

No	<u>Query / Objection / Support</u>	<u>Response</u>
1	<p>As a local business owner in Neepsend, I have never been so worried. You're going to cut off the passing trade in Neepsend lane, upon which we rely heavily on.</p> <p>My business brings A LOT of custom to Neepsend, not only does it support local businesses and bring them lots and lots of trade when we host our events, it also gives other businesses of Sheffield a platform to sell, helping the local economy.</p> <p>If you go ahead with these changes, you are going to RUN BUSINESSES INTO THE GROUND.</p> <p>Small businesses are already suffering due to your ridiculous clean air zone, now you're spreading this plague to Neepsend and Kelham Island, it's like the council want small businesses to fail and suffer.</p> <p>Not to mention, paid Parking in the area is going to put off lots of people visiting Neepsend.</p> <p>Turn this back around, otherwise you're going to kill Sheffield.</p>	<p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change the movement of traffic in Kelham and Neepsend as part of the Connecting Sheffield project.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. I understand your concerns and will be back in touch to let you know if we can recommend any changes to the plans.</p> <p>At the information event a few people asked whether we could look at leaving the lower half of Percy Street 'two way' to improve access from the north to businesses on Neepsend Lane - this will be one of the changes we will investigate. I will be back in touch to discuss the plans once our investigations have taken place, as well as reading all of the comments received.</p>
2	<p>With the resident's letter that has been posted about changes to Neepsend, Kelham and City Centre, I have some concerns regarding to changes being made to West Bar. The changes proposed indicates that changes will be made around West Bar to improve walking and cycling. I would like to know why the council feels it is important to improve the environment for pedestrians around West Bar but not extend further to the junction of Broad Lane and Rockingham Street where there is no pedestrian crossings on this junction. The number of incidents of pedestrians being involved in an accident is numerous and seems to have a double standard when these ideas are considered.</p> <p>I look forward to your response.</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments on the Connecting Sheffield proposals for Kelham, Neepsend and the City Centre.</p> <p>The main focus of the scheme is to improve active travel connections between the City Centre and Kelham / Neepsend (Housing Zone North) and therefore the budget allocated for the scheme has been targeted at the area north east of Townhead Street inside the ring road and into Kelham and Neepsend with quality links proposed between the two areas. We would like to extend the quality connections for walking and cycling further along Broad Lane towards Rockingham Street as you have identified and beyond, but this will be subject to future funding and or developer</p>

		contributions when new planning applications come forward. I hope this information helps
3	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Like the plans, but just a little confused & unfortunately cant make the meeting on Tuesday to ask about the plans....</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Maps A & B seem to be conflicting re Cycle Lanes. Map B shows a cycle Lane on both sides of the road up Tenter St, Map A shows it going up only on the city side (the original idea). Which is now planned? 2. Re blocked-off area where Silver St Head meets Tenter St, the 2 maps show different designs. Which one is planned? 3. What does 'soft landscaping' mean? Is it grey to green, or just grassed areas? <p>Thanks, keep up the good work.</p>	<p>Firstly apologies for the late response to your queries.</p> <p>Please find responses to your questions below (in red);</p> <p>Like the plans, but just a little confused & unfortunately cant make the meeting on Tuesday to ask about the plans....</p> <p>1Maps A & B seem to be conflicting re Cycle Lanes. Map B shows a cycle Lane on both sides of the road up Tenter St, Map A shows it going up only on the city side (the original idea). Which is now planned? This was an error on the plan on the website which showed the northern side cycle lane going past Solly Street, now corrected. The cycle links here work so that a bi-directional cycle track will continue further up Broad Lane / Tenter Street accessed by a crossing adjacent to the Solly Street junction.</p> <p>2Re blocked-off area where Silver St Head meets Tenter St, the 2 maps show different designs. Which one is planned?We have advertised the closure here as shown below, i.e the closure is proposed to be 33m from the junction with Silver Street. The second snip then shows what we are proposing (parking and loading wise) at the end of the street – this would be an amendment to the current parking bay, and inclusion of Double Yellow Lines to form a small turning head for vehicles.</p> <p>3What does 'soft landscaping' mean? Is it grey to green, or just grassed areas? The majority of 'soft landscaping' is planned to be like Grey to Green. This will be a Sustainable Urban Drainage (SUDs) system where possible but there are also areas where due to under ground utilities etc it will be just general planting. In essence though it will look like the Grey to Green scheme.</p> <p>Thanks, keep up the good work.I hope the information above helps</p>

4	<p>Hello, I hope you're well.</p> <p>I wanted to email regarding the changes being proposed to the roads in Neepsend.</p> <p>This came as very concerning news to me and my family. Although this worries me for my business,</p> <p>This change is going to stop any passing trade. Although many of the new businesses in Neepsend /Kelham Island are established online, meaning all the bars and restaurants are new to the area, there are many many businesses that have been here since long before. They are normal tradesman that don't have social media, they aren't those kind of businesses, they rely on word of mouth, returning customers, and passing trade.</p> <p>Many of their clients are elderly, and there's no way they're going to be able to navigate the diversion that will have to be taken due to the bus gate on burton road. Not to mention the extra emmissions you'll be contributing to the air by making people drive a long way around.</p> <p>It all seems rather silly, you say it's for the sake of pedestrians and cyclists, however we never see cyclists riding through, and the area is dead in the week other than on a Saturday when people come to eat and drink, the rest of the week it's just tradesman coming to work.</p> <p>The plans seems totally unnecessary, it's like you're trying to fix something that doesn't need to be fixed. The council have already implemented the clean air zone to the centre of Sheffield which is almost guaranteed to lose small businesses in the centre custom, but now it's like they are trying to deter people away from Neepsend.</p> <p>People come to Neepsend because it isn't town centre!</p>	See above response to No.1
---	---	----------------------------

	<p>We urge you to retract these plans, they are going to bury Neepsend.</p> <p>Thankyou.</p>	
5	<p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>I have some question in regards to the revised Kelham to City project.</p> <p>On the West Bar Green and Tenter Street plans, the description above this image says: "As well as this, the segregated cycleway which is proposed to run along Tenter Street from the roundabout will now run up to Solly Street rather than the Hampton by Hilton hotel car park, as previously proposed. This will help to improve connectivity for cyclists."</p> <p>On the north side of the road, the cycleway extended westwards of Solly Street, is this wrong on the new consultation image?</p> <p>Within the same topic, can you tell me which sections are one way cycle tracks and which are intended to be two way? Is it 2 way along the south side and 1 way along the north? The thickness of the cycleway on the plans are unclear.</p> <p>For the top end of Neepsend Lane, can I ask one question and make one comment.</p> <p>Will the cross roads still have a dedicated cycle crossing? This is the most dangerous point of the route and it is unclear if the protected cross road is being removed at the same time as the cycle lanes.</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Thanks for the comments and further questions on the Connecting Sheffield Kelham, Neepsend, City Centre scheme. We have received a large amount of responses both in favour and objecting to the proposals and it is taking time to work through the comments. In response to your questions I will do my best to explain;</p> <p>1)As you have spotted we changed the picture on the website – it was an error which showed the northern side cycle lane going past Solly Street, now corrected</p> <p>2)The section inside the ring road is mainly proposed to be segregated and this includes; two way over the ring road, two way on the Bower Spring Link from the ring road to Bower Spring, two way on the east side of West Bar / Gibraltar Street, one way around the roundabout, one way either side of Corporation Street from the roundabout to the ring road, one way either side of Tenter street / West Bar Green up to the crossing after Solly Street, two way across the crossing, two way on the south east side of Tenter street / broad lane from Solly Street up to Townhead street and then one way either side of the lower section of Townhead street / junction with Broad Lane.</p> <p>3)At the Neepsend Lane crossing / crossroads, given the space here, we have been able to provide a segregated crossing facility on the western arm (made possible by closing the end of Neepsend Lane), on the eastern side we unfortunately don't have the same space so this crossing is proposed to be a toucan with slip offs/ons</p>

<p>On the comment, given that parking & servicing space will be retained in replacement of the cycleways, will you be providing cycle parking along that stretch, ideally located in the carriageway? This would enable people to visit the new businesses here which have very low levels of cycle parking.</p>	<p>for cyclists on approaches.</p> <p>4)Absolutely – we can look at providing cycle parking in and around here as part of the scheme. We will also have the opportunity hopefully to provide further cycle parking as part of any future development on the eastern side. Given the amount of questions received on the project, we are happy to take further responses (in favour or otherwise) on the TRO's until early April. We always try to make changes where possible to address concerns, however if we can't make changes and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>
--	--

6	<p>Have you done an impact assessment on local traders for your proposed traffic changes? If so, please make them public. At a time when SCC is trumpeting efforts for growth policy after policy seem to be designed to deliver the exact opposite.</p> <p>And who came up with the road design that allows access to Kelham Island, but not egress from without entering the CAZ?</p> <p>Please, please reconsider the changes for Neepsend before irreparable damage is done to the livelihoods and the local economy.</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Thank you for your comments on the Connecting Sheffield proposals for Kelham, Neepsend and the City Centre.</p> <p>Please see a response to your questions below (in red) We have received a large number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and it has taken time to work through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>Have you done an impact assessment on local traders for your proposed traffic changes? If so, please make them public. At a time when SCC is trumpeting efforts for growth policy after policy seem to be designed to deliver the exact opposite. The impact will be that there is anticipated to be a reduction in the amount of through traffic both in Neepsend and Kelham on certain roads where the Council is proposing road closures, one way streets and the bus gates on Burton Road. Access to and from businesses and residential properties will however still be possible – this however, in some cases will be by other routes than existing.</p> <p>And who came up with the road design that allows access to Kelham Island, but not egress from without entering the CAZ? There are routes which can be taken that allow both access and egress from the area without entering the clear air zone.</p> <p>Please, please reconsider the changes for Neepsend before irreparable damage is done to the livelihoods and the local economy. As above over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the</p>
---	---	--

		<p>proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>
<p>7</p> <p>Page 283</p>	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I would like to support other people in writing to you this evening reiterating my anger towards Sheffield city councils plan for Neepsend.</p> <p>Not only effecting numerous buisness but also mine personally based on Bardwell Road, I could write all night and feel it's not even worth the time because it will never get heard but ultimately I'd like to just be a voice heard in my disapproval for the plans that will ultimately cost my buisness, friends who I've grown up with who also have businesses within the proposed changes. For customer's, and for my suppliers.</p> <p>You, from what I hear may be one person who can have a say on this matter like many can't and I would like for you to take this on board with you.</p>	<p>Many thanks for your comments, I have noted your objection to the changes proposed for Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>

8	<p>Firstly, I understand the need for a pedestrian crossing at the traffic lights on Rutland/Neepsend Lane.</p> <p>We own a business where 48% of our business comes from passing trade, if this becomes a bus gate which is planned, I really don't think we will survive as business is already difficult enough. Would you drive through a bus gate to go to a business or just go elsewhere I know what I would do!</p> <p>I think these changes will be the final straw for many businesses in the Neepsend area, remembering 98% of Neepsend is still industrial not residential or Restaurants/bars etc.</p> <p>Many businesses in this are reply on being easily accessible and this will completely put a stop to that.</p> <p>The closure of main roads forcing large HGV trailers down narrow side roads is just beyond belief and will not work again many large businesses are operating in Neepsend area. If the plans are implemented, we will be claiming full relocation costs from Sheffield Council to enable us to move elsewhere and am sure we will not be alone.</p> <p>Neepsend is not Kelham Island where 99% is now residential.</p> <p>What about supporting all the business that already exist and not forcing them out again all the staff we employ plus the tax and vat we pay etc?</p> <p>We accepted the low emission zone and bought a used euro 6 van again an unforeseen cost but the above point I am sure you will understand.</p> <p>I look forward to your in-depth reply by return.</p>	<p>Many thanks for your comments and I note your objection to the changes in and around Neepsend Lane.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>
---	---	--

9 Hello,
I currently live in Kelham Island.
I am all for the proposed new ideas in making the traffic area safer for pedestrians and cyclists in kelham island.
However we as residents in "car free developments" are increasingly worried and concerned regarding the new parking schemes that have been put forward. When I bought my flat I wasn't advised it was a car free development and knew before buying there was a lot of free parking around the area. It is completely unfair to actual living residents for them to be potentially paying daily charges in a place they live in. I have tried numerous times to buy/rent a space but it is so limited there are barely any options. Surely the "car free developments" need to be lifted for residents who live in kelham so they can at least apply for parking permits if this scheme goes ahead?
Like I say I am all for positive changes within the area but to say this is a car free zone is absolutely absurd. We have mainly commuters from the city parking here, which yes is a problem and creating parking charges helps this but does not help the residents who pay council tax, mortgages and everything else to live here when they are subjected to ridiculous parking charges without any other options.

Thank you for your e-mail. Kelham and Neepsend are popular for long term parking as it is free and unrestricted. This leads to a lack of parking opportunities for customers of local businesses and residents. The construction of properties at West Bar is also expected to increase parking demand in the area.

It is therefore proposed to introduce a parking scheme with parking charges and permits for eligible properties. Some of the residential properties within the proposed parking scheme have been granted planning consent on the grounds that they would be car free. Unfortunately residents of these properties are not eligible for a parking permit, though they will be eligible to purchase visitor permits within the scheme. A decision on the parking scheme is expected in July 2023 by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.

10	<p>Hi</p> <p>I'd like to understand why plans are to change the layout of kelham island to restrict the access of small independent businesses so much.</p> <p>Passing trade is essential to so many of the businesses in that area and paid for parking limits the amount of people who will nip to the the area. There are shops, cafes and all sorts of businesses that depend on people nipping in to collect/buy coffee/buy presents. The vibrancy of the area depends on it.</p> <p>I see from the reports that this was opened for consultation in 2021, nearly 2 years ago during a time when MANY more businesses have opened up there.</p> <p>Please review this again and make sensible changes! This on top of the ridiculous charges in town are killing the creative small businesses that the city should be so proud of!</p> <p>Why not invest in some proper public transport infrastructure. Buses that turn up, modern trams, bus stops with live signs etc...</p> <p>Bring people into the city rather than push them out! We would all love to bus/cycle in but it's really not possible with the current buses and their lack of reliability/costs.</p> <p>My small business stocks shops in the city and I frequently trade at Peddler market. This will have an impact on footfall and it will be so sad to lose places we should be so proud of.</p> <p>Please stop damaging businesses and use the money to invest in the small businesses and public transport.</p> <p>I have ccd in my local MP for their support too.</p> <p>Regards</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Thank you for your comments on the Connecting Sheffield proposals for Kelham, Neepsend and the City Centre.</p> <p>Please see a response to your questions below (in red)We have received a large number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and it has taken time to work through the responses.Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>Hil'd like to understand why plans are to change the layout of kelham island to restrict the access of small independent businesses so much. The project aims to provide better active travel (walking and cycling) connections between the City Centre and Kelham / Neepsend. To improve the environment for active travel in the Kelham and Neepsend area the strategy is to reduce through traffic movements so that cyclists can be in the road together with limited general traffic movements (limited to those accessing the area to and from businesses and residential properties).</p> <p>Passing trade is essential to so many of the businesses in that area and paid for parking limits the amount of people who will nip to the the area. There are shops, cafes and all sorts of businesses that depend on people nipping in to collect/buy coffee/buy presents. The vibrancy of the area depends on it. The proposed pay and display parking would remove a large amount of commuter parking and turn over spaces regularly while still allowing businesses to park and load in areas which in some cases are currently difficult to access. There would be a 20 mins free system in place which would allow anyone 'nipping in to collect / buy coffee / presents' etc to still do that without charge.</p>
----	---	---

I see from the reports that this was opened for consultation in 2021, nearly 2 years ago during a time when MANY more businesses have opened up there. **Noted, the parking scheme was consulted on however in 2022 and the TRO / information event was advertised for movement orders as part of the Connecting Sheffield scheme in February 2023 so there has been a continuation of consultation and opportunities for resident's / businesses to comment. The scheme is fairly extensive given it also covers parts of the City Centre and proposals have also taken time to develop. The information regarding the scheme has always been available to access on the Connecting Sheffield website and anyone moving in to the area should have been aware of the changes through property searches / their own research into future plans for the area.**

Please review this again and make sensible changes! This on top of the ridiculous charges in town are killing the creative small businesses that the city should be so proud of! Why not invest in some proper public transport infrastructure. Buses that turn up, modern trams, bus stops with live signs etc... **Improved sustainable modes will help as you say, South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (as Transport Authority) are investigating franchising, which would bring buses back under local Government control. However, this work is still at the feasibility stage and will not happen quickly. The enclosed link provides a bit more detail**

Bring people into the city rather than push them out! We would all love to bus/cycle in but it's really not possible with the current buses and their lack of reliability/costs. I'm a ceramicist and my small business stocks shops in the city and I frequently trade at Peddler market. This will have an impact on footfall and it will be so sad to lose places we should be so proud of. Please stop damaging businesses and use the money to invest in the small businesses and public transport. I have ccd in my local MP for their support too.

