.
- 11.1.3 Members commented that the drop in sessions used during the consultation were well attended and that these should be used from the start of the exercise in future. Officers agreed that discussions in person with members of the public considering proposed plans would be a preferred method moving forward. There had been lessons learnt from the iterative process which resulted in a positive outcome.
- 11.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:
- Approve that the elements included in Experimental Traffic Orders are made permanent in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984:

#### **CROOKES –**

1. Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on parts of Hands Road (at the junction with Leamington Street and Townend Street) and Newent Lane, with the extent of the restriction shortened on Newent Lane as detailed.
2. Prohibition of Motor Vehicles except authorised vehicles and permit holders (School Streets) Monday to Friday 8.15-9.15am and 2.45-3.45pm at Westways Primary School on Mona Avenue and Mona Road.
3. One Ways on Mona Avenue and part of Mona Road.
4. No Waiting at Any Time on parts of Cobden Place, Cobden View Road, Hands Road, Leamington Street, Matlock Road, Melbourn Road, Mona Avenue, Pickmere Road, Romsdal Road, Sackville Road, Slinn Street, Townend Street and Warwick Terrace is made permanent, with the extent of the restrictions shortened or not wholly implemented on Cobden View Road, Romsdal Road and Sackville Road as detailed.
5. No Waiting Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm on part of Western Road.
6. Amendment to Permit Holder Parking Places on Crookesmoor Road.

#### **WALKLEY –**

1. Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on parts of Fir Street, Highton Street and Matlock Road (western end).
  2. One Way on parts of Greenhow Street and Heavygate Avenue.
  3. No Waiting at Any Time on parts of Camm Street, Greenhow Street, Heavygate Avenue, Highton Street and Matlock Road is made permanent, with the extent of the restrictions shortened or not wholly implemented on Matlock Road as detailed.
- Approve that only the elements listed above under ‘Crookes’ and ‘Walkley’

are implemented on street on a permanent basis. Officers will take forward the revocation of all elements of the ETOs not listed above.

- Approve that physical works to make these changes permanent are designed and implemented and that until then the temporary materials creating the closures/one way are retained.
- Note that, if the above elements are made permanent, objectors will be informed accordingly and the Council will write to all properties within the boundary of the consultation area to inform them of the decisions.
- Approve the development of permanent options for pedestrian crossing facilities near the junction of Crookes/ School Road, Cookesmoor/ Conduit Road and at Heavycate Road/ Heavycate Avenue through normal procedures – these elements are not subject to an ETO.

### 11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

In general, the data does not support the general perception, and the council is tasked and supported through various strategies and polices to create better places live, provide transport options, and tackle the climate issues.

#### 11.3.1 **CROOKES**

It is recommended that the Council make permanent the current interventions as they stand.

This includes:

- Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on parts of Hands Road (at the junction with Leamington Street and Townend Street) and Newent Lane, with the extent of the restriction shortened on Newent Lane as detailed.
- Prohibition of Motor Vehicles except authorised vehicles and permit holders (School Streets) Monday to Friday 8.15-9.15am and 2.45-3.45pm at Westways Primary School on Mona Avenue and Mona Road.
- One Ways on Mona Avenue and part of Mona Road.
- No Waiting at Any Time on parts of Cobden Place, Cobden View Road, Hands Road, Leamington Street, Matlock Road, Melbourn Road, Mona Avenue, Pickmere Road, Romsdal Road, Sackville Road, Slinn Street, Townend Street and Warwick Terrace is made permanent, with the extent of the restrictions shortened or not wholly implemented on Cobden View Road, Romsdal Road and Sackville Road as detailed below
- Romsdal Road - keep the double yellow lines on western side at junction with Sackville Road
- Cobden View Road - keep the double yellow lines at junction with Cobden Place but not the extended ones at the junction with Springvale Road.
- Sackville Road - Keep all double yellow lines except on eastern side adjoining Romsdal Road
- No Waiting Monday to Friday 9am to 5pm on part of Western Road.
- Amendment to Permit Holder Parking Places on Crookesmoor Road.

Only the measures in place (and listed above) will be implemented on street on a permanent basis. Officers will therefore look to revoke all elements within the permanent order which are not included above. The revocation process will be subject to the statutory requirements for the modification of traffic regulation orders. It may also be subject to a further decision by the committee where that is

necessary (per the requirements of the Council's constitution).

There is general support for most measures that remain. Only the Sackville Road/Pickmere Road filter continues to generate correspondence and this intervention stands in isolation now that all the others have been removed.

## **WALKLEY**

The interventions have pushed some traffic onto boundary roads, but there has been significant reduction on traffic using the residential roads that have been treated. This, coupled with historical interventions east of South Road means we can start to develop a network of ATNs that could be linked further east toward the strategic A61 corridor, and Hillsborough centre.

