

## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

### INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION RECORD

The following decision was taken on 23 March 2018 by the Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability.

Date notified to all members: Friday 23 March 2018

The end of the call-in period is 4:00 pm on Thursday 29 March 2018

Unless called-in, the decision can be implemented from after 4:00 pm on Thursday 29 March 2018.

1. **TITLE**

Knowledge Gateway and Associated Traffic Regulation Orders

2. **DECISION TAKEN**

- i) That the scheme is approved and implemented; and
- ii) That the associated Traffic Regulation Orders are made.

3. **Reasons For Decision**

The project team have had lengthy discussions with SYPTE, bus operators and taxi representatives. Officers have investigated all options available and recommend that the layout as legally advertised provides the necessary kerb space for taxis and buses providing a balance of provision throughout the scheme.

Officers feel that the best chance for cycling to become a relevant part of Sheffield's transport system is to learn from a replicate practice from places that have succeeded in providing accessible and well used cycling infrastructure. Regrettably, these places are not in the United Kingdom, which has the lowest cycling rates of Western Europe, so we do not feel that advice is best sought locally – the guidance and design standards used for the scheme are included in section 3. The proposed layout complies with the guidance referred to in almost all respects, and is considered the most practicable means of providing for cyclists given scheme objectives and site constraints.

The evaluated 'comprehensive' approach to the scheme's development and design using SCRIF and contributions from developers and SHU will transform the corridor running from Sidney Street to Fitzalan Square, improving accessibility and safety as well as the local environment in order to encourage new investment and jobs. It is therefore recommended that this approach is approved so that the scheme can be delivered in the necessary timescales.

---

#### 4. Alternatives Considered And Rejected

##### **Option 1 : – Do nothing**

This is taken to mean "leave things as they are", except for the road resurfacing under the Streets Ahead contract.

Strengths: The Council/SCRIF do not have to incur expenditure and any improvements (over and above those undertaken by Amey) would be funded by another private/public body.

Weakness: SHU having already paid for improvements at Arundel Street and Fitzalan Street (within their campus but on public highways) are unlikely to spend more than they see as absolutely necessary in the immediate curtilage of their estate and are unlikely to be able to negotiate changes to bus and taxi routes e.g. in Fitzalan without support and involvement of SCC.

Others such as Esperanto Place developers, CIQ stakeholders (Workstation or Site Gallery) or HCA, (the owners of Sheaf Square and NMB sites) are unlikely to commit spend outside a partnership with SCC/SCRIF and are again unlikely to negotiate changes without the involvement of SCC and so will adopt an incremental approach, focussing primarily on their site rather than adopt a more comprehensive area wide approach (and will seek to pass the responsibility to a potential partner whenever this materialises).

This option has therefore been rejected.

##### **Option 2: Do Minimum based on Streets Ahead and Partners Contributions (SCRIF)**

This can be broken down as follows:

1. **Fitzalan Square and Flat Street** – work with SHU and s106 fund to remove buses from the eastern section of the Square and relocate them making good with secondary palette materials. No partnership will be formed with Esperanto Place/Arundel Gate linkage other than removing taxis.  
Strengths: reduces costs and maintains the Square in its current form and allows greater priority to pedestrians  
Weakness: No transformational change is likely and no stimulus to go beyond SHU plans. Unlikely to achieve the step change that is nec

current pedestrian profile (less family friendly, domination by street drinking, cash-converters and betting) is unlikely to change. The construction cost reduction is also marginal in that the bulk of the costs are on the sub base, which are the same irrespective of the finish, primary or secondary palette.

2. **Pond Street and Pond Hill** – rely on Streets Ahead Repair Programme only, with some tree planting but cycling continuing in existing carriageway possibly delineated by a white line

Strengths: does not necessitate changing kerb line or significant alterations to how this road currently operates, other than improvement to pedestrian environment and comfort.

Weakness: Potential loss of an opportunity for a comprehensive approach to significantly change the look and operation of this road making the most of Streets Ahead but building on it in a cost-effective way.

