



Report to Economic and Environmental Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee 24 October, 2018

Report of: Head of Strategic Transport and Infrastructure

Subject: Sheffield Transport Strategy 2018-34: assessing sustainable travel options (Supertram; Sheffield Bus Partnership; Sheffield Cycling Inquiry)

Author of Report: Tom Finnegan-Smith

Summary:

In July 2018 Cabinet endorsed a new long-term Transport Strategy for Sheffield. This sets out how the city proposes to deal with projected increases in population, homes and jobs to 2034.

This report briefs Scrutiny on the

- Implications of these new transport policies for the city and the strategic fit with Sheffield City Region's recent draft Transport Strategy, and Transport for the North's wider ambitions
- Current standing of key sustainable transport modes (see below) in the city in order to understand their potential fitness for purpose to meet the challenge of increasing their mode share as envisaged in the Strategy
 - Public transport: 1) Buses – focussing on the performance of the Sheffield Bus Partnership and its future trajectory
 - Public transport: 2) Supertram – with reference to the current consultation on the future of the system
 - Active travel: Cycling – taking into account the 2014 Cycling Inquiry and what has been learnt since
- Approach taken in progressing from Strategy principles towards scheme delivery “on the ground” and how Members, stakeholders and the public may influence this process further as we move towards adoption of the Transport Strategy by Cabinet in 2019

It is presented to Scrutiny in order to hopefully aid community “buy in” for the significant long term impact on Sheffield's transport infrastructure. Future transport interventions must be designed to enable transport to reach its full potential in addressing key challenges for Sheffield, as we strive to improve our economic, environmental and equality performance. As well as shaping (and re-shaping) Places in the city, the Strategy will also have a significant impact on people's lifestyles and result in changed travel behaviour.

Reviewing of existing policy	
------------------------------	--

Informing the development of new policy	X
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	X
Other	

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

Provide comments on

- sustainable transport prospects;
- compatibility with local access issues in delivering transport interventions
- how to build support for these ambitions to deliver the uplift needed in order to address transport related problems the city faces.

Background Papers:

Sheffield Transport Strategy – see Cabinet agenda 18th July 2018, Item 8

<http://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=123&MId=6980&Ver=4>

Report of the: Head of Strategic Transport and Infrastructure

Sheffield Transport Strategy 2018-34: assessing sustainable travel options (Supertram; Sheffield Bus Partnership; Sheffield Cycling Inquiry)

1.0	Introduction/Context
1.1	<p>Sheffield Council's new Transport Strategy (2018-34) sets out how to "do" transport differently in the future given the pressing need to</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Create "headroom for growth", especially in the city centre and Lower Don Valley, as more jobs and homes are required by an increased population• Address congestion, pollution and inequality so that we grow in a sustainable and inclusive way• Help realise the city's full economic and environmental potential as we prepare for the arrival of HS2 in 2034.
1.2	<p>The Strategy outlines a new "Sustainable Safety" methodology for achieving these aims that has particular implications for public transport and active travel. As such, it represents a shift away from emphasis on a "behaviour change" approach to encouraging sustainable journeys and marks a return to first principles. Thus greater stress is laid on Sheffield Council's role as Highway Authority and using our powers, where appropriate, to help create the right conditions for people to choose the right mode, for the right journey.</p>
1.3	<p>In essence this means ensuring safe conditions for cycling for short trips (the vast bulk being under 5 miles and many of these shorter still) and more priority for public transport to speed up door-to-door journey times. These sustainable modes therefore capture the projected increase in trips, whilst car use is pegged at 2015 levels. This, in turn, frees up capacity for longer trips including those by car that cannot be easily made by public transport. Classification of roads and reallocation of road space -- as in the Netherlands -- to minimise conflict between different modes of transport and improve safety and efficiency is essential to this.</p>
1.4	<p>The Strategy is thus consistent with both Sheffield City Region's (SCR) and Transport for the North's (TfN) aim to enable "agglomeration" -- in other words the opportunities for employers to draw on the skills of a larger pool of people and skills across northern England. Sheffield's lower levels of labour mobility are acknowledged as a constraint on the regional economy by SCR.</p> <p>It should be noted that, in this respect, the public transport component of the Strategy is dependent on other parties, especially Northern Powerhouse Rail aspirations for 30-minute city centre to city centre journey times between Sheffield, Leeds and Manchester.</p>
1.5	<p>Sheffield Council's Transport Strategy is being brought to the public's attention at the same time as SCR's own Transport Strategy. Equally, it follows on smartly from TfN's consultation on their Transport Plan which is due to be finalised before the year is out. The binding theme between the three tiered strategies is recognition that major transport</p>