The recommended option is to make permanent the measures that are currently in place as below:

- Prohibition of Motor Vehicles on parts of Fir Street, Highton Street and Matlock Road (western end).
- One Way on parts of Greenhow Street and Heavygate Avenue.
- No Waiting at Any Time on parts of Camm Street, Greenhow Street, Heavygate Avenue, Highton Street and Matlock Road is made permanent, with the extent of the restrictions shortened or not wholly implemented on eastern side of Matlock Road between Fulton Road and Heavygate Road

Only the measures in place (and listed above) will be implemented on street on a permanent basis. Officers will therefore look to revoke all elements within the permanent order which are not included above. The revocation process will be subject to the statutory requirements for the modification of traffic regulation orders. It may also be subject to a further decision by the committee where that is necessary (per the requirements of the Council's constitution).

### **11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

#### **11.4.1 Conclude the Experiment**

For both areas, returning everything back to as it was in April 2022. This would be counterproductive to central and local government policy and objectives commitments.

## **12. ACTIVE TRAVEL NEIGHBOURHOOD ETRO REVIEW: NETHER EDGE**

12.1.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures setting out an analysis of the effect of the implementation of an Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) in Nether Edge, including the results of formal consultation, along with feedback received pre and post formal consultation.

12.1.2 The consultation sought the views of residents, visitors to the area, businesses, local groups, institutions, and statutory groups to inform a decision on whether or not the Council wished to progress towards making the changes permanent or

not.

12.1.3 During the discussion of the above item the Committee agreed, in accordance with Council Procedure Rules, that as the meeting was approaching the two hours and 30 minutes time limit, the meeting should be extended by a period of 30 minutes.

12.1.4 It was moved by Cllr Sangar and seconded by Cllr Barker, as an amendment, that the recommendations submitted be amended by replacing recommendation three with the wording “The ETO is not made permanent and the Archer Lane road closure is removed”, the addition of recommendation four “A permanent Traffic Regulation Order is promoted for the double yellow lines associated with the Osborne Road and Psalter Lane pedestrian crossings which should be retained on a permanent basis.” The numbering of the subsequent recommendations was amended accordingly.

The amendment was put to the vote and carried.

(NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR – 6 Members; AGAINST – 2 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member.)

12.1.5 It was emphasised that the effects of reversing the road closure would need to be monitored closely.

12.2.1 **RESOLVED:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:

- 1) Note the assessment of the impacts of the Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) layout;
- 2) Consider the results of the formal consultation, and feedback received post formal consultation;
- 3) The ETO is not made permanent and the Archer Lane road closure is removed
- 4) A permanent Traffic Regulation Order is promoted for the double yellow lines associated with the Osborne Road and Psalter Lane pedestrian crossings which should be retained on a permanent basis
- 5) Authorise officers to carry out further design work and engagement to identify appropriate permanent options and report back to a future meeting; and
- 6) Note that the Council’s Traffic Regulations team will inform all consultation respondents accordingly;
- 7) Authorise officers to progress the formal revocation of those elements of the ETO which were not implemented

12.2.2 The votes on the amended recommendation were ordered to be recorded and were as follows: -

For the recommendations (6) -

Councillors Ian Auckland, David Barker, Craig Gamble-Pugh, Ben Miskell, Safiya Saeed and Andrew Sangar



Against the recommendations (2) - Councillors Christine Gilligan-Kubo and Ruth Mersereau

Abstained from voting – Councillor Richard Shaw  
on the recommendations (1)

### 12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

12.3.1 During the pre-experiment phase of the Nether Edge Active Neighbourhood consultation respondents said that they would like to see a reduction in traffic, improved crossings, and safer areas for children to play.

12.3.2 The perception surveys have consistently shown that most people perceive that the project has had more negative than positive impacts and the majority are opposed to it. For example, 69% of self-selecting resident respondents said that the project had negatively impacted congestion, 60% said the same for through-traffic and 74% said journey times had been negatively impacted by the project. 52% said that traffic speed had also been negatively impacted and less than a third said they would support the project.

12.3.3 The survey undertaken using a sample (thus moving away from self - selection) is more positive, especially from residents. For example, two in five residents (38%) suggest that the area now feels like a safer environment for walking and almost a half (47%) said they would support the project.

12.3.4 Members considered the results of the perception surveys in making a decision to not make the closure of Archer Lane permanent. The committee noted that there were a significant majority of people welcoming the introduction of the crossings and therefore the double yellow lines supporting the crossings along with the crossings themselves will be made permanent.

### 12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

#### Option A - End the Experiment

12.4.1 Ending the ETO without making a permanent Order would not include the retention of the double yellow lines that support the pedestrian crossings provided during the trial and that will be made permanent.