

Appendix A

Public Petitions and Questions –Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee– 16th March 2023

N.B - Please note that a period of up to 30 minutes shall be allocated at meetings of Policy Committees and other appropriate bodies for members of the public to present ordinary petitions or to ask questions of Members and officers present.

Petitions Received from Members of the Public x4

	Petitions	Response:
1.	<p>Lead Petitioner: Deborah Leonards</p> <p>Totley Deli and Cafe</p>	<p>Thank you for your petition. This issue has been raised by your local Councillors and all options have been fully investigated.</p> <p>It is not possible to install bollards or a pedestrian railing, both must be installed a certain distance from the kerb edge and there is not enough pavement width to allow the installation of these structures while maintaining the pavement width to ensure that all users (mobility scooters/prams/pushchairs as examples) can still access the area.</p> <p>It should be acknowledged that the recent incident that resulted in damage to the deli and café was as a result of driver error and we are not able to engineer solutions for all such circumstances.</p> <p>We have investigated raising the kerb edge but the survey concluded that raising the kerb would alter water run off and there would be potential that the water would then enter the shops as the pavement dips at this particular point.</p> <p>The options left are extremely limited and would result in loss of parking. Officers are continuing to discuss this with Local Ward Members.</p>
2.	<p>Lead Petitioner: Diane Wood</p> <p>Make the CAZ a non-charging scheme</p>	<p>Thank you for your petition raising highlighting areas of concern about the clean air zone consultation and charges.</p>

At various stages throughout the development of Sheffield and Rotherham's Clean Air Plan, consultation events were held. Here are some examples:

- Public consultation on the CAP proposals including a category C '+' (higher ultra-low emission standard for taxis) was undertaken between the 1 July and 26 August 2019 covering both Sheffield and Rotherham. Around 12,000 responses were received to the consultation.
- Additional stakeholder engagement with business and other impacted groups / individuals was undertaken during 2020 and into early 2021, this provided some essential insights to inform further development of the mitigation funding and exemption proposals.
- Consultation to inform the final proposals was undertaken from 22 November to the 17 December 2021 and fed into the final FBC proposals, changes were made to the financial assistance schemes and proposed exemptions based on consultation and engagement feedback.

Details of consultation events are [publicly available on our website](#)

Sheffield's charging clean air zone went live on 27 February, and was assessed, agreed, and signed off by government as the preferred option for delivering compliance with NO2 levels within the shortest possible time.

We would encourage as many motorists as possible to apply for financial support to upgrade their vehicles; this is the optimal way of avoiding the daily charge, and critically of driving fleet change that improves air quality such to the extent that the city is within legal limits of NO2.

The petitioner's proposal to implement a non-charging zone was considered but 'ruled-out' in the development of the council's outline business case, which was approved by central government in early 2021 – in effect a non-charging CAZ would be less effective (if at all) in delivering compliance within the shortest possible time. It should also be noted that the zone is one of a number of measures within our Clean Air Plan with Rotherham Council, of which the others are of a non-charging nature.

3.	<p>Lead Petitioner: Richard Brogden</p> <p>The introduction of red routes along Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road</p>	<p>Thank you for Petition highlighting concerns regarding the Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road bus priority project.</p> <p>Buses operating along Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road are experiencing delays and unreliable bus journey times due to significant congestion along these corridors. As a growing city, with plans for further growth in our economy, housing and employment, the need for transport to support this in a sustainable way is essential, particularly given the need to also address our climate and environmental challenges. As such, we are developing a range of bus priority measures along Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road to improve bus journey time reliability and consistency. These are part of our overall approach to improving local public transport services for people to access employment, retail and leisure along the corridors and in the city centre.</p> <p>The Council has not yet made a final decision as to whether it should implement these schemes which include a range of measures including: junction improvements; traffic signal upgrades; pedestrian crossings; or any amendments to bus lanes or the enhanced enforcement of parking restrictions.</p> <p>It is important to note that the consultation previously undertaken gauged opinion on potential amendments to bus lane hours of operation and red routes but at that point it was not a formal statutory consultation on final proposals.</p> <p>Officers have undertaken further investigations into the significant levels of illegal parking along Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road which currently plays a significant part in delays to both buses and private vehicles. Red routes are one option available to Local Highway Authorities to enforce illegal parking more effectively. However, parking, loading and unloading can still be accommodated on red route corridors during certain periods. The determining factor for the times that parking is allowed on red routes are normally the hours of operation of bus lanes, or those periods when corridors experience congestion. For example, a red route could be introduced on a corridor that has morning and afternoon peak period bus</p>
----	--	---

		<p>lanes, such as the current arrangements on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, with parking and loading provided in the inter-peak period.</p> <p>Following further analysis of the scheme it is proposed that a report on this project will be considered at a Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee meeting in summer 2023. This report will include consideration of the consultation, parking surveys, and the potential benefits and disbenefits of the options that have been considered. This will include an Equalities Impact Assessment and a Climate Impact Assessment.</p> <p>To reiterate, at this time there have been no final decisions on either the Abbeydale Road or Ecclesall Road bus priority schemes. When the Committee meet to formally consider the report on the scheme, if the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee determine that any amendments to the bus lane hours of operation or red routes should be taken forward a further statutory consultation stage on final detailed proposals will then be required.</p>
4	<p>Lead Petitioner: Charlie Chester</p> <p>Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road bus priority project</p>	<p>Thank you for Petition highlighting concerns regarding the Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road bus priority project.</p> <p>Buses operating along Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road are experiencing delays and unreliable bus journey times due to significant congestion along these corridors. As a growing city, with plans for an further growth in our economy, housing and employment, the need for transport to support this in a sustainable way is essential, particularly given the need to also address our climate and environmental challenges. As such, we are developing a range of bus priority measures along Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road to improve bus journey time reliability and consistency. These are part of our overall approach to improving local public transport services for people to access employment, retail and leisure along the corridors and in the city centre.</p> <p>The Council has not yet made a final decision as to whether it should implement these schemes which include a range of measures including: junction improvements; traffic signal upgrades; pedestrian crossings; or any</p>

		<p>amendments to bus lanes or the enhanced enforcement of parking restrictions.</p> <p>It is important to note that the consultation previously undertaken gauged opinion on potential amendments to bus lane hours of operation and red routes but at that point it was not a formal statutory consultation on final proposals.</p> <p>Officers have undertaken further investigations into the significant levels of illegal parking along Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road which currently plays a significant part in delays to both buses and private vehicles. Red routes are one option available to Local Highway Authorities to enforce illegal parking more effectively. However, parking, loading and unloading can still be accommodated on red route corridors during certain periods. The determining factor for the times that parking is allowed on red routes are normally the hours of operation of bus lanes, or those periods when corridors experience congestion. For example, a red route could be introduced on a corridor that has morning and afternoon peak period bus lanes, such as the current arrangements on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, with parking and loading provided in the inter-peak period.</p> <p>Following further analysis of the scheme it is proposed that a report on this project will be considered at a Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee meeting in summer 2023. This report will include consideration of the consultation, parking surveys, and the potential benefits and disbenefits of the options that have been considered. This will include an Equalities Impact Assessment and a Climate Impact Assessment.</p> <p>To reiterate, at this time there have been no final decisions on either the Abbeydale Road or Ecclesall Road bus priority schemes. When the Committee meet to formally consider the report on the scheme, if the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee determine that any amendments to the bus lane hours of operation or red routes should be taken forward a further statutory consultation stage on final detailed proposals will then be required.</p>
--	--	--

