

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

### Meeting held 11 December 2023

**PRESENT:** Councillors Ben Miskell (Chair), Christine Gilligan Kubo (Deputy Chair), Andrew Sangar (Group Spokesperson), Ian Auckland, Denise Fox, Craig Gamble Pugh, Ruth Mersereau 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 Councillor Sangar declared a non-pecuniary interest in item 10 as his son owned an apartment in Kelham Island.

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

4.1 The minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 15<sup>th</sup> November, 2023 were approved as a correct record.

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

5.1 The Policy Committee received three 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 'Fulwood 20mph area. Lyndsey McLellan attended the meeting and presented the petition to the committee.

The petitioner explained that the people that had signed the petition were in support of the 20mph zone but could not understand why Fulwood Road and Crimicar Lane were not included in that scheme. Parents at two local schools felt that these roads should be included and the headteachers were both in support. Serious collisions had occurred on Fulwood Road and as well as the two schools there were nurseries and other community venues in the vicinity. Traffic mixed with vulnerable road users and there were parked cars along the road as well as bus stops.

It was felt that SCC's 20mph policy was based on outdated Department for Transport policy. The petitioner gave examples of UK cities where 20mph speed limits were implemented just using signs with a proven reduction in injuries as a

result. It was asked that Sheffield City Council update its policy of best practice and urgently called for a signed default 20mph speed limit on roads where traffic mixes with other road users.

The Chair thanked the petitioner for bringing the petition and highlighted that a national change in approach to 20mph speed limits was required. It was explained that the Fulwood Scheme was in its consultation stage and Crimicar Lane was being considered for inclusion. The current policy was outlined and it was noted that South Yorkshire Police would object to any sign only scheme on roads that don't meet the criteria set out in the policy as well average speed criteria.

The Chair advised that the Senior Transport Planner had been investigating whether anything could be taken forward in relation to Fulwood Road and this, together with all the feedback that had been received would be included when the committee considered the scope of the final scheme.

- 5.2 The Policy Committee received six questions from members of the public. One member of the public did not attend to ask their question, a written response would be provided.

#### Questions from Roy Morris

"How can we ensure that Connect Sheffield fulfils its purpose and fully serves the people of Sheffield?"

I have noticed significant improvements.

- What final route is planned?
- Do the stops on the route genuinely serve the needs of the public?
- What can be done to increase awareness of the service?
- Would the service benefit from a name change? Freebee?!!
- Long term, would there be any point in planning a route in the opposite direction?

The Chair thanked the questioner for attending to ask their question and welcomed their support of the Connect Sheffield City Centre bus. It was confirmed that the service would be relaunched in the new year with new zero emission e-buses. The details of the routes and frequencies were dependent on tender costs so were not confirmed at this time. More information would become available in the new year via a refreshed communication strategy.

#### Questions from Patricia Stubbs on behalf of Friends of the Peak District, the Peak District Green Lanes Alliance and the Peak Horsepower Bridleway Group

1 The Peak District National Park Authority has made seven Traffic Regulation Orders excluding all types of motor vehicles from byways open to all traffic and other unsealed routes in the national park. To keep prohibited vehicles out, it uses only signage. It does not use barriers. Its monitoring data shows 90 per cent plus compliance with its TROs. Why does Sheffield need barriers to make a TRO on Moscar Cross road effective when the NPA has demonstrated that barriers are not necessary?

2 The committee paper says that one of the reasons that the proposed TRO does not cover motorbikes is because 'there are no physical restraint measures that restrict solo motorcyclists but allow other users through'. Why does the committee paper not mention or show the barriers installed at Wyming Brook - a combination of lockable gate, bridle gate and horse hop that excludes motorcycles as well as 4x4s but ensures access for all legal users?

3 The Moscar route is all grass with no underlying stone or rock and it is on a hill. This makes it peculiarly vulnerable to damage by powerful modern motor vehicles in wet weather, including the traction, gouging and wheel spin of motorbikes revving to get uphill on soft ground. Peak Park monitoring data for the route shows that two thirds of motor vehicles using the route are motorbikes. The committee paper says that motor bikes are damaging the route. This being the case, why is Sheffield willing to tolerate continuing use and damage by motorbikes during the wettest periods of the year?

4 In order to respond to surface conditions deteriorating quickly in unusually wet summers, some highway authorities that have made Orders for seasonal TROs have made the effective start date for the restriction variable. We understand that the Peak District Vehicle Users Group is in favour of this approach. Has Sheffield considered it? Will it consider it?