	<p>infrastructure deficiencies must be addressed if cities and regions are to flourish – this being a £100 billion Gross Value Added (GVA) economic question, according to Transport for the North.</p>
1.6	<p>This report aims to provide Scrutiny with a better understanding of how we arrived at the current position and the gap between where we are with sustainable transport, and where we need to be, to make our ambitions real.</p> <p>It also indicates some of the governance challenges and the financial, social and cultural changes that may be needed for this “quantum leap” to happen over the ensuing decades.</p>
1.7	<p>In order to aid that understanding it probes these issues by focussing on aspects of sustainable transport</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sheffield Bus Partnership, given that the initial five year agreement expired in October 2017 and is now subject to a 12 month rolling renewal • The Supertram network, given the current consultation led by South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) on its future • An appraisal of outcomes anticipated by the Sheffield Cycling Inquiry in 2014 and how the Strategy seeks to build upon or change them
2.0	Sheffield’s Transport Strategy – future implications for sustainable travel
2.1	<p>The need for a Sheffield Transport Strategy was prompted by a range of projections – a growing population and the need to facilitate additional jobs and homes in a much more sustainable way being chief amongst them.</p> <p>This was accompanied by SCR recognition that Sheffield would be the driver for regional jobs growth. Strong public transport links to the city centre were seen as a key enabler of this. Officers were also mindful of the distinctive nature of Sheffield as opposed to the wider City Region in development terms. Chiefly, the city’s larger, denser urban core largely precluded the building of new roads and necessitated a city specific approach.</p>
2.2	<p>Modelling to test various growth scenarios revealed some cautionary results. Considering forecasts on travel growth and trips from new development, significant additional congestion was indicated both on the Inner Ring Road and within the Ring Road. The latter would impact on the city centre itself, resulting in delay to buses particularly. A likely consequence of this would be a shift from public transport to car, with the additional problems for movement and the city that would create.</p>
2.3	<p>Whilst it should be acknowledged that all such traffic models and forecasts are flawed, they can be useful. Given that this was a projection that did not take into account the additional growth deemed necessary, the conclusions were clear enough. The constraints on the Ring Road were at the junctions, which widening would not resolve. This suggested that better use of existing highway space would form part of our approach.</p>

2.4	<p>In November 2015 consultation on the Sheffield Plan -- City-Wide Options for Growth to 2035 had started. Any Transport Strategy needed to be complementary to this emerging “Local” Plan but was also deemed to be necessary in its own right. Officers have worked collaboratively on both to develop them more or less in parallel and ensure consistency. The Transport Strategy thus takes into account the projected scale of growth and spatial distribution of that growth.</p> <p>Alignment was also ensured between the emerging Transport Strategy and the Green City Strategy. Both encourage a shift away from more carbon intensive to less carbon intensive transport modes, within the parameters set by wider corporate priorities.</p> <p>The Transport Strategy was also informed by the 2011 Mini-Stern Review for Sheffield City Region to understand the most carbon effective transport measures both to address climate change and make networks more resilient to the impacts of that change.</p>
2.5	<p>As a precursor to the full Strategy, officers worked up the Sheffield Transport Vision. This aimed to sketch out the bigger picture of the challenges we faced (captured above) and some solutions. Member involvement was ensured via a Working Group, chaired by Cllr Lindars-Hammond, Cabinet Advisor for Transport at that time.</p>
2.6	<p>It was also judged to be important to “firm up” the outcomes that transport needed to deliver. Therefore a separate piece of work was commissioned to identify the “measurables” we wanted to achieve in transport terms. Specialists SDG were appointed and conducted wide-ranging research to understand the policy, socio economic and transport contexts within which the outputs would be framed. They were able to derive a series of conditional outputs– essentially broad “stretch” targets that transport should help enable, given the necessary financial, political and public support.</p> <p>These outputs were deemed to be conditional on all these building blocks being in place. In part this was recognition that disaggregating the benefits delivered by transport is problematic in conventional economic terms. Whilst transport interventions may not directly result in new jobs and housing, without such interventions development may be stymied or not possible at all.</p> <p>Hence, transport has an indispensable under-pinning role in enabling the right conditions for growth and ensuring the most suitable type of development, particularly when it is coupled to “place-making” initiatives. These provide the kind of finer grain, neighbourhood uplift that makes for successful localities in which business and community can thrive.</p>
2.7	<p>The Vision established the need for change and the approaches that might best fit to deliver that change. The Transport Vision was consulted on in January – March 2018. The consultation was designed to be wide-reaching via an online Citizen Space survey. This sought to</p>