Questions Received from Members of the Public x 13

1.	<p>Question from Dexter Johnstone</p> <p>Background: I have seen that an application to install a cycle store by an individual at the front of their house has been turned down by Sheffield Council. The reason give was that it 'would be harmful to the character of the property itself and the street scene, detracting from the visual appearance of the street and would therefore be contrary to Policies H14 and BE5 of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan, Policy CS74 of the Core Strategy and Paragraph 130 of the Revised NPPF 2021.' For more info the application reference is 22/02010/FUL.</p> <p>Question: With the new local plan, which replaces these policies, would this application have been approved? Does the committee think that people should be allowed to install cycle stores at their houses? Is this something the council supports given that keeping bikes in homes is problematic especially for terraced houses, HMOs etc?</p>	<p>Response:</p> <p>Members are committed to providing sufficient and secure cycle parking for existing and future residents across our city. This is why the Parking Guidelines in the draft Local Plan set out minimum cycle parking standards and the expectation is that for new residential development cycle parking would be integrated into the development itself, however the supporting text makes provision for considering alternatives where that isn't possible. This can include on-street parking such as cycle hangars. It is not appropriate for this committee to comment on individual planning applications, but it is noted that the impact of alternative cycle storage proposals such as on-street cycle hangers will always need to be considered with respect to other factors such as the established character of an area, and the need to provide sufficient space on highways for residents to go about their daily activities safely.</p>
2.	<p>Question from D Cronshaw</p>	<p>Response:</p>
	<p>Can you tell me how many deaths they were in Sheffield in 2022 due to pollution, where did those people live and how old were they?</p>	<p>Air pollution is estimated to contribute to 36,000 premature deaths in the UK every year (a premature death is defined as someone who dies before the age of 75). This means about 1 in 20 deaths each year in people under the age of 75 in Sheffield are attributed to air pollution. A recent Health Matters report from Public Health England Health matters: air pollution - GOV.UK (www.gov.uk) details the health impacts that air pollution can have across a person's lifetime and the associated health inequalities including: low birth weight of babies; impaired lung development in small children; smaller lungs; a contributing factor in the onset of heart disease; acute respiratory exacerbation; and premature death. Therefore the research evidence is very clear – air pollution contributes to premature deaths from heart disease, stroke, lung cancer, dementia and other lung diseases. However these deaths are not recorded as air pollution deaths on death certificates – they are recorded as deaths from the various</p>

		diseases mentioned above. This means it is not possible to identify individuals whose death can be attributed to air pollution.
3.	Question from D Shore	Response:
	<p>Historically Sheffield pollution levels were high but, from figures published daily on the Defra Air Quality website, mean pollution levels in Sheffield have been within Govt guidelines for the last 2 years. So much has changed since the 2019 consultation (covid, energy price rises, cost of living crisis). In Manchester Labour, under Andy Burnham, have paused the introduction of their scheme while it is reviewed - a pause that has been in place for many months to date. In Leeds, when pollution fell within legal limits before its' introduction, a proposed chargeable CAZ was scrapped. A 3rd Labour administration, Liverpool, under the leadership of Steve Rotherham, looked closely at the effects and benefits of a chargeable clean air zone and concluded that it would not produce the results that they needed and so dismissed the idea before it even started, introducing targeted management measures, tailored to local pollution hotspots, and education to nudge public action instead.</p> <p>FOI requests have revealed that the areas of concern in Sheffield are: outside the railway station, Arundel Gate and the Lower Don Valley. Of these it is not unreasonable to assume that, with its' diesel trains, the station itself has an influence on the first, Arundel Gate has high volumes of buses, often parked, as well as stationary traffic, and the Lower Don Valley is outside the CAZ. What evidence do you have that the CAZ, in its' current form, will resolve concerns in these 3 areas? And how will a policy that incentivises vehicles off the ring road, into residential areas and past schools, help the health of our elderly and younger residents</p> <p>Why does Sheffield City Council feel itself uniquely vulnerable to Govt fines when 3 other Local Authorities have rejected CAZs, either temporarily or permanently, and why, since Sheffield's areas of concern appear to be very specific, cannot the Liverpool model of a non-chargeable zone, traffic flow improvements, education and "nudges" of public behaviour not be followed, rather than the</p>	<p>Firstly, we believe that the air quality data you are referring to has been taken from the Met Office Pollution forecast, which are produced by the Met Office on behalf of DEFRA to provide a Pollution warning for vulnerable people similar to the pollen warnings they issue.</p> <p>The Met Office use their weather forecast and climate prediction model, which includes an air quality forecasting system to provide an estimation of pollutant concentrations for that day and display them using a simple 10 point scale of severity. The model uses UK and European annual average pollutant emission maps and simulate against predicted weather to forecast chemical reactions occurring in the atmosphere and project pollutant levels. To provide confidence in the outputs of the forecast, the Met Office use taken from the DEFRA Automatic Urban and Rural Network (AURN), which is a network of real-time air quality monitors across the country. For reference to the AURN, locations of monitors and pollutant concentrations are available from the following website; https://uk-air.defra.gov.uk/interactive-map?network=aurn</p> <p>Therefore, the outputs from these forecasts are not used to demonstrate compliance with Air Quality Objectives, nor can the outputs be measured against legal limit values.</p> <p>Secondly, and with regards to our evidence for achieving compliance across the city, modelling was carried out for the entirety of the city to determine appropriate measures to meet EU compliance. To achieve EU compliance, modelled concentrations of NO2 had to be 40ug/m3. This modelling exercise informed Sheffield's decision-making process on the most appropriate measures to be included in the Clean Air Plan with Rotherham Council, and determined the boundary of the CAZ taking into account the consideration of potential displacement impact. A 2017 base model was created and verified against 2017 monitoring data across the district to give the council confidence in future predicted outputs.</p>

	<p>sledgehammer of a £10 / £50 per day tax on 17,500 vehicles (quoted by you) that risks pushing many businesses over the edge?</p>	<p>Thirdly, we understand the public interest in traffic displacement and air quality outside of the ring road itself. We would like to assure people that the impact of the CAZ will be closely monitored by Sheffield City Council and National Government to determine real-world impact of the CAZ.</p> <p>Notwithstanding, the council accepts that whilst the Clean Air Zone meets the legal requirements outlined in the ministerial direction to meet compliance, as part of our Local Air Quality Management regime function further we must continue work to keep making improvements air quality across the city, not just for NO2 but for Particulate Matter. Given that there is no 'safe' level of air pollution, we are beginning a process of review to our Clean Air Strategy and Council Action Plan to ensure it meets local needs and future demands. As part of this process, we will be seeking input from Stakeholders, to ensure that the policies have local support and are fit for purpose.</p> <p>Finally, it is worth highlighting that Sheffield is not unique; it is one of several cities to have implemented a clean air zone following a legal direction from central government. Other authorities that have been directed to implement zones include Bath, Birmingham, Bristol, Portsmouth, and Newcastle. Ultimately the charging zone is one of a package of measures across Sheffield and Rotherham set out in our Clean Air Plan to achieve compliance with NO2 levels in the shortest possible time.</p>
4.	<p>Question from D Rogers</p> <p>I have severe arthritis and so, with the hills in Sheffield, I cannot get out without travelling in either my partners' car or a taxi (the walk up from my nearest bus stop is impossible).</p> <p>Empirically I believe that the proportion of taxi drivers of South Asian descent in Sheffield is greater than that communities representation within Cities' population as a whole? The grants available for replacement vehicles equate to a very small percentage of the cost of a compliant taxi or private hire car, As such, can the Council please confirm that the introduction of the Clean Air Zone will not be unintentionally discriminatory to both the South Asian community, in being hit by the charges, and the less able, like myself, who are likely to face higher charges in taxis to access services in the City.</p>	<p>Response:</p> <p>The equality implications of Sheffield and Rotherham's Clean Air Plan (of which the CAZ is one of the measures) have been considered throughout the development of our business case and implementation.</p> <p>In relation to taxis, it may be useful to clarify that not all taxis are in scope for charging; it is those that do not meet Euro 6 Diesel or Euro 4 Petrol standards. Approximately 75% of the Private Hire Taxis in the city are already compliant and are therefore not in scope for charging, for example. However, we recognise that the proportion of chargeable Hackney Carriages is significantly higher than Private Hires. Whilst the programme goal is to achieve compliance with the legal NO2 levels, there is a complex balance between the socio-economic impacts of charging motorists and the need to address the health impacts of having non-compliant NO2 levels.</p>

		<p>Furthermore some of our most vulnerable citizens’ health conditions will be exacerbated by air quality issues, which is another consideration that formed part of our equalities assessment and Final Business Case.</p> <p>We have sought to mitigate the impacts you have suggested through the following measures:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lobbying government for additional funding support for Private Hire Vehicles • Introducing an additional temporary exemption for all Hackney Carriages to allow motorists further time to consider the implication of Licensing decisions on compliant vehicle choice. • Agreeing a broadening of scope for vehicles that can be registered as Hackneys (SCC’s Licensing Committee Feb 2023) – in purely economic terms, this means this means drivers have a wider range of more affordable options that will be compliant. <p>As a final point about taxi charges, it may be worth noting that the clean air zone entry fee works on a daily basis – i.e. a motorist pays the charge to come in the zone per day, and they can do so as many times as they like/need that day. It is not a £10 charge per trip into Sheffield city centre, for example.</p>
5.	<p>Question from G Jones</p> <p>According to our local Nitrogen Dioxide monitoring under the Council’s “Care 4 Air” scheme and an article in The Star (14.2.2023) which used a cocktail of data, Burngreave has some of the worst air pollution in Sheffield. https://www.care4air.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/Community-Graphs-to-Dec-2021-NOT-BIAS-ADJUSTED.pdf</p> <p>Some streets in this area are predicted by the council’s own modelling to endure even higher pollution following the introduction of the Sheffield City Centre Clean Air Zone (CAZ) due to displaced traffic avoiding the charges in the CAZ.</p>	<p>Response</p> <p>CAZ & Burngreave Air Quality</p> <p>As part of the Clean Air Zone’s evidence base, modelling was carried out for the entirety of the city to determine appropriate measures to meet EU compliance. To achieve EU compliance, modelled concentrations of NO2 had to be 40ug/m3. This modelling exercise determined the boundary of the CAZ considering displacement impact.</p> <p>A 2017 base model was created and verified against 2017 monitoring data across the district to give the council confidence in future predicted outputs. From the Burngreave monitoring sites, one location met EU prescribed monitoring criteria for validating the model, which was the Orphanage Road monitoring site.</p>

These are all areas of social deprivation and poor health. People in Burngreave, for example, have a life expectancy of ten years less than the residents of some wealthier parts of the city. Our local medical practices and the Northern General Hospital are already struggling to maintain decent levels of health care.

Council leaders have claimed in The Star that the CAZ is expected to generate £23,000 per day or £8 million per year. The health of people in disadvantaged areas of the city appears to have been traded off in order to generate income for the council. In view of this and the council's stated commitment to finance air improvement schemes in the city.

The Preamble to Sheffield's Clean Air Strategy clearly states:

We want clean air for everyone in Sheffield and we will close the gap between the communities with the least and most polluted air. We will focus on the biggest causes of air pollution and improve them as quickly as possible. We will support people to make healthy and active travel choices. We will particularly support and protect vulnerable people to ensure clean air for all. We will invest meaningful resources in becoming a clean, sustainable city.

Far from fulfilling this clear and just emphasis on narrowing the gap in air pollution across the city's communities, CAZ will actually worsen air quality in some of our most polluted and disadvantaged communities.

My previous questions to the council on the CAZ have been met with the reply that the CAZ will benefit everyone in the city by improvement by the replacement of the city's polluting buses. Of course since then we have already seen a shrinking bus fleet with ongoing cuts to and generally increased unreliability of bus services which makes car travel the preferred and often essential choice for a lot of people. But many people in our area cannot afford to run cars. But improved emissions from vehicles would benefit everyone in the city and would not narrow that pollution gap. In Burngreave we actually have the added injustice

Once the base model validation was completed, future scenario modelling was conducted to determine predicted concentrations along this link, which were predicted to be compliant with the limit value. According to the modelling exercise, even though the Burngreave area is not included in the CAZ, the model shows that the proposed type and boundary of CAZ is estimated to have a positive impact in the Burngreave area with concentrations improving along the A6135 above that of what would be expected from a "business as usual" scenario.

Future TRC Projects

In response to your question about how money could be spent, please see the following explanation.

Revenue generated by the Clean Air Zone Scheme will in the first place be used to cover the cost of operation, including the maintenance of cameras, operational staff etc. It is not intended that the scheme should generate substantial net proceeds after covering these costs. Government policy is that the level of any charges should not be set as a revenue raising measure and the purpose of the scheme is not to generate revenue but to encourage improved air quality.

The more vehicles that are compliant with the scheme, the less revenue the scheme will generate – as such we would expect income to reduce over time because of fleet change.

If net proceeds are generated from the scheme, these proceeds would be applied to facilitate the achievement of relevant local transport policies in Sheffield's Transport Strategy 2019 to 2035 and the Sheffield City Region Transport Strategy in accordance with the following high level spending objectives:

- supporting the delivery of the ambitions of the Scheme and promoting cleaner air;
- supporting active travel and incentivizing public transport use;
- supporting zero emission and sustainable infrastructure and actions in and around the city to improve air quality.

of having some of the lowest car ownership and some of the worst traffic pollution.

