

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

POLICY COMMITTEE DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Wednesday 13 March 2024 by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.

Item No

8. 2023/24 Q3 BUDGET MONITORING

8.1 Members considered a report of the Director of Finance and Commercial Services bringing the Committee up to date with the Council's General Fund revenue outturn position for 2023/24 as at Q3.

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

Note the updated information and management actions on the 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. PARKWOOD LEVELLING UP FUND ACCEPTANCE

9.1 Members considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures providing the context for a recommendation to accept government grant offers from the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities (DLUHC) of £19,389,336 for Parkwood as part of the Levelling Up Fund (LUF). This would fund the project through further feasibility, design and delivery.

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

Approves Sheffield City Council acting as the accountable body for £19,389,336 of Levelling Up Fund round 3 funding from DLUHC, in relation to Parkwood Springs, subject to the key terms, responsibilities and risks in the final Memorandum of Understanding being the same as those summarised in the report.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

9.3.1 The preferred option, to accept the funding and deliver the projects within the bid, takes advantage of an opportunity to regenerate a key part of the city. The

funding will allow us to deliver improvements that residence, business owners and other key stakeholders are keen to see happen and will make a real difference to the local communities.

- 9.3.2 It is therefore recommended to approve Sheffield City Council acting as the accountable body for Levelling Up Fund 3 Parkwood Springs subject to the key terms, responsibilities and risks in the final grant agreement being the same as those summarised in this Report.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 Do nothing

- 9.4.1.1 Not accepting LUF funding would mean foregoing the opportunity to deliver significant capital interventions in Parkwood and the associated economic, environmental and social benefits. No benefits would be delivered along with no contribution to the Council plan.

- 9.4.1.2 If the proposed programme does not come to fruition, the impact will be a continued decline in areas that have already suffered years of economic and social deterioration. These areas cannot continue to be ignored, if this funding is lost alternative funding will need to be sought to allow the necessary investment to be made to support the regeneration of these parts of the city.

10. **COMMITTEE CLIMATE STATEMENT**

- 10.1 Members considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures seeking endorsement of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee's Climate Statement.

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

Agrees their committee climate statement and to ensuring that the proposed actions contained in such statement are reflected in their Work Programme.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 It is important that the response to the Annual Climate Progress Report is open and transparent in setting out the challenges which the local authority faces in making progress and clarifies future expectations on the part we all have to play in addressing climate change.

- 10.3.2 Committee do not currently have specific strategic goals for climate. The process required to develop these, and have the statements approved to be read at each committee meeting meant that option 5.2 was not feasible with the available resource and timeframe.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 Not providing committee climate statements considered due to the resource required to collate.

- 10.4.2 Providing more detailed Committee Climate Statements that provided an overview

of strategic climate goals, with each Chair then reading the committees statement publicly at their respective committee meeting following release of the report.

11. DECARBONISATION ROUTEMAP: ENERGY, GENERATION AND STORAGE

11.1 Members considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures briefing them on and seeking approval of the Energy Generation and Storage Decarbonisation Routemap.

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

That the Transport, Regeneration, and Climate Policy Committee approves the Energy Generation and Storage Decarbonisation Routemap at appendix 1 to this report.

11.3 Reasons for Decision

11.3.1 The recommendation to approve the Energy Generation and Storage routemap is the preferred option because it will allow progress to be made on key activity to progress the decarbonisation of energy generation and storage in the city.

11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

11.4.1 Creating a single plan covering all areas requiring decarbonisation was considered, but to enable officers to continue to deliver projects at the same time this approach was rejected. Creating a plan which takes us all the way to 2030 was considered but given the changing technology and current shortfall in funding of several billion pounds, it was considered that creating a live and agile document that could be easily updated and added to was preferable.

12. SHEFFIELD TRANSPORT VISION

12.1 Members considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures outlining the work undertaken to develop the Sheffield Transport Vision and presenting the final document to the Committee.

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

- Notes the collaborative work undertaken to agree a shared Transport Vision for Sheffield, which clearly communicates the city's transport ambitions to everyone who lives, works, learns in or visits Sheffield.
- Notes the importance of adopting a shared Vision which will enable prioritisation and delivery of the City's ambitious transport programme.
- Endorses the Sheffield Transport Vision document.