3. **Paternoster Row** – As for Pond St confine interventions to Streets Ahead repairs but with a segregated cycle lane demarcated by white lining

Strengths: as above

Weakness: a missed opportunity to make use of surplus road space and achieve the refreshing of Sheffield's Cultural Industry Quarter's main street at a time that could be critical to the future of Site Gallery, Showroom etc. This would not address road safety issues from excessive vehicle speeds particularly at the Howard St crossing.

The above option would cost virtually nothing to the City Council (and SCRIF). The only cost falling on the Council would be towards the closure of a road in Fitzalan Square and contribution towards any enhanced work. The option has been rejected as work is likely to be undertaken in a piecemeal approach and is unlikely to address any highway safety / traffic management issues.

### **Option 3: Site only approach**

The direct economic benefits of this scheme come from the anticipated development of the sites. One option considered has therefore been to focus on the development work required to unlock these development sites but without the investment in the surrounding public realm. It would theoretically therefore be able to generate the bulk of the benefits, with less investment.

Whilst a detailed, quantitative analysis of each site has been carried out (in order to calculate the overall economic benefits) this analysis does not convey the critical importance of the feel of the area. Knowledge Gateway, as suggested by the name, is more than a collection of buildings. It is a critical arrival and transfer of place for people (increasingly students) and a key economic activity within the Sheaf Valley area of the city. Sites have not been developed out in part because of the physical infrastructure constraints this project will address but also because of the lack of investment in the area as a place and the generally poor physical environment. The public and private funding partners for this scheme have recognised that and the connecting infrastructure and public realm improvements are a critical element of their investment and continued support e.g. Sheffield Hallam University and Fitzalan Square.

It is not felt that addressing the constraints of the sites alone would make a sufficient

change to the area that is necessary to see the sites developed out, and therefore the benefits realised.

#### **Option 4 : “Comprehensive” Approach with SCRIF**

- 1. Fitzalan Square and Flat Street** – comprehensive upgrade to a consistent quality across the wider space and drawing on the widest partnership available whilst retaining/maintaining as much of existing design and materials as practical; re-configure Esperanto Place including removal of retail units adjacent to and along Arundel Gate to provide links/views from Norfolk St and Arundel Gate.  
Strengths: should achieve necessary upgrade to encourage more people including families to use this route, in turn helping to change the profile of Fitzalan Square, and its connectivity to the Heart of the City via Arundel Gate to attract footfall and a wider range of businesses.  
Weakness: will cost more, including SCRIF and use of Council capital receipt from Esperanto Place lease extensions to acquire the retail units. May be technically challenging.
- 2. Pond St and Pond Hill** – same as ‘Do Minimum’, above other than changes to kerbing on approach to Howard St crossing. This is because of the uncertainty surrounding future of the bus station and the minimal road widths, reducing our ability/options for increasing footpath widths and or tree planting etc.
- 3. Paternoster Row/Brown Street** – Combine SCRIF, s106, LTP and SHU contribution to achieve narrowing road width for vehicles, extending high quality pedestrian areas and event spaces outside key attractions, reducing bus and taxi speeds and introduce cycle facilities.  
Strengths: Makes good use of the over-wide carriageway, exploits opportunities offered by existing users on the east side (for outdoor café or spill out space), reduces accident risk at Howard Street by reducing speeds and provides good quality cycling links.  
Weakness: will cost more;

Based on the strengths and weaknesses provided above this is the project team’s preferred option.

A number of options for providing for cyclists were considered during the development of the proposals. in particular, these included –

- Not making specific provision for cyclists;
- Re-routing traffic (in particular buses) to reduce provide separation without physical infrastructure;
- Providing two unidirectional cycle tracks;
- Providing a single bidirectional cycle track;
- Introducing additional loading restrictions;
- Provision of advisory cycle lanes – this being the recommended approach.

A full summary of the options considered, opinion on them from both

Cycle Sheffield and Officers and the preferred approach are included section 3 and appendix 'C'.

5. **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

6. **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Executive Director, Place

7. **Relevant Scrutiny Committee If Decision Called In**

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee