

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

Meeting held 27 November 2024

PRESENT: Councillors Ben Miskell (Chair), Alexi Dimond (Deputy Chair), Andrew Sangar (Group Spokesperson), Craig Gamble Pugh, Ruth Mersereau, Janet Ridler and Richard Shaw

41. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

41.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ian Horner and John Wright.

42. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

43. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

43.1 Councillor Ruth Mersereau declared an interest in Agenda Item 10 – Transforming Cities Fund: City Centre Traffic Regulation Order Objection Report – as a local ward member.

44. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

44.1 The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 30 October 2024 were approved as a correct record.

45. PUBLIC PETITIONS, QUESTIONS AND STATEMENTS

45.1 Three questions had been received that related to the remit of the Committee. Written responses had been sent to the questioners and published on the Council's website.

45.2 Two supplementary questions had been received relating to remit questions, the questioners were not able to attend the meeting to ask their questions and had requested that a council officer read the questions out on their behalf. Verbal responses were provided by the Chair as follows:

Supplementary question from Roy Morris:

“Many thanks for your clear reply to my question.

If I may, I would like to add a couple of comments:

1. Thank you for installing a shelter at AG124. I am on Arundel Gate regularly and, unless I am totally mistaken about the numbering AG123 does not have a shelter yet?

1. Public confidence in public transport depends on stability and fixed routes. Therefore the sooner the new arrangements for Rockingham Street are in place, the better for both public and council.”

Response from the Chair:

“Thank you for your follow-up question.

Bus Stop AG123 was always intended as a temporary measure and is therefore not equipped with a shelter. The reason for this is that the stop will be removed due to the infilling of the lay-by, which is required as part of the Stack development.

As part of the Arundel Gate works, we are planning to introduce two additional bus stops with shelters between stops AG124 and AG13. However, this depends on the infilling of the lay-by where AG123 is currently located. These new stops will accommodate the bus services currently using AG123, but the allocation of specific services to these stops will be determined by SYMCA, which is responsible for managing bus stops.

The interim arrangements for bus services while AG123 is closed are still under discussion with SYMCA.

Regarding your point about public confidence in transport being linked to stability and fixed routes, we fully agree. Stability and reliability in transport services are essential for building public trust. This is one of the reasons why we strongly support the move towards bus franchising. As a council, we will be responding to the ongoing consultation on bus franchising. Franchising would enable greater local control over routes, timetables, and fares, ensuring the consistency that passengers need.

We encourage you to participate in the current consultation on bus franchising and share your views. Your input will help shape a public transport system that better meets the needs of Sheffield and the wider region.”

Supplementary question from Nick Talbot:

“Please report on the progress of the other 10 Charge Point sites funded by ORCS. Have any ORCS funded charging sites been completed? Prior to ORCS, in March 2023 the Government Getting Building Fund via the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority funded 48 Charging Points across 21 sites in Sheffield, operated by Blink Charging on behalf of Sheffield Council. 19 of those sites are in council car parks, and not true on-street charging. The Pond Hill site is for e-taxis only. Clarence Lane is a service road for Waitrose and not true residential on-street charging, with four chargers but two are for e-taxis only, and only two are available for general public use. Blink Charging also operate a true on-street charging site on Devonshire Lane behind the Kangaroo Works, but this is NOT a council operated site according to council website <https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/travel-transport/electric-vehicle-charging>. The

Kangaroo Works freehold is owned by Sheffield Council, but Leased to Kangaroo Works for 299 years. Is the Devonshire Lane site a privately operated charging site on a public street? Is this the only true on-street charging site in Sheffield? Does the council support planning applications from other private companies to provide residential on-street charging across Sheffield?”

Response from the Chair:

“Regarding the additional questions you have raised, the 22 on-street Residential Chargepoint Scheme (ORCS)-funded chargepoints are currently undergoing a final design review prior to implementation. We anticipate that all sites will be completed by the end of March 2025. As for the on-street chargers on Devonshire Lane, behind the Kangaroo Works, these are owned and operated by Sheffield City Council. I acknowledge that the map on the Council website requires updating to reflect all current sites, and we will ensure this is addressed.

On the matter of planning applications, these are considered on an individual basis. In 2023, a report was presented to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate (TRC) Committee, approving the procurement of a commercial partner(s) to work with Sheffield City Council on delivering EV charging infrastructure strategically, including on-street provision. This is a sensible approach for a city to take, in order to ensure that provision is not patchwork.

Following the publication of this Sheffield City Council report, the Government launched the Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Fund (LEVI), allocating £8.915M (capital) to South Yorkshire for EV charging infrastructure to support residents without off-street parking. This funding is subject to an application process and meeting the terms of the fund. Delivery is being developed collaboratively through procurement with South Yorkshire’s four partner local authorities to achieve scale and enable cross-subsidisation of less commercially viable areas. This work is currently being led by SYMCA. You are welcome to contact SYMCA directly on this or other matters.”

45.3 No agenda-related questions, statements or petitions had been received.

46. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

46.1 No questions were received from Members of the Committee.

47. WORK PROGRAMME

47.1 The Principal Democratic Services Officer submitted a report containing the Committee’s Work Programme which detailed all known, substantive agenda items for forthcoming meetings of the Committee to enable the Committee, other Committees, officers, partners and the public to plan their work with and for the Committee. It was noted that two referrals to the Committee had been received from Full Council: a petition for residents only parking on Troutbeck Road, Sheffield and actions from the motion titled “Make Sheffield a Pedestrian-Friendly City”.

