

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

POLICY COMMITTEE DECISION RECORD

The following decisions were taken on Monday 11 December 2023 by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.

Item No

8. 2023/24 Q2 BUDGET MONITORING

8.1 This report brings the Committee up to date with the Council's outturn position for Quarter 2 2023/24 General Fund revenue position

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

notes the updated information and management actions provided by this report on the Quarter 2 2023/24 Revenue Budget Outturn as described in this report.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 To record formally changes to the Revenue Budget

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

8.4.1 The Council is required to both set a balance budget and to ensure that in-year income and expenditure are balanced. No other alternatives were considered.

10. KELHAM/NEEPSSEND PARKING REVIEW

10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures considering the results of extra parking surveys and the outcome of the additional engagement with businesses in Neepsend since the first phase was approved in July 2023. It included a recommendation on how to progress with a parking scheme in Neepsend by making a TRO to implement the remainder of the original proposal, albeit with modifications

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

- Having considered the objections included in Appendix A, decide to make the Traffic Regulation Order (as amended) in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.
- Approve a more flexible approach to the number of permits issued to business during the implementation of the proposed pay and display/permit parking scheme in Neepsend, operating Monday to Friday (0900-1500) in bays on Boyland Street, Bardwell Road and Neepsend Lane (between Rutland Road and Bardwell Road) and operating Monday to Sunday (0900-1500) in bays in all other areas of Neepsend.
- 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 need to monitor the effects of the scheme and the potential for advertising a further Traffic Regulation Order should the effect of displaced parking lead to one needing to be promoted;
- Note that the recommendations being implemented are subject to funding being confirmed.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 The proposed Neepsend parking scheme should:

- Improve conditions for local businesses 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;

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.4.1 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.

10.4.2 Consideration was given to implementation of the whole scheme as initially advertised. However, this was discounted as it doesn't take account of the additional business engagement and revised parking surveys Neepsend.

10.4.3 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.

11. **MOSCAR CROSS ROAD - PROHIBITION OF DRIVING**

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

confirming receipt of objections to a proposal to introduce a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) and seeking approval to make the order after having considered those objections.

The effect of the order would be to introduce a Prohibition of Driving except for solo motorcycles on Moscar Cross Road, which was a byway open to all traffic.

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

- Approve the making of the Traffic Regulation Order in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984;
- Approve the introduction of the prohibition of driving except for solo motorcycles on Moscar Cross Road as shown on Appendix A attached, by installing regulatory traffic signs, lockable gates and an adjacent bridle gate.
- Note that all objectors are informed of this decision accordingly.

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

11.3.1 If a decision is made to proceed with the proposed TRO then the byway will not be subjected to the same level of damage, the safety and access of all other users will improve and the current maintenance costs and use of resources will reduce significantly. The measure will be reviewed to ensure damage is not caused solo motorcycles. The Council will also keep the scheme under review to monitor changing weather conditions and ensure the restriction time period remains effective.

11.3.2 There is no other alternative suitable to alleviate the issues.

11.3.3 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the TRO for the prohibition of driving motor vehicles except for solo motorcycles on Moscar Cross Road be made and implemented as the benefits of the scheme in terms of access, safety and sustainability are considered to outweigh the objections raised.

11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

11.4.1 An alternative option would be to propose a prohibition of driving TRO without an exemption for solo motorcycles. However, it could not be justified as there is no evidence to suggest this type of vehicle is causing infrastructure damage to Moscar Cross Road and the Police would not be willing to support the restriction without physical restraint measures that restrict solo motorcyclists

11.4.2 An alternative option is to do nothing. This option would result in the Council bearing the increasing maintenance costs of the infrastructure damage and may need to deny public rights of access due to the risk of injury

11.4.3 There is also an issue posed around sustainability, constantly repairing the highway is not a sustainable use of limited natural resources.

11.4.4 The proposed measures do not incur any adverse effects on either the climate or the economy.

12. CLEAN AIR ZONE UPDATE – 6 MONTH REVIEW

12.1 The committee considered a report of the Executive Director City Futures that provided an early stage review of the Sheffield Clean Air Plan including an overview and a summary of the findings.

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

- Acknowledges the significant improvement in the fleet upgrades across Sheffield in response to the CAZ to date and recognises the positive changes made by vehicle owners in the city, and that further promotion of the Financial Assistance Scheme available from the Council is undertaken.
- Endorses the guiding principles and governance principles for the use of the surplus CAZ income generated set out in section 4.2.6.
- Receives a further report that sets out the approach to defining a Clean Air Investment Plan (CAIP), with a range of potential scheme and programme options that could be funded from forecast surplus CAZ income. The potential for other funds to complement and support delivery through the CAIP will also be considered.
- In response to the risks associated with the performance of bus retrofits requests a further update when Government publish their review on this issue, and in developing the Clean Air Investment Plan that officers should explore the potential to use CAF funding to support further upgrades to buses.
- Endorses the continued liaison with HM Government for greater support to fund a cleaner bus fleet in Sheffield to mitigate impacts of their bus retrofit programme on air quality in Sheffield, including through the ZEBRA 2 zero emission fund.

12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

12.3.1 To apprise Members of the progress made in improving the health of the city, the limitations of available data at this time, the vehicle compliance levels and the financial status of the Clean Air Zone scheme.

12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

12.4.1 None

13. LOCAL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD TRANSPORT COMPLIMENTARY PROGRAMME (LANTCP)/ROAD SAFETY FUND PROGRAMME: 23/24 UPDATE.

13.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures that provided an update on delivery of the carry forward within the 2022/2023 Local and Neighbourhood Transport Complimentary (formerly known as the Local Transport Plan) and Road Safety Fund capital programmes, as well as the 2023/24 programme approved by committee on 16th March 2023.

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

- i. Note progress on the Local and Neighbourhood Transport Complimentary (LaNTCP - formally known as the Local Transport Plan Integrated Transport Block) and Road Safety Fund (RSF) programmes.
- ii. Approve the variations within the programmes (highlighted in sections 1.13 to 1.31 for the LaNTCP, and Appendix B for RSF), noting the individual projects will still need to go through the Councils capital process – to be approved by the Strategy and Resources committee.
- iii. Note the potential effect on future years' programmes, with the 2024/25 programme being subject to another report early in the new calendar year.

13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

13.3.1 The proposed LaNTP and RSF programmes balances the availability of funding sources with local and national policy to give a clear focus for the 2023/24 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.

13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

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