5 Are members of the committee aware that at the February 22 on-site meeting convened by Sheffield, all the user groups attending agreed to a seasonal TRO covering motor vehicles of all types, and that the organisations agreeing this included those representing motorcycle users?

6 The Peak Park Local Access Forum withdrew its original objection to motorbikes not being included in the seasonal TRO, but only on the condition that Sheffield re-consider the matter if there is damage from continuing motorcycle use. Is making a decision today that will almost certainly mean having to do a second or revised TRO next year a cost-effective use of funds and staff time?

7 In making its decision about the proposed TRO on Moscar Cross Road, Sheffield has a legal duty under S62 (2) of the Environment Act 1995 to have regard to the statutory purposes of the Peak District National Park, which are to conserve and enhance the natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage of the area and to promote opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the National Park by the public). Furthermore, if it appears that there is a conflict between the two duties, under the Act Sheffield must attach greater weight to the purpose of conserving and enhancing natural beauty, wildlife and cultural heritage. How and where has Sheffield demonstrated that it has had regard to this statutory duty?

8 On 29th Dec 2023 the Levelling Up and Regeneration Act (LURA) will change the current duty on the Authority to 'have regard' to the purposes of the Peak District National Park into a duty to 'further' the purposes of the National Park. Is Sheffield willing to adopt the spirit of the enhanced duty and show in relation to Moscar Cross how its proposal furthers both National Park purposes?

9 At present only one of the eight available legal grounds available for making TROs under the 1984 Road Traffic Regulation Act is being proposed ('to prevent damage to the road'). Has the applicability of the following grounds been considered and evaluated:

- 'For preventing the use of the road by vehicular traffic of a kind which, or its use by vehicular traffic in a manner which, is unsuitable having regard to the character of the road
- For preserving the character of the road where it is specially suitable for the use of persons on horseback or on foot
- For preserving or improving the amenities of the area through which the road runs
- For the purposes of conserving or enhancing the natural beauty of the area ..... This includes conserving its flora, fauna and geological and physiographical features'.

10 Moscar Cross Road is an ancient packhorse route. What assessment has been made of the value and importance of the route as part of cultural heritage?

11 Have members of the committee made a site visit to see Moscar Cross Road for themselves? How many have done so?

12 Why are there no photographs in the committee paper showing the condition of Moscar cross Road?

The Chair thanked the questioner for attending and for providing statements in advance to the members. Diana Mallinson was invited to read her questions also to allow the Chair to respond to both sets of questions at the same time.

#### Questions from Diana Mallinson

In paragraph 4.3 SCC have added 3 more of the purposes for a permanent traffic regulation order (TRO) to the prevention of damage purpose given in the proposal, i.e. for the avoidance of danger, facilitating passage of any class of traffic (including pedestrians) and preventing use by vehicular traffic which is unsuitable. And in paragraph 4.4 SCC say that the TRO will preserve the character of the byway and the area's natural beauty, and make the route more attractive to users i.e. improve the amenity of the area – again these are three more of the purposes available for a permanent TRO. Recent guidance from the British Parking Association, endorsed by the Minister of State for Transport, says that the statement of reasons should ideally refer to these legal purposes, because the statement of reasons is what consultees/stakeholders use to work out what the authority is trying to accomplish.

We think that the seasonal nature of the TRO as proposed and the non-prohibition of motorcycles, especially the latter, mean that it will not achieve these additional purposes, especially preventing use which is unsuitable, preserving the character

of the byway and the natural beauty of the area, and improving the amenities of the area. Motorcyclists cause some of the ruts on the byway and they also drive off the route onto the adjacent pasture. Wet weather in the summer months, coupled with continued recreational motor vehicle use, will also affect the character of the route and the natural beauty and amenity of the area, as demonstrated by the failure of the levelling and re-seeding you have done annually since 2012. Will you re-consult on the TRO proposal, so that you can explain to consultees how the TRO will meet these additional purposes in your statement of reasons?

Will you also consider re-consulting on a TRO proposal which would allow you flexibility in extending the duration of the seasonal closure period, if rainfall in summer months increases, as it has done in some years since 2012/3?

If you decide to accept the recommendation in the report and make the TRO as proposed, will you monitor the surface condition (e.g. the type of ruts, their depth and spread across the route) in the four open months and the eight closed months of each year, and see how this correlates with Met Office rainfall data for Sheffield? Will you make a temporary TRO if there continues to be damage?

