

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

POLICY COMMITTEE DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Wednesday 15 June 2022 by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.

Item No

8. BUDGET MONITORING REPORT MONTH 01, 2022/23

8.1 This report brings the Committee up to date with the Council's financial position as at Month 1 2022/23. The report also reports the proposed budget timetable for the development of the 2023/24 budget.

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

1. notes the Council's challenging financial position and the Month 1 position;

2. notes the budget timetable set out in the report including the requirement for the Committee to plan to develop budget proposals over the course of the summer;

3. notes that the Strategy and Resources Committee agreed at its 31 May 2022 meeting to "require any Policy Committee that is forecasting an overspend on their budget to develop an action plan to address the overspend in-year and ask the Finance Sub-Committee to monitor both the development of any required action plans and delivery against them"; and

4. agrees to commission work from Officers to develop and implement plans to mitigate overspends and deliver stalled savings plans to bring forecast outturn back in line with budget,

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 Under section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003, the Chief Finance Officer of an authority is required to report on the following matters:

- the robustness of the estimates made for the purposes of determining its budget requirement for the forthcoming year; and
- the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves.

8.3.2 There is also a requirement for the authority to have regard to the report of the Chief Finance Officer when making decisions on its budget requirement and level of financial reserves.

8.3.3 By the law the Council must set and deliver a balanced budget, which is a financial plan based on sound assumptions which shows how income will equal spend over the short- and medium-term. This can take into account deliverable cost savings and/or local income growth strategies as well as useable reserves. However, a budget will not be balanced where it reduces reserves to unacceptably low levels and regard must be had to any report of the Chief Finance Officer on the required level of reserves under section 25 of the Local Government Act 2003, which sets

obligations of adequacy on controlled reserves.

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. **SHEFFIELD LOCAL TRANSPORT PROGRAMME 2022/23**

9.1 This report outlines the proposed Local Transport Plan capital programme covering the current financial year and seeks approval to proceed with development and implementation of the proposals subject to the necessary capital programme and traffic/route management approvals being obtained.

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

1. approves the proposed 2022/23 Local Transport Plan capital programme and the indicative allocation as attached in Appendix A to the report, noting that the 2022/23 programme includes items already approved as part of the 2021/22 Local Transport Plan capital programme that will continue to be delivered this financial year; and

2. To the extent that reserved commissioning decisions are required in order to progress these schemes to completion, delegates authority to make those decisions to the Head of Strategic Transport, Sustainability and Infrastructure.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

9.3.1 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:

9.3.2 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.

9.3.3 The proposed transport capital programme balances the availability of funding sources with local and national policy to give a clear focus for the 2022/23 financial year. The proposed programme is extensive and ambitious which comes with its own challenges. The programme takes advantage of utilising external funding sources where possible to deliver impactful change to the transport system, considering environmental, economic and societal needs.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

9.4.2 It would also be possible to consider different schemes as part of the programme. However, it is felt that the proposed programme achieves the greatest balance of economic, environmental and societal benefits to the communities and businesses in Sheffield.

10. **DOUBLE YELLOW LINES – WOLSELEY ROAD/STAVELEY ROAD AND GLOVER ROAD/LONDON ROAD**

10.1 The report seeks approval for the Wolseley Road / Staveley Road and Glover Road /London Road cycle improvement schemes as shown in Appendix 'A' and 'B' of the report and seeks approval to make the associated Traffic Regulation Orders (TRO's), with recommended amendments as detailed, subject to authorisation of the project through the capital gateway process.

10.1.1 The schemes form part of the Sheaf Valley Active travel route. The report sets out the background to the scheme, consultation comments and officer recommendations.

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

1. approves the Wolseley Road / Staveley Road and Glover Road /London Road cycle improvement schemes, as shown in Appendix 'A' and Appendix 'B' of the report;

2. that the associated Traffic Regulation Orders as shown are made, subject to authorisation of the project through the capital gateway process; and

3. that arrangements be made for the Members of this Committee to visit the Sheaf Valley Active travel route.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 To ensure the two schemes, which contribute to the overall improvements on the 'Sheaf Valley Cycle Corridor' can be constructed when the contract is awarded.