11	<p>How about you don't kill an already suffering city centre.</p> <p>There are not enough cyclists to warrant all these cycle lanes.</p> <p>All you will do on drive the buses that serve the Hillsborough and beyond side of sheffield a different way making life even harder than it already is. Sheffield is not a cycle heavy enough city.</p> <p>By all means put standard narrow cycle lanes down the aides of wide enough roads but stop closing them completely.</p> <p>It's hairbrained and obviously these decisions are made by those who do not visit the city centre let alone work in it, or god forbid have to catch public transport.</p> <p>Enough is enough. These schemes and ideas you keep having such as the closing of shalesmoor over covid, the CAz and now this are ludicrous.</p> <p>You have no idea the impact of your decisions do you? How about you stop. And think. And ask the people who actually matter and who use these things and work these places? Stop killing sheffield</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Many thanks for your comments on the Connecting Sheffield (Kelham, Neepsend, City Centre) scheme, I have noted your objection to the changes proposed. We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses.</p> <p>Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>
----	---	--

12

I have stated my concerns about the plans for neepsend previously We are a small business running for 18 years now,finding it very difficult after covid,utility price increase, food price increase, and green air zone which has hit our customers who say they will no longer be able to use the shop due to cost of it.

Now we are going to be left with no parking on road for customers or staff how are we supposed to get passing trade.

Neepsend has always been industrial hgv vehicles delivering constantly if burton road becomes 2 way there will be no way these vehicles will be able to do there jobs.

I would like to know if it is the plan to get rid of all the businesses and make all neepsend residential because how things are going this will be the outcome.

Hello.

Thank you for your comments on the Connecting Sheffield proposals for Kelham, Neepsend and the City Centre.

Please see a response below (in red)We have received a large number of responses both in favour and objecting to the changes and it has taken time to work through these.Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.

I have stated my concerns about the plans for neepsend previously We are a small business running for 18 years now,finding it very difficult after covid,utility price increase, food price increase, and green air zone which has hit our customers who say they will no longer be able to use the shop due to cost of it.Now we are going to be left with no parking on road for customers or staff how are we supposed to get passing trade.The plan below which was previously consulted on in early 2022 shows how the area is proposed to look for parking provision. As you can see by the thick black lines (Proposed Pay and Display parking) Burton Road retains a number of areas to park (20mins free and charging previously advertised). The thin black lines show where the Council proposes double yellow lines (Loading permitted at all times)

Neepsend has always been industrial hgv vehicles delivering constantly if burton road becomes 2 way there will be no way these vehicles will be able to do there jobs.The changes to parking and introduction of double yellow lines will ensure that two way traffic is possible and the new restrictions should also make loading and access for HGV's easier. The changes will also remove pavement parking which is a problem for walking in Kelham and Neepsend.

		<p>I would like to know if it is the plan to get rid of all the businesses and make all neepsend residential because how things are going this will be the outcome. This is not the aim of either the parking scheme or the Connecting Sheffield Scheme for Kelham, Neepsend and City Centre.</p>
<p>13</p> <p>Page 290</p>	<p>I was at the consultation at Kelham Island yesterday and was advised to put my concerns to SCC in writing through this email address.</p> <p>At that meeting I was told that coming from Hillsborough I will still be able to come through the bus gate going towards the city centre to access my employer's car park on the right on Neepsend Lane but going back to Hillsborough I will have to turn right out of the car park go up Percy Street onto Hicks Street to go onto Rutland Road so is this correct?</p> <p>With this in mind my first concern is that between say 6.30 -9.00 am and again from say 4.00 – 6.00 pm Rutland Road both up and down is more often than not nose to tail traffic so the proposed new junction at both Hick Street and Boyland Street (where they meet Rutland Road) will be a nightmare for traffic trying to get onto Rutland Road or across it. This will especially be bad from Hick Street as in addition to traffic on Rutland Road vehicles coming out of Boyland Street to go over to Platt Street (being the proposed diversion) will stop vehicles turning right from Hicks Street to go up Rutland Road. As it stands vehicles can be stuck at that junction, who want to turn right up Rutland Road, for 5 to</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Many thanks for your comments and further questions (see responses in red below).</p> <p>Also thank you for visiting us at the information event held at Kelham Museum. We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and it has taken time to work through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>I was at the consultation at Kelham Island yesterday and was advised to put my concerns to SCC in writing through this email address. At that meeting I was told that coming from Hillsborough I will still be able to come through the bus gate going towards the city centre to access my employer's car park on the right on Neepsend Lane but going back to Hillsborough I will have to turn right out of</p>

10 minutes waiting for someone to let them out or chancing it while traffic both ways are travelling at speed. In effect as a driver you are looking up and down Rutland Road and across at Boyland Street which is in addition to possible cyclists on Rutland Road travelling down the hill fast.

My second concern is that I work on the corner of Rutland Road and Burton Road and on the front of our building (Burton Street aspect) there is parking for clients' cars and service vehicles so with the intended bus gate will vehicles still be able to access this area, which is on private land, from both ways?

My other comments are: -

1. As the bus service around the junction that the bus gate proposed is very sparse as there are only 2 routs (7 & 8) and the timings for these are not regular even when running so why are they given priority?
2. There is also very little foot traffic and cyclists so again why are they given priority? The percentage of buses, footfall and cyclists over the percentage of cars, vans and lorries that use this area are very small.
3. All around this junction there are so many small business manufacturers, bars, shops and housing so where are all the people on who these businesses rely on for trade and deliveries together with people who live here going to park as there are no parking facilities around there other than on the roads. My feeling is that business will shut shop and people looking to live out of the city will not want to come out this way if they do not have

the car park go up Percy Street onto Hicks Street to go onto Rutland Road so is this correct?**This is correct yes**

With this in mind my first concern is that between say 6.30 -9.00 am and again from say 4.00 – 6.00 pm Rutland Road both up and down is more often than not nose to tail traffic so the proposed new junction at both Hick Street and Boyland Street (where they meet Rutland Road) will be a nightmare for traffic trying to get onto Rutland Road or across it. This will especially be bad from Hick Street as in addition to traffic on Rutland Road vehicles coming out of Boyland Street to go over to Platt Street (being the proposed diversion) will stop vehicles turning right from Hicks Street to go up Rutland Road. As it stands vehicles can be stuck at that junction, who want to turn right up Rutland Road, for 5 to 10 minutes waiting for someone to let them out or chancing it while traffic both ways are travelling at speed. In effect as a driver you are looking up and down Rutland Road and across at Boyland Street which is in addition to possible cyclists on Rutland Road travelling down the hill fast.**The level of traffic travelling through the area is predicted to drop and through other schemes planned for the Ring Road we predict more drivers will stick to this circular route. That said we will look to monitor the Hicks Street / Boyland Street / Rutland Road junction an adjust in future if necessary.**

My second concern is that I work in Cannon House which is on the corner of Rutland Road and Burton Road and on the front of our building (Burton Street aspect) there is parking for clients' cars and service vehicles so with the intended bus gate will vehicles still be able to access this area, which is on private land, from both ways?

designated parking resulting in the re-development of this area to stop dead in it's tracks. Can't SCC see that all the derelict buildings around here, including the area at the junction of Rutland Road and the A61 Penistone Road, could be pulled down and the land cleared so it can be put to good use i.e., parking to alleviate this problem. In this way SCC could get extra revenue. Do departments in SCC talk to one another to join up the dots?

Finally, please will you please put this email address down so that I get notifications going forward.

They will be able to access it as you do accessing the car park – the exit route will also be the same.

My other comments are: -1. As the bus service around the junction that the bus gate proposed is very sparse as there are only 2 routs (7 & 8) and the timings for these are not regular even when running so why are they given priority? **The strategy is to remove through traffic to make it a better environment for active travel – less traffic will mean cyclists can be in the road with limited traffic accessing businesses and residential properties. To enforce this a bus gate is proposed (rather than closing the road) therefore the Council also promotes another sustainable mode of transport and locks in journey time savings for this mode for the future.**

2. There is also very little foot traffic and cyclists so again why are they given priority? The percentage of buses, footfall and cyclists over the percentage of cars, vans and lorries that use this area are very small. **Kelham Island has become an increasingly vibrant and cosmopolitan inner-city residential district and visitor destination, and Neepsend is now following suit. The St Vincent's Quarter around West Bar and Shalesmoor is also seeing new homes developed across the inner ring road, linking Kelham and Neepsend to the city centre. Connecting Sheffield: Neepsend–Kelham–City Centre has been designed to reinforce and accelerate the development of Neepsend and Kelham, helping to improve the environment for those living in, working in and visiting these areas.**

3. All around this junction there are so many small business manufacturers, bars, shops and housing so where are all the people on who these businesses rely on for trade and deliveries together with people who live here going to park as there are no parking facilities around there other than on the roads. My feeling is that business will shut shop and people looking to live out of the city will not want to come out this way if they do not have designated parking resulting in the re-development of this area to stop dead in it's tracks. Can't SCC see that all the derelict buildings around here, including the area at the junction of Rutland Road and the A61

Penistone Road, could be pulled down and the land cleared so it can be put to good use i.e., parking to alleviate this problem. In this way SCC could get extra revenue. Do departments in SCC talk to one another to join up the dots? **The main drivers for a scheme in this area are that we would be delivering a scheme included within both Sheffield's parking and transport strategies, as well as planning for the West Bar development currently on site (which does include a car park, but will likely be operated commercially) as well as planning ahead for a significant amount of development (around 1,500 units within the current boundary, over 2,000 if you include the Wickes site) planned in the area over the next 15 years or so. We do also get complaints about – and witness - both difficulty in larger vehicles both getting around the area and having space to deliver to businesses in the area. This is the reason why a number of places where people currently park are being replaced by double yellow lines in the design – you can still load and unload on double yellow lines, as long as there is no loading restriction (shown by kerb 'blips').** Finally, please will you please put this email address down so that I get notifications going forward. **Noted and will advise on when the Committee Meeting will take place.**

14	<p>Good Afternoon,</p> <p>I have some question in regards to the revised Kelham to City project.</p> <p>On the West Bar Green and Tenter Street plans, the description above this image says: "As well as this, the segregated cycleway which is proposed to run along Tenter Street from the roundabout will now run up to Solly Street rather than the Hampton by Hilton hotel car park, as previously proposed. This will help to improve connectivity for cyclists."</p> <p>On the north side of the road, the cycleway extended westwards of Solly Street, is this wrong on the new consultation image?</p> <p>Within the same topic, can you tell me which sections are one way cycle tracks and which are intended to be two way? Is it 2 way along the south side and 1 way along the north? The thickness of the cycleway on the plans are unclear.</p> <p>For the top end of Neepsend Lane, can I ask one question and make one comment.</p> <p>Will the cross roads still have a dedicated cycle crossing? This is the most dangerous point of the route and it is unclear if the protected cross road is being removed at the same time as the cycle lanes.</p> <p>On the comment, given that parking & servicing space will be retained in replacement of the cycleways, will you be providing cycle parking along that stretch, ideally located in the carriageway? This would enable people to visit the new businesses here which have very low levels of cycle parking.</p>	See above Response to No.5
----	--	----------------------------

15	<p>While I personally approve of the scheme outlined, we do have some reservations as a business.</p> <p>It says that “From the Gardener’s Rest pub on Neepsend Lane to the junction with Rutland Road, through traffic movements will be restricted to buses, cycles and pedestrians only. Access for deliveries will be maintained and taxis will be able to pass through the bus gates on Burton Road."With this in mind could you please outline the details for vehicular access for staff, customers and visitors for businesses operating on Bardwell Road, Douglas Road, Vale Road and Wallace Road.</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Thank you for your comments and question regarding access to Bardwell Road, Douglas Road, Vale Road and Wallace Road.I can confirm that should the scheme go ahead and traffic orders made as detailed on the web site, access to the roads above for staff, customers and visitors would be as follows;From the North-West (As existing from Penistone Road, Neepsend Lane and then left onto Bardwell Road).</p> <p>From the North East (As existing from Rutland Road, right onto Boyland Road then right onto Bardwell Road).From the South East (this would change to Harvest Lane / Burton Road, right onto Hicks Street then across to Boyland Road and right onto Bardwell Road). From the South West (partly as existing through Rutland Road and then instead of left onto Neepsend lane, left onto Boyland Road and then right into Bardwell Road.In essence the trips to and from the roads mentioned above from the north remain as existing, but from the south it means different routes to avoid travel through Neepsend Lane, with the overall strategy being to improve the environment for pedestrians and cyclists through Kelham and Neepsend by diverting through traffic to travel around the edges.</p> <p>Further improvements to the ring road (already completed at Bridgehouses in 2020 and proposed for Shalesmoor in future years) should also assist traffic flow on here and reduce the need to ‘rat run’ through Neepsend and Kelham. I hope this information helps Kind regards</p>
16	<p>I am in support of the proposed TROs and the works proposed as a whole. I regularly cycle and walk in the area, as well as leading group cycle rides in the area. The proposals will be great for Kelham and help promote much needed active travel.</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Thanks for your comments regarding the recently advertised TRO's for the Connecting Sheffield scheme at Neepsend / Kelham. Without providing any of your specific details, I will ensure that your support is included in a report which will be submitted to a future meeting of the Council’s Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind regards</p>

17	<p>As a local business owner in Neepsend, I have never been so worried for me and my family.</p> <p>You're going to cut off the passing trade in Neepsend lane, upon which we heavily rely. We bring A LOT of custom to Neepsend, not only does it support local businesses and bring them lots and lots of trade when we host our events, it also gives other businesses of Sheffield a platform to sell, helping the local economy.</p> <p>If you go ahead with these changes, you are going to RUN BUSINESSES INTO THE GROUND. Small businesses are already suffering due to your ridiculous clean air zone, now you're spreading this plague to Neepsend and Kelham Island, it's like the council want small businesses to fail and suffer. Not to mention, paid Parking in the area is going to put off lots of people visiting Neepsend.</p> <p>Turn this back around, otherwise you're going to kill Sheffield.</p>	See response to No.1
	<p>I have become aware of the plans Sheffield City Council are proposing on closing sections of Neepsend to vehicles, including the section of Neepsend lane where my business has been for many years. Not only is this going to be cutting off this small business' passing trade, but it's also going to make it extremely inconvenient for myself and people I know to access the business easily. This is one of the most reliable businesses I use, there's no online marketing, they rely on returning customers, word of mouth, and passing trade. This is going to be extremely detrimental to this business if these plans go ahead, as well as a massive inconvenience to myself and plenty of other people too!! seriously hope you consider the impact this will have on all parties involved and come up with alternatives that will consider these impacts. The support small businesses need in these very uncertain times should be of utmost importance within today's climate</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>