The Chair thanked the questioner for attending and explained that it was preferable that traffic restrictions were complemented with engineering measures to ensure that where possible they were self-enforcing and not subject to abuse. All traffic orders should be, as much as practicable, self-regulating to avoid a strain on the limited enforcement resources of the Police. No comments could be made on restrictions implemented by another Highway Authority or enforced by another Police service.

There was insufficient evidence on this route to show that solo motorcycles specifically were damaging the route enough to warrant prohibiting their access. The committee report did not specifically state that solo motorcycles were causing damage to the route. Consultation on such a restriction could take place should it be required it at a later stage.

Officers that attended the site meeting stated that whilst those attending may have agreed to a TRO covering all motorised vehicles, that the site meeting did not include solo motorcycle user groups.

Prohibiting motor vehicles except for solo motorcycle allowed officers to properly understand the direct impact of solo motorcycles. Apart from a small number of motor vehicles requiring access to adjacent land, solo motorcycles would be the only motorised mode of transport with access.

Subject to the decision by Committee on this issue, if it was implemented and in monitoring the scheme Sheffield City Council gained evidence that solo motorcycle use caused enough damage to warrant prohibiting them, then this was the right process to follow and that the funds and staff time were well allocated.

The different statutory requirements had been considered and it was believed that the proposed restrictions did support the aims of conserving and enhancing the

national park. However, in considering the removal of access rights it was believed that the significant improvement in condition would be from removing 4x4 vehicles from this route. In dry conditions the route could be used by all modes. This position would not be maintained in perpetuity and consequently it could be reviewed at some point in the future.

Additional potential benefits were described within the committee report. These were benefits that could be achieved by the proposed restrictions reducing damage to Moscar Cross Road.

Sheffield City Council did not feel that there was a need to reconsult on the current TRO proposals at this stage. The statement of reasons was clear and there was no scope to misinterpret the reasons behind why Sheffield City Council were promoting these restrictions.

Officers would continue to visit the route each month and take photographs as they have been doing for the past couple of years. A TTRO would be made if at any point it was necessary to (a) safeguard the public because the route has become dangerous to use or (b) exclude the public from the route in order to carry out repairs safely.

#### Questions from Sally Skelton

1. Archer Lane closure was the key to the success of the NE scheme yet the committee decided to reopen Archer Lane based on the number of objections received. Why were the less successful Crookes and Walkley schemes passed in full when they had greater numbers of objections?
2. Why was child safety not even considered when you decided to reopen Archer Lane to nearly 3000 vehicles a day?
3. The council has said there is a climate emergency yet your committee stopped a scheme that reduced traffic by 5,000 cars journeys a day. Please could you explain?

The Chair thanked the questioner for attending and asked Alison Teal to read her question so that both questions could be responded to together.

#### Questions from Alison Teal

1. On the 20th of September, this Committee, except for two Green Party Cllrs, decided to prioritise the voices of drivers living mostly outside of Nether Edge and chose to enable them to drive on narrow residential roads to avoid congestion on arterial routes. However, the officer reports made clear that the closure of Archer Lane had a positive effect, encouraging active travel and making roads safer for children, pedestrians and cyclists. How can members of the committee justify ignoring the officer's technical expertise and vote to reopen Archer Lane, which is the most vital aspect of the Nether Edge Low Traffic Neighbourhood scheme's success? Why did you disregard the empirical evidence in favour of drivers who don't even live in Nether Edge?

2. How is the Council going to meet its climate and nature targets when this committee has caved into a small unrepresentative but loud group of motorists and anti-cycling campaigners against the closure of Archer Lane? It sets a very bad precedent that will prevent any future schemes that will be required to be able to meet the targets.

The Chair thanked the questioner for attending and explained that an external contractor conducted a report into the Nether Edge Active Neighbourhood Scheme. That report came before this committee in September and showed that there was greater support for the schemes in Crookes and Walkley. Crucially, in both Crookes and Walkley there was demonstratable positive behaviour change in the area. That was why the committee opted to end the trial closure of Archer Lane and make permanent two popular crossings. The approach that considered those who lived in a wider area and not just in the immediate locality of the trial.

The September committee report included some initial data on collisions. Typically for transport projects, personal injury collision data for at least the most recent three-year period would be considered adequate to be able identify collision patterns. However, the Council still made pre and post implementation comparisons of casualty numbers in an around the Nether Edge area between June and December in 2021 ('pre') versus June and December 2022 ('post').