	<p>test the acceptability of the proposed approaches and to capture people's propensity to change how they travel; also, to understand the difficulties people had in travelling by sustainable modes or, indeed, making journeys at all.</p>
2.8	<p>Advertising via social media improved representation amongst such as motorists who typically are less likely to respond than more well-organised lobby groups. Field surveys were also commissioned to get a better sample from localities that tend to have lower participation. This helped produce a significant sample of nearly 2000 respondents.</p> <p>The results largely confirmed the evidence already assembled for the Vision. People saw the biggest issue with public transport as a lack of reliability (which we read as punctuality or timekeeping) for buses, although Supertram was popular than bus. Safety was the key barrier to uptake of cycling. There was an apparent willingness of a section of people to switch from car to more sustainable modes such as bus and bike. There were also significantly worrying numbers of disgruntled bus users who would switch in the other direction, given the chance.</p>
2.9	<p>To devise the new Transport Strategy, officers determined that an evidenced based approach should be followed. In order to provide wider expertise and resource consultants WSP were appointed to support Strategy development and work with the Transport Planning team.</p> <p>Pressing ahead with further work to consolidate the evidence base and work up the full Strategy, officers presented the Vision consultation findings, along with the Transport Strategy to Cabinet in July. The "big idea" at the core of this work was that the increase in trips as a result of growth should be taken up by public transport and cycling – not assuming a "car first" approach. Walking rates would only rise slightly, as a significant number of new cycling trips would convert from walking.</p> <p>Journeys by car would be capped at their current level by a range of measures to incentivise the alternatives – in summary ensuring safe cycling conditions and speeding up public transport by providing greater priority on street.</p> <p>Pollution would be addressed principally by changes in vehicle propulsion technology -- air quality having been the subject of a separate Clean Air Strategy at Cabinet in December, 2017 – but with benefits associated from greater use of improved cycling facilities and improved public transport services as set out in the Transport Strategy.</p> <p>These issues are to be dealt with in detail under the emerging Clean Air Zone for Sheffield and Rotherham. Air quality matters will be considered by the Health and Well Being Board meeting, also scheduled for October 2018.</p> <p>At July Cabinet, the Transport Strategy was endorsed by Members, with a view to further consultation in order to build buy-in for the major changes it indicated were needed.</p>

