

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

Meeting held 15 December 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Julie Grocutt (Co-Chair), Christine Gilligan Kubo (Deputy Chair), Andrew Sangar (Group Spokesperson), Ian Auckland, Dianne Hurst, Ruth Mersereau, Richard Shaw and Minesh Parekh (Substitute Member)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Craig Gamble-Pugh and Mazher Iqbal. Councillor Minesh Parekh attended as a substitute member.

2. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

2.1 Item 8 on the agenda (item 7 in the minutes) included exempt appendices that were not available to the public and press because they contained exempt information as described in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended. If members of the committee wished to discuss the information contained in the exempt appendices, members of the public and press would be kindly asked to leave the meeting at that point and the webcast halted.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 Councillors Richard Shaw, Ian Auckland, Andrew Sangar and Ruth Mersereau declared personal interests in the 20mph Traffic Regulation Order items on the agenda, due to these falling within the boundary of their respective wards.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 **RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the Extraordinary Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee held on the 3rd November 2022, were agreed as a correct record and the minutes of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee held on the 24th November 2022, were agreed as a correct record, subject to an amendment to the presenting petitioners name in regard to the Swift Bricks petition from Ms Nicola Gilbert to Ms Flora Jeferazade.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 The Policy Committee received no petitions and one question from a member of the public.

Question from John Chapman

'does the committee agree that the delivery of the Connecting Sheffield schemes should be sped up to help people travel cheaply by walking, cycling and by public transport in the cost living crisis or should the council continue to squander the

approx £50m funding it has already won from government for these schemes?'

The Chair advised that the Council, and this Committee remained committed to the programme outlined through the Connecting Sheffield proposals. This included the Transforming Cities Fund application, the Active Travel Fund, the day-to-day Local Transport Funding but most recently the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement. It was highlighted that delivering schemes of this scale, during a period of significant change, had not been easy. There had been wider forces at play within the construction industry which had ultimately slowed down delivery, but the council were working its best through the aftermath of these seismic deviations.

Providing access to and enabling Active Travel and public transport use was at the cornerstone of the transport policy. The needs sustainable and inclusive travel options, both for access to core social amenities but also to get people to work, education and effectively plan for the future. The council were working with funders, to which the council were not alone, to identify options for acceleration, whilst also critiquing in great detail our own practises, to ensure further delay was minimised.

6. WORK PROGRAMME

- 6.1 The Committee received a report containing the Committee's Work Programme for consideration and discussion. The aim of the Work Programme was 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.

Members raised concerns of the number of items that needed to be allocated to meetings and that more meetings may be required to get through the work load.

It was advised that a work programming session would take place in January 2023 to go through the items and prioritise. This would be an opportunity to bring items forward and discuss the budget setting item. The chair asked that anything needing discussion at this session would be added to a list held by Sarah Hyde in Democratic Services.

A suggestion was made around including another column in the work programme to show external deadlines.

6.2 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 give consideration to any further issues to be explored by officers for inclusion in Part 2 of Appendix 1 of the next work programme report, for potential addition to the work programme; and
4. that the referrals from Council and Local Area Committees (petition and resolutions) detailed in Section 2 of the report be noted and the proposed responses set out be agreed.

7. LEVELLING UP FUND - UPDATE CASTLEGATE

- 7.1 The committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that provided a progress update on the successful Gateway to Sheffield Round 1 Levelling Up Fund bid and set out recommendations to enable delivery of the three projects outlined in the Gateway to Sheffield Bid.

Progress on delivery of the scheme was set out in a previous report to the committee on 24th November 2022.

Following questions from members, it was confirmed that the recent walk about of the site was helpful for members and the report was much clearer than the previous report in November.

It was confirmed that only the development pot of money would be used for the project, and this was fixed. Additional reassurances were given to members that there would be an ongoing dialogue with the current tenants and that meetings were being held with various groups regarding the project. It was confirmed that meetings of the Castlegate Partnership Group were happening and the next one was due to meet in January. Members confirmed they were happy to move forward with the proposals following the reassurances from officers.

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

- a) Agrees that the resources identified in the Gateway to Sheffield LUF bid for the creation of development plots will be used in the first instance to make good two buildings on the Castle Site;
- b) Notes the exempt appendix 1 and 2 and authorise Officers to seek formal approval from the Department for Levelling Up Homes and Communities to relocate an element of the project to the Castle Site.

7.3 Reasons for Decision

- 7.3.1 The recommendations enable best use of the resources identified for development

plots within the LUF funding allocation, ensure all project outputs are delivered and that LUF investment in the Castle Site is enhanced.

7.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

7.4.1 Do nothing

If the Council decided not to include the two buildings as development plots there is a risk that they would be left to deteriorate further and become an increasing blight on the Castle Site and Exchange Street. There is a risk that this will detract from the investment made on the remainder of the site.