The information did not suggest the Nether Edge Active Neighbourhood project had a significant impact on personal injury collisions. During its implementation, the overall number of collisions did not change. In relation to Archer Lane, there were no collisions between June and December 2022. This compared with 4 collisions in an equivalent six-month period in 2020 on Crookes Valley Road (between Harcourt Road and Oxford Street) which led to the location being a high-priority site and a Local safety scheme was being designed which would be implemented in 2024.

When people in Nether Edge and Sharrow (NES) were asked about perceived impact on the safety of walkers and cyclists of the Active Travel measures; more responses said there had been a negative impact on people's perception of safety of walkers and cyclists due to the trial closure.

Locations were assessed and prioritised for measures according to certain criteria. The most important one of these related to the prevention of collisions, particularly those recorded as serious or fatal. All the incident data received from partners was analysed and used to prioritise budget on schemes in those locations that have a history of previous collisions. Collisions were more likely to happen at a location having a collision history than one with few or none.

Road safety was of concern everywhere, but it was noted that some of our most pressing road safety concerns were in our most deprived communities.

The Chair invited the questioners to stay and hear the discussion on item 9, which looked at the progress made towards our climate goals. The trial closure of Archer Lane did not see an overall reduction of car journeys. It simply dispersed them

and created problems elsewhere.

## **6. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

6.1 No questions were received from members of the Committee.

## **7. WORK PROGRAMME**

7.1 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.

7.1.1 Suggestions were made by members for future inclusions on the committee's work programme including;

- Sheffield City Council's (SCC) 20mph policy review
- The A61 corridor study
- Further decarbonisation routemaps
- An update on the East Bank Road Active Travel Scheme
- Electric Cargo Bikes

Members requested timescales for the Fulwood and High Green 20mph zones and officers explained that the consultation results for these would be brought to the February meeting. Timescales were also requested for the Crookes Valley Road and Barnsley Road Local Safety Schemes and the A625 Road Safety Project.

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 Q2 BUDGET MONITORING**

8.1.1 This report brings the Committee up to date with the Council's outturn position for Quarter 2 2023/24 General Fund revenue position

8.1.2 A member asked whether the shortfall in income for the Planning Service was due to the vacancies with the team. It was clarified the vacancies were not impacting the department's ability to process applications, rather that there was a lack of activity.

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

notes the updated information and management actions provided by this report on the Quarter 2 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. MOSCAR CROSS ROAD - PROHIBITION OF DRIVING**

11.1.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures report confirming receipt of objections to a proposal to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and seeking approval to make the order after having considered those objections.

The effect of the order would be to introduce a Prohibition of Driving except for solo motorcycles on Moscar Cross Road, which was a byway open to all traffic.

11.1.2 Members sought clarification on whether it was possible to approve the prohibition of driving and extend it to include all vehicles. It was explained that in order to make this amendment it would be necessary to promote a new TRO, consider any objections and bring this back to a later committee date. Strong evidence was required to implement a prohibition for all vehicles. Members requested a 12 month review of the TRO be carried out.

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

- Approve the making of the Traffic Regulation Order in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- Approve the introduction of the prohibition of driving except for solo motorcycles on

Moscar Cross Road as shown on Appendix A attached, by installing regulatory traffic signs, lockable gates and an adjacent bridle gate.

- Note that all objectors are informed of this decision accordingly.
- Request that a review be carried out within 12 months of implementation

### **11.3 Reasons for Decision**

11.3.1 If a decision is made to proceed with the proposed TRO then the byway will not be subjected to the same level of damage, the safety and access of all other users will improve and the current maintenance costs and use of resources will reduce significantly. The measure will be reviewed to ensure damage is not caused solo motorcycles. The Council will also keep the scheme under review to monitor changing weather conditions and ensure the restriction time period remains effective.

11.3.2 There is no other alternative suitable to alleviate the issues.

11.3.3 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the TRO for the prohibition of driving motor vehicles except for solo motorcycles on Moscar Cross Road be made and implemented as the benefits of the scheme in terms of access, safety and sustainability are considered to outweigh the objections raised.

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

11.4.1 An alternative option would be to propose a prohibition of driving TRO without an exemption for solo motorcycles. However, it could not be justified as there is no evidence to suggest this type of vehicle is causing infrastructure damage to Moscar Cross Road and the Police would not be willing to support the restriction without physical restraint measures that restrict solo motorcyclists

11.4.2 An alternative option is to do nothing. This option would result in the Council bearing the increasing maintenance costs of the infrastructure damage and may need to deny public rights of access due to the risk of injury

11.4.3 There is also an issue posed around sustainability, constantly repairing the highway is not a sustainable use of limited natural resources.

