

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

Meeting held 24 November 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Mazher Iqbal (Co-Chair), Christine Gilligan Kubo (Deputy Chair), Andrew Sangar (Group Spokesperson), Ian Auckland, Craig Gamble Pugh, Dianne Hurst, Richard Shaw and Maroof Raouf (Substitute Member)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Julie Grocutt and Councillor Ruth Mersereau. Councillor Maroof Raouf attended as a substitute member for the committee.

2. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

2.2 **RESOLVED:** That the public and press be excluded from the meeting before discussion takes place on the part 2 report of item 12 and 14 on the agenda on the grounds that, if the public and press were present during the transaction of such business, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraph 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.3 Councillor Ian Auckland declared a personal interest in item 5 on the agenda Public Questions and Petitions, as he was a member of the Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB).

3.4 Councillor Craig Gamble-Pugh declared a personal interest in item 11 on the agenda, Decarbonisation Route Maps update, as he was the Director of Company at the South Yorkshire Climate Alliance.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

4.1 The Policy Committee received a petition "Swift Bricks". Nicola Gilbert attended the meeting and presented the petition to the committee.

The petitioner explained that Swifts had been on earth for 72 million years, but they would become extinct in the next 30 years if they were not provided with permanent nesting opportunities now. Swifts had declined by 60% since 1997 and the main cause of this was nest destruction by eaves being blocked up in the fitting of modern soffits and fascias to buildings.

Ms Gilbert talked about how the installation of modern fascias and soffits to buildings meant historic nests in eaves of homes were lost and how the local swift groups worked to stop scaffolding being erected in nesting season, which

could threaten colonies of swifts returning to nests. Ms Gilbert explained how they watched the swifts continuously crash into scaffolding trying to enter their nests, many would break their wings and even die. Ms Gilbert explained that the group had had success by halting work taking place if swifts were nesting.

The group had worked with Sky-House to install 50 permanent bricks at Oughtibridge Mill like elsewhere in the country. Ms Gilbert explained that there were many brands of the brick and it was contained within the building, for life and was maintenance free, cheap and easy to install. The importance of the brick was unquestionable to the survival of the birds. There were still pockets of swift colonies in Sheffield and if there were no holes, there would be no nests, no chicks and no Swifts.

The Chair thanked the petitioner for her passionate speech.

The Chair advised Policy GS5 in the Draft Local Plan 'Development and Biodiversity' included a clause (part I) that required developments to "incorporate design features that enhance biodiversity". In the definition section of the policy, it was indicated that this "*could include, for example, green roofs, bird and bat boxes, hedgehog holes in walls and fences, water features, planting native or wildlife-attracting trees, shrubs, wildflowers etc.*" In response to the petition, it would be suggested adding 'Swift bricks' to the list of examples. This would be proposed as an amendment to the Draft Plan in the report to full Council on 14th December.

It was recognised that the provision of nest sites was an important factor in helping to boost swift numbers but it wasn't felt appropriate to include a *specific policy* solely on swift bricks in the Local Plan because this would involve a level of detail that goes beyond what is appropriate in a statutory development plan. A case could be made for having policies on the creation of habitats for any number of endangered species, so felt the appropriate approach was to have a general policy that required the inclusion of appropriate design features. This meant the approach to biodiversity design features could be tailored on a site-by-site basis. Whilst acknowledging that other local authorities have included a specific policy on swift bricks, SCC were mindful of Government advice to avoid overly long plans.

Due to the complexity of planning issues and number of development sites in Sheffield, the Sheffield Plan was already lengthy.

In due course, it was intended to produce a supplementary planning document (SPD) on planning for biodiversity. This would provide further guidance for developers on how biodiversity net gain requirements would be applied in Sheffield but envisaged it would also include more detailed advice on biodiversity design features, including, for example, Swift bricks.

The Chair agreed that ongoing dialogue should take place with the group and that it be a start of a relationship. The Director of Investment, Climate Change and Planning advised that there was an opportunity to explore further and would welcome more details.

- 4.2 The Policy Committee received a petition “Crossing at junction of Birley Spa Lane and Jermyn Crescent”. Jayne Mason attended the meeting and presented the petition to the committee.