2.10	<p>Thus we present to the Economic and Environmental Well Being and Policy Development Scrutiny Board as we prepare for the next major phase of the Strategy. This will involve working up the transport interventions in the key locations (corridors and more dispersed geographical areas) that have been identified for action.</p> <p>It is proposed that before the start of the 2019/20 financial year that the Council will consider the longer term financial “ask” – both revenue and capital – arising from these potential projects.</p>
2.11	<p>In doing so, there is an assumption that Sheffield will have to find in the region of 25% contribution towards future major transport schemes, although some projects we may have to fully fund. This is acknowledged in the Strategy with a suggestion for how we might hope to raise funds locally including, for example, a Workplace Parking Levy as has been successfully pioneered in Nottingham.</p>
2.12	<p>There is a growing consensus about the need for a major upgrade in Britain’s infrastructure, especially transport, and no shortage of evidence of the benefits of such investment. There is now also a quantified estimate of what this would cost –the National Infrastructure Assessment produced by the National Infrastructure Commission (NIC) in September. This sets out the long term infrastructure needs of the country to 2050. It proposes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £43bn of stable long-term transport funding for regional cities, with £30bn for devolved authorities by 2040 (£3.3bn between 2020-25 and ramping up thereafter to 2050) • This, however, would be tied to a commitment to deliver the new homes that this infrastructure enables. The report notes: <i>“To deliver thriving cities, metro mayors and other city leaders should develop integrated strategies for transport, employment and housing. Housing and infrastructure should be planned together: new housing requires new infrastructure. These integrated strategies should be backed up by stable, substantial, devolved funding. And for the cities that face the most severe capacity constraints, and with the most potential for growth, there should be additional funding to support major upgrade programmes, which would be agreed between the cities and central government.”</i>
2.13	<p>The NIC report is due to be laid before Parliament on a date to be set for a response. It recommends</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • By 2021, metro mayors and city leaders should develop and implement long term integrated strategies for transport, employment and housing that will support growth in their cities. • By 2021, government should ensure city leaders have the right powers to deliver these integrated strategies, including the power for metro mayors to make decisions on major housing development sites • Government should set out devolved infrastructure budgets for individual cities for locally determined urban transport priorities

	<p>in line with the funding profile set out by the Commission. Budgets for 2021-2026 should be confirmed by mid-2019. Government should pass legislation, by 2020, requiring cities to be given regular five year infrastructure budgets.</p> <p>Again this points to the need for close alignment with SCR objectives, in order to draw down funding. But we see Sheffield taking a clear lead on devising the type of interventions that we have determined best suit the distinctive environment and character of the city.</p> <p>So Sheffield's Transport Strategy is designed to be consistent with the wider policies of SCR but also to take into account the distinctive needs the city has – the larger urban core compared to the rest of the city region, its topography and large rural hinterland much of it in the Peak District National Park.</p>
2.14	<p>Early indications suggest that Sheffield's transport infrastructure funding requirement is likely to be in line with the NIA projections, but we should be under no illusion about the challenge that this presents. In summary, if the kind of money the NIA envisages is made available delivery within the industry nationally would be at risk from significant skills shortages.</p>
2.15	<p>Turning back to the here and now, Scrutiny has requested an appraisal of current sustainable transport options. This will aid an understanding of how "fit for purpose" sustainable modes are in terms of delivering the uplift in their use that is proposed.</p>
	<p>Sustainable travel implications – Public transport (1) Sheffield Bus Partnership</p>
	<p><u>The formation of SBP</u></p>
2.16	<p>Bus is the "workhorse" of local public transport. Whilst nationally much focus is on rail, perhaps reflecting the predominance of this mode in getting people to work in the capital, for most public transport users in the country at large it is bus that matters. In Sheffield more than 100,000 journeys a day are made, mainly with the two biggest operators, First and Stagecoach.</p> <p>Bus routes offer the greatest prospect for shorter term improvements in public transport (typically 2-5 years delivery timeframe for schemes depending on scale) as opposed to light rail / tram) (5-10+) years or heavy rail (15+) years.</p>
2.17	<p>Therefore bus is pivotal to the public transport mix. Since 2012, buses in Sheffield have been operated under the Sheffield Bus Partnership. This brings together Sheffield Council, SYPTE, First and Stagecoach along with minor operators Sheffield Community Transport and more recently TM Travel also.</p>
2.18	<p>At the time options for the future operation of buses were considered by Members of the then South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority (SYITA). A partnership approach was highlighted by SYPTE, as distinct from franchising (described then as Quality Contracts). The</p>

	<p>case made for partnership which persuaded SYITA to adopt was, in summary, that the benefits of franchising could be largely realised via a Partnership and delivered more immediately.</p> <p>Importantly it was suggested this could be done without the risk associated with franchising in terms of local authorities bearing the revenue risk arising from setting fares.</p> <p>There was also the wider possibility of ultimate failure to meet the public interest test stipulated by the 2008 Transport Act for franchising. This subsequently transpired in Tyne and Wear centred North East Combined Authority (NECA).</p>
2.19	<p>The benefits of franchising, in summary according to the Urban Transport Group that failed to persuade Members, were seen as</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Opportunity to “pool” the various funding pots in order to maximise benefits of investment • Better co-ordination between modes – bus, tram (and train) to operate as a single network rather than competing • Smart ticketing and single livery makes to ease of use by travelling public
2.20	<p>SYITA accepted that the benefits attributed to franchising could be largely delivered sooner by a binding, quasi legal Voluntary Partnership Agreement (VPA) with operators. Thus the Sheffield Bus Partnership was launched in October 2012, with similar partnerships subsequently rolled out in Rotherham, Doncaster and Barnsley.</p>
	<p><u>The evolution of SBP</u></p>
2.21	<p>Following the VPA initiated for five years in October 2012, a series of Qualifying Agreements allowed collaboration on key bus routes in the city. Operators joined up their timetables to create more even headways (gaps between scheduled arrival times) and reduce frequency on “over-bussed” corridors. The “saved resource” surplus was redistributed, with partner agreement, to increase frequencies in other areas of the city. This created better network coverage, something akin to the whole system approach taken under franchising.</p> <p>Some of the surplus was also used to cut multi-operator ticket prices, which remain some of the cheapest in the country. This in turn brought a cut in the price of operator-specific tickets. The reduction in fares alongside overall improvement in services was understandably well-received by the travelling public. It helped secure a period of public goodwill, notwithstanding some “teething” troubles that inevitably arise with a major service change.</p>
2.22	<p>Due to reported pressures by operators, SBP agreed proposals to seek additional saved resource from Sheffield’s bus operation in 2015. This resulted in a recast of the network.</p> <p>By the time of implementation, in the run up to Christmas 2015,</p>

	<p>patronage was falling, a reversal of the rise during the first phase of the Partnership. The downward trend continues as the SBP nears its second successive one year renewal of the VPA.</p> <p>The 2015 changes resulted in public petitions to Council in December and subsequent consideration by Scrutiny in March 2016. The Committee also reviewed the performance of SBP at its meeting in July that year.</p> <p>There has been further criticism from Members of SBP's performance, including during the most recent service changes and a robust defence from operators, especially Stagecoach who have publicly raised their concerns about the impact of congestion on their services.</p>
2.23	<p>The other key driver of improvements for the Partnership was the Better Bus Area (BBA) initiative, a Government policy designed to promote economic growth and reduce emissions by improving bus services for passengers. SYPTE developed and submitted a bid for funding on behalf of partners to enable Sheffield to become the first BBA in the country.</p> <p>In February 2013 a Department for Transport (DfT) grant of £18.3 million was confirmed to improve bus services and related information across Sheffield. The grant combined monies already paid directly to bus operators – Bus Services Operator Grant (BSOG, effectively a fuel duty rebate) – with new funding to improve bus services and traffic management. BSOG was effectively foregone by the operators and paid as part of the BBA grant to SYPTE instead.</p> <p>A top-up payment of £1.6 million per annum for four years was agreed to, in principle, although the payment could not be promised more than one year at a time.</p> <p>After planning a number of interventions likely to generate more benefit to operators than the existing BSOG payments, SYPTE and most of the bus operators agreed to phasing out the payment over five years, covering the initial lifespan of the VPA. In effect this pretty much replaced the traditional Local Transport Plan funding for bus improvement schemes, as that funding stream was reduced further by Government cuts.</p>
2.24	<p>The BBA programme, which is coming to a close around a year behind schedule, covered</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Key Bus Route (KBR) improvements – large scale interventions on key routes to/from Sheffield city centre (A61 Penistone Road, A61 Chesterfield Road, A6135 Barnsley Road, B6388 Gleadless Road) including new bus lanes, clearways, raised kerbs at bus stops, tactile paving and RIDS at key junctions. • Hotspot Improvements at locations where buses are regularly delayed • Real-time information displays (RIDS) • Audio-Visual equipment Installation (120 route) • Integrating bus real time information and surveillance at Urban Traffic Control (UTC) to ensure priority for clusters of

