

Agenda Item 4

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

Meeting held 24 July 2024

PRESENT: Councillors Ben Miskell (Chair), Andrew Sangar (Group Spokesperson), Craig Gamble Pugh, Ian Horner, Ruth Mersereau, Richard Shaw and John Wright

11. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

11.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Alexi Dimond and Janet Ridler.

12. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

13. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

13.1 There were no declarations of interest.

14. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

14.1 The Minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12 June 2024 were approved as a correct record.

15. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

15.1 A petition had been received from Jane Hilton which had received 85 signatures:

“Residents Only Parking on Castle Croft Drive, S2 2BF and S2 2BZ

For the last eight years, residents of Castle Croft Drive have been requesting parking restrictions. Our lives are blighted on a daily basis by the influx of 50 to 60 vehicles using our road as free parking. This results in pavements and driveways being blocked, speeding by some drivers, parking on blind bends, restricted access for large and emergency vehicles, pollution, ASB including drug taking, loud music and litter. Residents are faced with abuse and threats on a regular basis if they ask drivers to move their vehicles away from driveways. We are reporting parking issues and associated behaviour to SYP daily. The situation is impacting on our safety, that of our children and pets and our mental health. It is intolerable.”

The Chair responded with the following answer:

Thank you for coming to the Committee today to present this petition and for the supporting information that you kindly supplied to Members yesterday.

As you will recall, residents in the Park Hill area of the city were consulted on a permit parking scheme back in March 2022 and I recall speaking to many as part of a public meeting at the time.

Of the 1,088 responses to the consultation the Council received, 905 objected to the plans, including some residents of Castle Croft Drive. Sheffield City Council also received a petition with 2,145 signatures against the scheme.

Many of the objections received commented that the proposed project was too large.

A new proposal with a smaller boundary, including Castle Croft Drive, was presented to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee on 15 June 2023.

As you may recall, the Committee voted against the proposal back then, and as part of this it was stated the parking scheme would not be revisited in the near future.

You have raised the issue of dangerous parking in the supporting information that you kindly provided. This Committee has adopted Vision Zero, which is a commitment to eliminate all fatalities and serious injuries on Sheffield's road. We therefore take this very seriously and it is why many Members of this Committee have been dismayed to see South Yorkshire Police cancel Operation Park Safe, which allowed residents to take photos of dangerous parking, with a view to police carrying forward a prosecution. The council does have jurisdiction over aspects of parking in the city and therefore, considering your question I will write to the Chair of Communities, Parks and Leisure Policy Committee to request that appropriate enforcement action is taken.

In terms of a way forward to your petition, I have spoken to your ward councillors and political leaders across this Committee, and we have agreed to ask officers to investigate whether a limited parking scheme covering Castle Croft Drive could be delivered and if so, how this could be achieved at no cost to the council, given the financial pressures that we as a city face. We will ask for that this assessment be made and will write to you in due course.

Thank you for bringing this petition today along with the supporting evidence and photographs.

- 15.2 A petition had been received from Tom Barnard which had received 31 signatures:

“Osgathorpe Drive and Fir View Gardens Residents Petition for Traffic Calming

We, the residents of Osgathorpe Drive and Fir View Gardens, Sheffield, S4, hereby petition Sheffield City Council to re-install traffic calming devices/measures which were removed and not reinstalled after the recent housing development scheme which has extended Osgathorpe Drive by 20 residential properties, both

increasing the vehicular traffic and young children playing on Osgathorpe Drive.”

The Chair responded with the following answer:

Thank you for coming to the Committee today to present this petition and for the supporting information that you kindly supplied to Members.

As you may already know, part of the planning process when the new development was constructed was to make all the private road to the new development adoptable and therefore bring it up to highway standard. As I understand it, there are still some minor snagging issues outstanding with the developer, and the road is not yet adopted. I will ask council officers to look into this further, as I know that this is often an issue in parts of the city and leads to understandable frustration from residents. Please let me get back to you on this.

With regards to traffic calming measures, I have asked officers to look back over documents and there is nothing within the planning conditions that required any traffic calming measures to be introduced and we have no plans to introduce additional measures at this location.

For roads that are already part of the highway network, and I appreciate that Osgathorpe Drive continues to be unadopted, an established process for dealing with such requests and scoring them according to a set of criteria is used. This is to ensure that limited funding available is used in an appropriate manner to target interventions that require the most urgent attention.