10.3.2 Officers have considered alternative options involving representatives from 'Cycle Sheffield' and the previous Cabinet Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport and on balance consider the proposals to be the best solutions to achieve the predicted benefits, maximising the benefits to the overall improvements to a key cycling route to and from the City Centre.

10.3.3 Officers have carried out a consultation with statutory consultees and frontages,

making changes to parking and loading restrictions where possible.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 Glover Road / London Road

The existing Glover Road bollard closure is regularly blocked by parked vehicles, to the extent where it is difficult to find a way through for cyclists approaching from either direction without dismounting. Access to and from the crossing area on London Road is also regularly blocked by vehicles parking on the corner of Glover Road and London Road. The solution promoted provides further waiting restrictions in and around these key locations but also provides a planter arrangement for the closure to motor vehicles which should allow the passage of cyclists even if the promoted additional waiting restrictions are blocked by vehicles.

An alternative option could be to provide a much larger closure, for example from the junction with London Road, to tackle some of the current issues, however officers have tried to balance the preferred option described above with the retention of some space for loading and parking. The revised scheme following discussions with local residents also provides some alternative parking to offset spaces lost around the new closure.

Promoting a different route away from Glover Road is not feasible given that this provides the most direct and relatively traffic free corridor to and from the City Centre, away from the busy London Road / Chesterfield Road corridor which is, and will continue to be promoted as a key bus route. The route to and from London Road / Staveley Road along Glover Road is already popular with cyclists. These improvements (as part of a wider corridor scheme) aim to attract further cyclists in future.

10.4.2 Staveley Road / Wolseley Road

Two further options were considered to improve the junction of Staveley Road and Wolseley Road for cyclists and discussed with the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, Council Officers and Cycle Sheffield representatives, held in early 2020.

Alternative Option 1

This option provided an off-line segregated crossing for both cyclists and pedestrians. Although this proposal provided a high-quality crossing facility, there was difficulty in providing a facility on the desire line without completely closing both the north side and south side of Staveley Road, which when considering existing closures and one-way systems in the area would be very difficult. The layout did propose to change access so that vehicles could only enter the South side from Wolseley Road and come out on to Wolseley Road from the northern side, however it was thought to be likely that this system would be abused by drivers and there were also questions in the meeting whether the crossing facility which was still off the desire line would be used.

Alternative Option 2

This option provided a kerb build out on the south side to narrow the crossing

distance for pedestrians and cyclists. While this would be an improvement over the existing crossroads layout, at peak times and in queuing conditions it would still provide significant delay for cyclists at this location.

10.4.3 Preferred Option

Following an evaluation of the three options, all attendees of the meeting agreed that a solution which maintained a direct route through the junction using the low traffic 'on carriageway' roads on approach would be preferred. To give cyclists greater priority over the existing give way junction, the crossroads would be signalised, incorporating detection on both approaches to give priority over vehicles on Wolseley Road. A buildout would be incorporated into the layout to further narrow the crossing distance, improve visibility for crossing pedestrians and reduce speeds on Wolseley Road.

11. **20MPH SPEED LIMIT SCHEME IN CROSSPOOL**

11.1 To report details of the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Crosspool, report the receipt of objections to the Traffic Regulation Order and set out the Council's response.

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

1. agrees to make the Crosspool 20mph Speed Limit Orders as advertised, Speed Limit Order as amended in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

2. Inform objectors accordingly;

3. Introduce the proposed 20mph speed limits as advertised; and

4. Introduce part time, advisory, 20mph speed limits on part of Lydgate Lane.

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

11.3.1 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.

11.3.2 the former Executive Member made it clear that 20mph speed limits should continue to be introduced in residential areas in accordance with the City's 20mph Speed Limit Strategy as funds allow.

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

11.3.4 It is also recommended that a part time, advisory 20mph speed limit be introduced on Lydgate Lane outside Lydgate Primary school for the same reasons.

