

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

POLICY COMMITTEE DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Wednesday 19 July 2023 by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.

Item No

6. WORK PROGRAMME

6.1 The Committee considered a report of the Director of Policy and Democratic Engagement on the Committee's Work Programme detailing 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.

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

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.

6.3 Reasons for Decision

6.3.1 To give the committee members an opportunity to consider the direction of the work programme, align it with their key priorities and create a manageable workload for the committee.

6.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

6.4.1 None

7. CLIMATE DECARBONISATION ROUTEMAPS: OUR COUNCIL AND THE WAY WE TRAVEL

7.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures briefing the committee on the Decarbonisation Routemaps and seeking approval of the chapters contained within Tranche 1 which include chapters covering the Introduction, Our Council, The Way We Travel.

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

Approves the chapters contained within the Tranche 1 Decarbonisation Routemap at appendix 1 to this report.

7.3 **Reasons for Decision**

7.3.1 The recommendation is the preferred option because it will allow progress to be made at pace and for plans to iterate over the coming years.

7.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

7.4.1 Creating a single plan covering all areas requiring decarbonisation was considered, but to enable officers to continue to deliver projects at the same time this approach was rejected. Creating a plan which takes us all the way to 2030 was considered but given the changing technology and current shortfall in funding of several billion pounds, it was considered that creating a live and agile document that could be easily updated and added to was preferable.

8. **CONNECTING SHEFFIELD SW BUS CORRIDORS**

8.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures advising the Committee of the approach officers are taking to forward the Connecting Sheffield South West Bus Corridors Project. The report sets out the background to the scheme, the results of the initial consultation, the analysis of the issues affecting bus movements on these corridors, the options considered and actions at this stage.

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

- Endorse the implementation of a series of bus priority works at or near specific junctions along London Road, Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, including amendments to sections of bus lanes and a system of traffic signal upgrades with buses given priority at junctions.

- Note that the Head of Strategic Transport, Sustainability and Infrastructure will promote a Traffic Regulation Order for these measures and statutory consultation will be undertaken with any objections reported to a future TRC Policy Committee for a final decision.

- Endorse that the existing bus lane hours of operation on London Road, Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road corridors will be enforced using camera technology.

- Endorse that a further review of the public transport conditions on these corridors including an assessment following the implementation of these works to determine if further bus priority measures are required.

8.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 8.3.1 Officers have investigated alternative options and on balance consider the initial implementation of the bus priority works at or near junctions along with the camera enforcement of existing bus lane hours of operation to be the best solution. Following the implementation of these works a review will be undertaken to determine if further bus priority measures are required.

8.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

8.4.1 Option A – Do Minimum

This option assumes no investment from the Transforming Cities Fund and therefore no additional infrastructure. Doing nothing is not considered an appropriate option and would not address the delays to buses.

8.4.2 Option B – (Preferred option)

Bus priority works and traffic management amendments at or near junctions along London Road, Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road. Existing bus lane hours of operation would also be camera enforced.

There were few concerns with the proposed bus priority works and traffic management amendments at or near junctions along the corridors. The main concerns were regarding any potential amendments to parking restrictions and bus lane operating hours.

9. **KELHAM ISLAND AND NEEPSSEND PARKING SCHEME**

- 9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures detailing the receipt of objections to a proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) for the introduction 'no waiting at any time' restrictions as well as shared use permit and parking bays in Kelham Island and Neepsend. The report also set out the background to the Kelham Island and Neepsend parking scheme, other consultation comments and the Council's response to the representations received.

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

- Consider the objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order with particular regard to how they relate to the proposed double yellow lines included within the parking scheme;
- Having considered the objections, decide to make the Traffic Regulation Order (as amended) in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984, specifically;
- Approve the implementation of the proposed pay and display (P&D) parking scheme in Kelham Island, including ordering the P&D machines – but not in Neepsend at this time due to a desire to undertake additional work – focussing on businesses - to see how the effects of the originally proposed scheme could be

mitigated;