	late-running buses
2.25	<p>Evidence suggests that BBA interventions contributed to improved journey reliability and speed on those corridors treated. However, it is probably fair to say that although SBP has not achieved its targets in terms of patronage, without this significant investment, decline would have been worse.</p> <p>It should also be noted that the continued pressures on revenue budgets saw capacity reduced at both Sheffield Council and SYPTE, creating difficulties in terms of medium and longer term planning of such interventions.</p> <p>There has been no successor to the Better Buses programme of improvements beyond the end of the first five year VPA in 2017. Some prospects are now pinned on securing support from the Transforming Cities fund to help pay for actions that will be developed by SCC and SYPTE.</p>
2.26	<p>A range of factors are acknowledged for the decline in people travelling by bus. Some of them are objective ones -- demographic and societal changes beyond the control of any player in the field. So, more people are working and shopping from home, and there is a drop in the numbers qualifying for ENCTS partly because of the population's changing age profile.</p> <p>There is also an increase in car ownership overall as people at the older end of the age spectrum who never learned to drive, or never owned a car, are replaced by households where car ownership has been the norm.</p>
2.27	<p>Advocates of franchising often cite London as a model to follow, although buses there were never de-regulated and have enjoyed significant investment, especially since introduction of congestion charging. This resulted in growing bus patronage as distinct from the rest of the UK, albeit with one or two notable exceptions. Bus use in London is now falling for the first time in many years as investment levels fall back.</p>
2.28	<p>It is not consistent with our Transport Strategy to “manage decline” in public transport. Rather mass transit needs to play a growing role in order to increase its modal share. Significant investment will be needed to create more continuous priority on public transport corridors for journey times to become competitive with the car. High quality, non-polluting vehicles provide the kind of service which can at once reduce pollution and carry the share of journeys envisaged in a growing city.</p>
	The future for SBP
2.29	<p>A question which needs to be answered is to what extent are we dealing with objective as opposed to subjective factors in seeking to reverse patronage decline? For example, as Highway Authority, we</p>

	<p>can determine the degree of priority on street for buses and so minimise the impact of congestion. The Transport Strategy proposes that precise action of this sort is needed.</p> <p>The price and quality of bus services are largely down to operators, although the relative decline in the cost of motoring (the fuel duty escalator having been abandoned in 2000) is not.</p>
2.30	<p>There is a complex ticketing and network picture in Sheffield. Despite the multiplicity of tickets, a large number of single fares are still purchased with cash on bus. This has a consequence for boarding times. Operators recognise the need to reduce cash transactions for a variety of reasons and are taking steps to do so. Progress has been made with contactless payments.</p> <p>The reality of increased bus journey times has been spelled out elsewhere – every increase leads to a loss of passengers, a downward trend which has defined the bus market in most of the UK for decades.</p>
2.31	<p>There is no local “Oyster” style smartcard equivalent, as on the franchised London public transport network where passengers are charged for the journeys they make regardless of how occasional use may be. The system also caps daily charges across transport modes. In sum, it automatically ensures that the public travels on the best value ticket available.</p> <p>It also helps capture revenue without the penalty passengers may suffer when they buy a smartcard and load time-limited operator / multi operator tickets on to it. The flexible Oyster card probably fits better with future patterns of use, where people work and shop from home thus removing the need to make 8 or 9 journeys a week – the threshold at which Sheffield’s period ticket range (weekly, monthly) becomes value for money.</p>
2.32	<p>Consistent with our evidence based approach, more research is needed to assess the extent to which the Sheffield Bus Partnership has succeeded on its own terms – in other words the targets which were set in 2012. The “step change” the Strategy proposes is that public transport needs to be as easy to use as cars, in order to attract people. The action set out in the Strategy is to work with SCR on a wide-ranging review to establish the optimum operating, business and regulatory model required to make public transport fit for such a purpose. More work needs to be done to understand if the case made by SYPTTE five years ago still applies today in the light of the Bus Services Act 2017.</p> <p>To what extent do the key arguments still hold true? For example, how far has the new Act “de-risked” franchising for local authorities? Does the Act’s provision for “enhanced” Partnership mean this remains a beneficial option? What are the implications of a franchised model for Sheffield alone as opposed to the whole City Region?</p>