Officers have suggested that you and your neighbours may wish to speak with the developer – Great Places, to see if they would have an interest in funding traffic calming measures here, these would have to be installed to highway standards and would then be integrated into our highway network, once the road is adopted. I am happy to work with your councillors to see what additional support we can provide to you in making this case to Great Places.

Thank you for bringing your petition. I can understand just how frustrating this is.

- 15.3 A question had been received from Stephen Clarke regarding cycling on pavements and in pedestrianised areas. Stephen Clarke did not attend the meeting therefore a written response would be provided and published on the Committee webpage.
- 15.4 Three questions had been received from Amy Ashton regarding traffic growth and the impact on Meadowhead roundabout, the A61 bus corridor and Woodseats district centre. Amy Ashton did not attend the meeting therefore a written response would be provided and published on the Committee webpage.
- 15.5 Three questions had been received from Sam Wakeling, Sheffield Safe Streets Now, regarding street and road safety, particularly relating to the Park Hill junction, and involving the community in plans to make the streets in Sheffield safe. Sam Wakeling did not attend the meeting therefore a written response would be provided and published on the Committee webpage.

15.6 Four questions were received from David Cronshaw relating to the impact that the clean air zone had on pollution levels and the income from fines as a result of the Arundel Gate bus gate and clean air zone. David Cronshaw did not attend the meeting therefore a written response would be provided and published on the Committee website.

15.7 A question was received from Dr Mike Smith and Lyndsey McLellan relating to the 20mph strategy. Dr Mike Smith and Lyndsey McLellan did not attend the meeting therefore a written response would be provided and published on the Committee website.

16. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

16.1 A schedule of questions to the Chair, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated. There were no supplementary questions.

17. WORK PROGRAMME

17.1 The Principal Democratic Services Officer submitted a report containing the Committee's Work Programme which detailed all known, substantive agenda items for forthcoming meetings of the Committee to enable the Committee, other Committees, officers, partners and the public to plan their work with and for the Committee.

17.2 In response to Member's questions, it was agreed to review the items listed in Appendix 1, Part 1 (proposed additions and amendments to the Work Programme) to understand which items could be assigned to a Committee date and to keep the need for additional meetings under review.

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

1. agrees the Committee's work programme, as set out in Part 2 of Appendix 1, including any additions and amendments identified in Part 1;
2. considers any further issues to be explored by officers for inclusion in the next work programme report, for potential addition to the work programme; and
3. notes any referrals from Council (petition and resolutions) detailed in Section 2 of the report be noted and the proposed responses set out be agreed.

18. TRANSPORT, REGENERATION AND CLIMATE POLICY COMMITTEE – 2024/25 THE YEAR AHEAD

18.1 The Director of Investment, Climate Change and Planning presented a report that outlined a forward agenda for the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy

Committee for the 2024/25 year, setting out the key steps needed to build on the progress made last year to deliver the Committee's responsibilities under the Council Plan and retain delivery of quality statutory services.

18.2 As there were no City Council elections in 2025, Members discussed the opportunity this presented to the Committee to consider work over a two-year period and bring workstreams forward into 2024/25, particularly where there would be challenging decisions or decisions requiring change. In response to Members' questions, officers agreed to review workstreams and report back to Members on potential items that could be brought forward.

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

1. notes the progress made in 2023/24, recognising the work of Members, officers and partners to establish strong strategic foundations for the organisation and the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee's role in delivering these;
2. considers the key issues identified in section 3 of the report as part of our forward agenda for 2024/25; and
3. agrees to work in collaboration with other Policy Committees to ensure the opportunities and issues identified as Council Plan priorities are taken forward in 2024/25.

18.4 **Reasons for Decision**

18.4.1 The recommendations will enable Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to continue to have positive impact and benefit in delivering on the themes of people, prosperity and planet. It will enable us to effectively prioritise resource in the delivery of our Council Plan by agreeing the key issues that we need to address in the 2024/25 year.

18.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

18.5.1 Not set out a forward agenda for 2024/25 – this was rejected because having agreed a new Council Plan, we need to set out for citizens the things we want to achieve in 2024/25.

19. EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC ORDER - ARUNDEL GATE BUS GATE AND FURNIVAL STREET BUS GATE

19.1 The Assistant Director – City Transport and the Principal Transport Planner – Programmes presented a report that provided details of the consultation response to the Experimental Traffic Order for the Arundel Gate bus gate and the Furnival Gate bus gate, reported the receipt of objections to the order and set out the Council's response.

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

Policy Committee resolves that:-

1. the Arundel Gate and Furnival Gate Bus Gates Experimental Traffic Order (ETO) be made permanent as currently implemented and in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 to continue to secure the air quality and public transport journey time benefits realised;
2. objectors be informed of this decision; and
3. further works to make the infrastructure associated with the bus gates permanent be delivered as part of the wider Connecting Sheffield City Centre scheme.

19.3 **Reasons for Decision**

- 19.3.1 Sheffield's regeneration is flourishing with the Heart of the City 2 being built, "Europe's largest" food hall at Cambridge works now open, and the new Raddison Blu hotel, Leahs Yard and other developments opening soon. In parallel to these exciting new places to visit, the future plans for 20,000 new homes in the city centre and additional employment growth, require a public transport system to match. Arundel Gate is a key route for buses that travel across the City and to our South Yorkshire Neighbours too. Given the air quality and the journey time reliability benefits of the bus gates it is recommended that the current operating times are made permanent. Any reduction in operating hours at this time would reintroduce traffic, increase vehicle emissions and adversely affect bus delays at times when the Council is seeking to encourage people to travel sustainably into and around Sheffield to make use of these new venues as well as take advantage of what we already have to offer.
- 19.3.2 Air pollution is a major public health challenge that is damaging the health and life chances of people in Sheffield, contributing to the deaths of around 500 people a year in the city. Multiple places across our road network are in breach of legal limits for air quality with road vehicles (and particularly diesel vehicles), exposing communities to invisible but harmful concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂). Arundel Gate has been identified as a hot spot for particular high levels of NO₂.
- 19.3.3 Our response to this issue has been a tiered approach of measures which includes the CAZ-C, the Arundel Gate Bus gate and anti-idling measures. – with the bus gate having the greatest modelled impact on air quality improvements.
- 19.3.4 Modelling has shown that only with the introduction of all 3-tiered interventions, can we achieve clean air compliance so approving the bus gate on Arundel Gate to be made permanent allows us to stay on track for this.
- 19.3.5 As well as clean air benefits, bus journey times have improved, and we need to continue to improve sustainable access to our city centre, including the night time economy.
- 19.3.6 A permanent bus gate on Arundel Gate and Furnival Gate forms part of the 'City Centre' Transforming Cities scheme which is in the final detailed design stage and,

subject to SYMCA approval, implementation of this transformational scheme will commence in early 2025.

19.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

19.4.1 Removal of bus gates entirely

This would be contrary to the ministerial direction which the Council has received from the Secretary of State, where the Council is directed to implement a Clean Air Plan with measures that include the Arundel Gate bus gate. Modelling shows that the only way that we achieve clean air compliance in this part of the City Centre is with our “tiered” approach which includes CAZ-C, the Bus Gate and Anti Idling measures. The 2023 AQ data shows that the bus gate on Arundel Gate is having a positive effect on emissions and both bus gates support improved bus performance. This would be contrary to the Council’s net zero commitment. Modelling shows that the only way that we achieve clean air compliance in this part of the City Centre is with our “tiered” approach which includes CAZ-C, the bus Gate and Anti Idling measures.

19.4.2 Reduce hours of operation to 12 hours

As discussed in the report, modelling shows that the only way that we achieve clean air compliance is with our “tiered” approach which includes CAZ-C, the bus Gate and Anti Idling measures. By reducing the bus gate operating times we would be affecting our clean air ambitions. At present, given that not all of the monitored locations on Arundel Gate are compliant the full benefits of the 24hr bus gate in removing emissions from other vehicles is still required. The retention of the 24hr bus lane is therefore recommended and is in line with our Legal Clean Air Plan Direction from Government. As discussed in the report, modelling shows that the only way that we achieve clean air compliance is with our “tiered” approach which includes CAZ-C, the bus Gate and Anti Idling measures. By reducing the bus gate operating times we would be affecting our clean air ambitions. We could also be introducing traffic and delays at times when we really want to encourage people to travel into and around Sheffield to make use of our growing night time offer more sustainably.

This page is intentionally left blank