Therefore, we would like to ask the Sheffield City Council Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee how the council will implement their commitment use their "windfall profits" from the CAZ to finance air quality improvement measures in some of these deprived neighbourhoods, including Burngreave.

We have some suggestions which, are all within the spirit of the council's Clean Air Strategy and might be discussed in this context:

Work with the NGH and bus companies to improve bus connections to within the hospital campus in order to reduce traffic of their staff (12,000) and thousands of daily outpatients and visitors through the area. This is entirely within the mission statement of the Sheffield Teaching Hospitals "Our Sustainable travel priorities are aimed at providing alternatives to single use car journeys both to and from our main hospital campuses and also within our community based premises."

<https://www.sth.nhs.uk/clientfiles/File/NHS%20Sustainability%20Plan%20copy.pdf>

Review the possibility of introducing a green hydrogen powered bus service along a route from the city centre to NGH. This is a hilly route and not ideal for electric buses anyway. However, it seems that hydrogen buses can cope better with such topographical challenges. Hydrogen buses are being tested by First in Aberdeen and there is a Sheffield company with an innovative focus on hydrogen power for vehicles. <https://www.sheffield.ac.uk/news/university-sheffield-and-itm-power-announce-green-hydrogen-gigafactory-and-hydrogen-research-and>

Improved and signed walking routes along less polluted roads. Especially to the NGH.

Decisions about how money shall be allocated to schemes will be required to go through a formal governance approach with the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Change Committee. The committee and council officers are enthusiastic about working with the community to develop scheme ideas together in future.

In relation to the changes that have been referenced, through the City Region Sustainable Transport Settlement, the Council has two projects in this area of the city that will look at how to promote public transport and enable active travel. Both these projects are in the formative stages and are being developed as an extension to the Connecting Sheffield programme, which seeks to transform transport connectivity and promote sustainability through the infrastructure provision.

One of the key drivers for these two projects is how the Northern General Hospital is connected into both the local communities and the more strategic movements from across the city. We will be looking to work with the hospital to find a public transport and active solution for the site, therefore enabling trips by staff, visitors and patients to consider using non car forms of transport as a first choice, this in turn will help reduce the overall private car based trips in the locality immediately around the NGH and on the strategic roads to it.

The interventions that have been listed are very helpful and will be sent to the project team for consideration. On all of the options developed there will be full public consultation and engagement.

Create safe, less polluted, and signposted pedestrian/cycle routes to the Northern General with a new pedestrian crossing on Herries Road at Smilter Lane.

Installation of new pedestrian crossings at the junction of Barnsley Road and Norwood Road, and across all roads in the main junctions at Fir Vale.

Disperse some of the traffic going along the shopping area of Spital Hill and the residential area of Burngreave Road by :

1) Signposting a traffic route via Savile Street, Sutherland Road, and Carlisle Street or Brightside Lane to Ecclesfield and Chapeltown. A similar route was previously signposted along the part of Carlisle Street that was blocked off when Tesco was built, even though that entrance to Tesco is no longer in use. This route passes through industrial areas rather than residential ones. It is also straight, flat and not as congested as the Burngreave/ Barnsley Road A6135 route.

2) Block off Spital Hill between Spital St and Gower St. Encourage the restaurants put out tables on the former roadway and create a safe playspace for children there. Buses could go via Gower Street and Savile St. New stops on Gower Street and Ellesmere Road would compensate for the removed Ellesmere Green stops. The northbound stop by Spital Street on Spital Hill was removed several years ago (to create one car parking space!) and the entrance of Tesco near the southbound stop has now been closed. So it would be easier for customers/passengers to get on the bus at Savile Street rather than walking up to Ellesmere Green with bags of shopping. And it would be safer and easier to get off the southbound bus at Savile Street rather than undertake the difficult and dangerous route down to the car park from the current Southbound Spital Hill stop. The 95 could be diverted from Nottingham St along Verdon St to the southern end of Spital Hill. This route would also thus avoid the congestion around Bridgehouses roundabout and provide a useful route for people on Verdon St. The 83A would continue to serve the southern end of Rock Street. This

	<p>proposal would affect the car wash on Spital Hill but this was originally given planning permission to be a baker's etc not primarily a car wash!</p> <p>More traffic restrictions on local school streets.</p> <p>Anti idling bus signs at the stops at Abbeyfield Park, Arnold Clarke and the Bay Horse (any others?). These already exist in some wealthier parts of the city where air quality is better than ours.</p> <p>Reduced waiting times for pedestrians at crossings, especially at Abbeyfield Academy and Gower Street.</p> <p>Enforce 20 mph speed restrictions to prevent diverted traffic using residential side roads.</p> <p>More support for local taxi drivers not only to make the transition to less polluting vehicles but to develop a modern taxi service which could reduce the number of cars on the road and offer more secure employment to local people.</p>	
6.	Question from Jill Giannotta	
	<p>COUNSELLORS, before you destroy hundreds of businesses along Ecclesall and Abbeydale Rd with the Red Lines Proposal, think carefully: ARE YOU EVEN SURE THAT THIS IS THE SOLUTION TO THE ALLEGED CONGESTION ON THOSE ROADS?</p> <p>Because you have to be very, very sure before taking such drastic action, and I am not certain that you are. I can find no proper report/ study/ investigation in the public domain which supports the need for such action.</p> <p>So, in the absence of this evidence I did a little investigation and observation myself. I live on Ecclesall Rd South, just 300m from where the bus Lane begins. I have a shop on Lower Banner Cross with a bus stop just outside. I also have relatives living on lower Ecclesall Rd, just below the Tesco Precinct.</p>	<p>Thank you for raising your concerns regarding the Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road bus priority project and for undertaking such as detailed empirical analysis of the corridor.</p> <p>In relation to the congestion point, there are specific junctions which are causing the queuing, which as you say, are exacerbated at certain times of the day and week. The package of schemes propose specific interventions at this locations, along with traffic signal technology to help improve the flow for all highway users.</p> <p>However, one of the issues with the congestion is its variability and this changes from day to day and hour to hour. Monday peak hours are different to Thursday which are different to Saturday afternoons for example. It's the variability of the congestion which makes the operation of public transport difficult and less predictable, which then impacts on their attractiveness. This is why the bus lane hours are being investigated.</p>

Using those three points of reference, over a six month period, noting traffic flow, I would challenge the assumption that there is congestion on the WHOLE of Ecclesall Rd, during the WHOLE of the day. Of course there is congestion in the morning and evening rush hour, but bus lanes are already in operation during these times. Hunter's Bar roundabout and Brocco Bank are areas of concern, as you are well aware.

At times outside the rush hours, traffic flows fairly smoothly. The 2pm congestion build-up, postulated by a senior member of the Green Party during a conversation in my shop is totally at variance with my own observations. During the 2 weeks since our conversation, I observed no early rush hour, and indeed the average number of people on the bus was 10 at this time of day.