	Future sustainable travel implications – Public transport (2): Supertram
2.33	<p>Supertram is the flagship public transport system in Sheffield. It tends to be popular with the travelling public and moves significant numbers of people to and from the city centre in a space efficient, non-polluting and high quality manner. As such it is central to the Sheffield Transport Strategy which makes both securing and expanding the current network a priority.</p> <p>It also underpins the assumptions around the options for growth that help in identifying potential future development sites for the Sheffield Plan. It is one of the components of the range of types that make up the “mass transit” element of both SCC’s and SCR’s Transport Strategies along with heavy rail, tram train and bus rapid transit.</p>
2.34	<p>The Sheffield Supertram system is operated by Stagecoach under a concession granted by SYPTE in 1997 and until 2024. Under this arrangement Stagecoach assumed responsibility for the operation and maintenance of the network. Ownership of the asset remains with SYPTE who are contractually obliged to undertake re-railing. Essential works were completed between 2012-15 and contracts for further re-railing work were awarded in May 2018. Additional extensive renewal of the wider Supertram asset – signalling, communications, power supply and vehicles – is also required to secure the system for another generation.</p>
2.35	<p>SYPTE were granted funding from DfT to develop an Outline Business Case (OBC) to secure the system beyond 2024, due to be presented in the first half of 2019. The costs are forecast to be in excess of £200m and the OBC funding is conditional upon considering all options including closure of the network – a cost which would need to be borne locally.</p>
2.36	<p>SYPTE has therefore recently launched a public consultation on the future of Supertram. This follows the 2016 consultation ahead of securing OBC funding. Sheffield Council intends to make a submission spelling out the necessity of securing the tram network and its potential expansion to aid sustainable development in the future.</p>
2.37	<p>Light rail is capital intensive in that it requires regular maintenance and periodic renewal. Under the present system Stagecoach take the revenue risk and have been able to return a regular annual dividend to their shareholders. This reduces the funds available to invest in the network.</p> <p>During the period of the Stagecoach concession, Nottingham has created a tram system from scratch and Manchester has significantly expanded its network. Sheffield’s network has not expanded, although tram train to Rotherham is belatedly due to launch imminently.</p> <p>The current franchise ends in 2024. As part of further Transport Strategy work the future operating model will need to be considered as</p>

	part of a wider understanding as to how future costs associated with the network are to be met.
2.38	<p>There is also a reality that Supertram patronage has fallen in recent years, coincident with the major re-railing work already undertaken. During these works, replacement bus services were provided for passengers. One conclusion may be that some people did not want to use a bus, even for part of their journey, and found an alternative way to travel and did not return to tram.</p> <p>Clearly any decline in patronage contributes to a squeeze on the viability of tram and makes the prospects for extension of the system more distant.</p> <p>The Strategy is clear that mass transit – whether tram, train or rapid bus (limited stop, high quality vehicles) – is essential to the functioning of Sheffield as a successful city. Seeing tram as part of this “mix”, the wider Metro style network that operates as a single unit with cross ticketing and a simple fares structure makes good sense if public transport is to be an attractive enough option to reverse patronage decline.</p>
2.39	<p>Finally, it is worth acknowledging escalating cost of implementing light rail projects in Britain and the cost and delays in bringing tram-train into operation locally. Both suggest that despite the apparent popularity of tram with the travelling public, there is a high price to be found and a significant wait if we wish to have a public transport of this quality in the future. In delivering mass transit, the most appropriate solution – whether train, tram, Bus Rapid Transit – will need to be considered.</p>
	Active travel: cycling (with reference to the 2014 cycling inquiry)
2.40	<p>Taking our lead from the All Party Parliamentary Cycling Group’s 2013 report, Sheffield conducted its own Cycling Inquiry. This drew evidence from a wide range of groups and individuals, not just those with an active interest in cycling. The Inquiry produced a report which was agreed by the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee in February 2014.</p>
2.41	<p>The Inquiry report endorsed the Get Britain Cycling target to increase cycle use nationally to 10% of all journeys by 2025 and 25% in 2050, although this was not subsequently adopted by government. It made 19 recommendations encompassing strong leadership, infrastructure and getting people cycling. Achievement of these was conditional upon the necessary funding being made available.</p>
2.42	<p>A South Yorkshire Cycle Action Plan setting out a strategic sub regional network was drawn up which subsequently helped inform the ongoing production of the SCR Local Cycling and Walking Infrastructure Plan (LCWIP). In order to deliver a step change in cycling in Sheffield in line with the aspirations of the Sheffield Transport Vision, it became clear that an integrated approach to wider</p>

