

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

Meeting held 21 September 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Grocutt (Co-Chair), Mazher Iqbal (Co-Chair), Christine Gilligan Kubo (Deputy Chair), Andrew Sangar (Group Spokesperson), Ian Auckland, Craig Gamble Pugh, Ruth Mersereau, Richard Shaw and Mike Chaplin (Substitute Member)

1. WELCOME AND HOUSEKEEPING

1.1 The Chair at the start of the meeting issued a statement on behalf of the committee around the issues facing Sheffield in relation to public transport and bus service companies.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Dianne Hurst. Councillor Mike Chaplin attended as a substitute member for the committee.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 Councillor Andrew Sangar declared a personal interest in agenda item 11, Shalemoor Gateway, as his son was purchasing a flat in the Kelham Island area.

4. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

4.1 **RESOLVED:** That the public and press be excluded from the meeting before discussion takes place on the part 2 report of item 8 on the agenda on the grounds that, if the public and press were present during the transaction of such business, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended. Agenda item 8 would be considered as the last item on the agenda for the purposes of the public present and the webcast.

5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

5.1 **RESOLVED:** - that the minutes of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee on 15th June 2022, were agreed as a correct record.

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

6.1 The Policy Committee received a petition "Alteration to the junction of Rivelin Valley Road and Rivelin Road". There was no speaker to this petition. The petition was noted, and the petitioner be provided with a written response in respect of the issue.

6.2 The Policy Committee received an electronic petition "Request for a pedestrian

crossing on Cross Hill Street". There was no speaker to this petition. The petition was noted, and the petitioner be provided with a written response in respect of the issue.

6.3 Question from Lindy Stone:

The following question is asked on behalf of the South Yorkshire Climate Alliance: Addressing the urgent demands of the current energy crisis must not drain attention away from the critical need to improve our renewable energy generation. We know that solar and onshore wind generation is the cheapest, most secure and most swiftly developed electric energy we can have, a fact noted and acted on by many of our European neighbours in their response to the current crisis. Many Local Authorities in the UK have already taken steps to boost renewable energy generation such as Cambridgeshire, who are developing solar farms, Stroud which is using the vehicle of its local plan to identify appropriate sites for renewable generation and Warrington Council which is investing in renewable energy through the use of Community Municipal Bonds. All these examples and more can be found here <https://takeclimateaction.uk/resources/councils-tackling-climate-chaos>

In the light of the above, what steps are Sheffield City Council taking to secure future renewable energy generation for the needs of residents and to play our part in reducing carbon emissions?

The Chair stated the forthcoming Draft Sheffield Plan will include policies relating to renewable energy generation, carbon reduction and other requirements relating to sustainable design. The Draft Plan is due to be considered by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee on 3rd November.

It is also worthy of note that the Sheffield Labour councillor budget amendment last year provided an extra £3.5m for local renewable energy and as part of our review of ethical procurement we are also looking at how we can make it much easier for renewable firms to be part of our procurement.

6.4 Question from Michael Helliwell:

I wish to ask the committee a question on behalf of Sheffield residents that do not have off street parking and own an electric vehicle. What are the councils plans for them to have the ability to charge their vehicles at home? This being the easiest and most cost-effective way to charge. Have any types of charging solutions been approved or near approval? Trojan energy have had trials with others city's in the uk as I'm assured you are already aware. Barnet Council have recently signed a contract with Trojan to install their chargers as their preferred solution. This solution seems to be the best in my view as when not charging there's no equipment left in the street or pavement leaving no trip hazard and no obstruction on the pavement which have been the councils main concerns throughout my own enquiries into installing a charging facility. As the council want to be net zero by 2030 I see this problem as one that needs addressing as a matter of urgency. I am more than willing to be trial participant in our own city and looking forward to seeing your solutions to this problem.

The Chair stated that Charging electric vehicles at home is convenient and offers

potential benefits around the cost of electricity and impact on the grid. However on street solutions for residents without off street parking have a number of issues which must be considered, including for example the potential to limit future uses of the public highway and more challenging business cases. They may also not be available to all residents who for example may not be able to park outside their house or are limited by other infrastructure above or under the ground.

Within the report it is proposed that the roll out of residential charging infrastructure will be based around a local charging hub model (public EV charging units located to serve nearby residents, on highway, in a local car park or other local site). Whilst Sheffield's lamp columns are mainly at the rear of the footway and we understand that there may be technical issues we are looking at a trial to understand the potential for street lamp column charging to be included within this model. Priority however must be given to ensuring that access to, and use of, pavements is not impeded and safety of pedestrians is not jeopardised.

Innovative on street home charging solutions will continue to be investigated and may be used in addition to the local hub model once further developed. Cable channels / gulley's / lance type solutions such as that referred to will be kept under review as the outcomes of those trials are further understood, technology developed and practical issues explored. For example issues around ownership, maintenance, licensing and planning need to be resolved before any of these solutions could be approved.