I also searched the online Sheffield Forum for conversations about congestion, and Ecclesall Rd and Abbeydale Rd hardly get a mention. The areas of most concern are Park Square, The Parkway, Maylin Bridge and Heeley.

I have reached the conclusion therefore that you do not believe wholeheartedly in the efficacy of this project, and that some of you are disingenuous in your promotion of the scheme as an improvement of traffic flow which you use as smokescreen. I would go further and suggest that this project is dogma driven, and promotes an ideology which trumps the needs of the community, and most certainly views businesses as mere collateral damage in pursuit of a certain agenda.

I would welcome comments on my observations and a response to my question.

In addition to this, the resilience of the bus lanes during the current hours of operation are severely impacted by unlawful parking. One car parked in the bus lane can have a huge impact on buses trying to use the bus lanes. Therefore, greater enforcement of the existing restrictions is the red route option. The red route option itself does not remove parking. It would retain all parking and loading, but allow a greater opportunity for enforcement. It is the hours of the bus lane that determine the period at which parking would be allowed.

As mentioned, buses operating along Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road are experiencing delays and unreliable bus journey times along these corridors, partly as a result of inconsiderate parking and congestion at key intersections. As a growing city, with plans for housing growth and employment, the need for transport to support this in a sustainable way is essential, particularly given the need to also address our climate and environmental challenges. This is an issue faced by all major cities across the country. As such, we are developing a range of bus priority measures along Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road to improve bus journey time reliability and consistency. These are part of our overall approach to improving local public transport services for people to access employment, retail and leisure along the corridors and in the city centre and beyond.

The Council has NOT yet made a final decision as to whether it should implement these schemes which include a range of measures including: junction improvements; traffic signal upgrades; pedestrian crossings; or any amendments to bus lanes or the enhanced enforcement of parking restrictions. This committee will make that decision.

It is important to note that the consultation previously undertaken gauged opinion on potential amendments to bus lane hours of operation and red routes but at that point it was not a formal statutory consultation on final proposals. Any changes to this would require a formal, legally binding consultation, which would be presented to this committee, before any work would be done.

Officers have undertaken further investigations into the considerable levels of illegal parking along Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road which currently

		<p>plays a significant part in delays to both buses and private vehicles. Red routes are one option available to Local Highway Authorities to enforce illegal parking more effectively. However, parking, loading and unloading can still be accommodated on red route corridors during certain periods. The determining factor for the times that parking is allowed on red routes are normally the hours of operation of bus lanes, or those periods when corridors experience congestion. For example, a red route could be introduced on a corridor that has morning and afternoon peak period bus lanes, such as the current arrangements on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, with parking and loading provided in the inter-peak period, exactly the same as what is available currently.</p> <p>Following further analysis of the scheme it is proposed that a report on this project will be considered at a Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee meeting in summer 2023. This report will include consideration of the consultation (including the Petitions), parking surveys, and the potential benefits and disbenefits of the options that have been considered. This will include an Equalities Impact Assessment and a Climate Impact Assessment.</p> <p>To reiterate, at this time there have been no final decisions on either the Abbeydale Road or Ecclesall Road bus priority schemes. When the Committee meet to formally consider the report on the scheme, if the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee determine that any amendments to the bus lane hours of operation or red routes should be taken forward a further statutory consultation stage on final detailed proposals will then be required.</p>
7.	Question from Sam Wakeling	
	What are the costs to SCC for energy or other costs to provide EV chargers over the last two years? And what is the current ongoing cost at the revised tariff rates?	Sheffield City Council has been successful in leveraging government funding to install both public rapid and fast charge points. Funding for the installation, operation and management of the points was granted from governments Ultra Low Emission Vehicle Taxi Infrastructure Fund, Early Measures Fund, Local Transport Plan, National Highways and South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority.

		<p>The first of these charge points became operational in 2021/22. By the next financial year (2023/24) we will have a network of 29 rapid charge points and 77 fast charge points across Sheffield that have been publicly funded. It is essential that these can be run sustainably.</p> <p>Energy costs associated with our EV chargers have increased by over 80% during the last year. The cost to SCC for the electricity (plus fees) in 21/22 was £ 40,252 and in 22/23 (up to end Feb) was £189,223 (this increase reflects both increased costs and additional infrastructure / use). Transactional fees also apply, which for 22/23 are estimated at approximately £12,000.</p> <p>The cost the Council pays for electricity varies depending on time of day, site location and infrastructure provided. Standing charges, capacity charges, feed in tariffs and other fees also all contribute to the cost at each site. Ongoing costs will depend on usage profile. The current forecast is that the cost of associated energy to the Council will increase again in April 2023 by approximately 14%.</p>
8.	<p>Question from Robert Reiss</p> <p>The Archer Project, S6 Foodbank and The Besom in Sheffield. All are charities in Sheffield that require vans to conduct their vital work in this city.</p> <p>The clean air zone will require these charities, and many like them, to either spend £10 a day to conduct their work or spend their own money on new vehicles because the grant doesn't go far enough.</p> <p>Does the committee believe that this is a good use of public donations to these charities and were charities considered when this scheme was designed?</p>	<p>Thank you for your question.</p> <p>Can I start by thanking you for all of the great work you are doing to support people through the cost of living crisis and the difficult circumstances people currently find themselves in, which has clearly worsened over the last 12months as the CAZ was being finalised.</p> <p>Our Clean Air Zone does include certain exemptions from charges and I will commit to working with officers to see if further support can be put in place to assist the work of the food banks in the city.</p>
9.	<p>Question from Diane Wood</p> <p>1. Could you please confirm which report has been used and the date that report was produced for quoting about the 500 deaths in Sheffield</p>	<p>Response to 1</p> <p>The number of deaths figures attributed to air pollution are taken from the following sources:</p> <p>ONS data on annual mortality rates in Sheffield</p>

caused by Air Pollution, and could you please make this report accessible to the general public?

2. If you have used figures from the House of Commons report by Robert Vaughan from DEFRA in 2010 as quoted in SCC's "2015 Air Quality Plan", (which indicates it is SCC interpretation of the DEFRA report) does that mean an additional 3500 or more people have died **unnecessarily** in Sheffield due to SCC's inaction and does that mean SCC has failed to protect its citizens?

3. According to Friends of the Earth website, Sheffield has 2 neighbourhoods with very high air pollution, they also stated Leeds had 20, can you please confirm why Sheffield City Council have failed by not been able to cancel the CAZ Category C scheme with only 2 areas that have high air pollution, but Leeds who had 20 areas have improved their air pollution allowing them not to have a CAZ. **Can you please tell the citizens of Sheffield why you as a council have failed where Leeds have succeeded and does that mean this council is not fit for purpose?**

<https://policy.friendsoftheearth.uk/insight/which-neighbourhoods-have-worst-air-pollution>

4. Below are details from the Office for National Statistics from information provided by DEFRA on NO2 levels. As you can see there is only one instance where the NO2 level is above the illegal level of 40µg per the Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010, and that was in Sheffield Barnsley Road site in 2016, **What data has SCC got that has**

[Public Health England's data on causes of death](#)

These sources of [government data attribute approximately 5% of deaths for Sheffield to air pollution](#). Applied to [annual deaths in Sheffield](#) over 2018 and 2022, this percentage gives 250-500 deaths each year where air quality was a likely contributory factor.