- Approve the implementation of the ‘no loading and no waiting’ restrictions within Kelham Island and Neepsend; and
- Note that there will be additional engagement within the Neepsend area – focussing on businesses - to see how the effects of the originally proposed permit scheme could be reduced. The pay and display/permit scheme in Neepsend will not be implemented until after this engagement has taken place. Any future recommendation to implement a pay and display/permit scheme in Neepsend would be made via officer or Committee decisions as appropriate and per the requirements of the Council’s constitution;
- Note that the Council’s Traffic Regulations team will inform all consultation respondents accordingly;
- Note that a review of the scheme will be carried out after around 12 months of the approved scheme being active;
- Note the advertising of additional restrictions on Douglas Road/Wallace Road to help reduce the effect of potential displaced parking, especially for larger vehicles
- Note the use of a Temporary Traffic Regulation Order to help facilitate the implementation of the scheme (if approved), using ‘tow away’ powers if necessary

Note that the recommendations being implemented were subject to funding being confirmed.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

9.3.1 The proposed Kelham Island and Neepsend parking scheme should:

- Improve conditions for local businesses residents by ensuring the availability of convenient parking spaces for residents, business and visitors and giving them a greater level of priority where appropriate through issuing permits;
- Improve access through the area and loading and unloading opportunities for all vehicles (especially larger ones) by removing parking at or near junctions; and
- Improve conditions for sustainable travel modes – the Kelham Island/Neepsend parking scheme includes restrictions that enable improved facilities for walking and cycling, as well as ensuring that public transport is not impeded by inappropriate parking.
- Following the initial consultation, not implement the pay and display element in Neepsend at this time due to a plan to undertake additional work with businesses in Neepsend to see how the effects of the original scheme could be mitigated.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 Consideration was given to limited waiting, without charging (e.g. 4 hours, no return within 2 hours), with permits considered where appropriate. However, this was discounted for the following reasons:

- Enforcement of the restrictions are more resource intensive and time consuming;
- Puts pressure on existing enforcement resources as limited extra income through enforcement may not cover additional costs;
- Lack of consistency of approach with other areas of the City;
- Residents and businesses could feel that they are being charged to park in the area where visitors (and potentially commuters) may not; and
- There is anecdotal evidence from schemes around the City that suggest that people may move their vehicles part way through the day to avoid the 4-hour restrictions.

9.4.2 Consideration was given to implementation of the whole scheme as initially advertised. However, this was discounted for the following reasons:

- Doesn't take account of the differential parking demands and needs between Kelham Island and Neepsend
- Following the initial consultation, it is planned to undertake additional work with businesses in Neepsend to see how the effects of the original scheme could be mitigated

9.4.3 Consideration was given to cheaper all day parking tariffs. However, this was discounted for the following reasons:

- Demand must properly be managed through the setting of appropriate tariffs. Otherwise, parking capacity for local businesses, residents and visitors could at times be inadequate
- Cheaper tariffs could also increase the occurrence of traffic circulating searching for car parking spaces, leading to increased traffic movements.
- Lack of integration with local and regional strategies.

10. KELHAM ISLAND AND NEEPSSEND ACTIVE TRAVEL AND PUBLIC TRANSPORT SCHEME

10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures detailing the objections to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) required to fulfil the objectives of the Kelham Island and Neepsend Active Travel and Public Transport Scheme. If approved, the TRO will revoke other, existing TRO and introduce new provisions as necessary so as to implement bus lanes, bus gates, one-way restrictions, prohibition of motor vehicles and speed limit amendments.

The report also sets out the background to the scheme which the order is intended to facilitate, other consultation comments, officer feedback and recommendations.

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

- Consider the objections to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO).
- Authorise the making of the TRO with the following modifications to the original proposal:
 - The removal of the one way on Percy Street between Neepsend Lane and Burton Road
 - The removal of the one ways on Rowland Street and Wilson Street
 - The removal of the prohibition of motor vehicles on Vicar Lane
 - A reduction in the length of the prohibition of motor vehicles on Neepsend Lane from 88m to 20m from its junction with Burton Road.
- Note that a further, separate TRO will be promoted on Paradise Street and Silver Street to improve access to a business on Paradise Street.
- Inform all objectors accordingly.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 The proposed Kelham Island and Neepsend Active Travel and Public Transport scheme aims to:

- Reinforce and support the regeneration of Kelham Island and Neepsend by providing sustainable access into the city centre through new, high-quality cycling and walking infrastructure and improved routes for bus services.
- Provide attractive sustainable travel outcomes for the growing resident population and complement proposals for the Shalesmoor Gateway and other local active travel schemes.

The proposed TRO is required in order to deliver the scheme and meet the above aims.

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 All the elements of the TRO are required to enable the implementation of the Kelham and Neepsend Active Travel and Public Transport Scheme. Without the TRO the full benefits of this scheme will not be realised.