11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

11.4.1 In light of the objection's received consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Crosspool. 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.

12. **20MPH SPEED LIMIT SCHEME IN WOODSEATS**

12.1 To report details of the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Woodseats, report the receipt of objections and set out the Council's response

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

1. agrees to make the Woodseats 20mph Speed Limit Orders as advertised, Speed Limit Order as amended in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

2. Inform objectors accordingly;

3. Introduce the proposed 20mph speed limits; and

4. Introduce part time, advisory, 20mph speed limits on part of Chesterfield Road

12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

12.3.1 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

12.3.2 The former Executive Member has made it clear that 20mph speed limits should continue to be introduced in residential areas in accordance with the City's 20mph Speed Limit Strategy as funds allow.

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

12.3.4 It is also recommended that a part time, advisory 20mph speed limit be introduced on Chesterfield Road outside Woodseats Primary school for the same reasons.

12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

12.4.1 In light of the objections received consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Woodseats. 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.

13. **APPROVAL OF THE HUMBER RIVER BASIN DISTRICT FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PLAN**

13.1 Sheffield City Council is a Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and flood Risk Management Authority (RMA) as described in the Flood Risk Regulations 2009. These regulations require the RMAs to identify nationally significant flood risk areas (FRAs) and to prepare Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs) for the FRAs that they identify. These plans are required to be reviewed on a 5-year cycle.

The latest FRMPs have been prepared by the Environment Agency working in partnership with LLFAs across England. The draft plans were published online in autumn 2021 and a public consultation was held from 22 October 2021 to 21 January 2022. Following broad support for the plans it has been agreed to publish the final plan in line with the draft document without changes.

Ahead of publication of the final plans in autumn 2022 the Environment Agency has requested that all LLFAs acknowledge our responsibility in writing for our part in the FRMPs and confirm we have internal approval for publication of certain information provided to the Environment Agency.

The report outlines how approval of the FRMP as proposed is to the benefit of the City of Sheffield and will fulfil our responsibilities under the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 in the preparation of an appropriate plan.

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

1. acknowledges the Council's responsibility in writing, as requested by the Environment Agency, for our part, as Lead Local Flood Authority, in the Humber River Basin Flood Risk Management Plan; and

2. notes that this will fulfil our responsibilities under the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 to identify nationally significant Flood Risk Areas (FRAs) and to prepare Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs) for the FRAs that they identify.

13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 13.3.1 The Flood Risk Regulations 2009 require the Flood Risk Management Authorities (RMAs) to identify nationally significant flood risk areas (FRAs) and to prepare Flood Risk Management Plans (FRMPs) for the FRAs that they identify. These plans are required to be reviewed on a 5-year cycle
- 13.3.2 The Environment Agency, given its strategic oversight of flood risk across England, has led on the production of the latest FRMPs. Sheffield City Council, in common with our fellow Lead Local Flood Authorities (LLFAs), have worked with the Environment Agency in preparing these plans. Ahead of their publication of the finalised plans the Environment Agency has requested that all LLFAs acknowledge our responsibility in writing for our part in the FRMPs and confirm we internal approval for publication of certain information provided to the Environment Agency.
- 13.3.3 Sheffield City Council approval of the Humber River Basin FRMP confirms our ongoing commitment to deliver our flood programme and acknowledges our statutory responsibilities but does not place any direct addition duties or burdens on us in itself.
- 13.3.4 Were we not to endorse this plan, as prepared in partnership with the Environment Agency, we would be required by the Flood Risk Regulations 2009 to prepare our own. Significant revenue and resources would be required to produce our own independent FRMP. This would result in delays and an additional unbudgeted cost.
- 13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**
- 13.4.1 No reasonable alternative exists, we are being asked to endorse the plan already prepared in partnership and consulted on. FRMPs are a statutory requirement.
- 13.4.2 If we were not to sign up to the Regional Plan as prepared in partnership with the Environment Agency, then we would be required to prepare our own Sheffield specific FRMP from scratch. This would have significant resource implications and a significant unbudgeted revenue cost.