	transport was required and aligned within the broader strategy. The Strategy outlines our approach to deliver a coherent and comprehensive network, as recommended by the Inquiry.
2.43	<p>Meanwhile, as part of SCR, Sheffield is among the first tranche of cities to develop an (LCWIP) with support from the DfT. This is currently being developed during 2018/19. The Transport Strategy has also made use of the DfT's new cycling propensity tool to model where uptake of cycling is most likely, in line with the LCWIP development, taking into account distance and topography. On this basis it proposes to prioritise improvements in areas where there is the greatest opportunity for short cycling trips, principally to the city centre, to replace car journeys and thus relieve congestion.</p> <p>The first priority identified is connecting the Broomhall, Highfield, Sharrow and Nether Edge areas, informally known as the "Brincliffe Wedge". Other priority areas are the Upper Don corridor linking to Middlewood, Wadsley Bridge, Southey Green and Parson Cross; around the Darnall, Attercliffe, Greenland and Handsworth area to Meadowhall and the Advanced Manufacturing Park and in the Mosborough townships to connect with stops on the blue Supertram line.</p>
2.44	The Strategy adopts the proven "sustainable safety" approach, including segregation where the volume or nature of traffic necessitates it and reallocation of highway space. It draws on best practice from the Netherlands to design the type of infrastructure that has succeeded in creating the conditions for cycling levels that are consistent with "going Dutch" (570% above the 2015 levels). Area wide interventions are deemed necessary to provide for the journey door-to-door including local trips to schools and services.
2.45	A level of locally based concern is anticipated, as might be expected when delivering change on this scale. For example, arising from an early component of the "Brincliffe Wedge" scheme there have been objections to the changes in traffic management, including making Broomhall Road one way. This was necessary for a new route connecting Sheffield Hallam University's Collegiate Campus (off Ecclesall Road) with the city centre. People may need to travel further to access the wider road network and parking space may be curbed. Difficult decisions ensue for Members if we are to achieve growth that is of wider benefit to the city, not only for those directly impacted but for the city as a whole. Members may understandably wish to strike the right balance between the two imperatives.
2.46	There is also a risk that significant amounts of officer time are devoted to engagement from the limited resources available. The Parking Strategy highlights this issue and suggests that a legal minimum consultation rather than full engagement may be adopted in certain circumstances. For certain schemes particularly where behavioural and lifestyle change needs to be adopted, further or fuller engagement will need to be considered as part of scheme development.

3.0	What does this mean for the people of Sheffield?
3.1	<p>There is widespread and growing recognition that infrastructure shortcomings are impeding the development of Britain's economy and that the imbalance between the south-east of England and the regions is not good for either. Locally, there is a community of interest around the need for sustainable development between Sheffield Council and SCR as local authorities along with key stakeholders who also have wider concerns about the environment and inclusive growth.</p> <p>The Strategy sets out a clear direction for the approach that we wish to take. The ambition set out is high, whilst current funding curbs create real limitations.</p>
3.2	<p>In order to make this kind of change people, businesses, community and media in Sheffield ideally need to be actively engaged with shaping the process.</p> <p>Active engagement is also important given the need for a local revenue stream to help draw down the funding from Government for future transport schemes.</p> <p>This will form part of feedback on the Strategy as we seek adoption by Members. Buy in from politicians and opinion formers will be invaluable. If the benefits of a sustainable transport strategy are more fully understood then so will the seeming inconvenience, disruption, costs and set-backs that inevitably accompany ambition of this scale.</p>
3.3	
4.0	Recommendations
4.1	<p>The Committee is asked to consider the contents of this report and the transition that will be necessary to deliver the Transport Strategy. Views on the following would be particularly useful</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Measures necessary to ensure sustainable travel modes are fit for purpose to play their full role in the Strategy • Considerations of how wider ambition sits alongside the more local considerations as transport schemes are implemented.