The petitioners explained that they had created the petition as a way of getting a pedestrian crossing installed at the junction of Birley Spa Lane and Jermyn Crescent since a young boy was knocked over on there recently. Historically there had been a school crossing patrol warden situation on Birley Spa Lane and is the only crossing point for pedestrians and is the main access for both primary schools in the area. At present it is not recognised as a crossing area and was unfortunately the main crossing point for children, hence why a boy was knocked over. There was limited signage in the area to highlight that there are schools in the area. There used to be a school crossing patrol warden but not for the last 4 years. The current signage only states crossing patrol but did not highlight the schools in the area and children crossing. There was currently a vacancy for the crossing patrol warden and this had been vacant for quite some time. The area was a main heavy bus route and had an issue with vehicles speeding. The proposal was for a zebra crossing as the vacancy for a crossing patrol warden has not been filled, but they were aware that the request had been placed on a master list due to budgeting. Ms Mason also advised that they wanted it highlighting to drivers that it was a crossing point and to put some temporary measures in place in the meantime to make it safe for the children, such as making the road around to and leading up to the schools a 20mph zone and also to remove the school crossing patrol signs. The crossing point was also used by the elderly and disabled. It was advised that the local school Birley Spa Academy would also like to be involved with any extra safety measures put in place.

The Chair thanked the petitioners for bringing this issue to the committee.

The Chair stated that Ms Mason contacted the Transport Planning department directly in September and received a response directly from John Priestley.

As with all other requests, the request would be assessed in the next rounds of requests where it would then be considered, with the other assessed sites, when future programmes of work were being developed. We were not able to confirm at this time if and when any future works for a pedestrian crossing would be carried out at this location.

The Chair also advised that the council would be looking at how the council can accelerate the School Streets project and would like to see where this fits within that. The Chair also would like to understand how long the school crossing patrol role had been vacant and a written answer would be provided to this aspect. The local ward councillor would also be made aware of the issue, so that they are able to get involved. The Chair advised that he would be more than happy to come along and have a look with the local ward councillors to see how the area can be made safer. To manage expectations, the Chair advised that requests such as these came from all over the City, with very similar issues. The Chair did say that outside of London, Sheffield was one of the worse areas

for road accidents and fatalities within to 0–15-years age bracket.

The Chair gave a commitment that it would be assessed.

The Head of Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure advised that school crossing patrol wardens could be difficult to recruit to due to the pattern of the working hours.

- 4.3 The Policy Committee received a petition “Amendment to bollards on Ruby Lane Estate to prevent off road bikers”. Samantha Nicholson attended the meeting and presented the petition to the committee.

Ms Nicholson explained that since the creation of Ruby Lane estate, the bollards between Redwood Lane and Westfield Crescent, whilst preventing cars from cutting through the estate, it did not prevent bikes from using this as a rat run. Off road and illegal bikes were tearing through the estate day and night. Miller Homes had refused to carry out any further work, so therefore the petition was brought to ask the council to look at the design of the bollards. The bollards were not fit for purpose and padlocked down.

The Chair stated that the current site layout could be seen in the attached photos, gave a clear idea of what were being dealt with. 6no. bollards to block the highway, narrowing the footpaths either side. The 4 in the highway were removable, this allowed access for emergency services and maintenance vehicles.

Due to the grassed area on the left, it was easy to get a car between the property and the bollard let alone a quadbike. So it was very easy for off road vehicles/motorbikes/cars to get through if they really wanted.

If another bollard was provided on the pavement to the left of the picture, unless the residents garden was fenced off then there would still be nothing to stop vehicles running through the area.

The estate was not yet adopted (checked 23.11.22) there was a significant snagging list that our Highways Development Team had given to Miller Homes and adoption was still likely to be some months away.

The Council would not consider any works while the estate is unadopted.

The council had notified local councillors and Clive Betts that even when adopted there was no easy solution here. Bollards needed to have a minimum gap to allow legitimate users to access the area – pushchairs, cycles, mobility scooters etc.

The Chair advised that he was not familiar with the area but was happy to come and have a look.

The Head of Sustainable Transport and Infrastructure explained that lockable bollards used a standard key that the emergency services could unlock. It was

advised that the issues would be taken away and discussed with Highway Control colleagues but did say there would be a challenge in the design as areas needed to be left open for all users to access, but this can bring anti-social behaviour.

The Chair also suggested talking to South Yorkshire Police regarding the anti-social behaviour, as they now had a unit that dealt with these issues. The Chair advised that the petitioner would receive a fuller response in due course.

4.4 The Policy Committee received a petition "Safe Street – Crookes and Walkley". There was no speaker to this petition. The petition was noted, and the petitioner be provided with a written response in respect of the issue.

4.5 The Policy Committee received 10 questions from 10 different members of the public. 5 members of the public did not attend the meeting to ask their question therefore would be provided with a written answer.

4.6 Question from: Jennifer Carpenter

The following question is asked on behalf of South Yorkshire Climate Alliance:

"The SCC Governance Committee Report dated 22 February 2022 on the Committee System Structure recommended in Section 6.2 that committees adopt an Engagement Toolkit to enhance public engagement, participation and communications.

With this expectation in mind, and in view of the high level of public engagement that will be necessary to successfully implement the decarbonisation route maps, will this Committee undertake to implement the Engagement Toolkit in respect of the route maps with immediate effect? This would aid its own objectives with the route maps, and would provide valuable learning for all the other SCC Committees."

The Chair agreed that public engagement would be crucial to the delivery of the decarbonisation route maps. The approach to engagement was to be discussed within the body of the report being presented today. The Council's current approach was to use the LGA's New Conversations Guide, which was the industry standard for Local Government. The Sustainability and Climate Team received training from Involve as part of their Local Climate Engagement Programme, and would also be using the framework and resources that this had provided, to deliver the best possible engagement within the available resources.

4.7 Question from: Anthony Wood

1) Firstly, in recommendation d) *Note 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;* we have been informed at a consultation event that the two buildings referenced are the Mudford Building and Market Tavern, both of which are currently outside the

defined envelope for the LUF funding and not a permissible use of this money.

We would like confirmation that the money currently being spent on the Market Tavern is not being drawn from the LUF fund and that no money will be drawn from it, until approved by the Department of Levelling UP, for any works outside the permitted envelope as this risks causing issues with the entire fund.

2) Could we have confirmation on exactly what Recommendation E is, what the financial implications are and why this doesn't get explained in the report? *"Note the exempt appendix 2 and authorise Officers to seek approval from the Department for Levelling Up Homes and Communities to relocate an element of the project to the Castle Site."*

3) Could the Council please confirm that there will be no reduction in the funds for the public realm, deculverting (including re-naturalisation and fish passage) and archaeology as a result of diverting resources to the Market Tavern and Mudford Buildings? Can the relevant figures in Appendix 2 be shared with us to substantiate this?

4) Could the Council also confirm whether discussions have been held with the Frehiwet Eritrean Restaurant and Andalus Community Centre, who currently occupy the Mudford building, and what the outcome of these discussions was?

5) Could the Council also confirm whether the Market Tavern and/or the Mudford Building have been offered to S1 Arts, if so why is this not in the report and why were other community or arts projects such as those already in occupation in Castlegate, not also given an opportunity to bid for them as Council disposal policy would normally require?

The Chair stated in response to each point that:-

1) The works were being funded by revenue and not from the LUF funds.

2) The information in Appendix 2 was commercially sensitive and could not be revealed at present.

3) There was no change in the budget for the public realm, deculverting and heritage. The funding identified for development plots would be used IF the buildings were included as a development plot and approved by DLUHC.

4) Officers had met with the tenants of the Mudford building to discuss the repairs required to this building. It was worth re-iterating that no decisions had been made on the future of these buildings, just that options were being pursued.

5) The buildings had not been offered to anyone, they were Council buildings and the intention was for them to remain in Council ownership.

4.7 Question from: Tawfek Ahmed

1. Regarding Castle Street development, we are a charity and an existing occupier of Mudford's building since 2009, serving a large number of the community mainly vulnerable and disadvantaged people. On a daily basis through funded advice bureau that serves on average 700 beneficiaries every week, why we were not included on any consultations?
2. Since 2009 we have committed large financial investment in the building, which has made the property watertight and useable as a community centre and advice bureau.
3. In this centre we managed to create and fund five full time advisors with the highest possible qualifications, experience and over 30 volunteers. what is your plan towards our projects and our property.
4. will you give us a commitment that we will not be forced out of our building? If not, are you aware of the impact on the particular section of the community that we serve?