19	<p>Hello</p> <p>I have just seen an Instagram post from a local business, regarding proposed permanent road closures and one-way system for the Neepsend area, expressing some concern about the likely effect on local businesses.As a resident, this is of concern to me also.I wonder if you could direct me to relevant information online or elsewhere?</p> <p>Many thanks</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Firstly apologies for the delay in responding to your query.</p> <p>We are currently working through the feedback we have received for the proposed Traffic Regulation OrdersYou can view all the plans and proposals at tinyurl.com/49ajj2nv If you want to look at the specific TRO's which complement the above please visit the following links;www.sheffield.gov.uk/home/roads-pavements/traffic-orders (go to the drop-down list -'Proposed Traffic Orders'). Details of the original Kelham/Neepsend parking scheme which were consulted on in Jan 2022 are available at www.sheffield.gov.uk/parking/new-parking-zones</p> <p>If you have any further questions please let me know or you can submit comments by the 10th of April. If you do have any comments (in favour or otherwise), we'll consider these and see if changes can be made to address any concerns. If it's not possible and objections remain outstanding, the matter will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind Regards</p>
20	<p>I gather you will have received a number of emails rejecting the plans to the roads around Neepsend and the impact this will be having on local businesses.</p> <p>The city has sadly become a shadow of its former self and the implementation of all these traffic schemes are having a severe impact on people's livelihoods. Myself included as from Monday I will have to pay £300 a month just to leave my home in Kelham due to the previous road closures which is forcing me to reconsider my weekend job which I need. I therefore wish to state that I oppose the plans to redesign the Neepsend road system.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>

21	<p>I am writing to you after reading about the changes you are making to Neeps end!</p> <p>It's going to make accessing the area impossible for us! Not only have you brought in the clean air zone which has caused thousands of people to change their routs to work and vehicles they are driving which might I add a lot can't afford to do, you are now changing the roads around the area which people use daily! This is going to have a catastrophic effect on the business around that area!</p> <p>Absolutely ridiculous!</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind Regards</p>
----	---	--

Good morning.

I have received this morning proposed road changes to the area around Neepsend Lane, and the formation of a bus/cycle route.

I wish to raise my objection to this part of the scheme as this will have a large detrimental effect on the local business on that road. The impact on this closure will seriously impact on our business. In addition it will impact on the amount of business obtained from passing traffic, which when the road has been closed in the past has seriously impacted financially the business.

As a council you are trying to enforce a clean air zone, but in the process causing more unnecessary vehicle usage when customers are trying to access these premises, either via additional travel time or confusion upon access to roads. I understand and do agree with some of the proposals in this overall plan, but the closure of this road to passing traffic does seem a step too far for the local area.

Furthermore making bus/cycle gates at the end of these roads also throws confusion many will not expect vehicles to be using this route. We/you should be encouraging local business in the area not driving it away. What exactly will happen to this area, apart from leaving more derelict buildings from failed businesses, there can only be so many bars in the area!

Regards

Hello .

Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.

We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind Regards

I am shocked to learn of the council's plans to close roads to vehicles in the neepsend area of Sheffield and am emailing both to object to the plans and support the upcoming small businesses in the area. As well as new, blossoming businesses the area is full of newly revived existing businesses that are benefiting from the increase in trade and attracting new visitors to Sheffield. All benefit from passing trade in the area and closing roads - and parking areas - will be terribly detrimental to all businesses. Not to mention the area is also becoming partially residential and sought after - and this plan will affect residents.

Can I ask what the benefits are of these closures? Is something being put in place to either compensate or help local businesses with this inconvenience and threat to their trade? Does the council not think there are enough restrictions, one way systems, clean air charges and high parking costs restricting visitors to the city centre? I hear they're also planning on charging to park too - which I understand and am happy to do to prevent irresponsible parking and help maintain the communal areas - but if prices match other areas in town, I will no longer visit or spend money in the area. Parking costs already prevent me from visiting Sheffield all that often. Such a shame Sheffield is putting barriers in place for potential visitors rather than encouraging them to return.

Thank you for your comments on the Connecting Sheffield scheme to improve active travel links to and from the City Centre from Kelham and Neepsend as well as various other issues and concerns. I have noted your objection to the proposals. We have received a lot of comments both in support and objecting to the proposed changes and we are currently working through these. I can see you have requested further information and asked some questions. Over the next few weeks I will have a look at these in more detail and come back to you with a more detailed response once I have had chance to speak with members of the project team. We always try to make changes where possible to address concerns, however if we can't make changes and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.

Kind Regards

Thank you for your e-mail. Whilst traffic management measures are proposed within Kelham and Neepsend, access to all businesses is retained. The traffic management measures such as one way systems aims to reduce the volumes of traffic travelling through Kelham and Neepsend and provide more priority for buses, pedestrians and cyclists to improve sustainable access between Neepsend, Kelham and the city centre. The closure of Neepsend Lane at the junction with Rutland Road is required to allow pedestrian and cycle crossings to be introduced at this junction.

Kelham and Neepsend are popular for long stay parking as it is free and unrestricted. This leads to a lack of parking opportunities for customers of local businesses and residents. The construction of properties at West Bar is also expected to provide additional parking demand in the area. It is therefore proposed to introduce parking charges in Kelham and Neepsend and a decision on this scheme is expected in July 2023.

		Kind regards
Page 301	<p>24 To whom it may concern, I am writing to you out of concern for local businesses in the Neepsend area of Sheffield that will be affected by the proposed traffic control measures. Although I understand the need to reduce emissions and keep roads safe for all users, I feel that some of your plans have not been fully thought through. There are a number of long-standing family-owned businesses in the area whose trade will be seriously affected by the lack of access to the area. The proposed one-way system with bus gates, creating a long diversion around the area will be a nightmare for many people who will choose to take their custom elsewhere. I am concerned that many of these businesses will simply disappear as the cost and difficulty of relocating will be too much to bear. In addition to these plans, I also have concerns about the general impact on the city centre to small businesses, and the increased traffic around the centre, as people choose to divert around the proposed clean air zone, particularly as the Sheffield Parkway (the main access to the M1) is included in this scheme. Thank you for taking the time to read this and I hope that you consider taking another look at some of the proposals in order to support Sheffield business both now and in the future.</p>	<p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p>

25	<p>Hello,</p> <p>We strongly support these proposals. We have a couple of questions / comments regarding the designs. Neepsend Lane/Rutland Road crossroads - does this still have a dedicated cycle crossing allowing people cycling along Neepsend Road in either direction to cross over Rutland Road?</p> <p>This is the most dangerous point of the route and it is unclear if the protected cross road is being removed at the same time as the cycle lanes. Please can the crossing be reinstated if it has been removed from the plans?</p> <p>Neepsend Lane - given that parking & servicing space will be retained in replacement of the cycleways, we need additional cycle parking along that stretch, ideally located in the carriageway? This would enable people to visit the new businesses here which currently have a handful of cycle stands.</p> <p>Please add or relocate a Cyclehoop rack to this location. Tenter Street - On the West Bar Green and Tenter Street plans, the description above this image says "the segregated cycleway which is proposed to run along Tenter Street from the roundabout will now run up to Solly Street" however, the plan shows the cycle way continuing westwards of Solly Street, is this wrong on the new consultation image?</p>	<p>Thanks for the comments and further questions on the Connecting Sheffield Kelham, Neepsend, City Centre scheme. We have received a large amount of responses both in favour and objecting to the proposals and it is taking time to work through the comments so apologies for the late response to your e-mail. In response to your questions (see below in red);</p> <p>Neepsend Lane/Rutland Road crossroads - does this still have a dedicated cycle crossing allowing people cycling along Neepsend Road in either direction to cross over Rutland Road? This is the most dangerous point of the route and it is unclear if the protected cross road is being removed at the same time as the cycle lanes. Please can the crossing be reinstated if it has been removed from the plans? At the Neepsend Lane crossing / crossroads, given the space here, we have been able to propose a segregated crossing facility on the western arm (made possible by closing the end of Neepsend Lane), on the eastern side we unfortunately don't have the same space so this crossing is proposed to be a toucan facility with slip offs/ons for cyclists on approaches. We are currently amending the detailed design at this location so it works with the new layout on Neepsend Lane, north of Rutland Road. Once the detailed design is complete I can share further information if useful?</p> <p>Neepsend Lane - given that parking & servicing space will be retained in replacement of the cycleways, we need additional cycle parking along that stretch, ideally located in the carriageway? This would enable people to visit the new businesses here which currently have a handful of cycle stands. Please add or relocate a Cyclehoop rack to this location. Agree that cycle parking would be</p>
----	--	---

useful here and we can also incorporate this into the above. We will hopefully also have the ability to add additional cycle parking through any further developments on the eastern side as and when these come forward.

Tenter Street - On the West Bar Green and Tenter Street plans, the description above this image says "the segregated cycleway which is proposed to run along Tenter Street from the roundabout will now run up to Solly Street" however, the plan shows the cycle way continuing westwards of Solly Street, is this wrong on the new consultation image? **This was an error on the plan on the website which showed the northern side cycle lane going past Solly Street, now corrected. The links here work so that a bi-directional cycle track will continue further up Broad Lane / Tenter Street accessed by a crossing adjacent to the Solly Street junction.**

Given the amount of questions and comments received on the project, we are happy to take further responses (in favour or otherwise) on the TRO's until early April. Following this we will be writing a Committee report to be submitted for consideration at the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. I hope this information helps

Kind Regards

26

This email is in response to the proposals for the 'Connecting Sheffield: Neepsend-Kelham-City-Centre' scheme. I am a resident in kelham, I understand the need to make areas of the city centre more pedestrianised, but I do not agree with the changes put forth for the above scheme.

The changes proposed for the Kelham/Neepsend area are too extreme and harsh. I believe it will have an extremely negative impact on the community and especially the businesses in the area. This is one of the main routes in and out of the City Centre, with the introduction of the clean air zone which started Monday 27th February, there will already be an improvement in the traffic volume around this area. Plenty of people drive in to the area to walk and visit the small businesses, especially on the weekend. The changes proposed will only put people off visiting the area, which will cause a drop in the footfall, people will not want to pay to park here. This is one of the reasons the City centre is so derelict, because people do not want to pay to park to spend a day out with family or friends, especially when there are places like Meadowhall in the immediate area. Also as a resident of Neepsend I am not happy to see the changes being brought in, I personally have a parking space but getting in and out of that car park via the intended changes to the road layout will mean a huge diversion for myself, when the council are trying to improve the air quality of the city centre? It doesn't make any logical sense.

Also the plan to introduce paid parking on the current free parking areas is just an excuse for the council to make more money out of the working class. Yes people park here and walk in to the centre for work, who wouldn't when the standard daily rate to park in a multi-storey car park in the centre is anywhere between £6 - £20 per day. This is also applicable on the weekend, which again is the main reason people park in to the area and walk in to town. The introduction of the bus gate is also a baffling idea. There are 2 buses that come through this area, the 7 & 8 service, which run the same route with 1 slight diversion on each. I've never seen the bus struggle to get through the area so the idea of

Hello

Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend. We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.

Kind Regards

	<p>introducing a bus gate for 2 buses to use does not make any logical sense. Again I feel that the proposed changes for this scheme are too harsh and will only have a negative impact on the area, which is a shame as it's often said that Kelham/Neepsend is an up and coming area. I personally love living around here because of the small businesses, bars and restaurants, but also because the area is easy to get out of and is connected to the main routes in and out of the city, to Meadowhall, the motorway etc.</p>	
<p>27</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 305</p>	<p>We wish to log our objections to the proposed Neepsend Road Scheme. As "Ladies of a certain age" (Ie over 60) we are extremely upset if we are no longer able to park near the community businesses that have sprung up in the Neepsend area over the last 5 years. Now no longer a deserted back water, independent and community enterprises have made this a wonderful location to enjoy at weekends. The local community led pub "The Gardeners" has provided a wonderful programme of live entertainment on Sunday afternoons as has the Cutlery Works in providing a vibrant place for whole families to come and eat. We rely totally on using our cars as the area is poorly served with public transport and several of us have walking difficulties.</p> <p>WE also understand that the local factories would have difficulties accessing their own business premises if certain roads are restricted in usage. There is no public car park to use, so the side roads off Boyland and Bardwell are vital to enabling families to access the businesses on Neepend Lane without prohibitive parking penalties. As there are no residential premises there, our cars are not causing a nuisance to anyone. Surely the only voices that actually matter in this debate are the business owners who have benefitted Sheffield in providing a thriving alternative safe recreational area for families and older people who do not use the "dying" city centre. Have you asked for and taken their views into account?</p>	<p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. We will also be taking into account the comments received at the information event held at Kelham Island Museum at the end of February. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p>

I am writing to object to the proposed Neepsend road scheme. I have been a Sheffield resident for many years and take an interest as to what changes are made in the area. I have studied the proposed changes and I cannot believe how ridiculous it all looks. It is worse than the Shalesmoor cycle lane fiasco that was introduced a few years ago, only to be removed a couple of months later. Neepsend Lane is a major route through the area which has worked well for the past 50 years and more, the proposed diversion of the B6074 is total madness which will cause traffic mayhem.

Regarding the proposed parking restrictions, these will severely impact the local businesses in the area. I have been a regular visitor to this area for the past 20 years. Boyland street is a total dump that has been neglected by the city council for all the time I have known, there are the empty buildings which become more unsafe by the day. On the plus side, there is somewhere to park when visiting the area. Why not start by cleaning up the area and making safe the derelict buildings. As it is, the area works quite well, although some improvement is needed. This appears to be another Sheffield City Council stick to beat the motorist with. Please take note that this is my objection to the scheme.

Hello.

Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.

We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. We will also be taking into account the comments received at the information event held at Kelham Island Museum at the end of February. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind Regards

Good afternoon

It has been brought to our attention the proposed changes to the road layout around Neepsend / Burton Road and surrounding area. Whilst we are aware of the, recently launched, Clean Air Zone and the proposed parking permit scheme in the same area, we were not aware of the additional changes planned in regards to the bus gate scheme, rerouting the B6074 and the series of changes to existing traffic movement. We are struggling to comprehend how we are to easily continue to access services if the proposed scheme goes ahead. There will be problems accessing other businesses we do trade with. The added complication of crossing Rutland Road, which is already a busy road at all times of the day, especially rush hour to access Platt Street, takes us away from a business we need to access we would have to loop back on ourselves, extending the journey and travel time. How this extended journey can be deemed to be better under the Clean Air Zone scheme, when it actual requires us to take a longer route than currently exists.

Whilst we understand the directive behind the scheme and the idea to connect the Kelham Island area with the City Centre, what must be taken into account is the fact that a large percentage of the Kelham and Neepsend area is still an industrial and commercial area, with long standing established businesses. These businesses currently exist and work cohesively together with other users and residents, this adds to the attraction, draw and unique footprint of the Kelham and Neepsend area. We believe the proposed scheme will destroy this current footprint leaving many businesses no option other than to re-located / sell, thus changing the whole dynamic of this unique community. We hope that all points raised will be considered and that a sensible resolution will be forthcoming in regards to the future of the businesses and industries in this area.