Response to 2

Please see the previous response.

We add that Sheffield Council has worked in accordance with its action plan to improve air quality concentrations across district, which is evidenced in falling concentrations.

The development of the Clean Air Plan has been rigorously assessed by government with Sheffield required to work within a strict framework and governance process. This work has been running since 2017 when Sheffield was first directed to conduct a Clean Air Feasibility Study.

Response to 3

Sheffield and Rotherham have worked with government to develop and implement a Clean Air Plan addressing NO2 exceedances; this plan comprises charging and non-charging elements.

At all stages the plan has been developed and assessed within the process set out by government, with ministerial scrutiny and approval. Our focus is on delivering what is right for Sheffield, in line with our legal duties, and less so on other authorities.

Response to 4

Our data is publicly available:

Realtime monitoring data - [Sheffield \(airviro.com\)](#)

Map of monitoring locations across city - [Air quality in Sheffield | Sheffield City Council](#)

proved that we are exceeding the NO2 levels, and can that be made public via SCC website

Annual Mean NO2 Roadside

Year	Site	Annual Mean NO2 concentration ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	95% confidence interval for 'All sites' (+/-)	Data capture (%)
2016	Sheffield Barnsley Road	44	42	
2017	Sheffield Barnsley Road	38	97	
2018	Sheffield Barnsley Road	37	97	
2019	Sheffield Barnsley Road	38	82	
2020	Sheffield Barnsley Road	32	87	
2021	Sheffield Barnsley Road	35	87	

Annual Mean NO2 Urban

Year	Site	Annual Mean NO2 concentration ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	95% confidence interval for 'All sites' (+/-)	Data capture (%)
2016	Sheffield Tinsley	26.36	98	
2017	Sheffield Tinsley	26.74	97	
2018	Sheffield Tinsley	26.86	97	
2019	Sheffield Tinsley	27.89	96	
2020	Sheffield Tinsley	22.28	98	
2021	Sheffield Tinsley	23.14	99	

[ARCHIVED CONTENT] ENV02 - Air quality statistics - GOV.UK
(nationalarchives.gov.uk)

5. Under a recent Freedom of Information request to the Office for National Statistics (ONS) they have confirmed that between 2001 and 2022 only 1 person has died as a direct result of Air Pollution and that was in London. How can SCC state that Air Pollution kills 500 people

Response to 5 – CAZ

The case you are referring to is the [Ella Adoo-Kissi-Debrah](#), who died from an asthma attack. Her family actively fought for the cause of death to be recorded as air pollution, which was agreed by a further coroner's inquest.

every year in Sheffield and where is the evidence to support this claim?

6. How many small businesses are SCC willing to sacrifice to this CAZ scheme and the Kelham Island/Neepsend road plans scheme, which also impacts on peoples' livelihoods and ultimately their lives.?

7. Can you please confirm or deny that in 2018 the Government wrote to SCC asking what SCC are doing about NO2 levels, and at that point in time no compulsory CHARGEABLE CAZ had been dictated to SCC by Central Government, could you also confirm or deny that in December 2018 SCC "voluntary" replied to Central Government that the preferred option they wanted was a "Chargeable CAZ (Class C)" and could you confirm/deny that in 2019 the Government confirmed to

Whilst Ella's case has set a legal precedent, death certificates more typically record conditions such as asthma attack, stroke, heart attack etc where air quality has been a contributory factor.

In this respect, there is some merit in drawing a comparison between an issue such as smoking, which is widely recognised nowadays as being a contributory factor to mortality rates, and air pollution. We estimate that 1000 people die in Sheffield each year because of smoking; however, smoking (like air pollution) is not typically listed as a cause of death on someone's death certificate – instead the cause of death is recorded as a heart attack, stroke, lung cancer and other diseases all caused by smoking. Air pollution can permanently damage children's lungs, can cause strokes, lung cancer and cardiovascular disease.

Response to 6 – CAZ

Sheffield Council has secured upwards of £20m in funding to support businesses to upgrade their vehicles, and therefore avoid charging altogether. Whilst this is a limited pot of money, there are opportunities for the council to draw down almost a further £8m in funding to support upgrades. Our focus is on supporting as many businesses as possible to take up financial support. We encourage everyone to review [scheme details on our website](#) and to apply for funding support.

The Confederation of Business Industry conducted [analysis of the implementation of Clean Air Zones](#), noting that improvement in health outcomes associated with NO2 exposure could lead to benefits to the overall economy. We have provided the link to Sheffield's case study - [12651_caz_clean-air-fund_sheffield.pdf \(cbi.org.uk\)](#)

Response to 7 – CAZ

To assist with your query, here is a potted history of activity:

- 2017 – Sheffield and Rotherham were legally directed by Secretary of State to conduct a Clean Air plan feasibility study and submit an Outline Business Case (OBC); this was neither optional, nor voluntary.

SCC that it was ok to consult on the scheme and implement it and to send a full business case to the Government.

8. The “Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010” require that the annual mean concentration of NO2 must not exceed 40. According to a recent FOI reply from SCC they stated that there were only 2 areas within the current CAZ scheme that had illegal NO2 levels, Location 1: Arundel Gate, which SCC stated “operates as a busy bus interchange and is exposing a significant number of pedestrians and bus passengers to its non-compliant levels of NO2 and will therefore need to be treated as a ‘special case’, Location 2: is Sheaf Street (Train Station). In the 2018 Business Case from SCC to Central Government, point 2.3.11 states “The locations for target determination in Sheffield are Parkway (A57), Sheaf Street (A61), Sheffield Road (A6178) and Arundel Gate (C710)”. Can you please confirm when and why SCC changed this to include the ring road which was built to take traffic away from the city centre. And which party if any did not want the ring road included in the CAZ scheme?

Air Quality Standards Regulations 2010

- Dec 2018 – the OBC was submitted to government, stating as its preferred option the implementation of a CAZ C+
- First quarter 2020 – government reviewed, approved, and signed off the OBC
- Oct 2021 – Sheffield Co-Op Executive reviewed and approved the Clean Air Plan Final Business Case (FBC), which removed the C+ higher standards for taxis, and set out a CAZ C Charging Zone in line with national framework.

At all stages national government assessed plans to ensure they delivered the necessary air quality compliance, were fair, cost effective and where possible delivered wider benefits. Government provided feedback on Local Authorities’ initial plans and decided to approve final plans.

Response to 8 – CAZ

Sheffield’s OBC set out a range of options for addressing NO2 compliance in the shortest possible time, as required by and in accordance with the government’s Clean Air Zone Framework. Within the OBC the ring road was included in all options because there was a location of exceedance.

In relation to your second question, the FBC was approved by Co-Op Executive in October 2021, with the decision not subject to a ‘call in’ under our scrutiny process. We have provided this [explainer on call ins](#).