6.5 Questions from John Wright:

- 1) I live next to Westways School, on a road that doesn't have parking restrictions, unlike Spring Hill, School Road and others, and hasn't been included in the school streets scheme. With the Active Neighbourhood this has exacerbated the parking problems on my road particularly during school drop-off times. I support the aims of the active neighbourhood but I worry that this scheme didn't have enough community engagement in its design phase. If there had been more I would have asked for my road and others like it, that have been missed out by both sets of restrictions, to have been included in the school streets scheme. I'm disappointed that I didn't get the chance to share my views when the scheme was being planned. Would the Chair give a view on the need for more community engagement and co-design with active neighbourhood schemes to increase the chances of them being successful?

The Chair stated that the streets included in the school streets as part of the Crookes and Walkley Active Neighbourhood were selected following consideration with our school street officers and Westways school. These were deemed to be the most appropriate to restrict vehicle movement and have a positive effect to aid children heading to and from school without restricting vehicle movement in the larger area. This was likely to see some changes in driving and parking behaviour associated with dropping off and picking up

children by those not able to walk/ cycle to school. These changes would then, unfortunately, also have negative impacts on some areas where these vehicles would now be parked. We will be monitoring the impact of this as part of the trial.

The Crookes and Walkley Active Neighbourhood is a trial scheme, which means the consultation is ongoing for around six months, during this time anyone can let us know what they think, and alert us to any concerns they may have. This means that the measures in place are subject to ongoing review. We have been actively making changes based on feedback through this consultation to improve the changes and make sure the scheme is effective. As part of the trial the public is also invited to contribute comments regarding to the scheme and its effects in order for us to assess the impact it has on people's day to day lives, alongside what the traffic data tells us. This will influence the recommendations that will be put to the committee at the end of the trial period to decide whether some, all, or none of the measures in are made permanent.

The community were involved in the Summer of 2021 where we discussed and consulted on the types of measures we could use. As the scheme has been implemented on a trial basis through an Experimental traffic Regulation Order (ETRO) the community engagement happens alongside the measures being in place. Having more time to engage the public with the design ideas and consultation would certainly add some benefits but also significant time to the scheme delivery. In the case of this scheme, the trial option through the use of ETRO was the only option given the criteria for using the government funding available.

We welcome your feedback and would be happy to discuss this further, this would then be included in the consultation and monitoring of the scheme.

- 2) Some parts of the Crookes and Walkley scheme haven't yet been implemented and we are nearly 3 months on from when the revised ETRO went live on June 23rd. What is happening with the outstanding implementation work, and are there any plans to extend the ETRO or the 6-month consultation?

The Chair advised that the difficulty has been painting the double yellow lines at the locations where we need to install the some the road changes. The double yellow lines are needed to allow larger vehicles to turn when the road changes are in place. Amey have tried on a number of occasions to paint the double yellow lines but there are always parked cars blocking the area where the lines need to be painted. They have tried leaving notes and door knocking with limited success. We are now taking steps to be in a position to enforce on parking in these locations, this should free up the space to paint the lines and then install the interventions. The delay has also provided time to review and consider the feedback received on the scheme to date and talk through with local Councillors options for the next steps. It is currently anticipated that the remainder of the scheme will be implemented towards the end of October.

- 6.6 The committee discussed at length the Experimental Traffic Regulation Orders (ETRO) and interventions that had not yet been implemented in the current schemes. Members supported the questioner's comments around a pause on any new ETRO's proposed to ensure the appropriate engagement had been sought.
- 6.7 Members also discussed officer delegations and wished for this to be considered with the six-month review of the Committee System. The Chair advised that she would raise this as part of the six month review with the Governance Committee.
- 6.8 Members of the Committee requested that officers consider a pause on any new proposed ETRO's coming forward.

7 members voted in favour, 1 member voted against and 1 member abstained.

7. WORK PROGRAMME

- 7.1 The Committee received a report containing the Committee's Work Programme for consideration and discussion. The aim of the Work Programme is to show 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. It was highlighted that this was a live document and Members input to it was invaluable. Sections 2.1 in the report; References from Council and petitions were noted.

A question was asked when the Decarbonisation Route Maps would be brought to the committee to have them agreed within the municipal year. The Head of Transport Sustainability and Infrastructure advised that some prioritisation has been made around decarbonisation agenda and a briefing had recently taken place that would inform the timetable into the route maps. It was advised that an update could be provided to the next meeting on the timeline of the route maps and provide some comfort in terms of what could be delivered in this municipal calendar.

It was agreed a discussion would take place informally to discuss the cross-cutting issues and the timetable for the route maps.

Members stated that the Committee work programme was busy and that they would like to see the long list of potential agenda items prioritised and allocated to meeting dates.