Kind regards

Hello

Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.

We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. We will also be taking into account the comments received at the information event held at Kelham Island Museum at the end of February. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind Regards

30	<p>Dear Traffic Regulations department,</p> <p>It's disappointing that no one in your service has acknowledged or responded to my valid questions. As there is so little information it is not possible to understand the impact of prohibiting vehicles on vicar lane, on residents and services to residents via vehicles. Nor is it possible to understand what your are aiming to achieve or the process by which you arrived at this regulation.It's now been over a week now, which is more than reasonable time to expect a response. Consequently I have submitted a complaint, reference 201001285407.</p> <p>Please can you respond with answers to questions within the council complaint policy timescale of 3 working days.</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail We have received a lot of comments, both in support and objecting to the proposed changes for the Housing Zone North Connecting Sheffield scheme (Kelham, Neepsend and City Centre) and we are currently working through these, providing further information where possible. I can see you have requested further information and asked some questions – please find a response to these below in red</p> <p>1)why haven't Chimes residents been informed?Our design and construction partner for the Housing Zone North (HZN) Connecting Sheffield scheme let us know a few weeks ago that the delivery company they use had not been able to access some of the apartment blocks in your area. To address this we followed up by sending a letter out by royal mail which I am glad to hear you have received. Given this information arrived with some residents and businesses late we wanted to extend the date for consultation and therefore this is why the letter states the 3rd April and the street notice shows an earlier date. It has taken the team some time to run through responses and supply further information, so we are happy to receive further indications of support or objections to our proposals into early April.</p> <p>2) the traffic order took ages to find on the website as it was placed under Housing Zone North movement , while others are under specific roads or districts.The proposed changes for Vicar Lane do form part of the HZN Connecting Sheffield scheme. The letter you have received will provide links to where all the proposals can be</p>
----	--	--

found. The changes to Vicar Lane, which puts in a point closure between the two access points will stop through traffic using Vicar Lane but retain full access from either Campo Lane or Church Street – it will be possible to move both ways (two way) to and from the closure point (which will be enforced by a row of bollards which still allows through movements for Pedestrians and Cyclists).

3) it suggests vehicles are prohibited from driving on vicar lane 2 metres from st James house. Can you answer the following: **As above there would be a row of bollards in between the two buildings – removing through traffic but retaining access to both buildings.** In a residential city centre block of flats, with a 1 way road accessing its 2 car parks , if vehicles are prohibited how do:

- 1) residents get their cars in and out of the Chimes **Access will be from Campo Lane (in and out)**
- 2) how do taxis drive to collect disabled residents, and my disabled mother from visiting? **Access will either be from Campo Lane (in and out) or from Church Street (in and out).**
- 3) how do furniture deliveries get to the building? **As above**
- 4) how do I get my weekly Tesco and Waitrose online food deliveries when they park on vicar lane? **As above but they shouldn't be parking on the footway to make deliveries.**
- 5) how do plumbers and electricians get to the car park to service my flat? **As above from Campo Lane.**
- 6) how do I get online courier deliveries? **As above but they**

shouldn't be parking on the footway to make deliveries.

7) how do bins get collected? Refuse collection would be as above either from Campo Lane or Church Street.

Residents who live in residential city centre apartments require access to and from services with vehicles that need to drive on the road you are prohibiting driving on. Including those without cars who live there. Agreed and access is still possible as indicated in the ways described above.

It's very disappointing after last time to still find the council has an allergy to communication with affected residents and instead chooses to communicate via lamppost in 2023. I can only apologise again that you didn't receive the first letter we sent out to accompany the TRO street notice. As indicated, as soon as we were aware of the problem we sent out a follow up by royal mail. Also as indicated we extended the consultation time so that people had time to respond to the proposed changes.

I hope the information above helps

Kind regards

31	<p>I am writing to you to lodge my objections towards the planned changes to the current road lay out on Burton road and around the neepsend area. We are a local business who have been based on Burton road for the last 6 years. We conduct face to face meetings on a daily basis with clients and to remove the on street parking and place restrictions on routes would have a massive detrimental affect to our business and the other businesses in and around this area. This area is currently thriving with start up businesses and the council should be trying to help them, not put them out of business.</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. We will also be taking into account the comments received at the information event held at Kelham Island Museum at the end of February. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p>
----	---	---

<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 312</p>	<p>32 Dear Sir,</p> <p>I am writing to protest at the, I find, ridiculous plans for traffic in Neepsend. It seems to me that all you want to achieve by this is to kill off the burgeoning businesses in the area. Nobody will benefit from this scheme, people and businesses will just be inconvenienced and as I've said this could have a serious impact on the small and upcoming businesses in the area. I am pleased to see the crazy plan for Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road have been abandoned and this Neepsend Kelham idea should follow. I live in the area and have witnessed vastly increased traffic on my road since the trial of banning cars from Archer Road. Another crazy situation as we have 2 pedestrian entrances to Chelsea Park in this area. The speed limit here is 30 miles an hour yet just down the road where Brincliffe Edge Road joins Nether Edge the speed limit is 20 mph. So wrong on every level.</p> <p>We were told by one of your colleagues at a meeting at the Bowling Club that the people who designed this hadn't physically visited the area and didn't realise it was hilly. Enough said. I hope you will see the error of your ways and cancel this crazy scheme.</p> <p>Yours,</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. We will also be taking into account the comments received at the information event held at Kelham Island Museum at the end of February. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p>
<p>33</p>	<p>I didn't get to the event myself, our facilities manager went on our behalf and relayed back to everyone on site here. My main issue is not being consulted. I don't understand how you can say an extensive consultation happened without sending letters / emails essentially contacting the businesses you know operate in this area and are to be directly affected by these plans. I see you have lots of visitors on the site but I am frustrated to have only just heard about the site and this information when it's all been decided. The issues about the plans concern the access to our business on Mowbray St being pushed to one small side road as access and parking area changes which will mean it will be very difficult to park anywhere near work and this also causes problems with clients visiting.</p>	<p>Response Provided by Cllr D. Johnson following information event held at the Kelham island Museum</p>

	<p>Our facilities manager is convinced that the new road structures and parking plans have been decided which came as a big shock to everyone here having only just heard about them. Kind regards.</p>	
34	<p>I object to these plans massively! Endangering businesses and the families that have ran them for decades! How can you think this is a good idea? Just like the Penistone Road "cycle lane" this is a joke! I don't know how you can sleep at night knowing you are going to ruin businesses that pay into SCC. Do you have any sympathy for the families that will not be able to pay their mortgages? The families that already can't afford heating? Their children that will go hungry?</p>	<p>Hi</p> <p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. We will also be taking into account the comments received at the information event held at Kelham Island Museum at the end of February. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>
Page 913	<p>Re the cycle lane proposed for Tenter Street. Why? Has anyone actually looked at the number of cyclists in the area? Or should I say the number of non-existent cyclists in the area... It is after all a steep hill and difficult to cycle. But it is also a heavily used traffic road – and a cycle lane will only increase the flow of traffic and therefore increase the pollution in the city centre, which I thought these schemes are supposed to be helping, not making worse.</p> <p>May I suggest that someone takes a more sensible approach and removes this cycle lane – or will it be like Shalesmoor – a complete and utter waste of money and time and removed in a matter of months.</p>	<p>Re the cycle lane proposed for Tenter Street. Why? Has anyone actually looked at the number of cyclists in the area? Or should I say the number of non-existent cyclists in the area... It is after all a steep hill and difficult to cycle. The Tenter Street and West Bar Green/Gibraltar Street proposals continue the 'Grey to Green' style proposals which have been implemented in phases through West Bar, Bridge Street and Castlegate and join with future proposals for the City Centre. The proposals will totally transform these roads offering attractive routes to and from the City Centre and Kelham / Neepsend for walking and cycling. The proposals have also been designed to reinforce and accelerate the development of Neepsend and Kelham, helping to improve the environment for those living in, working in and visiting these areas. The scheme aims to improve connections for active travel and therefore we anticipate trips by walking and cycling to increase on these routes – away from mixing with traffic and in turn improving safety. The increase in popularity of electric bikes also means that gradients can be overcome on</p>

		<p>routes which were once considered difficult by bicycles.</p> <p>But it is also a heavily used traffic road – and a cycle lane will only increase the flow of traffic and therefore increase the pollution in the city centre, which I thought these schemes are supposed to be helping, not making worse. Recently completed schemes at Bridgehouses (Ring Road) and future changes planned for Shalesmoor (Ring Road) are anticipated to create a more efficient system at moving traffic. This is also anticipated to allow improved flows to and from accessing the City Centre when necessary by car, bus etc and follows the overall Transport Strategy for the City.</p> <p>May I suggest that someone takes a more sensible approach and removes this cycle lane – or will it be like Shalesmoor – a complete and utter waste of money and time and removed in a matter of months. Covid allowed the Council to experiment with measures which would be difficult to implement under normal traffic conditions, providing temporary measures to improve cycling and walking during this time. Some were successful and others created problems but all were equally useful to assess future improvements for more sustainable travel.</p>
36	<p>As someone that has worked on Burton road for 5 years, you will be contributing to so much loss of business. I rely on car journeys to and from my work (disabled), and the lack of cameras and lighting and police presence along with the sex worker problem it doesn't even feel safe to be walking around. The parking situation is already bad enough, just make it pay and display. You don't realise how many people rely on nipping in and out of the sandwich shops, coffee shops, and other businesses round Kelham, including taxis that all the small businesses rely on. If this route goes ahead, you could deter us from getting any new custom, or at least reduce it. Not something any of us need at the moment. Don't do this I beg!!!</p>	<p>Hello .</p> <p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. We will also be taking into account the comments received at the information event held at Kelham Island Museum at the end of February. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>

		Kind Regards
37	<p>I would like to raise a objection to this plan, there are businesses which will loose trade based on the plans and it will create even further congestion in the area. The back roads been proposed to be used are used by curb crawls and prostitutes and also constantly have HVGs parked outside business delivering machinery. I genuinely believe that you are killing the city and you should use the funds to fix the roads correctly rather than having gaping holes everywhere.</p>	<p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. We will also be taking into account the comments received at the information event held at Kelham Island Museum at the end of February. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p>
Page 315	<p>I don't know if I am reading the West Bar proposals correctly but are you REALLY planning on reducing the lanes coming past the Hilton Hotel towards West Bar roundabout and making it a pedestrian/cyclist priority roundabout. Have you accurately taken figures of how many, or how few pedestrians and cyclists actually use this roundabout currently. Traffic already moves slowly down from Broad Lane at peak times and to me it looks like your scheme will actually reduce the rate at which this traffic will be able to access onto the inner city ring road causing yet more traffic congestion at your behest. Of course I forget that you are assuming when you extend the pollution tax to personal vehicles the traffic will reduce. I also assume this area will take years to "beautify" and cause great inconvenience to people as it did with the wild gardens on Snig Hill and outside the courts.</p> <p>Personally for me, just a lone figure in the ludicrous decisions re traffic management you have recently taken your plans will mean, when leaving town in my taxi, I will no longer be able to use the Snig Hill/West Bar route so will be forced to exit town via West</p>	Acknowledged Receipt of comments

Street, University and Crookes Valley. If my diversion is replicated by others you will be forcing more and more traffic onto these roads causing even further traffic chaos which if I was a naive soul I would believe is what you want to happen and then you can "attack" these routes too with your very unbelievable schemes. Do you not intend anyone to be able to get into town unless they walk or cycle, a very difficult task for all us elderly and infirm people of VERY hilly Sheffield. I would love to know how all the Councillors get to their meetings. I assume those very able bodies of the Green Party who cause so much inconvenience to most Sheffielders do what they preach by cycling or walking but would love to know what the others do. I really believe in your quest to get people walking or cycling you have absolutely, totally lost all reasoning and consider no one other than cyclists who many I believe are dangerous and aggressive individuals with their belief of God given rights to put everyone else to inconvenience and danger (after almost being severely injured on 2 occasions) by cyclists who think no one else but them is entitled to ride the roads and pavements..

Dear Sir,

I am a residential tenant in the kelham island area and I am wanting to voice my concerns regarding the above. I am all for introducing permits and pay and display parking in the area as it is very frustrating when I see people abusing the free street parking and walking into town however with the proposed road closures there will be nowhere for residents to park anyway.

You thought by closing ball street bridge and alma street that it would reduce traffic pollution in the area but it's just caused more traffic on Mowbray Street. I've lived in Kelham for nearly 6 years and I can't afford to look for somewhere else to live if I'm not even going to be able to park near my own house. Business premises break ins are on the rise in the area all getting broken into overnight last night, why don't you look to increase CCTV in the area which the community would actually benefit from rather than

Hello.

Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.

We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. We will also be taking into account the comments received at the information event held at Kelham Island Museum at the end of February. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.

Kind Regards

	<p>imposing traffic restrictions where the only residents who have voted for it are the ones that don't even drive.</p>	
<p>40</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 317</p>	<p>I've been down to the exhibition at Kelham Island this afternoon and I just wanted to say that as city centre residents me and my family fully support the schemes to reduce traffic, pollution and encourage sustainable transport. I know that some people are upset by the proposed changes and worry about how it will affect their businesses etc. and I can understand their concerns.</p> <p>From our point of view though, we moved to the city centre because we wanted to reduce our car use and have everything on our doorstep. We knew the changes would be coming with the government policy and transport funding being linked to breaking the back of short term car use. We downsized about 18 months ago and spent 12 months in Kelham while we were waiting for our new apartment to be finished. Having lived in an area where public transport was incredibly poor and where you had to drive to the top of the road because the roads were too dangerous to cross, the changes being introduced into Sheffield would have only been a pipe dream. We had two cars and spent most of our time in them driving backwards and forwards. When we moved to Kelham, we got rid of one car straight away. Our other car we use a couple of times a week. We would like to get rid of that if there were more Car Club rental schemes like there are in London. A lot of people support what Sheffield City Council are doing but prefer to keep quiet about it. They don't want the pile on from people who come across as being so dogmatic in their views, they cannot possibly see that a lot of us welcome the changes.</p> <p>Best wishes</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Many thanks for your comments regarding the scheme proposed at Neepsend / Kelham and for attending our information event at Kelham Island Museum at the end of February.</p> <p>Without providing any of your specific details, I will ensure that your support is included in a report which will be submitted to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind regards</p>

41	<p>Hi</p> <p>I disagree with the parking scheme in Neepsend, as I drive a van and already now getting charged to come to work and this will again add another charge onto my daily costs. I strongly disagree with this and feel we don't have a problem here and this will again damage the local businesses.</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind</p> <p>Regards</p>
----	--	---

Good afternoon

We have visited the Kelham Island Museum with respect to the 'Connecting Sheffield: Neepsend-Kelham City Centre scheme' and spoke with the relevant people regarding the proposal and great length. Our main concern regarding the proposal is the 'Parking' issues which have been and remain an issue within the vicinity of our premises. In addition, the proposal certainly raises alarm bells with regard to this issue as it will just be moving the problem and we believe this will impact greatly on our business. We have concerns about access.

It is important that our business supports the emergency services. You will see from the attached, I highlighted the issues we had back in August 2021 and this still remains a problem for us. The proposal for moving 'some' parking from Boyland Street and surrounding areas will potentially move the problem to other streets. In addition, it would be beneficial to understand the thought process with regard to 44 Tonne Articulated Vehicles, Tankers, Trailers etc passing through the proposed route of Boyland Street, Platt Street and Harvest Lane, i.e. will this be possible.