9. SCC have stated that private cars will not be included in the CAZ scheme, however, in the “2018 Business Case” under the “Procurement Approach section” point 4.5.16 stated “It is acknowledged that, whilst SCC has identified a CAZ C+ as the preferred option, there may be a requirement, either as determined through the OBC / FBC approvals, and point 4.5.17 states “The tender documentation will therefore include requests for costs and proposals in relation to the delivery of infrastructure to support a CAZ D, alongside the core requirement for delivery of the CAZ C+. This CAZ D element will be optional and triggered at the discretion of SCC, either at contract award following FBC, or as a contract change once the contract is in place. So why if SCC has stated this will NOT include private cars does it need the Category D section including in its charging system?.

10. In the recent Street Tree enquiry, several points were raised. • “The Council was slow to understand the scale and nature of opposition that was building gradually in several parts of the city” • “Despite a large and growing number of information requests, correspondence and complaints, the Council genuinely thought that things were progressing smoothly. They dismissed as unrepresentative evidence to the contrary from local people, experts and interest groups. • “Our conclusion is that the Council’s behaviour amounted to a serious and sustained failure of strategic leadership. Responsibility for that ultimately rests with the political leadership, in particular the relevant Cabinet member and the Council Leader: they were responsible for setting the direction and tone. • And people on all sides suffered anxiety, stress, injuries, wider physical and mental health problems and other harms which some continue to carry. Can you please acknowledge that SCC have still not learnt lessons, there are people all over this city who are against the ring road being included in the Chargeable Clean Air Zone, and also against the plans for Kelham Island road changes, however, SCC seem to just be forcing these on Sheffield residents even though there are large numbers who oppose both schemes, and as with the “Tree debacle” SCC are still not listening to the will of the citizens of Sheffield and they are causing

Response to 9 – CAZ

At the point of procuring our ANPR system Sheffield had not had an FBC approved. However, subsequent decisions taken by the council confirmed and committed Sheffield to the implementation of a charging CAZ C zone.

Response to 10

It should be noted for the Clean Air Plan, Sheffield Council has followed a strict government framework to assess and implement a Clean Air Zone. For several years the scheme’s development has been scrutinised, assessed and assured against the government’s requirements. At all points formal governance arrangements both internally and externally have been in place to make decisions, with the Secretary of State approving our plan.

Furthermore, the council has conducted extensive consultation throughout the development of the scheme. Headline details have already been provided to the enquirer in response to the raised petition.

many to suffer anxiety, stress, and physical and mental health problems.

11. On 1st March 2023 Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Co-Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee stated on BBC Radio Sheffield that he had taken the red line zone proposals on Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road ‘off the table’ after meeting with businesses who were worried about the bus priority plan. The proposals included a 12-hour bus lanes operating from 7am to 7pm. councillor Mazher Iqbal also confirmed that Labour councillors do not want to see any changes to the current parking arrangements and no increases to the restriction time, councillor Barbara Masters (LibDem Ecclesall) and councillor Andy Sangar, group spokesman on the transport committee, gave their own assurances at the meetings with businesses this week. On 2nd March Council leader Terry Fox said: “The reason we are doing this is quite simple – private operators have significantly cut back our bus networks since these red route schemes were being devised 18 months ago. However, according to “The Star”, Councillor Douglas Johnson (Greens) said it was “encouraging that councillor Julie Grocutt (Labour) was finally facing up to the problems of pollution, parking and congestion on Ecclesall and Abbeydale roads. Councillor Douglas Johnson stated on BBC radio Sheffield that what Councillor Mazher Iqbal had said was a complete lie. **Could you please confirm if the plans for Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road have been taken off the table permanently or just until the summer after the local elections have taken place? And do councillor Terry Fox and councillor Julie Grocutt have differing views on this issue? And is Councillor Douglas Johnson right to say Councillor Mazher Iqbal lied? We as voters need to know who is lying about this issue** <https://www.thestar.co.uk/news/politics/council/sheffield-red-lines-labour-confirm-their-opposition-to-abbeydale-and-ecclesall-roads-scheme-4048879>

12. In a meeting on 20th February (available to view on SCC website) councillor Mazher Iqbal stated that members of the new transport, regeneration and climate policy committee, especially himself and co-chair Councillor Julie Grocutt, had been “mopping up his messes”

Response to 11

The Council has not yet made a final decision as to whether it should implement these schemes which include a range of measures including: junction improvements; traffic signal upgrades; pedestrian crossings; or any amendments to bus lanes or the enhanced enforcement of parking restrictions.

It is important to note that the consultation previously undertaken gauged opinion on potential amendments to bus lane hours of operation and red routes but at that point it was not a formal statutory consultation on final proposals.

Following further analysis of the scheme it is proposed that a report on this project will be considered at a Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee meeting in summer 2023. This report will include consideration of the consultation, parking surveys, and the potential benefits and disbenefits of the options that have been considered.

To reiterate, at this time there have been no final decisions on either the Abbeydale Road or Ecclesall Road bus priority schemes.

Response to 12 – Political, officers cannot answer

	<p>(referring to councillor Douglas Johnson), could you please confirm what councillor Johnsons messes are so the citizens of Sheffield are aware of these issue</p> <p>https://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=154&MId=8360 Sheffield Green accuses Labour councillor of 'lying' in row over red line zones The Star</p> <p>13. In the same meeting, Councillor Mazher Iqbal has previously stated that councillor Douglas Johnson (Greens) "owes an apology to the residents of Crookes, to the residents in Walkley, to the residents in Nether Edge, to the residents in Abbeydale Road and businesses, and to the same residents and businesses on Ecclesall Road, because the anxiety, the frustration and the fear, the scaremongering, has been caused by himself." Could you please confirm what Douglas Johnson needs to apologise for, and has he done this yet?.</p> <p>https://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=154&MId=8360 Sheffield Green accuses Labour councillor of 'lying' in row over red line zones The Star</p>	<p>Response to 13 – Political, officers cannot answer</p>
10.	<p>Question from B Kelly</p> <p>There is considerable concern amongst residents of Ecclesfield and Chapeltown about traffic flow, both areas having close proximity to the M1 and A61, respectively. Traffic comes off a fast moving road, designed for that purpose, at speed into built up, urban areas where mothers with pushchairs and people with mobility issues have to navigate roads unfit for the speed or volume of traffic. Safety issues resulting from the speed of traffic are by a lack of safe crossings. Particular areas of concern are around many of our local schools. Poor signage and in some instances no signing of speed limits, compounds this road safety hazard.</p> <p>This is a resource issue. I ask the Chairs of the Committees to work with Ecclesfield & Chapeltown Traffic Action Group (ECTAG) to find ways of funding solutions. The group would also offer a sensitive and responsive local consultation.</p>	<p>Local speed limits are set using strict criteria defined by the Department for Transport. The assessment process includes the determination of the speed limit related primarily to how the road environment feels to the driver. Therefore, the transition from a motorway/dual carriageway to a local road should be obvious to a driver and their behaviour changes accordingly. If this is a concern, this should be raised with South Yorkshire Police for enforcement. Any speed limit should also be accompanied by the appropriate speed limit signs. If these are not present as you suggest, can you please inform the Council and we will get this looked into immediately.</p> <p>As I am sure you will appreciate, the Council receives numerous requests for road safety measures from local residents and ideally we would like to be able to respond to most of them. However, the limitations on our resources</p>