It was also flagged that the work programme for this committee was very heavy. The Chair confirmed this would be brought up with the Governance Committee as part of the six-month review of the committee system.

A request was made for a presentation to the committee on the Sheaf Valley Cycle route scheme.

7.2 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: -

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 gave 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.

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.

The Director of Finance and Commercial Services advised that the budget was broadly balanced and one off government funding was used to deal with the shortfall this year.

Councillor Sangar advised that he was pleased to see the spend on the Clean Air Zone project. The Director of Finance and Commercial Services advised that the penalty charge notices had delivered a saving and the scheme was about making quality of life better for the public. The Clean Air Zone project was a partnership and was government funded. The Council was currently agreeing the dates for the Clean Air Zone going live in early 2023 to achieve compliance.

- 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.

Councillor Gilligan Kubo advised that officers needed to be open in the reports regarding Climate Impact Assessments and provide narrative if an assessment had not been carried out. The Senior Transport Planner, Jenny Wood advised that she had worked with Climate Officers on the summary and would ensure that this was flagged in future reports.

Councillor Mersereau commented on paragraph 4.1.1 of the report on the Equality Impact Assessment, namely the comment that stated "overall there should be a positive impact from the proposal, in particular for disabled people and poverty and financial inclusion". Councillor Mersereau stated she would question this due to the high cost of electric vehicles. The Senior Transport Planner advised that the report was only in relation to the infrastructure for electric vehicles.

Councillor Shaw asked if reassurance could be made that there would be no detrimental impact on residents regarding the infrastructure, such as impeding on space and that suitable provision was made.

Councillor Mersereau asked for clarity around what vehicles would be able to park for free. The Senior Transport Planner advised that a separate paper would need to be prepared, on if vehicles would qualify for free parking.

- 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. Notes the work currently being undertaken to deliver public electric vehicle charging infrastructure in Sheffield;
- iii. Agrees short term actions to progress the delivery of additional public electric vehicle charging infrastructure;
- iv. Notes 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.

- v. Notes 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. SHALESMOOR 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 outlined the potential future financial commitment required by the Council, in advance of any development and construction funding by the Department for Transport.

Appendix A showed the indicative scheme proposals. This was preliminary design and would be refined, taking on further comments from stakeholders through detailed design.

Appendix B outlined the spend profile of the scheme.

The Transport Planning and Infrastructure Manager advised that the case had been submitted to the DfT (Department for Transport) for approval and that members were welcome to have a walk around the areas in the proposal. Cycle Sheffield had submitted an objection to the scheme outlining a few specific requests of the design that would be looked at through the later phases. Active Travel England had commented that they felt the scheme was well balanced.

Councillor Iqbal asked for an understanding of the figures.

The Transport Planning and Infrastructure Manager advised that financial contribution was sought through the Corporate Investment Fund for £3.4m. £430k had been spent to date on the outline business case development, with approval of seeking the remaining £2.97m to be made available for additional

work and match funding for construction of much needed houses and signage.

Councillor Chaplin asked if the scheme brought bus stops closer to the tram stops. The Transport Planning and Infrastructure Manager advised that they were looking to improve the integration between bus stops and tram stops. The Council had spoken to Supertram about getting stops closer together around Fox Hill and Grenoside.

Councillor Shaw asked if there had been any notable objections to the scheme. The Transport and Infrastructure Manager advised that these would be reported back to the committee.

Councillor Auckland commented that the scheme was necessary in unlocking development in the city, but did the scheme still deliver or improve public transport reliability. The Transport and Infrastructure Manager advised that this was detailed within the analytics of the business case and the scheme introduced a bus priority bypass. Bus Drivers had met with the Council and talked through their experiences. The new scheme had developed fresh thinking.

The Chair of the committee commented that the scheme was exciting and that it fitted together, she hoped it gave the public the whole overview.

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 were 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 would include detailed design, public consultation, and tendering for the works to be undertaken;

Notes that the Full Business Case would 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 Executive 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 would 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 set 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.

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

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.

15. BUDGET PROPOSALS FOR YEAR 2023/2024

- 15.1 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.

- 15.2 **RESOLVED:** That the public and press be excluded from the meeting before discussion takes place on the part 2 report of this item on the agenda on the grounds that, if the public and press were present during the transaction of such business, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraphs 3 and 5 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.
- 15.3 The meeting was re-opened to the press and public.
- 15.4 **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.

15.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 15.3.1 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.
- 15.3.2 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.
- 15.3.3 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
- 15.3.4 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.

15.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 15.4.1 **Do nothing**
If none of the proposed actions are progressed, there is no likelihood of delivering a balanced budget.
- 15.4.2 **Deliver Balanced Budget**
Make further savings by revisiting those options currently rejected by Committee Members.

- 15.4.3 **Offer greater budget savings by stopping services**
Make further savings by stopping non statutory services