

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

South Local Area Committee

Meeting held 7 March 2024

PRESENT: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones (Chair), Richard Shaw (Deputy Chair), Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Alexi Dimond, Mohammed Mahroof, Maroof Raouf, Sophie Thornton and Paul Turpin

1. WELCOME AND HOUSEKEEPING ARRANGEMENTS

- 1.1 The Chair, Councillor Simon Clement-Jones welcomed those in attendance, and advised that it was likely that public questions would have to be grouped together by topic rather than asked individually, due to time constraints.
- 1.2 Two questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting, requesting the introduction of lower speed limits on Barkers Road. The Chair advised that these would receive written answers which would be sent to the questioners and published on the Council's website.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 2.1 Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Ibbi Ullah, Nighat Basharat and Marianne Elliot.

3. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

- 3.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 4.1 Item 6
Councillor Mohammed Mahroof declared that he worked for North East Derbyshire District Council, and part of the proposed development would be taking place in Dronfield, within the jurisdiction of that Council.

5. A61 CHESTERFIELD ROAD SCHEME- UPDATE AND Q&A

- 5.1 A presentation regarding the proposed scheme on the A61 Chesterfield Road, to improve public transport and road safety by giving buses priority, was delivered by Mark Gibbons, Senior Transport Planner, Sheffield City Council and Neal Byers, Consultant. The presentation, which was subsequently published on the Council's website, outlined the background to the project, its current status, the delivery themes and the next steps.

5.2 The following information was provided by Mark Gibbons and Neal Byers in response to questions from members of the public:-

- Comments made in previous consultations by shopkeepers along the route, including views on any potential loss of trade had been taken into consideration and they would be consulted again later in the scheme.
- Some parking provision might change but there were no plans to reduce overall provision.
- Provision of accessible parking spaces would be considered in the detailed design stage.
- Officers were aware of the previous scheme which had taken place near St Thomas's Church.
- The issue of traffic displacement was being evaluated via traffic modelling. If it was found that there was likely to be a negative effect, this would be managed/ mitigated as the aim of the project was to encourage bus use and enable buses to run on time.
- No short term fluctuation in the level of bus fares was anticipated but the providers set their own rates (which could be capped by the Council).
- The governance arrangements for buses were being reviewed and any resulting changes, would be more likely to have an effect on fares than any aspect of the A61 scheme, which should assist operators with regards to affordability.
- Cycling infrastructure would potentially be improved by the extension of the Sheaf Valley Cycle Route, which was thought to be preferable to mixing bicycles with buses.
- Consideration was being given to whether there were opportunities to improve cycling infrastructure along the A61.
- The budget was insufficient to address traffic "necking" at Heeley Bridge, which was a civil engineering scale matter.
- Compulsory purchase, e.g. for car parking had been considered and was part of the options appraisal. Whether it would be used would be dependent on funding.
- Current issues regarding traffic at Meadowhead Roundabout were acknowledged but this project would not provide sufficient funding to completely resolve them.

5.3 Members advised that the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority was considering the reform of bus franchising and attendees should contact the Combined Authority if they wished to contribute to this discussion.

5.4 The following information was provided by Mark Gibbons and Neal Byers in response to questions from Members of the Committee: -

- There was insufficient data to answer whether decreasing parking was necessarily bad for local businesses.
- Further funding from CRSTS (City Region Sustainable Transport Settlements) might be available for other projects.
- Engagement would take place with the landowner regarding what improvements could be made to traffic around St James Retail Park.
- Monitoring the effect of a scheme on air quality was not straight forward due to the duration of monitoring needed in order to provide reliable data,

i.e. 10 years. In such a long monitoring period it was likely that other changes would also take place which would make it difficult to identify the impact of one particular change.

6. SHEFFIELD FOOTBALL CLUB - PROPOSED NEW DEVELOPMENT AT MEADOWHEAD

6.1 A presentation, subsequently published on the Council's website regarding the proposals for a new development to accommodate Sheffield Football Club and Sheffield Eagles, was delivered by Jim Lomas, Regional Director, DLP Planning Ltd. The presentation outlined the details of the proposal, the actions taken to date and the public engagement. Information was also given regarding timescales for the submission of planning permission for both the schemes at Meadowhead and at Dronfield.