I hope you take the time to look at this email and the attachments within and would welcome any visit if required to discuss/assess our concerns

Thank you for your comments on the Connecting Sheffield scheme as well as various other issues and concerns about parking in the area. We have received a lot of comments both in support and objecting to the proposed changes and we are currently working through these. I can see you have requested further information and asked some questions. Over the next few weeks I will have a look at these in more detail and come back to you with a more detailed response once I have had chance to speak with members of the project team. We always try to make changes where possible to address concerns, however if we can't make changes and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.

Kind Regards

Thank you for your e-mail.

The proposed traffic management measures in Neepsend and Kelham, such as one way systems, aims to reduce the volumes of traffic travelling (travelling) through Neepsend and Kelham and provide more priority for buses, pedestrians and cyclists to improve sustainable access between Neepsend, Kelham and the city centre. All the measures have been designed to accommodate all vehicles including Heavy Goods Vehicles.

The proposed parking restrictions in Neepsend and Kelham aim to

		<p>address parking on junctions, on footways and on both sides of narrow roads. This may obstruct people, especially those with wheelchairs or pushchairs and block access for larger vehicles. Parking should be completely on the carriageway and leave enough space for a large vehicle to pass safely.</p> <p>Colleagues are investigating possible parking restrictions on Douglas Road to improve access to businesses, particularly for larger vehicles. Following these investigations, and if appropriate, a Traffic Regulation Order would be advertised for the restrictions, and [] would be consulted.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
<p>43</p> <p>Page 320</p>	<p>Hi,</p> <p>Read the piece from the city council regarding the revisions along West Bar. Yet again, NO MENTION OF BUS SERVICES!!One can't help feeling that we bus passengers are regarded as a bunch of plebs who do not merit consideration. I myself regularly use services 57 & 57a from Stocksbridge to access not only the City Centre but also the bus & rail stations, while I've also heard concerns from Stannington & Loxley people using the 31, 81 & 82. Then there are those from Grenoside / Wadsley Bridge on the 86.CLARIFICATION PLEASE!!! Being thrown off the bus at Shalesmoor to catch a tram is not a viable option----</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments I can confirm that these proposals do not include any plans to stop bus services at Shalesmoor.</p> <p>The changes which form part of the Connecting Sheffield (Kelham,Neepsend and City Centre) project are anticipated to improve bus journey times through Kelham and Neepsend by reducing through traffic and implementing two bus gates on Burton Road. There are also improvements for buses on Mowbray Street as well as bus stop improvements throughout the scheme. If you can let me know any specific concerns relating to the bus journeys listed below I can forward these to the relevant Council officers / operators / SYMCA to respond accordingly.Kind regards</p>
<p>44</p>	<p>I just came across a leaflet entitled 'REDICULOUS NEEPSSEND ROAD SCHEME' (sic) trying to persuade me to believe that bumper-to-bumper traffic and nightmare parking are a <i>good thing</i> for Neepsend and that your scheme will somehow 'kill trade'.In this case, I'm just writing to tell you that your scheme has my <i>full approval</i>. Traffic is a curse, especially the larger SUVs that seem to be breeding alarmingly, and anything you can do to keep them firmly <i>out</i> of this area has my full support.Pedestrianisation <i>works</i>, and the thought of being able to idly wander down by the river, then back towards Yellow Arch studios for a coffee without the <i>noise</i>, the <i>pollution</i>, the outright <i>terror</i> when contemplating some</p>	<p>Many thanks for your comments regarding the recently advertised TRO's for the Connecting Sheffield scheme at Neepsend / Kelham.</p> <p>Without providing any of your specific details, I will ensure that your support is included in a report which will be submitted to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>

	<p>of the road junctions round here as a pedestrian fills my heart with joy. Thank you for your time, and please do not hesitate to contact me should you want to discuss any issues further</p>	
45	<p>Main comments from Info Event - Restricted hours for bus gate or why that can't be done? Reduce parking bay length of Russell Street (for sight lines for cyclists to cope with cars coming off the ring road) Move bus stop o/s printers (Neepsend Lane) towards Rutand Road junction to aid front door deliveries. Move bus stop on Burton Street towards town to aid deliveries. Additional restrictions. Concern about Hicks/Rutland/Boyland junction – suggested need for signalisation.</p>	None Required

I am sending this email in order to raise an objection to the proposed Neepsend Road Scheme. In the last 5 years many community businesses have sprung up in the Neepsend area. It has become a lively and entertaining location due to the independent and communal enterprises which now exist. At the moment, people in all age groups can and do enjoy these facilities both during the week and at weekends. There are various places to eat and drink, such as the Cutlery Works and the Gardener's Rest which also provides a lively programme of musical events of all genres for music lovers. Due to the area being poorly served by public transport, it is, however, reliant on people using their cars to reach these establishments.

The plan to cut off various side roads will prevent persons, including families, from accessing the places they wish to visit and support, unless they are willing to incur a parking penalty. A public car park does not exist. The proposed Neepsend Road plans will cause financial harm to the business and company owners in the area who rely on the constant support of their visiting customers. This will not continue if the planned scheme goes ahead. I hope that you will take these objections into account and reconsider your plans which will affect business partners, local entrepreneurs, and the general public who choose to take advantage of what the Neepsend area has to offer. Thank you.

Hello.

Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.

We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind

Regards

47	<p>Hello,</p> <p>I'm writing in reference to the above scheme, particularly in relation to my complaint in relation to information about it: complaint 201001285407. I have asked for very specific information in relation to the traffic order proposed for Vicar Lane and how prohibiting vehicles will impact upon residents in the 70 flats accessed from vicar lane. Instead I have been sent a generic standard letter in the post which tells me about the general scheme, but answers none of the questions I asked in my email and my complaint. It also points me back to the website for more information on the traffic order. I complained precisely because there was no specific information and no one was answering my questions. In light of no one responding to my questions (which after all was simply to understand how it may or may not affect residents) I have no other alternative but to object to the prohibition of driving vehicles on vicar lane. What does banning vehicles solve that outweighs deliveries and services and access for the flats? I should also point out that the closure date on the lamppost note is 23rd March but on the letter is 3rd April.</p>	See above response to No.30
----	--	-----------------------------

I have a business based in Kelham on Burton Road

We employ people and are just about to start recruitment for a forth (with growth plans to employ more this year and next)

Our employees come from different areas of Sheffield, our location is based on being able to park on the street with no charges. We also have customers and suppliers visiting us on a daily basis who obviously need to be able to park nearby

Under the current plans we would lose access from certain areas and I believe we would lose on street parking spaces?

This would lead to us having to move premises, which we have invested in, and lose money relocating which could affect the prospects of us employing more people (and making us very sad to leave, as you can imagine)

I understand that you have plans to meet and this might mean "shepherding" traffic through areas but Neepsend and Kelham have grown organically by local people - do you really feel you now need to tell these people how best to organise themselves?

Sheffield is famous for its independent spirit and building things out of nowt - please do not ruin our area by making mainstream

I am happy to discuss anything further

Thank you for your comments on both the proposed parking changes in Kelham / Neepsend and the Connecting Sheffield scheme to improve active travel links to and from the City Centre. We have received a lot of comments both in support and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through these. I can see you have requested further information and asked some questions about the proposed parking changes. Over the next few weeks I will have a look at these in more detail and come back to you with a more detailed response. We always try to make changes where possible to address concerns, however if we can't make changes and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind Regards

Thank you for your e-mail. Kelham and Neepsend are popular for long stay parking as it is free and unrestricted. This leads to a lack of parking opportunities for customers of local businesses as well as for residents. The construction of the West Bar development is expected to provide additional parking demand in the area too. It is therefore proposed to introduce parking charges in Kelham and Neepsend and a decision on this scheme is expected in June 2023. Businesses will have the opportunity to apply for parking permits and we are investigating the number of permits that could be allocated to businesses. There are also schemes that businesses could access with public transport operators which could provide incentives for your staff to travel by bus or tram.

Currently some parking in Kelham and Neepsend is on junctions,

<p>I look forward to hearing from you?</p> <p>Dear Andrew and Oliver Further to my email below, would you send a response with your views and/ or official standing? Also, today (Tuesday 21.03.23) there seems to have been an influx of cars parked on the streets around Neepsend, they arrive around 8.30 this morningas it happens there is also a CCTV van (?) - can you please note that the parking around here today is not a reflection of the normal parking, we have all commented on the fact there are many more vehicles than normal and they seem to be parked erratically Thanks!</p>	<p>on the footway or on both sides of narrow roads. This can obstruct people, especially those with wheelchairs or pushchairs and block access for larger vehicles. Parking should be completely on the carriageway and leave enough space for a large vehicle to pass safely. As a consequence a number of parking spaces will be removed, however parking will be available throughout Kelham and Neepsend and we aim to limit the number of parking spaces that are removed.</p> <p>Whilst traffic management measures are also proposed in Kelham and Neepsend to reduce through traffic, along with localised junction improvements for pedestrians and cyclists, access will be retained for all residents, businesses and deliveries.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
---	--

<p>Page 326</p>	<p>49 Good evening,</p> <p>On returning from a holiday, I have arrived at my business this week to find some significant changes to the area, being proposed on lamposts. Having looked up the maps and information online, I have a series of comments and questions, outlined below. I have also included the email address of the Sheffield Central MP, Paul Blomfield, on this email, as I am sure he will have already heard many questions and concerns raised so far by locals and suspect he is keen to hear all points of view. Please find my comments listed below:</p> <p>*will there be an in-person meeting with business owners and residents in the area offering full consultation?*the designated introduction of only one 'green space' is disappointing. As a post-industrial and current-industrial area, there is a significant lack of green space, wildlife corridors and natural habitats. There are a number of small spaces that can be further developed to create planting to assist birds and bees in the area, as well as providing outdoor space for workers in the area. This should be better considered in my view and there is real opportunity to positively involve local business in creating green spaces, hanging baskets, planting, birdboxes and more.</p> <p>*I can foresee that some of the junctions which have been proposed for redirecting large vehicles, such as flatbed trucks, are unsuitable in turning width and clearance which is likely to cause damage to buildings, cause danger to pedestrians, slow the</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments on the Connecting Sheffield scheme as well as various other issues and concerns. We have received a lot of comments both in support and objecting to the proposed changes and we are currently working through these. I can see you have requested further information and asked some questions. Over the next few weeks I will have a look at these in more detail and come back to you with a more detailed response, once I have had chance to speak with members of the project team. We always try to make changes where possible to address concerns, however if we can't make changes and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail. A consultation event on the proposed Traffic Regulation Order for the Connecting Sheffield scheme was undertaken in February 2023. No further events are planned.</p> <p>The funding for this project is mainly allocated for bus priority measures and infrastructure interventions for pedestrians and cyclists. Planting is proposed where feasible, such as at the Bardwell Road, Neepsend Lane and Boyland Street junction, though unfortunately funding from this project for further green spaces or trees in Neepsend is not available.</p> <p>The proposed traffic management measures in Neepsend and Kelham, such as one way systems, aims to reduce the volumes of through traffic. All the measures have been designed to</p>
-----------------	---	---

movement of traffic and create congestion and therefore increased emissions. It makes better sense to leave roads such as Burton Rd as a main through way, being straight and easier for trucks, and of suitable width for main traffic. Then pedestrianise smaller side roads with continuous walkways, allowing for business vehicle entry/egress to protect staff and customer access. The plans for the one way proposals and truck redirections appear dangerous and not fit for purpose.

I find it hard to believe that this has been effectively surveyed with something like an 18 wheeler present.*outside my own building on Burton Rd there is a bus stop proposed right on our building loading bay. This seems impractical for a number of reasons not only the fact that busses will be obstructed by truck deliveries unloading goods.

*how will bus gates be communicated? Beyond an occasional sign which can be obscured or missed if a bus or van is in the way....(like the woefully communicated tram gate in Hillsborough). Will there be physical tarmac colouring, a physical swipe barrier? Will there be something to prevent this becoming a fine generating trap?

Many of our clients are out of towners, coming from as far as Ireland, Surrey, London, Birmingham and more. They bring their families into this area, spend the day, and spend money here. How will this new maze be communicated to people who don't know the area?*if you intend to prevent and reduce cars passing through the area, presumably there will be a park-and-walk/cycle

accommodate all vehicles including Heavy Goods Vehicles. Colleagues are undertaking further investigations into the locations of bus stops along Burton Road. Access will be maintained for all businesses in Neepsend including along Burton Road, and the proposed introduction of parking restrictions along Burton Road will assist businesses and customers with loading and unloading. Pedestrian and cycle crossings are proposed at the Rutland Road, Neepsend Lane and Burton Road junction.

The signage for the proposed bus gates on Burton Road will be in line with the required regulations. This will include advanced warning signs of the bus gates. Car parks on the approach to Neepsend and Kelham are not proposed.

The proposed parking restrictions in Neepsend and Kelham aim to address parking on junctions, on footways and on both sides of narrow roads. This may obstruct people, especially those with wheelchairs or pushchairs and block access for larger vehicles. Parking should be completely on the carriageway and leave enough space for a large vehicle to pass safely.

Following the Kelham and Neepsend Parking Scheme consultation colleagues are investigating potential amendments to the scheme. A decision on this scheme along with the Kelham and Neepsend Active Travel and Public Transport Scheme is expected at the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee meeting in June 2023.

Thank you for highlighting safety concerns in Neepsend, we will

provision somewhere? The new parking proposals reduce parking capacity significantly. I don't see any car park introduction proposed on the approach to the area so that people can switch to on-foot after arriving from the motorway for example.

*the initial consultation in 2021 re: parking regulations stated that it was to reduce the number of people who park and then walk into town. If this is the case, why are parking charges applicable until 8pm at night? People don't park and go to work in town at 8pm at night. Parking congestion significantly reduces after 4pm in Neepsend. If the proposals were genuinely to help tackle townies using our spaces then charges should end at 4pm to allow the evening businesses to cater for their clients without clock watching. People going out for dinner should not have to clockwatch and rush out of places. This will unnecessarily negatively impact some of the hospitality businesses in the area.

*where will new tree planting occur? Surely an important aspect of fighting emissions and creating pleasant space for walking/cycling is introducing carbon reducing trees and foliage? *neepsend is not a particularly safe area. Its poorly lit and is rife with car crime and graffiti vandalism. For all the newly proposed walking and waiting around at bus stops in the dark after work, what is proposed to keep those people safe at night. If you are reducing the movement of cars in the area this will make even the current semi-busy through-ways more remote/unobserved, particularly for women who are having to walk through the area to get to their, now remote, car or wait for a bus.

*since you wish to reduce cars and promote use of public transport, will you be working with Stagecoach to allow dogs to be taken on the tram? The one main reason I don't tram to work is because I work 12-13 hr days to make my business pay and so my small dog comes to work with me. I believe a rear carriage could be designated as dog friendly, leaving the rest of tram dog-free for people nervous or uncomfortable around dogs. This would be easy to introduce via sticker signs on the rear carriage

raise these concerns with colleagues at the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority who are responsible for public transport infrastructure and with South Yorkshire Police. We will also highlight your request to allow dogs on trams with the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority.

windows. A dog 'in arms' or 'dog in bag' policy could be introduced like on the NY subway system. Even London tubes allow dogs. Many weekend visitors to Kelham and Neepsend have dogs with them. I pass at least 20 or so on arrival to each Saturday shift. If you wish to encourage walking in the area, inevitably that will bring more dogs too. You need to work with Stagecoach to address this.