The Chair stated in response to each point raised that:

1. Up until now the buildings were not proposed to be part of the levelling up fund proposals. Public consultation ran from the 7th-20th of November but it would have been better if your organisation had been invited to the Castlegate Partnership and this was an oversight for which we apologise.
2. We understand your organisation has spent on the building and having met with you, Officers are working through the detail of this. Nevertheless, there were still issues with the condition of the building that needed further discussion.
3. No decisions had been made on the future of the building other than seeking permission form DHLUC to use Levelling Up Funds to make good the building. The Council recognises the work that your organisation undertakes and the benefit it brings and are committed to ensuring a solution is found to safeguard the the activity carried out by your organisation in the Mudford building. We are equally keen to ensure that the condition of the building does not become a barrier to this delivery by ensuring work to make good this Council owned building is carried out.
4. Securing the immediate future of the Andalus Community Centre is important to the Council, but the conditions of the building if not tackled are a threat to the activity in the building. The future of the Community Centre could be either in a refurbished building once work has been carried out, (recognising that there may be a need to temporarily decant whilst works are undertaken) or in a different location in Castlegate. The

council are committed to working with the Community Centre to find a solution.

5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

- 5.1 **RESOLVED:** - that the minutes of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee on 21st September 2022, were agreed as a correct record.

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.

It was confirmed that the Sheaf Valley item on the work programme would be brought back to committee in the summer 2023, subject to resource requirements. A discussion took place around what could be done about officer capacity and it was noted that the work programme was very full.

It was suggested that the Committee put forward comments as part of the Governance Review around the concerns of officer capacity and the amount of work the committee considers in its work programme.

The Chair stated that the Council was in its 13th year of funding cuts and officers were having to pick up more and more work. It was noted that the issue would be raised with the Executive Director-City Futures around the capacity issues, but it was advised that the council had been in discussion with SYMCA to seek more resource support.

The Director of Investment, Climate Change and Planning advised that he recognised the points raised and the work loads going through this committee. The recent work programme session held with officers and members of the committee should be the first of many to ensure that the work programme is being regularly reviewed. It was advised that officers would look at further opportunities with various models through the governance review to increase the revenue budget of the committee.

Members advised that they would welcome a further session on the work programme and the committee should be prioritising the climate work and leading on the response to this.

The Chair advised that Co-Chair Julie Grocutt requested an item be included on the committee's work programme for Speed limit on Rails Road/Bingley Road. This would be included in the work programme for further discussion.

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 gave 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

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. DECARBONISATION ROUTE MAPS UPDATE REPORT

7.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director- City Futures regarding the Council's 10 Point Plan for climate action that was adopted in March. The plan provided a framework for how the organisation would act in the short-term and included how we would put climate at the centre of decision-making as well as committing the organisation to working towards reducing Council carbon emissions to net-zero by 2030.

One of the commitments of the 10-point plan was to produce a series of 'route maps' that covered the detailed actions which the council and the city needs to take to support this pathway to net zero.

The report responded to the request made by Members of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee in September to provide an update on the progress that the Council was making in the production of the route maps and the programme for presenting the draft route maps to the Committee for formal approval.

Mark Whitworth – Head of Sustainable City was in attendance to present the report.

Following members questions the key points to note were:

Officers were seeking extra support to help produce the route maps and meet deadlines. It was advised that the recommendations within the route maps would be not delayed until all route maps were presented, it was clear in the 10-point plan that the maps were alliterative and would change where necessary. It was confirmed that the delivery of the plan would be focussed, and progress and action would be reported through the committee.

Timescales were driven by the need to focus on the route maps and officers were liaising with planning colleagues on this. The route maps were produced in

line with other services, for example the 'Our Homes' route map was produced in line with what Housing Strategy were doing.

The Biodiversity plan would be tied in with the Local Plan.

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

Notes the approach being progressed and delivered including the timing and phasing of the route maps, in line with the milestones that have been agreed in the Councils One Year Delivery Plan (adopted June 2022).

