

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## POLICY COMMITTEE DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Wednesday 21 September 2022 by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.

### **Item No**

#### **7. BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR YEAR 2023/2024**

7.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director – City Futures. The report sets out the budget pressures and risks facing services that sit within the responsibility of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Change Policy Committee (TRC Committee), and a budget action plan to mitigate these as far as possible in the 23/24 financial year.

It provides savings recommendations which form part of Sheffield City Council's objectives around setting a balanced budget.

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

- Acknowledge the recommendation approved at the Strategy and Resources Committee on [5 July 2022](#) that “Policy Committees will be asked to develop savings / additional income options that cover their own pressures – in effect cash standstill” and to “require Policy Committees to report at their meetings in September on how they can balance their budgets.”
- Note, as this Committee's initial response to the Strategy and Resources Committee's request, the set of budget proposals set out in this report, including part 2.
- Note that Officers will now work with Members to consult with relevant stakeholders (including with partners, trades unions and in respect of equalities and climate change) on the proposals in this report so as to inform final budget proposals.
- Note that Officers will work to develop any necessary detailed implementation plans for the proposals in this report so that the proposals, if ultimately approved, can be implemented as planned before or during the 2023/24 financial year.
- Ask to receive a further report in November that will set out the final budget for this Committee following consultation and any adjustments requested by the Strategy and Resources Committee.

7.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 7.3.1 Committee Members and officers have sought to strike a balance between meeting budget challenges and continuing to deliver strategically important and statutory services to support Sheffield's corporate priorities around transport, climate change, regeneration, sustainability and planning.
- 7.3.2 It is critical that services are maintained to further support regeneration in the city and underpin game changing projects like Heart of the City, Sheffield's Levelling Up city centre pilots, Local Plan development and strategic transport improvements for the city. Added to this, there is a critical need to address Sheffield's commitments around Net Zero and the climate agenda.
- 7.3.3 Removal of services and budgets will dramatically reduce the City's ability to bid for and win external funding, which is critical to delivery of Member and corporate priorities
- 7.3.4 The recommended proposals allow the TRC Committee to make a substantial contribution to the Council's budget challenges. Further options can be considered by Strategy and Resources Committee with the TRC committee, as the range of options proposed across all Committees are considered together.

#### 7.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

##### 7.4.1 **Do nothing**

If none of the proposed actions are progressed, there is no likelihood of delivering a balanced budget.

##### 7.4.2 **Deliver Balanced Budget**

Make further savings by revisiting those options currently rejected by Committee Members.

##### 7.4.3 **Offer greater budget savings by stopping services**

Make further savings by stopping non statutory services

### 8. **REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING - MONTH 04**

8.1 The Committee considered a report of the Director of Finance and Commercial Services. The report brought the Committee up to date with the Council's financial position as at Month 4 2022/23.

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

Note the Council's challenging financial position as at the end of July 2022 (month 4).

### 8.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 8.3.1 The Council is required to both set a balance budget and to ensure that in-year income and expenditure are balanced.

### 8.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 8.4.1 No other alternatives were considered.

## 9. **ELECTRIC VEHICLE PUBLIC CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE UPDATE AND SHORT-TERM ACTION PLAN**

- 9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director – City Futures. The report outlined the current policy background to public electric vehicle charging infrastructure development in Sheffield. It sought endorsement of the Council's currently adopted position, and agreement to the carrying out of the short-term actions set out to progress public electric vehicle charging infrastructure delivery.

It also sought agreement that the submission of funding bid(s) for government's On Street Residential Chargepoint Scheme and / or Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Fund (as either SCC or part of a wider consortium led by South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority) would be consistent with both the policy position and short-term actions, if agreed.

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

- i. Endorse the Council's current policy position in relation to public electric vehicle charging infrastructure provision
- ii. Note the work currently being undertaken to deliver public electric vehicle charging infrastructure in Sheffield
- iii. Agree short term actions to progress the delivery of additional public electric vehicle charging infrastructure
- iv. Note that the submission of funding bids to governments On Street Residential Chargepoint Scheme and/or Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Fund (as either SCC or part of a wider consortium led by South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority) would be consistent with the Council's current policy position and short-term actions, if agreed.
- v. Note that the delegated authority to submit the aforementioned bids rests with the relevant Exec Director (in consultation with the Council's Chief Finance Officer), and that commitment to the use of the funding will further be subject to the approval of the Finance

Sub-Committee, where appropriate.

### 9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 9.3.1 For the reasons outlined previously, following the recent publication of the governments national Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure Strategy it was the opportune time to confirm the Councils current position in relation to public electric vehicle charging infrastructure and agree a short term plan of action to capitalise on opportunities to further roll out this infrastructure.
- 9.3.2 Sheffield City Council had set itself a Net Zero target and electric vehicles (EVs), alongside modal shift, will be crucial to meet this goal. The development of a sub-regional strategy and local evidence-based delivery plan will ensure we are in a position to further progress charging infrastructure in the city as opportunities arise and that we are working towards our zero carbon targets.
- 9.3.3 The short-term actions outlined are necessary to support the existing network, expand it, ensure inclusion, inform future delivery and future proof development.