*I may have missed it but I couldn't see plans for a pedestrian crossing on Rutland Rd/Burton Rd 4way junction. This is already dangerous for pedestrians at current volume. If more people are to be dropping off their cars on approach to the area, this entryway to the area needs serious consideration.*in areas that become pedestrianised or bus-gated off, how will vehicle access be arranged for businesses?

I would appreciate answers to the above if possible and would certainly welcome a Neepsend Community in-person meeting in order to clarify objectives, make motivations clear and transparent, and find a way to support the workshops, heavy industries, and heritage of the area during a phase of development. Gentrification without proper wisdom, consultation and sensitive city planning could seriously harm an area that is not only thriving but also growing. Not to mention some of the businesses that have been here for decades. Any developments should be in support of the local business and resident community, not to the detriment of it, and much more consultation is required to communicate and troubleshoot these proposals.

50	<p>Hi I would like to lodge an official complaint to disagree with your proposed road closures and alterations to roads at Neepsend in particular Harvest Lane and Mowbray St ect. I believe your proposal are not practical for local businesses to maintain access and for customers to access. Our company owns premises on Harvest La we believe we will be seriously affected by your proposals and will seek compensation for loss of use and loss of businesses and loss of access which has not been took into consideration with your plans.</p> <p>Ps I would have thought a representative from your team should have been out to visit us at our site on Harvest la that least discuss your proposal with us, or minimum send out a letter to firms who may be grossly affected by thealterations proposed. Proposal to increase speed limit on Harvest la is a major flaw and saftey risk, also width of Harvest Lane is very NARROW and totally unsuitable to carry all the traffic proposed by you.Hope to hear your feedback soon,</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.Kind Regards</p>
----	--	--

51	<p>Hello</p> <p>I have been looking at the information regarding multiple changes to access to Kelham Island and yet more bus gates! I live in Hillsborough and park in Q Park in Millsands for work and therefore need to access this area on a regular basis. For information - I pay to park and therefore am supporting a business in the city centre, who I assume pay taxes locally as well as nationally.</p> <p>Looking at the plans of proposed routes, how do you go straight forward when you get to the end of Boyland Street to go forward onto Hicks Street when travelling towards town? Are there going to be traffic lights there for this manoeuvre? Otherwise it will be chaos! And are there going to be traffic lights at the junction of Boyland Street and Neepsend Lane for all the traffic getting diverted to turn right at the bottom of Rutland Road going towards Hillsborough? This is a dangerous junction already where the 3 roads meet! How are cars going to access West Bar from Corporation Street?</p> <p>Some of your plans refer to roads but the name of the roads aren't on the plan which is a bit annoying when trying to work out the new proposed route. Plenty of people I know use bars & restaurants in Kelham but do not always drink alcohol and prefer to drive into Kelham due to living on the outskirts of Sheffield and the costs of taxis etc. Where is the proposed parking for those wishing to visit Kelham by car?</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments on the Connecting Sheffield scheme to improve active travel links to and from the City Centre from Kelham and Neepsend as well as various other issues and concerns. We have received a lot of comments both in support and objecting to the proposed changes and we are currently working through these. I can see you have requested further information and asked some questions. Over the next few weeks I will have a look at these in more detail and come back to you with a more detailed response. We always try to make changes where possible to address concerns, however if we can't make changes and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail regarding the project to improve active travel to and from the city centre from Neepsend and Kelham. It is not proposed to signalise the Boyland Street, Rutland Road and Hicks Street junction, though colleagues will monitor the junction if the proposed scheme is implemented to determine if further measures are required. The Neepsend Lane and Boyland Street junction is proposed to be redesigned as part of the measures in Neepsend and Kelham. The plan for this junction is on the Connecting Sheffield website, please visit: https://connectingsheffield.commonplace.is</p> <p>Kelham and Neepsend are popular for long stay parking as it is free</p>
----	---	--

One of my pet hates is electric scooters! They are illegal on public roads and paths and dangerous to pedestrians especially, yet the police and authorities seem to do little about it. You are able to catch motorists out at bus gates with ANPR etc, but how are you going to stop the illegal use of electric scooters on these prioritised routes for cyclists and pedestrians? Nobody seems interested in addressing this, yet are happy to penalise motorists who are easier targets!

For information - I do not agree with implenting of the Sheffield CAZ as you are just pushing vehicles onto the outer routes to go round the city, such as through Hillsborough corner and Rivelin etc, therefore just making pollution worse for residents in these areas! Traffic is still going to drive through the city centre but just get charged for it, so not actually reducing emissions but making money for the council and adding traffic to the outer areas.What is the CAZ money being used for?

I look forward to hearing from you and answers to my questions.

Thank you.

and unrestricted. This leads to a lack of parking opportunities for customers of local businesses as well as for residents. The construction of the West Bar development is expected to provide additional parking demand in the area too. It is therefore proposed to introduce parking charges in Kelham to reduce long stay parking, and pay and display parking would be available for visitors.

The funding received from Clean Air Zone (CAZ) charges needs to cover the operational costs of the scheme over the duration that the zone operates. As more vehicles upgrade income should decline and we will be undertaking a full review of CAZ income and future forecast income and expenditure at the full year review of the scheme aligned with the Government's evaluation.

Any net funding beyond covering the costs of the scheme can only be used to fund improvements to transport in Sheffield in line with the Transport Act 2000 which is the statutory legal instrument. Sheffield's CAZ Charging Order, Annex 5 describes the approach and how net funds could be applied. Please visit:
www.sheffield.gov.uk/sites/default/files/2023-03/consolidated_sheffield_clean_air_zone_charging_order_2023.pdf

Kind regards

52	<p>Having attended the presentation regarding the above at The Kelham museum it served to underline my fears.As the owner of a small business the proposed restrictions could have a serious impact on our deliveries and despatches.It will have the effect of throwing much traffic onto the inner ring road and into the CAZ charging area.The alternative is to go across Rutland Road where no traffic lights are proposed and round a one way system via Hick Street and small back roads to Mowbray Street.I must object very strongly to the proposed changes given the impact they will have on the majority of the small and medium sized businesses based in the area.</p> <p>As a predominantly business area we need as much access as possible and the proposed changes will not help this in any manner, in fact quite the reverse.I hope you take on board my legitimate concerns.</p> <p>Regards</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Many thanks for your response to the Council's Traffic Regulation Order advert to change roads around Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. We will also be taking into account the comments received at the information event held at Kelham Island Museum at the end of February. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.Kind Regards</p>
----	---	---

53

Hello,

I'm a current resident in Kelham Island. I hope this email finds you well. I've recently read and seen the flyers explaining the latest updates regarding the proposed parking scheme in the Kelham Island/Neepsend area. I have concerns I would like to raise with you regarding this. I'm currently living in one of the 'car-free developments' which appears to include a good deal of the apartment blocks within the Kelham island side. I understand the want to introduce car parking permits and would welcome this, but I strongly disagree with the 'car free developments' being restricted from purchasing a permit, given these changes are happening after having moved into our apartment. We would not have chosen to live here if the permits/works were already undergoing.

Due to the nature of me and my partners work we both require cars individually as we can often have to travel to work in different locations within South Yorkshire - an issue I suspect will not be individual to us. With the increasing costs of living, having to spend an extortionate amount for a private car park is the last thing people need e.g. Paying for an annual Q-Park pass is over £2,000. I strongly urge you to consider allowing anyone who lives within Kelham Island/Neepsend, regardless of which property they live in to allow purchasing of at least one car parking permit. Otherwise I object to the proposal. I hope you will consider this when making your decision, as I feel I'm not alone in thinking this will cause a lot of disruption to our daily lives if this goes ahead, or end up forcing us to move out of Kelham due to this which would be a great shame.

Thank you for your e-mail. Kelham and Neepsend are popular for long stay parking as it is free and unrestricted. This leads to a lack of parking opportunities for customers of local businesses as well as for residents. The construction of the West Bar development is expected to provide additional parking demand in the area too.

It is therefore proposed to introduce parking charges in Kelham and Neepsend. Some of the residential properties within the proposed parking scheme have been granted planning consent on the grounds that they would be car free. As such, unfortunately, residents of these properties are not eligible for a parking permit. A decision on the parking scheme is expected in July by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.

Kind regards

54	<p>Good morning,</p> <p>I appreciate the update and the reasons for the delay. Can I expect a response before or after the traffic regulation order deadline of 23rd March?If it is after the deadline, will the TRO consultation period be extended accordingly?</p> <p>Kind regards</p>	Response provided
55	<p>Hi</p> <p>Seems like everything is already decided, it doesn't matter that it affects local business / employees of these business or not.Thank you for the reply anyway.Can I ask when does the parking charges come into place or if they are coming into place at all as we will probably more than likely have to leave the area due to these.</p>	<p>We are currently working through the responses received and towards the end of April we will be writing a Committee report to be submitted for consideration at the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>At the moment we are aiming to get to the next meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee which is in June, however I will be able to confirm this to everyone who has responded to the TRO consultation once an agenda has been set. Further details about the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee can be found in the following link;Although the Connecting Sheffield (Kelham, Neepsend, City Centre) and Kelham parking schemes have been progressed separately, they have been developed to complement each other and work together therefore at the time of writing to you we are aiming to take both to the June meeting for a decision on how to proceed, however as above I will confirm this to you</p>

56	<p>Objection to the new road scheme that Sheffield council is implementing, This scheme will cause my Business considerable disruption especially deliveries. We have Deliveries regularly by HGV s and can take up to 30mins to offload or load up. You Have put a bus stop directly outside my side door which will not only cause problems when we have a delivery and a bus loading or unloading passengers is a health and safety issue . Why the bus stop can't be moved further down the road where regent works is and there is a stone wall and it doesn't impact on any businesses or alternatively further up Burton road where the bus gate is going to be. Also there will be limited parking for staff and clients /customers with this new scheme. The new road layouts will have a very big impact on local businesses especially those that rely on customers pulling up and needing to park for 5-10 minutes Also When we have a delivery and opposite have delivery's or loading up and you have 2 way traffic on Burton road this will be a big problem trying to keep traffic flow</p>	<p>Acknowledgment of objection sent. The design team have reviewed the proposed location of the outbound bus stop and can confirm this will be moved.</p>
----	---	---

57	<p>Hi ,</p> <p>we run a Business , we are very concerned about the proposed new road layout in the Neepsend Area. I strongly object to the road alterations I saw at the meeting at Kelham Museum . For a start Harvest Lane is too narrow for the increase in traffic, & no parking on the beginning of Harvest lane is ludicrous. I am sorry to say your plans could be the final straw for our small local family business! We have been through covid , increased running costs , low emission zone & now this ? We also rent an industrial property in the area , the tenant has already said he will be forced to move if your plans go ahead. Please , please consider local business, our rates are £7,700 & now this !</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail and for attending the drop in session in February.</p> <p>Firstly please accept my apologies for the late response to your e-mail, while going through the spreadsheet of responses I noticed that I hadn't provided a reply to your e-mail at the end of March. We are currently investigating requests made and note the objections received from Neepsend and Kelham residents and businesses in the recent TRO consultation - I have made a note of the issues you have raised.</p> <p>Responses to the TRO consultation will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee (currently anticipated to be in June) where a decision will be made on how to proceed. The proposed parking changes including double yellow lines to manage parking in the area and improve access for larger vehicles can be seen in the following link; (link provided to Kelham parking scheme)I have attached below the current proposals for Harvest Lane which shows parking is only proposed to be allowed in marked bays on one side of the road towards Burton Road where the road width is suitable (see highlighted parking in red). The thick black lines indicate proposed parking bays and thin ones double yellow lines with no restrictions on loading, this should address parking on footways and provide easier access to and from businesses for larger vehicles.</p>
----	---	--

58	<p>Please confirm whether traffic heading North along Hicks St or Percy Street towards Platt Street may instead join turn left to join Rutland Road or are we forced to turn right at the junction between Hick Street and Platt Street? Does a bus gate mean tenants access and deliveries to Albyn Works will be prohibited and what about unloading and loading on Burton Road or Percy St? Is this limited or worse prohibited? We need clear access along Burton Road and Percy Street for the 25 businesses to be able to access our yard and their business entrances as well as trades and delivery drivers. Please confirm the new scheme does not prohibit this.</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>I have just picked up your e-mail which you sent earlier this week Please accept this as an acknowledgement of receipt and that I have seen your questions. I will aim to address your queries early next week and come back to you with a more detailed response. Given the amount of questions and comments received on the project, we are happy to take further responses (in favour or otherwise) on the TRO's until early April. Following this we will be writing a Committee report to be submitted for consideration at the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind regards</p> <p>Firstly may I apologise for the late response to your queries. Please see my responses (in red) below;. Please confirm whether traffic heading North along Hicks St or Percy Street towards Platt Street may instead join turn left to join Rutland Road or are we forced to turn right at the junction between Hick Street and Platt Street? If you are travelling north along Hicks Street or Percy Street you can (under the proposals) continue towards the Rutland Road junction where you will be able to turn left as you can now. Does a bus gate mean tenants access and deliveries to Albyn Works will be prohibited The bus gate shouldn't impact on access for tenants / deliveries as far as I can see, as this will still be possible from Neepsend Lane from the North West and from Harvest lane / Burton Road from the South East as shown in the plan below.</p> <p>Exiting from Albyn Works would however change and this would be via Hicks / Percy (one way) to the North or back on Harvest Lane /</p>
----	--	---

Burton Road (two way to the South East) .and what about unloading and loading on Burton Road or Percy St? Is this limited or worse prohibited? We need clear access along Burton Road and Percy Street for the 25 businesses to be able to access our yard and their business entrances as well as trades and delivery drivers. Please confirm the new scheme does not prohibit this. The extract above shows what is proposed for where on Burton Road / Percy Street (Thin black lines are double yellow lines – loading can be done from these at all times and this change should actually help loading throughout the area. Thick black lines show where pay and display parking is proposed). I hope the information above helps – if you want to make any additional comments or require any further assistance please let me know We are currently working through the responses received and towards the end of April we will be writing a Committee report to be submitted for consideration at the Council’s Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.I would appreciate a call or email to confirm the above tomorrow, 22nd March. Yours sincerely

59	<p>Hi</p> <p>I will begin stating my main issue is when the 28 day TRO began and we visited the discussion evening @ Kelham Island Museum you (the council representatives) admitted the plans are not a true representation or correct of the exact plans, so how can you even begin the TRO process and how do you even expect us to comment and yet still I haven't seen altered plans that are correct and this is now 21st March 2023 (2 days until the TRO ends) this is not acceptable and I am sure this is not following the correct legal procedure or guidelines.</p> <p>These road changes are simply ridiculous and will ruin many businesses in Neepsend noting all consultations regarding these changes were made I didn't see a single positive comment from a business in Neepsend which have all been ignored. This will create major traffic problems as the proposed road layout will simply not work especially for large HGV lorries which will struggle to navigate the area. The Neepsend area is not a rat run or shortcut and traffic is never busy as the main traffic uses Penistone road and there is a fantastic cycle lane that runs along there too. Neepsend Lane and Mowbray Street plus Burton Road are wide main roads could which easily cope with far more traffic than currently passes through. I really do not understand why I am going to have to make a 1.5 mile round trip to get back to my place of work in 1 direction making the LOW EMISSION ZONE look absolutely ridiculous and yes as my employer invested in a newer van to avoid the charges but in reality we will be creating more pollution due to the additional mileage and am sure many</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Thank you for attending the information event at Kelham Museum at the end of February and for your comments below. Please see the additional information in red below to answer your queries. I have made a note of your objection to the proposals and will ensure your comments are included in a report to be presented at a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p> <p>Hi</p> <p>I will begin stating my main issue is when the 28 day TRO began and we visited the discussion evening @ Kelham Island Museum you (the council representatives) admitted the plans are not a true representation or correct of the exact plans, so how can you even begin the TRO process and how do you even expect us to comment and yet still I haven't seen altered plans that are correct and this is now 21st March 2023 (2 days until the TRO ends) this is not acceptable and I am sure this is not following the correct legal procedure or guidelines. The TRO plans can be found on the Council's website Traffic Orders Sheffield City Council (see proposed traffic regulation orders / HZN). These haven't changed since the Council advertised them at the end of February and show what legal changes the Council is seeking to make to change the movement of vehicles in the City Centre as well as through Neepsend / Kelham to facilitate the Connecting Sheffield (Kelham, Neepsend, City Centre) scheme.</p>
----	--	---

other people have stated this.