7.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 7.3.1 Noting the approach set out in this report will enable Officers to continue to work towards achieving the milestone that has been agreed in the Council's One Year Delivery Plan, alongside those in the 10-point plan for climate action.

7.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 7.4.1 Do nothing – this option has been rejected on the grounds that the Council would not be progressing towards its net zero by 2030 target, achieve the objectives of its 10-point plan for climate action or the milestone set out the in One Year Delivery Plan.

8. **LEVELLING UP FUND-UPDATE**

- 8.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures, that provided a progress update on the successful Round 1 Levelling Up Fund bids and a summary of the as yet undecided Round 2 Levelling Up Fund Submissions

In addition, the report recommended the acceptance of the recommendations of the recent "Live Works" coproduction workshops for the Gateway to Sheffield Levelling Up Fund activity.

An on-screen presentation was given which showed members the visuals of both the Attercliffe and Castlegate projects. Tammy Whittaker, Head of Property Services advised that a number of thr projects were dependent on match funding some of which was yet to be approved.

Following members questions the key points noted were:

Members did not feel comfortable to agree to recommendation d) and e) of the report without further briefing.

The Head of Property Services advised the committee that the proposal was to incorporate two additional buildings on the Castle Site as development plots.

The budget for the Castle Site would not change. No funding was being moved from the de-culverting or heritage works to accommodate the buildings. If approved funding would be used from the existing development plots budget line. The Chair confirmed that there was to be no deviation from the de-culverting work and no impact on the public realm funding.

Members asked for assurances that if people had to move out of the buildings would they be moved within a similar location. It was confirmed it would be within the area.

It was advised that if the two building were not part of this plan, then they would not be developed. At the present time one building was in a poor state of repair and the other needed work on it to ensure it remained in use.

8.2 **RESOLVED:** That the public and press be excluded from the meeting before discussion takes place on the part 2 report of this item on the agenda on the grounds that, if the public and press were present during the transaction of such business, there would be a disclosure to them of exempt information as described in paragraphs 3 of Schedule 12A to the Local Government Act 1972, as amended.

8.3 The meeting was re-opened to the press and public.

8.4 Councillor Craig Gamble-Pugh put forward a recommendation –

That officers seek clarification of agreement in principle from the Department of Levelling Up, as to whether they would approve the relocation element of the project (Castle Site), subject to the committee then approving it at a subsequent meeting;

This recommendation was seconded by Councillor Christine Gilligan-Kubo.

All members voted in favour of the recommendation.

8.5 Councillor Andrew Sangar put forward a recommendation –

Requests that the Castlegate Members Working Group is reconvened, and the first meeting of that group is before the 20th December 2022.

This recommendation was seconded by Councillor Dianne Hurst.

All members voted in favour of the recommendation.

8.6 Recommendation a), b) and c) were agreed unanimously.

Recommendations d) and e). All members voted in favour of deferring both recommendation d) and e).

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

Policy Committee:-

- a) Notes the positive progress made on the LUF Round 1 projects Gateway to Sheffield and Attercliffe;
- b) Notes the submission of two bids to the LUF round 2 and request a further report is brought to this committee once the outcome is known;
- c) Approve the implementation of 13 recommendations of the Live Works workshop, subject to the availability of funding;
- d) Defers the decision to note 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;
- e) Defers the decision to note the exempt appendix 2 and authorise Officers to seek approval from the Department for Levelling Up Homes and Communities to relocate an element of the project to the Castle Site;
- f) That officers seek clarification of agreement in principle from the Department of Levelling Up, as to whether they would approve the relocation element of the project (Castle Site), subject to the committee then approving it at a subsequent meeting;
- g) Requests that the Castlegate Members Working Group is reconvened, and the first meeting of that group is before the 20th December 2022.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 The recommendations recognise the work done so far in discussion with a wide range of stakeholders and the public and allows for these views to be used to inform the design of the Castle Site.

8.3.2 Furthermore 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.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

8.4.1 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. The funding would continue to be used to bring forward other development plots within the Castle Site.

8.4.2 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 not deliver all of the outputs for the project and therefore was unlikely to be acceptable. Additional applications for funding could be made but these would take time to secure and may jeopardise delivery of LUF scheme, project and outputs.