### 9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 9.4.1 *The alternative* 'do nothing' option is not considered appropriate as this is likely to result in:
- Disjointed approach to provision of Electric Vehicle Charging Infrastructure that risks inequitable access, inability to leverage available funding and undermines the ability of citizens to transition to electric vehicles;
  - Financial risk to the council due to a failure to comprehensively assess the risk associated with installing electric vehicle charging infrastructure through the various available approaches. These risks are further described in Appendix B to this report
- 'Do nothing' does not tackle the climate emergency and is not considered to be a viable way forward
- 9.4.2 The development of the delivery plan will consider the implications of a number of approaches to electric vehicle charging infrastructure development.

## 10. **SHALES Moor GATEWAY**

- 10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director – City Futures. The report updates the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee on the work undertaken to date on the Shalesmoor Gateway Outline Business Case, in preparation for a submission to the Department

for Transport's Major Road Network National Roads Fund.

The key benefits of the scheme remain unchanged from the project mandate, supporting and protecting the city's growth objectives within the City Centre, Kelham Island and Neepsend areas, in terms of enabling access to key development sites which will bring forward thousands of new homes along with other local facilities and employment opportunities.

The project will form part of the emerging City Centre Masterplan and aligns with the strategic Local Plan growth ambitions. The scheme also reduces traffic congestion and improves resilience of the Inner Ring Road, allowing traffic to move efficiently along the A61, which is a blue light route for the emergency services and is defined as the Department for Transport's Major Road Network.

In addition, the scheme provides improvements for public transport, pedestrians, and cyclists, tying into the Connecting Sheffield programme and the Kelham Neepsend project. This integrated and balanced approach delivers against the longer-term priorities of the Council in terms of sustainable transport and working towards net zero carbon by 2030.

The report outlines the potential future financial commitment required by the Council, in advance of any development and construction funding by the Department for Transport.

Appendix A of the report shows the indicative scheme proposals. This is preliminary design and will be refined, taking on further comments from stakeholders through detailed design.

Appendix B of the report outlined the spend profile of the scheme.

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

Endorse the work undertaken thus far to develop the Outline Business Case for Shalesmoor Gateway to the Department for Transport;

To the extent that the relevant decisions are not already delegated to officers, authorise the Executive Director of City Futures, in consultation with the Chair or the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, to undertake all necessary work to continue the development of the Shalesmoor Gateway scheme and prepare the Full Business Case. This will include detailed design, public consultation, and tendering for the works to be undertaken;

Note that the Full Business Case will be brought back to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee for its endorsement prior to submission to the Department for Transport; and

Note that the delegated authority to submit bids for further funding via the

OBC and FBC rests with the relevant Exec Director (in consultation with the Council's Chief Finance Officer), and that commitment to the use of that funding as well as the commitment of the remaining £2.97m allocation of Community Infrastructure Levy funding in accordance with the proposal detailed in this report will further be subject to the approval of either the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee or the Finance Sub-Committee, where appropriate.

### **10.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 10.3.1 The Council's Housing Infrastructure Fund identified the wider strategic benefit in delivering an integrated highway improvement at the Shalesmoor Gateway on the A61. This improvement was included in the Housing Infrastructure Fund bid; however, it was unsuccessful
- 10.3.2 Recognising its strategic importance, the Council also submitted the scheme through the Department of Transport's National Roads Fund. It was subsequently added to the long list of schemes by Transport for the North, via a South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority submission. The Shalesmoor Gateway scheme is the only scheme to be shortlisted within the Sheffield City Region.
- 10.3.3 The work done to date on the scheme has been critical to the identification of viable alignments and the OBC has identified the preferred option to meet the wider strategic objectives and deliver value for money. The business case is very strong and is ready for submission
- 10.3.4 Entry to the National Roads Fund programme requires rigorous assessment and compliance with well-established DfT processes and procedures in the assessment of options. The requirements are understood and are well known to the Council, with previous schemes having been subject to DfT requirements and progressing successfully.
- 10.3.5 The funding and delivery timescales are limited. It is therefore critical that the OBC is submitted to the DfT and that the FBC works are undertaken without delay to meet the programme. Failure to meet programme and / or DfT requirements may compromise future further funding opportunities for the scheme.
- 10.3.6 The award of funding for the development of the FBC does not guarantee future DfT funding, either for scheme development costs at the FBC stage, or for implementation of the scheme. It is essential that all avenues for funding continue to be investigated.

### **10.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 10.4.1 1.1. 'Do nothing' has been considered, but is not considered appropriate as this is likely to result in:
- Increased congestion and negative impact on journey times and journey time reliability
  - Failure to promote access to the supertram network;
  - Prevent the accelerated completion of development in and around HZN and city centre leading to growth in economy
  - Reduced facilities for pedestrians and cyclists, failing to encourage more active and sustainable travel choices.