		<p>mean that we have to assess and prioritise locations for measures according to certain criteria.</p> <p>Therefore we have to prioritise which schemes we do choose to carry out each year, to ensure that the most deserving locations are built first with the limited resources that we have available. Under the procedure, all identified locations are given points based on several set criteria and those scoring the highest are taken forward and constructed on site, whilst the others are deferred and considered for future funding.</p>
11.	<p>Question from R Tinker</p> <p>Having just viewed the agenda for the transport committee meeting on the 16th March, it is noted that Castle Croft Drive parking scheme has not been included again. At the last meeting in February it was bumped from the agenda by the co-chair for reasons stating for further discussion with partners (whatever that meant) The residents of Castle Croft Drive have not been contacted and I would like to know a valid reason why our issues have not been included yet again.</p> <p>In addition to the above, I am yet to receive a response to my question presented at the last meeting!</p> <p>A very disgruntled tax payer</p>	<p>It is proposed to present a report on the Park Hill Parking Scheme at the June 23 TRC PC to ensure that officers can consider if there are any potential parking issues related to the launch of the CAZ before the Committee consider their decision on the scheme. This has been agreed following further discussions with TRC Co-Chairs, Deputy and spokesperson and Local Ward Members</p>
12.	<p>Question from John Wright</p> <p>I would like to submit a public question to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee which is meeting this Thursday the 16th of March.</p> <p>As a resident living within the Crookes Active Neighbourhood Scheme I have a personal interest in this issue. I am directly affected by the scheme and very keen to know which measures will be made permanent (if any) and what is going to happen next.</p> <p>I hear that £200,000 has been committed to the ongoing development of the Active Neighbourhood Schemes.</p>	<p>The initial six month period for comments linked to the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order for this scheme has now ended and accepted comments until 3rd March 2023. The scheme will then be reviewed, this is expected to take place in summer 2023.</p> <p>During this review period, the scheme will remain in place while decisions are taken around which elements of the trial should stay in place and which should be removed or changed. Decisions will be based on feedback received during the trial period, data relating to traffic flow changes, and the funding available.</p>

	<p>How is the £200k is to be allocated - what proportion of it is intended to be used for making any retained interventions permanent?</p> <p>Is there any scope for alterations to the trial interventions if analysis of the consultation responses demonstrates an appetite for amending or re-designing, rather than scrapping certain measures?</p> <p>Is it possible that any of this funding could be allocated to scoping out potential residents' parking permit zones, given that this has been raised as a request by a number of residents in response to the Active Neighbourhood trial? I would support such a move, parking on my road is terrible and has been worsened by the implementation of the scheme.</p>	<p>With regard to this £200,000 allocation, it is expected that this will be used to pay for a contribution to ongoing communication, monitoring and evaluation and data collection, in the run up to the decision being made at the TRC Committee.</p> <p>Some of this allocation could be used to fund making elements of the scheme more permanent, should the TRC Committee decide that this would be the appropriate course of action. A controlled parking zone/parking scheme is currently outside of the scope of this £200,000 funding allocation.</p>
13	Question from Nasar Raof nasraoof1@gmail.com	
	<p>I would like to ask questions at the committee regarding the red lines and bus lanes saga</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Lack of consultation- 2. When will businesses be given the clear clarity which is lacking ? 3. Will political parties make the assurance today and take this opportunity to respond to the petitions and questioners ? 4. Why business's being treated with such contempt to not even get a response for over a year ? 	<p>Thank you for your question.</p> <p>Buses operating along Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road are experiencing delays and unreliable bus journey times due to significant congestion along these corridors. As a growing city, with plans for further growth in our economy, housing and employment, the need for transport to support this in a sustainable way is essential, particularly given the need to also address our climate and environmental challenges. As such, we are developing a range of bus priority measures along Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road to improve bus journey time reliability and consistency. These are part of our overall approach to improving local public transport services for people to access employment, retail and leisure along the corridors and in the city centre.</p> <p>The Council has not yet made a final decision as to whether it should implement these schemes which include a range of measures including: junction improvements; traffic signal upgrades; pedestrian crossings; or any amendments to bus lanes or the enhanced enforcement of parking restrictions.</p> <p>It is important to note that the consultation previously undertaken gauged opinion on potential amendments to bus lane hours of operation and red</p>

		<p>routes but at that point it was not a formal statutory consultation on final proposals.</p> <p>Officers have undertaken further investigations into the significant levels of illegal parking along Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road which currently plays a significant part in delays to both buses and private vehicles. Red routes are one option available to Local Highway Authorities to enforce illegal parking more effectively. However, parking, loading and unloading can still be accommodated on red route corridors during certain periods. The determining factor for the times that parking is allowed on red routes are normally the hours of operation of bus lanes, or those periods when corridors experience congestion. For example, a red route could be introduced on a corridor that has morning and afternoon peak period bus lanes, such as the current arrangements on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, with parking and loading provided in the inter-peak period.</p> <p>Following further analysis of the scheme it is proposed that a report on this project will be considered at a Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee meeting in summer 2023. This report will include consideration of the consultation, parking surveys, and the potential benefits and disbenefits of the options that have been considered. This will include an Equalities Impact Assessment and a Climate Impact Assessment.</p> <p>To reiterate, at this time there have been no final decisions on either the Abbeydale Road or Ecclesall Road bus priority schemes. When the Committee meet to formally consider the report on the scheme, if the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee determine that any amendments to the bus lane hours of operation or red routes should be taken forward a further statutory consultation stage on final detailed proposals will then be required.</p>
13.	Question from Michael Chilton	
	<p>1) How and when was the working group for the Draft Local Plan formed and who sits on it?</p> <p>2) Can residents and I have an update on the Eckington Way site following the working groups meeting on the 6th March?</p>	<p>1) The Local Plan Member Working Group was formed following endorsement by the Cooperative Executive in October 2021.</p>

		<p>After the Local elections in May 2022 the role and mandate of the Working Group was reinforced at the Strategy and Resources Committee in May 2022.</p> <p>Current Membership of the Group is</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- Cllr Julie Grocutt- Cllr Mazher Iqbal- Cllr Paul Turpin- Cllr Christine Gilligan Kubo- Cllr Mike Levery- Cllr Andrew Sangar <p>2) Officers are still working through the large number of comments that were made on the Draft Plan. Recommended responses to the issues raised (including any proposed amendments) will be discussed with Members from mid-April to the end of June before being considered formally by the Strategy & Resources Policy Committee in July 2023 and full Council in September 2023</p>
--	--	---

This page is intentionally left blank