12.3 Reasons for Decision

- 12.3.1 The purpose of the proposed Sheffield Transport Vision is to provide an overarching narrative which clearly communicates the shared transport ambitions and priorities for the city to 2035. The Vision has been carefully aligned with more recently emerging city ambitions and broader priorities relating to climate change, growth and sustainability, and underpinning the priorities set out in the adopted Transport Strategy.
- 12.3.2 As outlined in paragraph 5.1, a full refresh of the Transport Strategy is not considered appropriate at this point in time, when the focus must be on successfully delivering our ambitious transport programme for the benefit of the city and its people.
- 12.3.3 Adopting a shared Transport Vision which consolidates and reinforces the TRC Committee's collective priorities will strengthen our ability to influence decision makers both at a regional and national level to secure the best deal for the people of Sheffield in future. It will also ensure that Members are able to make decisions about future delivery plans and schemes, within the collectively agreed framework of the Transport Vision, which is fully aligned with the broader city ambitions and goals.

12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 12.4.1 The alternative option would have been to undertake a full review of the existing Transport Strategy. This option was not felt to be appropriate at this time, partly because of the imminent development of the next statutory South Yorkshire Local Transport Plan which will be the reference point for national government transport investment in South Yorkshire, but also because the key elements of the existing Sheffield Transport Strategy are still very valid.
- 12.4.2 The emergence of the new broader strategies and policies outlined in this report means that it is more important at this stage to align our overarching priorities, building a clear narrative for the city.

13. **ROAD SAFETY ACTION PLAN**

- 13.1 Members considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures seeking approval for the Road Safety Action Plan 2024-2029.

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

- a) Endorse the progression of the points and actions in the Road Safety Action Plan 2024 – 2029 – Action List, within the Road Safety Action Plan, and,
- b) Note that any actions requiring future approval by the committee will be reported back to the committee at a future date.

13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 13.3.1 The expected benefits from the action plan are focused on road safety – to reduce the opportunities for road traffic collisions resulting in injury. This aligns with Sheffield and South Yorkshire's joint aim of Vision Zero.

- 13.3.2 Further expected benefits from the measures outlined in the action plan are an

increase in safety, perception of safety, and improving health by supporting safe active travel movements.

13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

13.4.1 'Do nothing' has been considered but is not deemed appropriate as Sheffield needs a Road Safety Action Plan.

14. **LOCAL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD TRANSPORT COMPLIMENTARY PROGRAMME (LANTCP) 2024/25**

14.1 Members considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures outlining the proposed Local and Neighbourhood Transport Complimentary Programme (LaNTCP) for 2024/25 and seeking approval to proceed with development and implementation of the proposals subject to the necessary capital programme, traffic orders, and route management approvals being acquired.

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

- i. Approves the proposed use of 2024/25 LaNTCP programme funding, set out in this report, noting that it is subject to:
 - a. Detailed development of individual proposals;
 - b. The capital approval process;
 - c. Any necessary development and regulatory consents.
- ii. Continues to delegate authority to the Head of Strategic Transport, Sustainability, and Infrastructure to make reserved commissioning decisions where they are necessary in order to progress these schemes to completion.

14.3 **Reasons for Decision**

14.3.1 For the reasons outlined previously, the investment in local transport. schemes will ultimately help to address the ambitions of Members and deliver against the requests of the Sheffield public, without reliance on external funding opportunities or incorporating these improvements into wider major investment projects. The primary objectives of the fund are detailed below:

14.3.2 The expected benefits from this fund are centred primarily on the community, with improved transport connectivity increasing mobility and accessibility, creating a greater sense of safety, enhancing the environmental amenity and improving health by supporting more active. travel movements. In addition, there would be fewer road traffic collisions. through design and modest associated mode shift.

14.3.3 The proposed transport capital programme balances the availability of funding sources with local and national policy to give a clear focus for the 2024/25 financial year.

14.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 14.4.1 'Do nothing' has been considered, but is not considered appropriate as this will result in projects not being delivered. The LaNTCP would not introduce the opportunity for economic, environmental, and societal benefits will be missed.
- 14.4.2 It would also be possible to consider a different balance between types of schemes as part of the programme. However, it is felt that the proposed programme achieves a good balance of economic, environmental, and societal benefits to the communities and businesses in Sheffield.

15. **ON-STREET RESIDENTIAL CHARGEPOINT PILOT SCHEME (ORCS): TRO CONSULTATION REPORT**

15.1 Members considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce an on-street residential chargepoint scheme (ORCS), report the receipt of objections to the scheme and set out the Council's response.