7.4.2 Do More

Whilst there is no more funding available from DLUHC, one consideration would be to ask DHLUC to vire more of the funds allocated to the Gateway to Sheffield Project to do more than undertake initial repair of the buildings. However, this would be detrimental to other elements and the delivery of outputs for the project. Additional applications for funding could be made but these would take time to secure and may jeopardise delivery of LUF scheme, project and outputs.

7.4.3 Chosen Option

The proposals in the report are considered to be the minimum required to ensure that the Gateway to Sheffield project can deliver the outputs required for the Levelling Up Fund as agreed with Government

8. **CAR/PERMIT-FREE DEVELOPMENT: PARKING PERMIT POLICY**

- 8.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that recommended approval of a policy confirming that residents of designated car/permit-free developments would not be eligible for residents' parking permits or business parking permits (for businesses registered at the car/permit-free address) in the local area. This was to be applied to all car/permit-free developments, both existing and future, where there is a relevant condition or directive on the planning permission.

Following member questions, it was confirmed that officers would find out what the limitations were on visitor parking permits.

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

- a) Approves the *Car/Permit-Free Development Parking Permit Policy* that residents of properties which are designated as car/permit-free developments will not be issued with residents parking permits or business parking permits (for businesses registered at the car/permit-free address) in the local area, to be applied equally regardless of how the car/permit-free

nature of the development was detailed in the planning permission (i.e. by condition and/or directive), aligning with the intention of the City Council as Local Planning Authority when the approval of planning permission was granted.

- b) Notes that the text of the *Car/Permit-Free Development Parking Permit Policy*:

“Residents of developments designated as car/permit-free developments will not be issued with resident parking permits or business parking permits (for businesses registered at the car/permit-free address) in the local area where there is a permit scheme in place. Residents may be eligible for other types of parking permit (carer, visitor, Blue Badge) in the usual way according to the relevant criteria.”

8.3 Reasons for Decision

- 8.3.1 The proposed policy supports the refusal of parking permits for developments which have been assessed and designated as car/permit-free and is considered to strengthen how decisions in respect of issuing parking permits are made in the city.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 8.4.1 The alternative option considered was to continue without formalising the position. This was felt to be unreasonable because the current position relied upon the planning decision without having any formalised policy in respect of refusing permits on the basis of developments being designated as car/permit-free.

9. LOCAL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD TRANSPORT COMPLIMENTARY PROGRAMME AND ROAD SAFETY FUND PROGRAMMES - 22/23 DELIVERY UPDATE

- 9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that updated on the delivery of the Local and Neighbourhood Transport Complimentary (formerly known as the Local Transport Plan) and Road Safety Fund capital programmes, as approved by committee on 15th June 2022.

It also sought approval to proceed with taking variations within the programme through the Councils capital approval process.

Officers advised that the feasibility study was still on course to be received by early 2023.

It was advised that officers were happy to discuss the priority in areas with members and discussions would take place in the new year with LAC chairs around the use of local CIL funding.

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

- i. Notes progress on the Local and Neighbourhood Transport Complimentary (formally known as the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Block) and Road Safety Fund programmes, as approved by committee on 15th June 2022;
- ii. Approves the variations within the 2022/23 programmes (highlighted in section 1.11 and Appendix A), noting the individual projects will still need to go through the Councils capital process – to be approved by the Strategy and Resources committee
- iii. Notes the increase in spend profiled in 2023/24

9.3 Reasons for Decision

9.3.1 The proposed LaNTP and RSF programmes balances the availability of funding sources with local and national policy to give a clear focus for the 2022/23 financial year, with an opportunity for changes to be considered by Committee that could be made in future years of the current 5-year programme. The proposed programme is extensive and ambitious which comes with its own challenges. The programme utilises internal and external funding sources and staff resources to deliver change to the transport system, considering environmental, economic and societal needs.

9.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

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

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

10. DOUBLE YELLOW LINES 22/23 PROGRAMME

10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City futures describing the measures to restrict inappropriate parking at three locations across the city through the introduction of double yellow lines (no waiting at any time) parking restrictions.

The committee were advised that additional funding was not available through the scheme for any additional capacity to enforce the double yellow lines.