I would personally like to speak to the planners when giving permission for more bars and restaurants etc without the thought where are all these people going to park if you're reducing parking from 800 spaces to 450? Why as an employee should I pay to park to go to work? My employer's business has been in the same building for a long time, maybe you should listen to the long term businesses not ones who will come and go in a few years. I look forward to your lengthy reply to all of the above points, my employer is taking legal advice as this has all been done unprofessionally and underhandedly.

These road changes are simply ridiculous and will ruin many businesses in Neepsend noting all consultations regarding these changes were made I didn't see a single positive comment from a business in Neepsend which have all been ignored. We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. This will create major traffic problems as the proposed road layout will simply not work especially for large HGV lorries which will struggle to navigate the area. Many large HGV lorry drivers will use sat nav / google map type systems to navigate their way to businesses in areas where we are proposing changing road layouts and access routes. The addition of double yellow lines and managed parking (advertised in 2021) will also assist for access.

The Neepsend area is not a rat run or shortcut and traffic is never busy as the main traffic uses Penistone road and there is a fantastic cycle lane that runs along there too. Neepsend Lane and Mowbray Street plus Burton Road are wide main roads could which easily cope with far more traffic than currently passes through. I really do not understand why I am going to have to make a 1.5 mile round trip to get back to my place of work in 1 direction making the LOW EMISSION ZONE look absolutely ridiculous and yes as my

employer invested in a newer van to avoid the charges but in reality we will be creating more pollution due to the additional mileage and am sure many other people have stated this. The project aims to provide better active travel (walking and cycling) connections between the City Centre and Kelham / Neepsend.

To improve the environment for active travel in the Kelham and Neepsend area the strategy is to reduce through traffic movements so that cyclists can be in the road together with limited general traffic movements (limited to those accessing the area to and from businesses and residential properties). I would personally like to speak to the planners when giving permission for more bars and restaurants etc without the thought where are all these people going to park if you're reducing parking from 800 spaces to 450? It is anticipated that many future housing developments in the area will be car free and also bars and restaurants are not anticipated to generate a big increase in parking demands (parking however will be still possible, but is proposed to be in a more manageable layout (also see above). The proposals put forward for the Connecting Sheffield (Kelham / Neepsend and City Centre) Why as an employee should I pay to park to go to work? My employer's business has been in the same building for 117 years maybe you should listen to the long term businesses not ones who will come and go in a few years. Commuter parking is likely to reduce due to the introduction of parking restrictions including a charge to park. Eligible residents and business will be able to purchase parking permits to enable parking within designated parking bays, although the number of permits per business will be restricted. In addition, visitors to businesses can make use of 20-minute free parking in all parking bays in the area, with availability of spaces expected to be greater than at present. I look forward to your lengthy reply to all of the above points, my employer is taking legal advice as this has all been done unprofessionally and underhandedly.

Hello.

I am writing to object to the whole package of proposals being made to the area and to make suggestions to improve your proposals to reduce any detrimental impact on the existing and future businesses in the area. Let me first try and summarise the aims of the plan. 1. To improve parking in the area for the benefit of local businesses and residents. 2. To improve the accesses for buses in the area. 3. To improve cycling routes into and out of the area. Have I missed any of the key aims of this plan. In general I am unable to speak on behalf of the residents and businesses in Kelham Island as I spend very little time in that area.

I have had a business here in Neepsend for the last 19 years and know this side of the river quite well. My first question is about your proposed cycle route crossing the Ball Street bridge and turning along Neepsend Lane. The question is Where is it going to and Why. This seems to be the key to the whole project around Neepsend. If it is to service the potential 222 homes identified on either side of Boyland St then one must wonder if the disruption and inconvenience to the existing businesses within Neepsend by this proposed re-routing of the road system is going to be worth the cost.

Suggestion 1. There is a 2m wide path which runs from the end of Cornish St in Kelham Island to the side of the Rutland Rd bridge next to Wickes. The entrance to Cornish St is about 20m from the entrance to Ball St. Obviously you would need to make a crossing point onto Rutland Rd at this point. If you move the traffic lights on Rutland Rd back to this point you would be able to integrate this crossing point with the lights, place a cycle space at the front of each of the lights on this junction and there would be no need to make the end of Neepsend Lane a pedestrian zone. As there is not really that much day time traffic crossing Rutland Rd at the Neepsend Lane / Burton Rd junction there is no need to make bus gates and to re-structure the roads around Neepsend which would save a massive amount of money which

I have just picked up your e-mail which you sent last week. Please accept this as an acknowledgement .. Given the amount of questions and comments received on the project, we are happy to take further responses (in favour or otherwise) on the TRO's until early April. Following this we will be writing a Committee report to be submitted for consideration at the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.

could be better spent elsewhere. I also note that no mention has been made of the existing pathway which runs from just above the Woodside lane railway bridge, along the side of the railway, past the old Neepsend Station to meet with Pitsmoor Rd just prior to the proposed walking route.

Parking. I have a great reservation about introducing a pay to park scheme around Neepsend. I will not deny that there are people who park in this area and walk into town to work. I will not deny that there are people who park in Kelham island and walk into town to work. I would question how many people there are who park in these areas and walk into town to work. I do know that over the last 19 years the number of people who drive into Neepsend to work in Neepsend has increased. I also know that the number of people who drive through Neepsend, stop and pick up something from the increased number of food and beverage outlets and then drive on has increased. If you are trying to reduce the number of people who park in Neepsend and walk into town to work then firstly one must surely ask the following questions. How many of them are there? Where do they come from? Why do they drive to this area rather than using public transport/park and ride schemes? Without the answers to these questions I would suggest that putting a pay to park scheme while reducing the number of parking spaces in the area would be akin to using a sledge hammer to crack a nut. Increasing and improving public transport around the city while reducing fares (which could all be done by reintroducing regulation) could go a long way to reducing the issue where charging businesses to allow their staff to park near those businesses seems excessive and will only increase costs overall and your proposed scheme has to end up being self funding. Rather than "By restricting parking to permit holders or pay and display tickets, we want to encourage commuters to park elsewhere" may I suggest that offering commuters a viable alternative would stop the issue in the first instance. I also note that there have been a potential for 132 new homes identified as the development of the old Cannon Brewery site, a further 93 on the site of the old warehousing on Boyland Street and a further

	<p>180 off Harvest Lane and Mowbray Street (let us ignore for now the potential for 966 homes identified just over the river along Penistone Rd.) Could I ask what parking provision has been allocated to these sites or would these all be applying for residents parking permits as well. If so the proposed reduction in parking would make this area untenable.I look forwards to hearing your replies</p>	
61	See above	<p>Hello.</p> <p>I am writing to object to the whole package of proposals being made to the area and to make suggestions to improve your proposals to reduce any detrimental impact on the existing and future businesses in the area. Let me first try an summarise the aims of the plan.1. To improve parking in the area for the benefit of local businesses and residents.2. To improve the accesses for buses in the area.3. To improve cycling routes into and out of the area.Have I missed any the key aims of this plan. Points 2 and 3 are correct – For point 1 Currently Kelham and Neepsend has free and unrestricted parking which means it can be difficult for larger vehicles to get round (and deliver to) the area, but is also used for longer stay commuter parking. The area is likely to be attractive to park in for users of the new West Bar development too, so yes in essence the changes should improve access to business and resident's.</p> <p>In general I am unable to speak on behalf of the residents and businesses in Kelham island as I spend very little time in that area. I have had a business here in Neepsend for the last 19yrs and know this side of the river quite well.My first question is about your proposed cycle route crossing the Ball Street bridge and turning along Neepsend lane.The question is Where is it going to and Why. The project aims to provide better active travel (walking and cycling) connections between the City Centre and Kelham / Neepsend. To improve the environment for active travel in the Kelham and Neepsend area the strategy is to reduce through traffic movements so that cyclists can be in the road together with limited</p>

general traffic movements (limited to those accessing the area to and from businesses and residential properties).

This seems to be the key to the whole project around Neepsend. If it is to service the potential 222 homes identified on either side of Boyland St then one must wonder if the disruption and inconvenience to the existing businesses within Neepsend by this proposed re-routing of the road system is going to be worth the cost. The proposals aim to improve walking and cycling access and safety to existing businesses / residential properties as well as catering for any future demands, as the area becomes more populated. By taking the proposals as far as Boyland Street the Council can also link in with any future developments (Ski Village area etc).

Suggestion 1. There is a 2m wide path which runs from the end of Cornish St in Kelham Island to the side of the of the Rutland Rd bridge next to Wickes. The entrance to Cornish St is about 20m from the entrance to Ball St. Obviously you would need to make a crossing point onto Rutland Rd at this point. If you move the traffic lights on Rutland Rd back to this point you would be able to integrate this crossing point with the lights, place a cycle space at the front of each of the lights on this junction and there would be no need to make the end of Neepsend Lane a pedestrian zone. This path, although recently improved, is not overlooked and is not wide enough (taking into account current cycling infrastructure standards) to accommodate cycle movements through the area. There is also limited scope to widen and improve lighting and safety. When this route comes out onto Rutland Road there would still be the need to get cyclists and pedestrians across the road near the bridge – again there isn't the room here to provide an adequate landing area fully segregated from traffic movements, unless you create this at the Rutland Road, Neepsend Lane junction (again requiring the closure of the end of Neepsend lane to traffic).

As there is not really that much day time traffic crossing Rutland Rd

		<p>at the Neepsend Lane / Burton Rd junction there is no need to make bus gates and to re-structure the roads around Neepsend which would save a massive amount of money which could be better spent elsewhere. Bus gates and road closures / movement restriction orders allows the Council to follow the strategy outlined above to reduce through traffic movements while still prioritising bus travel through the area.</p> <p>I also note that no mention has been made of the existing pathway which runs from just above the Woodside lane railway bridge, along the side of the railway, past the old Neepsend Station to meet with Pitsmoor Rd just prior to the proposed walking route. As above this footpath is not overlooked and is difficult to improve and promote as a direct route from housing / businesses in Kelham and Neepsend to and from the City Centre.</p>
62 Page 347	<p>Dear sir,</p> <p>I ask you to reconsider the bus gate to be placed on neepsend lane. We still have many heavy vehicles using the road to access various businesses. Routing them through small backstreets, as you would have to if you were coming from the parkway, would be dangerous and impractical. On a daily basis the amount of buses using neepsend lane compared to commercial and domestic vehicles is minuscule. Rerouting all that traffic into smaller roads with longer routes will inevitably have a negative impact on air quality and pedestrian safety.</p> <p>Yours sincerely.</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Thank you for your comments on the Connecting Sheffield proposals for Kelham, Neepsend and the City Centre.</p> <p>Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>

I attended the meeting held on Tuesday 28 February 2023 regarding the parking scheme and road changes at Kelham Island and the surrounding areas.

As a business we have already written to inform Connecting Sheffield of our objections at the outset of the proposed changes. I believe that any objections and concerns of ours or the numerous local small businesses in the area have not been listened to. And now we fear that the Traffic regulation order date for objection has passed and we have missed the deadline. From the perspective of Joe Public it is a complicated process to understand how to make any suggestions/objections. From our point of view the parking scheme and the rerouteing of the roads will have disastrous consequences for us and many other businesses in this area, which we have been part of since the early 80's after being moved out of ecclesall road for road widening scheme. A point to note that Neepsend is a majority industrial/business area, with narrow roads, not suitable as the main route. Cyclists/pedestrians if they are the intended beneficiaries of this whole scheme are being prioritised over people trying to earn a living. Loading and unloading are essential for deliveries and customers and parking for staff is a necessity. Our staff have to start work before buses are available (as early as 3.45am 3 days of the week) we work a 5 and a half day week so the parking would be a cost incurred more than £30 per week. This is an unsustainable expense for staff and unfortunately our business is not going to be able to pay staff parking.

This is just the kind of thing that will tip small businesses over the edge. We are already suffering from after effects of Covid, excessive fuel costs, increase in costs of raw materials, clean air zone affecting our wholesale customers collecting their orders and deliveries, also minimum wage increasing by 10%. I voiced my concerns at the meeting. It was said the Council would perhaps reconsider the parking permit idea, is this likely?? We have not even mentioned the ridiculous route we and any deliveries or

Hello

Thank you for attending the information event at the end of February and for your comments / objections below.

We have received a large number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.

	<p>customers coming to our business will have to take to get from the ring road to our premises. I'm not sure it is even possible with the bus gate at the junction of Percy street/Burton Road!!!We request that you please listen to the voices of the business owners is the area and try to help them by making the minimum of alterations nearer the areas where most of the housing is situated and the working heart ofNeepsend as it is.</p>	
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 349</p>	<p>64 I totally Agree that the alterations in plan for neepsend road will ruin businesses and the area needs to be kept commercial and industrial cheers</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Many thanks for your comments and I note your objection to the changes on Neepsend Lane (I assumed you meant Neepsend Lane and not Neepsend Road)</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.Kind Regards</p>
<p>65</p>	<p>See pfd objection letter - To also note that they attended the info event and were pleased we were thinking of introducing DYL to make route from Silver Street easier and also easier to load outside the car park</p>	<p>Thank you for your comments on the Connecting Sheffield proposals for Kelham, Neepsend and the City Centre.</p> <p>Please take this e-mail as a confirmation that your objection to the proposals around Paradise Street / West Bar for Armadillo Storage have been received. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.</p>

66	<p>thank you for the reply. It may take me some time to digest the details.I think that all sounds appropriate and positive from a quick skim over.Thank you for your time,</p> <p>Best wishes,</p>	See Response Above - follow up in general support
67	<p>when will the meeting at the city hall be regarding this? You guys mentioned you were hoping for June and we obviously want to be there.I also hope you guys have seen look north today, if not please watch it on catch to. Lunchtime news on the 24th March. They covered the issue and spoke to local businesses. We've also managed to get this on other news outlets including Yorkshire live as well as an interview on radio Sheffield.This CANNOT go ahead, I can't imagine you have more than 2 comments in favour of the changes.Why can't the council just install some pedestrian crossings to the area, as at the moment there aren't any, and add more bus's to the area because people can't even catch a bus from town to Neepsend at the moment. Road changes are pointless and make no sense.</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Thank you for your additional comments. As indicated at the information event, we are aiming to take a report to the June meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee. Once a report has been written and is confirmed to be on the Committee agenda I will be in touch to let you know an exact date and time. Taking one step back from this however, and as indicated in my e-mail on the 22nd March, (attached below) we will firstly see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses - again I will be in touch once we have run our further investigations following the comments received as part of the Traffic Regulation Order process.</p> <p>Kind Regards</p>

Dear Sirs,

I would like to object to the proposals outlined in the Connecting Sheffield Neepsend-Kelham-City Centre plan. The particular area of my concern is Neepsend.