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

- Considers the objections to the TROs for the proposed on-street residential chargepoint scheme (ORCS) and officer responses.
- Approves the making of the Traffic Regulation Orders in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- Notes that all objectors will be informed of the decision prior to implementation.

15.3 **Reasons for Decision**

15.3.1 The scheme will provide new EV infrastructure in areas where drivers wishing to charge an EV do not have access to a private driveway or an off-street facility. This could reduce inequalities and result in a greater use and uptake of EVs which can contribute to the reduction in carbon emissions and the contribute towards tackling the climate emergency.

15.3.2 This is one of the key drivers for this project nationally, supporting a move away from the use of traditional fossil fuels to cleaner technologies such as electric.

15.3.3 The development of a public electric vehicle charging infrastructure network contributes towards addressing health inequalities and other causes and identifiers of inequality in Sheffield as identified in the Equality Impact Assessment.

15.3.4 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.

15.3.5 The impact of the on-street spaces and infrastructure on existing parking

pressures in these areas should be seen in context with the current and future benefits of the facilities as well as the small amount of space that would be needed out of the streets or car parks in each of these neighbourhoods.

15.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 15.4.1 The proposed on-street EV chargepoints have been designed to minimise the space used, look to comply with standards for accessibility where feasible and not install lots of EV equipment on footways. Placing the EV infrastructure on footways is an option but is not considered to be appropriate as this would reduce footway widths which in many residential areas are less than 2metres wide and so would introduce a hazard to pedestrians.
- 15.4.2 Alternative designs for on-street charging infrastructure that does not require a reduction in footways were considered. These included larger buildouts which then encourage drivers to access the chargepoint via the footway level. This would require more space and so further reduce opportunities for on-street parking. It was considered that the need to have a minimal impact to on-street space whilst also making the infrastructure as accessible as possible ruled out using a larger island or buildout.
- 15.4.3 The council are investigating the potential for charging EVs via streetlighting. However, there are technical issues which need to be worked through in order to understand the commercial viability as well as practical issues with the approach for the City.
- 15.4.4 The EV chargepoints have been promoted with a TRO as implementing EV infrastructure but not restricting the bays usage to EVs would likely result in these facilities not being available to those wishing to use them. However, the usage data will be reviewed and the timings and extents of the restriction may be recommended for change if it is considered that the space is being underutilised. This would be subject to another TRO process and consultation.

16. **SHEFFIELD ACTIVE TRAVEL INFRASTRUCTURE PLAN: INITIAL ENGAGEMENT PROPOSALS**

- 16.1 Members considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures summarising the proposed approach to delivering initial public engagement this summer to feed into preparation of the Sheffield Active Travel Infrastructure Plan.
- 16.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:-
- Notes the contents of the report and approve the approaches outlined to delivering initial public engagement in support of the development of a Sheffield Active Travel Implementation Plan
 - Approves the commissioning of a community engagement specialist to assist in finalising the engagement plan, to work alongside Council officers in delivering engagement this summer and to produce a report summarising the findings for TRC in September

16.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 16.3.1 The proposed SATIP engagement work aims to:
- Ensure that all communities, especially those that are “seldom heard” are reached through engagement.
 - Identify appropriate channels for reaching a demographically diverse city in general and seldom heard people in particular.
 - Pay close attention to postcodes where response rates tend to be low, help facilitate community level discussions about local destinations, how people travel to these, what would help them to travel actively and what is preventing them from doing so currently.
 - Capture these views for inclusion in our SATIP evidence and summarise in an engagement evaluation report.
- 16.3.2 It is therefore recommended that Committee approves the recommendations set out in this report and the expenditure required to appoint a community engagement specialist to work with us in reaching seldom heard groups and individuals across the city. This will inform the development of the SATIP and help the Council to better understand active travel considerations as a step towards more sensitive and responsive way of undertaking public engagement.
- 16.3.3 Note that a further report will be presented in September when Members will be furnished with the results of engagement as part of the scheme prioritisation process.