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

- a) Notes the representations received;
- b) Concludes that the reasons to support the proposals outweigh any unresolved objections;
- c) Approves the making of the Traffic Regulation Order, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- d) Approves the introduction of the associated double yellow lines as shown on the plans in Appendix B (Hoyland Road and Bawtry Road) and one plan from Appendix A (Southey Hill);
- e) Requests that officers inform the objectors accordingly.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 The proposed measures would address obstructive parking. This would improve access and visibility and thereby safety for all road users. It would also achieve the removal of parking that obstructs footways and thereby improve pedestrian safety, accessibility and assist traffic flow. Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the Traffic Regulation Order to introduce the double yellow line restrictions be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 The only alternative was to not introduce any parking restrictions at these locations. This was not considered to be an acceptable option. The measures proposed would contribute to pedestrian safety by improving visibility at crossing points and prevent parking that blocks footways. The improvement of sight lines at junctions also contributes to vehicle safety. The removal of obstructive parking ensures accessibility for all vehicles, including emergency service vehicles

10.4.2 Without the introduction of the parking restrictions, outlined in the report, all road safety and accessibility issues, for both pedestrians and vehicles, would remain.

10.4.3 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. No other alternatives to parking restrictions have been considered.

11. **PART-TIME ADVISORY 20MPH SPEED LIMITS OUTSIDE SCHOOLS**

11.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that

informed Members about a proposed programme of part-time advisory 20mph speed limits outside schools using funding from the Road Safety Fund (RSF).

It was advised that there was no national criteria of how part-time 20mph speed limits outside schools were put in place and Sheffield used an in-house formula as not all core cities had the schemes. Members felt that prioritising the need of the schools instead of having a scheme in each LAC area would be preferred. A suggestion was made about a change in policy to the speed limit on residential roads. Officers advised that they would feed in the suggestion to the Road Safety Plan.

Members recognised the rationale, but if the council was looking at preventing loss of life or injury, then it would need to prioritise the need and check the weighing against the statistics.

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

- 1) welcomes the development of the programme, however it does not approve recommendations a) and b) as set out in the report.
(2 members voted in favour of approval of recommendations a) and b), 5 members voted against approval of recommendations a) and b) and 1 member abstained from the vote)
- 2) the Committee therefore requests that officers (1) bring back a report to a future meeting with more background information on all schools in the city and other programmes of work impacting on school safety (e.g. 20mph area-wide zones, school streets etc) and (2) review the scoring mechanism, to enable the committee to make a more informed decision.

11.3 Reasons for Decision

11.3.1 Advisory 20mph speed limits outside schools are a low-cost method of reducing speeds at the start and end of the school day in the vicinity of the school. They act to slow drivers at the time of day when vulnerable young people are walking to or from school.

11.3.2 20mph advisory limits in these chosen locations is a cost effect way of achieving the following outcomes:

- Reduction in traffic speeds
- Improve road safety for all by reducing the number and severity of road traffic collisions
- Safer school entrances
- Promote a more pleasant local environment and encourage active journeys
- Improve air quality

11.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 11.4.1 The alternative option is to do nothing and retain the existing speed limit. However, such a recommendation would run contrary to the delivery of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. This would also mean that pedestrian safety at school times 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. HIGHFIELDS 20 MPH TRO OBJECTIONS

- 12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Highfield, reports the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and sets out the Council's response.

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

- a) Approves the making of the Highfield 20mph Speed Limit Order, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- b) Approves the implementation of the Order on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage;
- c) Requests that objectors be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team.

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 Highfield 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 Highfield 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. DEERLANDS 20 MPH TRO OBJECTIONS

13.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Deerlands, 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:-

a) Approves that the Deerlands 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

b) Notes that 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 was recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Deerlands 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 objections received, consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Deerlands. 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. BATEMOOR 20 MPH TRO OBJECTIONS

14.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Batemoor, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

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

- a) Approves that the Batemoor 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- b) Implements the Order on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage;
- c) Requests that objectors be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team.

14.3 **Reasons for Decision**

14.3.1 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.

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

14.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

14.4.1 In light of the objections received, consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Batemoor. 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.

15. WATERTHORPE 20 MPH TRO OBJECTIONS

15.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Waterthorpe, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

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

- a) Approves that the Waterthorpe 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;

- b) Approves the implementation of the Order on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage;
- c) Request that Objectors be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team.

15.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 15.3.1 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.
- 15.3.2 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it was recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Waterthorpe be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme in terms of safety and sustainability are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

15.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 15.4.1 In light of the objections received, consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Waterthorpe. 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.

16. **NORTON LEES 20MPH OBJECTIONS**

- 16.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, City Futures that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Norton Lees, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.
- 16.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:-
 - a) Approves that the Norton Lees 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
 - b) Approves the implementation of the Order on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage;
 - c) Requests that objectors be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic

Regulations team;

- d) Approves the introduction of a part time 20mph limit on Derbyshire Lane outside Mundella School.

16.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 16.3.1 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.
- 16.3.2 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it was recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Norton Lees be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme in terms of safety and sustainability are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.
- 16.3.3 It was also recommended that a part time, advisory 20mph speed limit be introduced on Derbyshire Lane outside Mundella School.

16.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 16.4.1 In light of the objections received, consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Norton Lees. 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.