11.4.4 The proposed measures do not incur any adverse effects on either the climate or the economy.

## **10. ANNUAL CLIMATE REPORT 2022/23**

9.1.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures providing an update on progress and activity during 2022/23 to inform the Committee and public of the current situation.

9.1.2 Members discussed specific areas including;

- Increased emissions in the grey fleet sector and potential solutions
- A decarbonisation routemap for Housing including private homes
- Renewable energy sources
- Resources available in the sustainability team
- A new Council Plan that prioritises the Climate Emergency

9.1.3 Members asked whether the Transport, Climate and Regeneration Policy Committee was the strategic lead for this work or if it would be led by the Strategy

and Resources Policy Committee. The Director of Investment, Climate Change and Planning advised that each Policy Committee had the ability to determine its approach to Climate Change and that a radical change of approach was required. Responsibilities would need to be distributed across the organisation. It was also confirmed that the climate emergency was on SCC's Corporate Risk Register and the Local Plan also had an ambitious programme for decarbonisation.

- 9.1.4 It was acknowledged that climate change impact should be considered at the start of the Council's decision making process and a protocol was under development to facilitate this. Members asked if there was anything that they could do as politicians to empower officers to achieve the Council's ambitions. The question was welcomed and The Director of Investment, Climate Change and Planning agreed to come back with suggestions.
- 9.1.5 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

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

Notes the report.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 9.3.1 It was felt that it was important both to be open and transparent, to outline the extent of progress and activity which is underway and the challenges which the local authority faces in making progress.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 9.4.1 Not providing an annual report, or providing a much shorter report, was considered due to the resource required to provide a report with the detail included here.

**11. KELHAM/NEEPSSEND PARKING REVIEW**

- 10.1.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures considering the results of extra parking surveys and the outcome of the additional engagement with businesses in Neepsend since the first phase was approved in July 2023. It included a recommendation on how to progress with a parking scheme in Neepsend by making a TRO to implement the remainder of the original proposal, albeit with modifications.
- 10.1.2 Councillor Mersereau declared a non-pecuniary interest in the item as the ward councillor for this area.
- 10.1.3 Discussion took place around the Council's aspirations to reduce the number of permits required by businesses and the ways that this could be achieved including cycle storage, an e-bike scheme and travel plan offers.
- 10.1.4 Members asked whether new civil enforcement officers would be recruited to enforce the restrictions on junctions and officers confirmed that safety at junctions was one of the key considerations of the scheme and would be enforced.

10.1.5 The committee discussed whether existing permit schemes incurred a cost to the Council and officers clarified that it was not expected that any costs would be incurred and the situation would be monitored. Any income generated would have restrictions on how it could be spent.

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

- Having considered the objections included in Appendix A, decide to make the Traffic Regulation Order (as amended) in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- Approve a more flexible approach to the number of permits issued to business during the implementation of the proposed pay and display/permit parking scheme in Neepsend, operating Monday to Friday (0900-1500) in bays on Boyland Street, Bardwell Road and Neepsend Lane (between Rutland Road and Bardwell Road) and operating Monday to Sunday (0900- 1500) in bays in all other areas of Neepsend.
- Note that the Council's Traffic Regulations team will inform all consultation respondents accordingly;
- Note that a review of the scheme will be carried out after around 12 months of the approved scheme being active;
- Note the need to monitor the effects of the scheme and the potential for advertising a further Traffic Regulation Order should the effect of displaced parking lead to one needing to be promoted;
- Note that the recommendations being implemented are subject to funding being confirmed.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 The proposed Neepsend parking scheme should:

- Improve conditions for local businesses by ensuring the availability of convenient parking spaces for residents, business and visitors and giving them a greater level of priority where appropriate through issuing permits;

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

- Enforcement of the restrictions are more resource intensive and time consuming;
- Puts pressure on existing enforcement resources as limited extra income through enforcement may not cover additional costs;
- Lack of consistency of approach with other areas of the City;
- Residents and businesses could feel that they are being charged to park in the area where visitors (and potentially commuters) may not; and
- There is anecdotal evidence from schemes around the City that suggest that people may move their vehicles part way through the day to avoid the 4-hour restrictions.

10.4.2 Consideration was given to implementation of the whole scheme as initially advertised. However, this was discounted as it doesn't take account of the additional business engagement and revised parking surveys Neepsend.