The proposals do not improve the situation for promoting cycling, they are detrimental to most if not all of the businesses in the area and have not appropriately addressed the concerns set out by businesses in the area during a Zoom meeting of 11 February 2022, in fact the consultation dismissed all the concerns and have subsequently proposed changes which are worse for businesses operating in the area. This has not done what the consultation set out to do by 'Developing Support for the scheme to enable smooth delivery on time and on budget'. The proposals create a barrier to safely connect the new experimental cycle infrastructure changes in Kelham Island to the north of the city by pushing more traffic onto roads previously used to cross the area. By moving the main route through the area to Hicks Street and Platt Street the connection to the quieter Woodside Lane has been severed.

The proposals have not addressed the need for good quality pedestrian and cycle crossing points throughout the area while concentrating on the need for a crossing point at the junction of Rutland Road and Neepsend Lane by closing off vehicular access to the latter. The maintaining of the current one way direction of Ball Street and Lancaster Street continue to create dangerous visibility lines for both Cyclists, Pedestrians and Vehicles. Businesses in the area which will be severely impacted

Hello.

Many thanks for your comments received on the 23rd march, I have noted your objection to the changes proposed for Kelham and Neepsend.

We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed. Kind Regards

by these changes. . These changes will make it even harder to find our business with a complex route through the area. Notwithstanding our business there are many businesses that have been built up on passing trade from the existing main road routes, if these are to move those businesses are bound to suffer. If businesses cannot support themselves through their normal trade then they will cease to exist and the area will become a ghost town, dangerous and not desirable to visit. I remember the days of the red light district in Neepsend and this is not what I want for our city again.

Many of the businesses in the area are also related to automotive trade, at present most of these businesses inhabit the streets that are proposed to be upgraded to the new B route through the area, this would no doubt present an issue for them and their customers being able to park and visit their operations. Sheffield has a proud history of industry and steel manufacturing and yet those businesses that have existed decades still performing that task and succeeding are being persecuting for doing so, the changes will make operating a HGV and articulated lorry incredibly difficult and dangerous to cyclists and pedestrians. The original proposed bus gate was discussed at the zoom meeting and it was suggested that this wouldn't operate at all times, however your proposals do have it in operation at all times. There is a bus stop located directly at the entrance to my business. The improvements to bus routes will not be offset with any increase in services to the area and at present the area has minimal services. The focus on cyclists following the river route is misguided without massive improvement to Neepsend Lane toward Hillfoot Bridge and as such this will not be a route followed by cyclists in preference they will follow the established route along the South side of the river. Details of the proposed junction of Boyland Street, Rutland Road and Hicks Street are negligible and focus entirely on the right turn into Boyland Street, for this junction to perform successfully with the level of traffic flow it will have to be controlled by traffic lights and the provision for a right turn into Hicks Street being made available. The changes South of the

River will push more traffic heading north to Rutland Road and this will again increase the risks to cyclists and pedestrians in the area. Pitsmoor Road however which would be an amazing route to access the North of the city if properly managed has been completely overlooked by this scheme.

The Neepsend area is a heavily industrialised and commercial area, notwithstanding the recent changes in trading it is still such and should never have been included in these proposals or dealt with in a way that suits the demographic of the area. The consultation is a bias one due to the density of people living in the Kelham area compared to the number o businesses in the Neepsend area and by consulting on the entire scheme as one entity it has disenfranchised all the businesses in the Neepsend area. I live in the North of the city and cycle to work regularly, these proposals in my view will make this a more dangerous commute due to the increased traffic on roads I currently use and also due to changes to the junction of Hicks Street and Rutland Road, I do not believe that this has been considered adequately in the designs and therefore I must strongly object.

<p>69</p> <p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 354</p>	<p>In reference to the TRO proposals in Neepsend and the surrounding area. Initially I would like to state how absolutely appalled I, and many others in the area are at the councils lack of openness relating to the consultation which commenced two years ago. I raised concerns at the time stating the way the initial consultation was handled it seemed apparent the plans had been approved and the council were going through the motions, as required, whilst trying to limit the number of concerns raised by the local business community by excluding them where possible. Since the initial consultation it is evident this appears to be the case as none of the concerns raised by the local business community appear to have been considered or addressed. Please find below some of our objections relating to the plans and the justification behind the objection.</p> <p>1. 24/7 bus gate at the junction of Rutland road / Burton road, also bus gate at Burton Road Percy Street.* It is hard to understand why there is such priority being given to both buses and cyclists within an active industrial area, which in it's own rights is a health and safety concern considering the number of commercial vehicles, HGV's, Forklifts and other machinery is actively moving in the area.* The bus gates will require staff driving to the area, customers and delivery vehicles to take excessive detours to reach the required destination within this zone, based on the plans for the road network it will be unlikely HGV's will be able to negotiate the planned system without being forced into the congestion zone.* The introduction of the congestion zone was implemented on the idea this will help improve air quality within the city, yet the proposed plans for Neepsend directly contradict</p>	<p>Hello.</p> <p>Many thanks for your comments, I have noted your objection to the changes proposed for Kelham and Neepsend.</p> <p>We have received a number of comments both in favour and objecting to the changes and we are currently working through the responses. Over the next few weeks we will look to see if any changes can be made to address issues raised by local residents and businesses. If it's not possible to change the proposals and objections remain outstanding, these will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee where a decision will be made on how to proceed.Kind Regards</p>
---	--	--

this message.

2. Directing Traffic along Percy street as a main route through the area.* A concern which has been raised during and after the initial consultation is the number of times this road is blocked by HGV's loading and unloading along with many other large vehicles. As this is an active industrial zone with active businesses it will be inevitable that at some stage there will be a blockage on this main diversion through the area. Currently on these occasions vehicles have multiple options to avoid Percy Street which will no longer be a viable option once these plans have been forced through. This is not an issue which is exclusive to Percy street as numerous businesses in the area utilise large HGV's and vans for deliveries and collections, which can render roads impassable for periods or limited to small vehicles passing.* The additional congestion these blockages will inevitably cause are a direct contradiction of Sheffields city councils claims to reduce congestion and pollution within the city and render the reasoning behind the congestion zone null & void.

3. Closure of Neepsend lane / Rutland road junction for vehicles in preference of cyclists and pedestrians, and redirection of traffic wanting to join Rutland road via Percy street and Hicks Street.* Currently the only safe route to turn right from Neepsend onto Rutland road is via the junction at the end of Neepsend lane which is controlled by lights. Had anyone making the proposals for the road changes visited the area during a working week and rush hours would identify immediately the right turn from Hicks street to Rutland road is dangerous due to the traffic coming from 3 directions. This is an issue which will be severely exasperated upon the introduction of these proposals and vastly increased traffic utilising the junction.* There is no valid justification to pedestrianise or provide preference to cyclists within an active industrial zone.

4. Damage to local businesses* An issue that has been raised throughout the consultation is the immediate and long term

damage to businesses within the area, however very little seems to have been done to address the concerns raised. The proposed changes will have an immediate negative impact to many of the long standing businesses within the area to a point many will not survive the first few months. Many of the other businesses will see a gradual decline in customers due to the difficulty and obstacles that are being imposed which will force them to look for alternate suppliers with easier access. This is a brief summary of some of the concerns which were raised at the initial consultation, none of which have been addressed in the subsequent years.

As previously mentioned it feels this was approved before the consultation took place and everything that has followed has been a box ticking exercise with little to no regard of the issues or concerns of the local businesses which have occupied the area for decades. The working industrial nature of the area has been it's greatest appeal to many of the new businesses that have been attracted to the area and brought life into a once neglected region of the city. It is unfortunate that Sheffield council fail to notice and celebrate this in preference of turning it into yet another faux themed area of no substance. Due to the lack of interest in the concerns of the local businesses, the determination to prioritise an industrial area for cyclists, pedestrians and buses it seems apparent that this is the first phase in forcing the businesses from the area without having the courage to state directly this is the wish of the council long term. This then leads to further concerns of compulsory purchases being forced through in the coming years for the companies you are unsuccessful in eradicating naturally. I find it abhorrent how the council refused many businesses planning and approval for improvements to the area due to it not fitting within the industrial zone criteria then completely contradict that position with these plans.

70	<p>information is not currently accessible on the Connecting Sheffield website – is there an updated link you could provide- it's not clear where the bollards are to be sited on the hill – can you clarify?- removal vans can't reverse into the courtyard – is this the case – I don't see why it would be if there's still access both ways from Campo Lane- have emergency services been consulted about this? – I'm guessing that they certainly have, but please can you confirm?</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>The project team have been going through all the correspondence to the TRO consultation in relation to the Kelham-Neepsend-City Centre scheme as we look to finalise the Committee report which will hopefully go to the June meeting on the 14th June. I have gone through the spreadsheet of correspondence and it looks like I didn't respond to you on the e-mail below – please accept my apologies. We have received two objections to the proposals on Vicar Lane – these will be included in the appendix to the report and addressed in the report itself. I can share the report with you once it is finalised and on the agenda. For now please see my responses to your questions below in red</p> <p>Kind regards</p>
----	--	---

71

From Business

The issue I do want to bring to your attention and get your position on is to do with my business that is also situated in the ward at Neepsend. You are probably aware of the council proposals for road alterations, bus gates and one way systems around Neepsend and I was wanting to know what your take on these road alterations are and whether you would support us in getting these scrapped. There are numerous local businesses which would close due to lack of passing trade and the difficulty of deliveries. The acute lack of parking and the ability for deliveries would also force people to move their business as both employee's, visitors and clients would not be able to park to allow the business to function, fortunately my business fall's into this category of needing to move and not close down. Neepsend has changed over the year's a lot of the changes and the added facilities that have supported the changes have been welcomed by business. This though has the potential to totally change the area to the detriment of business and people livelihoods.

I wasn't aware of the parking scheme it is the Connecting Sheffield scheme which will force business closure's and is the one which is causing the majority of issues. I had had a quick look at the proposed parking scheme and although I don't like the fact it restricts parking and is another added local tax to our business alongside everything else that is on top of us at the moment we could hopefully make this work.

Our business we have a delivery entrance Percy Street. As is typical of this council buried under the Housing Zone North proposal there is a 12 metre at all times bus gate outside across the road from our front door, this was never shown on the Connecting Sheffield maps. That alone will close down Crusty Cob Sandwich Shop whose front door it is bang outside putting those ladies out of business and reducing further amenities for office and factory workers in the area. I'am also unsure how I or

Thanks for your e-mail. Access is retained for all businesses in Neepsend and Kelham including the businesses on Burton Road. Colleagues initially planned Percy Street to be one way between Neepsend Lane and Hicks Street, though due to concerns from businesses, we are investigating retaining two way traffic on the lower section of Percy Street between Neepsend Lane and Burton Road for access and deliveries.

No further public meetings are planned, though the contractor will be available throughout the work.

<p>any of our employee's can access our workplace without getting a fine.</p> <p>I made comments on the original consultation, attended the Neepsend Business Webinar where unfortunately no members of the council attended despite some being in attendance in Community Group Webinar and the Business Group being the most heavily attended event. It appears the council does not care about business and much needed employment within the city and is just working with a small section of the community. I would be grateful if you could pass my comments onto the relevant team, and I think myself and businesses around here would be delighted if they contacted us and came to see us so they can understand the business closures and loss of jobs this scheme will cause in the area.</p>	
---	--

72

Hello,

Re Scheme: SD/2120TCF/01ATM TROI object to, in the strongest possible terms, the prohibition of traffic on Vicar Lane. There is no convincing justifiable benefit to this that outweighs Chimes residents needs and safety. I've today been informed by another resident regarding this proposal of a bollard onto Vicar lane and am extremely appalled that residents have been given zero notice of this. It has taken a fellow resident who I by chance ran into to mention it which is almost one month after the April 3rd consultation date. Do the council have some allergy to communicating with residents that fund it?

80 dwellings use the Vicar lane access to get to their flats and receive deliveries of all goods. I know for a fact there are disabled residents of The Chimes who would be heavily impact by this change as they use delivery services to pull into the courtyard area to make accessing the services easier. I cannot for the life of me understand the benefit of pedestrianising the road, there exists paths of each side currently which is more than usable for people. All that would change is that people would be able to walk 4-5 in a line when in a group that is all. I cannot fathom how that is a benefit that outweighs the benefits of keeping the road as is for the 80 dwellings that currently utilise it. Further to this we do not currently have access to Campo lane as you propose as well as the Chimes car park exiting onto Vicar Lane. Therefore if things were to go ahead you would either need to eliminate the car park which means the property value for residents would decrease or the current building managers would need to establish access to Campo lane therefore costing the residents further as ultimately it would fall on them to foot the bill.

Finally echoing points made by another resident, the emergency service access would be severely affected, are we burn to death or die from accidents due to lack of ambulance/fire truck access just so some pedestrians can walk 4 in a line with their friends down the path? I assume a proper emergency service audit has

Hello

Thank you for your e-mail I have noted your objection to the proposed Traffic Regulation Order (TRO), advertised to complement the changes proposed as part of the Kelham-Neepsend-City Centre, Transforming Cities Fund scheme. We are currently working our way through the responses received and will report all feedback to the TRO consultation to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee (currently anticipated to be in June) where a decision will be made on how to proceed.

Kind regards

	<p>been carried out regarding the plan?In summary I think it is disgusting that you fail to properly communicate with your local residents who elect you and pay for services through council tax. Considering local elections are coming up soon I hope you reconsider the proposal and I hope to hear back ASAP as I currently do not plan to vote for the Green party ever again as this proposal without resident consultation feels like a slap in the face.</p>	
<p style="writing-mode: vertical-rl; transform: rotate(180deg);">Page 361</p>	<p>73 I am writing to you to express my concerns at the proposed traffic scheme that will effect the Neepsend and Kelham island area, the proposed changes will effect my business directly I believe.I have taken the opportunity to study the proposals and I visited the display and meeting opportunity at Kelham island museum earlier this year. Unfortunately I wasn't re assured since the council officer had no answers to my concerns and the detailed drawings of parking and rd detail were not displayed.The closing off of Neepsend Lane with parking either side of the rd will make it very difficult to receive deliveries as many off the loads come on curtain sided HGVs 40' long they would have to block the road, off load then reverse down into any traffic to Percy Street to perform a turn as there is no where for them to turn ahead at the end of the closed rd.Drivers making deliveries and customers will find it even more difficult to locate my business than it already is.Fundamentally I don't believe there has been proper consultation to develop the scheme and look at the broader aims that could be set and achieved to improve the area for pedestrians, cyclists, public transport without detrimentally effecting the many successful business that operate and have helped to develop the area over the past years.Incidentally I do cycle to and from work choosing to leave my van at work and I would be happy tosuggest some simple ways that my route home could be made safer and improved to encourage more people to use bikes.</p>	<p>Hello</p> <p>Thank you for your e-mail and for attending the drop in session in February.</p> <p>We are currently investigating requests made and note the objections received from Neepsend and Kelham residents and businesses in the recent TRO consultation - I have made a note of the issues you have raised. Responses to the TRO consultation will be reported to a future meeting of the Council's Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee (currently anticipated to be in June) where a decision will be made on how to proceed. The proposed parking changes including double yellow lines to manage parking in the area and improve access for larger vehicles can be seen in the following link;https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/parking/new-parking-zonesI have attached below the current proposals for Neepsend lane which shows parking will only be allowed in marked bays on one side of the road (thick black lines indicating parking bays and thin ones double yellow lines with no restrictions on loading.</p> <p>Once we have finalised the report and it's on the agenda I will send you the details.</p> <p>Kind regards</p>

This page is intentionally left blank