6.2 The following information was given by Jim Lomas in response to questions from members of the public:-

- Regarding concerns about the effect on air quality, an air quality assessment would be carried out and a report was being prepared, however the fact that use of electric cars was on the increase should also be taken into consideration.
- The proposals to improve Meadowhead Roundabout would decrease emissions.
- Parking Wardens would be used to tackle any unauthorised on street parking. A permit system would be in place for residents.
- There would be sufficient parking on site to serve the number of seats in the stadium. This was worked out according to ratios set by the Council and by FIFA.
- Customers would receive an allocated parking space with their ticket.
- A Traffic Management Plan would be in place, and this would include a point of contact for the public to raise any issues.
- Elected Members had the ability to stop the development from taking place via the Planning Application process.

6.3 The Chair read out the following information that had been provided by the Head of Planning regarding the planning application process:

"The Council's Online service enables documents to be viewed online. For those without IT access, there is the option to view at local libraries (Greenhill and Woodseats), as well as at Howden House, Union Street. Staff would be present at these venues to assist navigating and understanding the website service for those who would find that to be helpful. The Case Officer and/or Planning staff members would be available to help answer any questions on the details of the proposals at any point.

The application will be assessed through the course of its determination process, and ultimately a recommendation will be put to the Planning Committee. As part of the Planning Committee meeting there will be opportunity

for individuals to speak and to raise comments and to input into the decision-making process at that stage, as well as in the written forms already flagged up.

Your local councillors can also assist with publicising the proposals, advising on how to submit comments, and convening wider discussion if required.”

6.4 The following information was given by Jim Lomas in response to further questions from members of the public:-

- He could arrange for correctly sized paper copies of plans to be available at libraries for inspection by the public as it was acknowledged that they could be difficult to interpret from smaller image on a computer screen.
- No extensions to the planned shorter stadium stand were anticipated at present but if this was done in the future the parking ratio would have to be reconsidered accordingly and a further planning application submitted.
- He was aware of the potential repercussions on the accommodation of Sheffield Amateur Radio Club, however this would have to be negotiated with the Football Club, as it was not within the remit of the Planning Agents.
- There was some Park and Ride provision as part of the proposed scheme, with shuttle buses proposed from Dore and Totley, Sheffield City Centre and Dronfield. Jordanthorpe Parkway would not be appropriate for Park and Ride as it was not on the planned route for away supporters.
- It was anticipated that the use of the stadium for Rugby matches would have higher attendance than the football use.
- There would be a display of historic items in the stadium relating to the Football Club, which were currently held at Dronfield.
- Parking would be available for Coaches.
- Parking permits for residents on match days were part of a suite of measures to prevent on street parking, but it was not anticipated that the proposed scheme would generate the level of parking that some of the public were concerned about.
- It was hoped that the facilities would be utilised by Meadowhead School.
- There were no plans to use the stadium as a music venue. If this did happen in the future it would be subject to a separate licence application which would be in the remit of the City Council

7. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

7.1 The minutes of the previous meeting held on the 28th November 2023 were agreed as a correct record.

8. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

8.1 The following questions was asked by Marion Gerson, who attended the meeting:

“In July 2023 I had a reply to a LAC question from Cllr Alexi Dimond about work to Sheldon Road pavements. He said that all designs and consultation would be ready by March 2024. Eight months on and I discover that the design for Sheldon Road hasn't even been sent to the Tree Panel, and Officers estimate that it will be October at the earliest before even the consultation is carried out. That will mean YET ANOTHER winter with dangerous pavements that are not even accessible for wheelchairs and mobility scooters.

Why is it considered acceptable by our representatives on the relevant Council Committee?”

Councillor Alexi Dimond advised that he had raised this with the relevant Officers recently and would chase up a response.

9. SOUTH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE BUDGET 2023-24 REPORT

9.1 The report was presented by Diane Owens, South Local Area Committee Manager.

9.2 **RESOLVED:** That the South Local Area Committee

- Notes the further expenditure up to the £5,000 delegated authority limit. Agrees the further project expenditure over £5,000, as detailed in the report:
 - a) £6,300 for work with the Lowedges community.
 - b) £10,000 is proposed to support Heeley City Farm with their plan to revitalise and re-build its dementia garden and;
 - c) £6,700 is proposed to support the revitalisation of Highfield Play area.
- Agrees the reallocation of £14,000 underspend from the 2022-23 budget to £3500 per ward to support local street art projects as outlined in the report.

9.3 **Reasons for Decision**

The South LAC was asked to note the use of funding under its delegated powers and agree the further expenditure outlined in the report, which will help to address local priorities within the South LAC Community Plan.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

The LAC could choose not to allocate budgets at this stage and through its delegated authority, but this would delay local projects and facilities for local communities.

10. DATE OF NEXT MEETING.

- 10.1 The Chair thanked all present for attending and advised that the next meeting of the South Local Area Committee would take place on a date and time to be confirmed.