## **11. SCHOOL STREETS**

11.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director – City Futures. The report described the measures taken to restrict vehicle movements and associated inappropriate parking at four school locations across the city through the introduction of a School Streets scheme (restriction of the road outside school gate to all but exempt traffic at certain times) via a series of Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETROs).

It sets out officer's responses to objections received in respect of the ETROs and seeks a decision from the Policy Committee as to making the School Streets scheme permanent by making the restrictions in the associated ETROs permanent.

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

Having considered the representations received and having determined that the reasons to support the proposals outweigh any objections, it is agreed that:

The Traffic Regulation Orders are made in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

Establish the 4 School Street schemes on a permanent basis at the 4 locations shown on the plans in Appendix B.

### **11.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 11.3.2 The proposed measures (the making permanent of the School Streets schemes described in this report) will address the following:
- Dangerous parking at the school entrances by parents dropping off and collecting children from school
  - Idling engines at the school gates
  - Traffic congestion outside school gates
  - Improve conditions for those who walk, cycle and scoot to school
  - Encourage others to leave the car at home and choose active ways

- of getting to school
- Health benefits for all
- Community benefits as streets are prioritised for active journeys become a more enjoyable space to use.
- Where planters at scheme entrances are used the school and community can take ownership of their street and be proud of their space.

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

- 11.4.1 The only alternative is to not introduce School Streets at these locations, this is not considered to be an acceptable option. The removal of obstructive parking and dangerous vehicle manoeuvres outside the school gates ensures the safety for the most vulnerable users at these times. Consequently, the measures proposed will contribute to pedestrian & cyclists' safety and their removal will result in the opposite

Without the introduction of the School Street outlined in this report, all the road safety, accessibility, and air quality issues, for children, their families & local residents will remain.

The beneficial effects of the proposed measures do not incur the penalty of having adverse effects on either the climate or the economy as there are none.

## 12. **MANOR PARK 20MPH TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS**

- 12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director – City Futures that reported details of the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Manor Park, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

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

Approves that the Manor Park 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Objectors will then be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team and the order implemented on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage.

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

#### 12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 12.4.1 In light of the objection's received consideration Manor Park was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in. 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. **HANDSWORTH 20MPH TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTIONS**

- 13.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director – City Futures that reported details of the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Handsworth, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

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

Approves that the Handsworth 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Objectors will then be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team and the order implemented on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage.

#### 13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 13.3.1 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.

#### 13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 13.4.1 In light of the objection's received consideration Handsworth was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in. 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.

#### **14. LOCAL CENTRE DISABLED BAYS, WOODHOUSE TRO OBJECTIONS**

- 14.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director – City Future that reported details of the consultation response to proposals to install a disabled parking bay at Woodhouse Local District Centre, report the receipt of objections and set out the Council's response

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

Approves the installation of a disabled parking bay on Chapel Street in Woodhouse in accordance with the Traffic Regulation Order as advertised under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and Inform objectors accordingly

#### **14.3 Reasons for Decision**

- 14.3.1 The Council's Core Strategy sets out for the period to 2026, the overall vision for the city, the relationships between the areas within it and how different factors come together in each area. Local District Centres are to provide everyday needs with a range of retail, leisure, and community facilities. This would be supported by improving the quality of the environment, the mixture of uses, and accessibility and safety for all
- 14.3.2 To develop and maintain the desired outcome of a thriving local district centre at Woodhouse, it is vital that all local people have direct accessibility to the facilities and amenities within the village. There is currently on street public parking throughout the village, including a public car park off Market Street and Vicar Lane. Unfortunately, the public parking available on the highway does not currently include provisions specifically for disabled drivers
- 14.3.3 The recommendation is to install a disabled parking bay within Woodhouse village to provide inclusivity and accessibility for all local people. There are no public disabled parking bays on the main highway that goes through Woodhouse district centre from Chapel Street, through to the end of Cross Street where many of the shops and amenities are located. The surface of the public car park on Vicar Lane is not tarmacked and would cause mobility difficulties for those who require mobility aids such as wheelchairs, tri pods and walkers. There are also no allocated disabled parking bays in the car park to guarantee sufficient vehicle space. The car park off Market Street does not provide direct access to the amenities which would be a

disadvantage to many disabled people who are unable to walk the required distance to access the amenities.

Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the disabled parking bay on Chapel Street be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the proposal are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

#### **14.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 14.4.1 There were originally 3 proposed disabled parking bays for the Woodhouse local district centre. 2 of which were proposed to be installed in the parking bay outside of the Lloyds Bank on Cross Street and one disabled parking bay on Chapel Street which has been included in the consultation. It was decided after a discussion with the Ward members that only one disabled parking bay was to be proposed at this time.
- 14.4.1 Apart from the proposed disabled bay in question, there are no other provisions for disabled parking in the whole local district area. Doing nothing to improve this would be contrary to the Councils' equal opportunities commitments.