47.2 In response to Members’ questions, officers agreed to consider whether

extraordinary meetings were required to manage the workload of the Committee between January and April 2025.

47.3 Officers also agreed to update the work programme to distinguish between the items without a date that would be brought to the Committee before the end of 2024/25 and those that would be brought to the Committee in 2025/26.

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

1. agrees the Committee's work programme, as set out in Appendix 1, including the additions and amendments identified in Paragraph 4 of the report and any agreed by Members at the meeting;
2. notes the referrals from Council and Committees (petition and resolutions) detailed in Paragraph 2 of the report and reported in the meeting, and agrees the proposed responses set out; and
3. that the first point in the motion referral, "ensuring pavements are kept clear of litter, fly-tipping, bins, leaves and ice, including supporting community activity such as litter pickers and snow wardens" be referred to the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee as the responsibility fell within that Committee's remit.

48. GREENLAND AND BRINCLIFFE 20MPH SPEED LIMIT ORDER OBJECTION REPORT

48.1 The Principal Transport Planner and Assistant Director – City Transport presented a report that provided details of the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Brincliffe and Greenland, reported the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Orders and set out the Council's response.

48.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee approves that the Brincliffe and Greenland 20mph Speed Limit Orders 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.

48.3 Reasons for Decision

48.3.1 Alternative Option 1:

Retention of existing speed limit in the area (do nothing) This would be contrary to the delivery of the Sheffield 20mph speed limit strategy and would be detrimental to the Council's active travel ambition and vision of safer streets in the city.

48.3.2 Alternative Option 2:

Reduce scope of scheme to just outside schools This is contrary to the council's 20mph speed limit strategy that commits to installing 20mph speed limits on all

suitable residential roads and would relatively reduce the benefits.

48.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 48.4.1 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.

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

49. CROSS-COMMITTEE TASK AND FINISH GROUP: ENFORCEMENT OF TRAFFIC RESTRICTIONS

- 49.1 The Transport Programmes Manager and Assistant Director – City Transport presented a report that set out the purpose and basis to appoint a Task and Finish Group to review the effectiveness of enforcement of traffic restrictions (as well as considering new policy areas for traffic enforcement on roads - where agreed by the group), including ensuring the continuation of appropriate use of income from enforcement activities.

- 49.2 The Committee requested that the task and finish group present their final report to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee as well as the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee. Members also expressed a desire for Members to be invited to join the task and finish group based on their interests and skills. Officers explained that there was sufficient flexibility in the terms of reference for Members with specific interests or skills to be invited to the group.

- 49.3 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee approves the appointment of a Task and Finish Group to review the effectiveness of enforcement of traffic restrictions (as well as considering new policy areas for enforcement on roads - where agreed by the group), including ensuring the continuation of appropriate use of income from enforcement activities. Membership will be drawn from the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee and the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee.

49.4 Reasons for Decision

- 49.4.1 The Task and Finish Group will bring together a small, focused group of members to examine the area of enforcement of traffic restrictions and provide clear advice to officers should there be a change to existing policies of ways or working requested. Cross party representation will mean that political agreement is reached at an early stage of the process allowing the strategy to progress.

49.5 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

49.5.1 An alternative would be to deliver a series of Knowledge Briefings for both Committees separately. This was rejected as it would not enable constructive debate and advice to be provided to officers, and the existing Committee work plan commitments would mean this would add further time to the process (and therefore increased delays before the benefits provided by this proposal could be delivered).

50. TRANSFORMING CITIES FUND: CITY CENTRE TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER OBJECTION REPORT

50.1 The Transport Programmes Manager and Assistant Director – City Transport presented a report that detailed the receipt of objections to the advertised Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) required to fulfil the objectives of the City Centre Active Travel and Public Transport Scheme. The TRO would revoke other, existing TROs and introduce new provisions as necessary so as to implement bus gates, one-way restrictions, prohibition of motor vehicles and changes to loading and waiting restrictions. The report also set out a brief background to the scheme which the order was intended to facilitate, other consultation comments, officer feedback and recommendations

50.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee approves that the TRO be made (with an amendment to the order to provide a 'loading area' of 13.5 metres to enable vehicles with a permit to load and unload on Surrey Street, near the junction with Norfolk Street) 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.

50.3 Reasons for Decision

50.3.1 As outlined in Section One, the location of the City Centre scheme, and the potential impact it would have on improving the retail vitality and cultural offer, makes this a high profile and significant proposal. Approving the TRO with amendment as detailed in Section 2.7 will enable a positive transformation of the City Centre, the opportunity and funding for which would be lost if not progressed at the present time.

50.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

50.4.1 Alternative Option 1:

Surrey Street: Loading Requirements

One alternative that was considered were amendments to the design on Surrey Street to accommodate loading requirements of the shops at all times of day, but this was not pursued as it would remove one of the aims of the scheme, which is to improve the overall vision for - and attractiveness of - the useable public space in the City centre.

50.4.2 Alternative Option 2:

Surrey Street: TRO not progressed

Another option would be progress the TRO as advertised except for the proposals for Surrey Street, i.e. to leave Surrey Street in its present highway layout but progress everything else. This was not pursued as it would remove one of the aims of the scheme, which is to improve the overall vision for - and attractiveness of - the useable public space in the City centre.