16.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 16.4.1 The Council has been charged with preparing an Active Travel Infrastructure Plan, together with the other SY districts, to prioritise areas and develop proposals for future infrastructure funding, especially CRSTS2. Given the above, prior public engagement is deemed necessary and funding is available to undertake it. Officers have set out the preferred approach above. Alternative options therefore centre on the following:
- 16.4.2 Doing more engagement – officers are reasonably confident that the level of engagement which has been put forward here can be delivered within budget and timescales, and that it is sufficient for purpose. Doing anything more would require more specification, and time and resource to deliver and process, thus jeopardising its’ usefulness in terms of effectively feeding into the necessary programmes of work.
- 16.4.3 Doing less engagement – Members have a clear priority for early and responsive engagement around active travel proposals. Doing less engagement would compromise that requirement. Officers believe the task should be to ensure best value from the resource which the Council has. However, some “scaling back” of work may become necessary given changes to funding and deadlines or difficulties in procurement and delivery.
- 16.4.4 Doing “the minimum” engagement – this option only becomes appropriate if funding and timescales change more drastically. In any other scenario officers believe this to be an unacceptable way to proceed, given Member priorities and it not being expected to deliver all of the desired outcomes.

17. LODGE MOOR 20MPH SCHEME SLO CONSULTATION REPORT

- 17.1 Members considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures containing

details of the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits Lodge Moor, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

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

a) Approves that the Lodge Moor 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 that the order implemented on street subject to no road safety issues being

17.3 **Reasons for Decision**

17.3.1 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.

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

17.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

17.4.1 In light of the objections received, consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Lodge Moor (do nothing). 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.

17.4.2 Another possible option is to reduce the scope of the scheme. This is not considered a suitable option as it is contrary to the Council's 20mph speed limit strategy that aims to install 20mph limits on all suitable residential roads.

18. **HIGH STREET MOSBOROUGH - LIMITED WAITING PARKING BAYS**

18.1 Members considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce Limited Waiting Parking Bays on Mosborough High Street, report the receipt of objections to the Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) and set out the Council's response.

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

a) Having considered the representations received and thus satisfied that the reasons to support the proposals outweigh any unwithdrawn objections, to:

- Make permanent the Experimental Traffic Order, as currently implemented, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984; and
- Before the order is implemented, ask that the objectors are informed.

18.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 18.3.1 The implementation of the Mosborough High Street - Limited Waiting Parking Bays experimental traffic order has resulted in a limited number of objections, but it has also resulted in the opportunity for more visitors to utilise the parking bays in a district shopping centre.
- 18.3.2 The parking survey undertaken post scheme implementation, noted that drivers are on the whole respecting the restrictions. An increase in individual vehicles was recorded within the restricted area as being approximately 50% higher than pre scheme. These results suggest the scheme has increased the turnover of vehicles and improved numbers of short stay visitors, resulting in more spaces being available on average.
- 18.3.3 The survey also indicated that parking has not been adversely affected on Stone Street or Church Mews.
- 18.3.4 Having considered the responses from the public and other consultees and in light of the parking survey information obtained, it is recommended that the ETO is made permanent in full.

18.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 18.4.1 The parking bays could be pay to park spaces instead of time limited parking. This would help with turnover and enforcement. It is likely that this would not be well received by the community or local businesses and may have an adverse effect on trade. It may also cause additional migration of parking onto nearby residential streets, as vehicle users would utilise the nearby unrestricted parking instead of paying a fee.
- 18.4.2 Do nothing was also considered but this would likely result in business employees moving back onto the street and parking for the majority of the day. It would make it more difficult for customers to park and may reduce trade for the businesses themselves.

19. **DIGITISATION OF THE DATABASE MANAGEMENT OF TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDERS AND ASSOCIATED DELEGATED DECISION MAKING**

- 19.1 Members considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures to inform Committee about an initiative to introduce a digital platform for the database management of Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's) and to seek Committee approval to delegate determination of any objections received in relation to the making of the TRO associated with the move.

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

- Endorses the move to a digital platform for the management of TROs; and
- Approves the delegation of the decision whether to make the proposed consolidated TRO to the Director of Investment, Climate Change and

Planning subject to their following the process outlined within this report (including the consideration of any objections received).

19.3 Reasons for Decision

- 19.3.1 The move to a digital map based database of traffic order information will make access to the orders made by the Council easier for internal and external people and organisations to access.
- 19.3.2 The Council will be working towards meeting the aims of the Department for Transport with regards to the digitisation of traffic orders.

19.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 19.4.1 The only other option considered which would still allow the Council to proceed with the proposal to consolidate its TROs and switch to the new system was to follow the current procedure i.e. objections considered by this Committee. This is not considered viable, for reasons of easing the burden on Committee (by not, for example, holding an extraordinary meeting outside of the schedule purely so as to expedite the making of the order as quickly as possible) while still also ensuring any objections are fully considered. The recommended course of action was consequently deemed the preferred way forward.