10.4.3 Consideration was given to cheaper all day parking tariffs. However, this was discounted for the following reasons:

- Demand must properly be managed through the setting of appropriate tariffs. Otherwise,

- parking capacity for local businesses, residents and visitors could at times be inadequate
- Cheaper tariffs could also increase the occurrence of traffic circulating searching for car parking spaces, leading to increased traffic movements.
- Lack of integration with local and regional strategies.

## **12. CLEAN AIR ZONE UPDATE – 6 MONTH REVIEW**

12.1.1 The committee considered a report of the Executive Director City Futures that provided an early stage review of the Sheffield Clean Air Plan including an overview and a summary of the findings.

12.1.2 Members asked questions covering the following points;

- The lack of changes to traffic volume with the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) and whether that was due to people using public transport instead. Officers explained that the vast majority of traffic entering the zone were cars and as they were not included in the CAZ restrictions the numbers had remained the same. People had not been discouraged from entering but the vehicles were becoming cleaner.
- Given the delay in the bus retrofitting programme, had upgrades to the tram system been considered. It was noted that the trams were a zero emission fleet and an extension to the tram system was ideal, however would involve lengthy timescales that would not assist in meeting the clean air targets set out by the Government. Officers were working closely with bus operators to push for zero emission buses for Sheffield.
- How many vehicles within the SCC fleet were compliant. The data was not available at the meeting but officers agreed to obtain the information and circulate to members.
- Whether the Council paid the CAZ charges for non-compliant vehicles used by their contractors. Officers confirmed that this was not the case.
- If the displacement of traffic caused by the bus gate was being monitored as residents had noted an increase in queueing traffic on match days. It was explained that, as cars are not affected by the CAZ it was unlikely that any match day traffic would be affected and therefore displaced in this way.

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

- Acknowledges the significant improvement in the fleet upgrades across Sheffield in response to the CAZ to date and recognises the positive changes made by vehicle owners in the city, and that further promotion of the Financial Assistance Scheme available from the Council is undertaken.
- Endorses the guiding principles and governance principles for the use of the surplus CAZ income generated set out in section 4.2.6.
- Receives a further report that sets out the approach to defining a Clean Air Investment Plan (CAIP), with a range of potential scheme and programme options that could be funded from forecast surplus CAZ income. The potential for other funds to complement and support delivery through the CAIP will also be considered.
- In response to the risks associated with the performance of bus retrofits requests a further update when Government publish their review on this issue, and in developing the Clean Air Investment Plan that officers should explore the potential to use CAF funding to support further upgrades to buses.
- Endorses the continued liaison with HM Government for greater support to fund a cleaner bus fleet in Sheffield to mitigate impacts of their bus retrofit programme on air quality in Sheffield, including through the ZEBRA 2 zero emission fund.

**12.3 Reasons for Decision**

12.3.1 To apprise Members of the progress made in improving the health of the city, the limitations of available data at this time, the vehicle compliance levels and the financial status of the Clean Air Zone scheme.

**12.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

12.4.1 None

**13. LOCAL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD TRANSPORT COMPLIMENTARY PROGRAMME (LANTCP)/ROAD SAFETY FUND PROGRAMME: 23/24 UPDATE.**

13.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures that provided an update on delivery of the carry forward within the 2022/2023 Local and Neighbourhood Transport Complimentary (formerly known as the Local Transport Plan) and Road Safety Fund capital programmes, as well as the 2023/24 programme approved by committee on 16th March 2023.

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

- i. Note progress on the Local and Neighbourhood Transport Complimentary (LaNTCP - formally known as the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Block) and Road Safety Fund (RSF) programmes.
- ii. Approve the variations within the programmes (highlighted in sections 1.13 to 1.31 for the LaNTCP, and Appendix B for RSF), noting the individual projects will still need to go through the Councils capital process – to be approved by the Strategy and Resources committee.
- iii. Note the potential effect on future years' programmes, with the 2024/25 programme being subject to another report early in the new calendar year.

**13.3 Reasons for Decision**

13.3.1 The proposed LaNTP and RSF programmes balances the availability of funding sources with local and national policy to give a clear focus for the 2023/24 financial year, with an opportunity for changes to be considered by Committee that could be made in future years of the current 5-year programme. The proposed programme is extensive and ambitious which comes with its own challenges. The programme utilises internal and external funding sources and staff resources to deliver change to the transport system, considering environmental, economic and societal needs.

**13.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

13.4.2 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.