8.4.3 The proposals in the report are considered to be the minimum required to ensure that the Gateway to Sheffield project can deliver the best outputs for the funding awarded

9. LOCAL RENEWABLE ENERGY FUND - PROGRAMME SCOPE

9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures. Following the approval of a capital budget amendment of £3.5m for the installation of renewable energy and energy efficiency works on Council buildings, the report sought approval of the proposed scope of the programme, to include £33k match funding contributions towards two Heat Network Delivery Unit grant applications, the use of funds as development costs to pilot a community energy project and to approve the process for business case approval of individual programme elements.

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

- i) Approves the proposed programme scope.
- ii) Approves the allocation of £33k as match funding contributions to two Heat Network Delivery Unit grant funding applications.
- iii) Approves the use of this funding allocation for any development costs required for the pilot of a community energy project on a Council owned building.
- iv) Approves the principle that individual schemes within the programme scope can be submitted directly for financial approval within the capital approval process.

9.3 Reasons for Decision

9.3.1 The proposed scope would ensure maximised cost and carbon savings for the Council, demonstrating its leadership in climate mitigation.

9.3.2 The recommendation to not fully finance the heat network feasibility from this funding but to use some of it as match funding to draw down grant funding will enable more of the local renewable energy fund to be spent on capital delivery.

9.3.3 The recommendation to use some of this allocation to fund any required development costs to pilot a community energy scheme was due to a commitment in the 10 Point Plan, which sought to increase the amount of community owned energy in the city.

9.3.4 The decision-making recommendation will enable the timely delivery of the local renewable energy programme.

9.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.4.1 The alternative decision-making option would be for each Policy Committee where a project was taking place to agree the business case of the project and then approval to draw down funding is sought from Strategy and Resources Budget, which due to timescales of reporting cycles, would be a lengthier process.

10. **BEIGHTON 20MPH TRO OBJECTIONS**

10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures which detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce a 20mph speed limit in Beighton, report the receipt of objections to the proposed Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

It was advised that the proposal was welcomed.

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

Approves that the Beighton 20mph Speed Limit Order 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.

10.3 **Reasons for Decision**

10.3.1 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.

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

10.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

11. **BURNCROSS 20MPH TRO OBJECTIONS**

- 11.1 The Committee considered a report that detailed the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Burncross, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

The committee were advised that Chapel Road was not included within the order and would remain at 30mph. Councillor Gamble-Pugh commented that it was regrettable that Chapel Road was not included in the order and this reinforced his belief that these issues should be discussed at Local Area Committee's.

Councillor Sangar welcomed the proposal.

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

- 1) Approves that the Burncross 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 and that:
 - a. the order be implemented on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage.
 - b. objectors will be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team
- 2) Approves the introduction of a part time 20mph limit on Ecclesfield Road outside Ecclesfield Secondary School.

11.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 11.3.1 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.

- 11.3.2 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is

recommended that the 20mph speed limit in Burncross be implemented as, on balance, the benefits of the scheme in terms of safety and sustainability are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

- 11.3.3 It is also recommended that a part time, advisory 20mph speed limit be introduced on Ecclesfield Road for the same reasons.

11.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

12. **REVENUE BUDGET MONITORING REPORT - MONTH 06**

- 12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-Resources that brought them up to date with the Council's financial position as at Month 6 2022/23.

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

Notes the Council's financial position as at the end of September 2022 (month 6).

12.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 12.3.1 To bring the committee up to date with the Council's current financial position as at Month 6 2022/23.

12.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

13. **BUDGET POSITION FOR YEAR 2023/2024**

- 13.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-Resources that updated the Committee on the progress of the 2023/24 budget process.

The appendix contained specific budget proposals that the Committee were asked to endorse.

The committee were advised that a report would be submitted to Strategy and Resources on the 5th December 2022.

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

1. Note the update on the Council's 2023/24 budget position.
2. Endorse the budget proposals set out in Appendix 1.

13.3 **Reasons for Decision**

13.3.1 The Council is required by law to set a balanced budget each year. This report is pursuant to that objective and is in line with the process and timetable agreed by the Strategy and Resources Committee on 31 May 2022 and 5 July 2022.

13.4 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

13.4.1 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.

This page is intentionally left blank