

Agenda Item 8

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

South Local Area Committee

Meeting held 1 October 2024

PRESENT: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones (Chair), Steve Ayris, Rob Bannister, Alexi Dimond, Marieanne Elliot, Mohammed Mahroof, Paul Turpin and Ibbby Ullah

4. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

4.1 Apologies for absence had been received from Councillors Nighat Basharat, Maroof Raouf, Richard Shaw and Sophie Thornton.

5. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

6. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

6.1 There were no declarations of interest.

7. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

7.1 The minutes of the previous meetings held on the 7th March and the 15th May 2024, were agreed as a correct record.

8. A61 CONSULTATION

8.1 An update and presentation (published on the Council's website) on the A61 improvement scheme was given by Mark Gibbons (Senior Transport Planner, Sheffield City Council) and Neil Byers (Consultant, Nota Bene Consulting) who advised that the consultation was open until Friday 4th October and further comments were welcomed.

8.2 Mark Gibbons explained that following the closure of the consultation, feedback would be reviewed, then an outline business case put together and detailed designs developed. Due to funding constraints, the project had to be delivered by March 2027.

8.3 The Chair, Councillor Simon Clement Jones, read out the following public question which had been provided in advance of the meeting by Joseph Shroeter:

"Please explain how the impact of proposal 8 from the A61 Chesterfield Road consultation on local residents, will be mitigated/residents will be compensated.

Proposed plans include removing existing parking and replacing to a location where parking is already very difficult with cars parked bumper to bumper on Ulverston Road. Local residents will also face a toucan crossing located directly in front of houses with the impact of increased standstill traffic and the increase in noise/fumes that comes with this in front of properties, as well as the impact of increased light pollution (from the traffic lights) in homes.

How can the clear and large negative impacts on local residents be justified for a few metres of cycle lane that will prove to be unusable

1. The entrance to the proposed cycle lane on Ulverston Road will inevitably be blocked by the car garage - N. Grayson - during working hours.

2. The end of the proposed cycle lane on Woodseats Road will inevitably be blocked by parked cars - with cars competing for less parking the remaining parking on Woodseats Road will inevitably be in constant use. 3. The end of the proposed cycle lane on Smithy Wood Road will also be blocked by parked cars from local residents/the Jupiter car garage. Thus all proposed cycle lanes will be unusable the vast majority of the time?

Have traffic calming measures that slow traffic on Woodseats Road rather than bring it to a complete stop been considered (speed bumps/20 mph zone/speed camera at the junction of Athol Road to name a few possible examples?)

Have the impacts of Proposal 8 on local businesses such as Cob and Crumb/ N. Grayson/Jupiter been considered?

Have planners visited the site of proposal 8 prior to planning? The non-viability of the proposed relocation of parking to Ulverston Road would/should have become immediately clear if so.

Will the council commit to local residents working directly with the planners of this scheme, as well as future schemes, to bring changes that actually benefit the local area for the local population? Only local residents/local businesses can truly know what the local area needs.”

8.4 In response to the question from Mr Shroeter, Mark Gibbons stated that this was useful feedback and confirmed that several site visits had been carried out. The aim was to deliver a safe crossing for vulnerable road users and help cyclists to use the corridor. There may be other ways to deliver those aims e.g. by traffic calming, and such feedback would be taken to the designers. He added that the Council was aware that parking issues were sensitive in this section of the project and adjustments could be made to the scheme to increase capacity and minimise impact. Regarding access to Ulveston Road / Smith Road, there was a balance to be struck between design and regulating people’s parking behaviour. It was hoped that engagement with local users and businesses could prevent parking issues having to be solved via enforcement action. A feedback session for local businesses had been held on the 30th September.

8.5 The Chair advised that in addition to the consultation, Councillors could also help resident’s voices to be heard, and that the public should get in touch with their Councillors, if they wished to make comments on the subsequent phases of the

scheme.

8.6 Mark Gibbons and Neil Byers gave the following information in response to questions from Members:

- Members' points regarding parking spaces being used by other parties, and therefore not available to shoppers, had also been raised by the public. The introduction of metered parking bays could be considered, but at the same time it was important not to stifle economic growth in Woodseats. This was a difficult balance which should be discussed with local businesses and Councillors. It might not be possible to resolve this issue by the time the project had to be delivered in March 2027.
- Regarding potential Council acquisition of an existing private car park, some early engagement had taken place with relevant parties but it might not be within the project budget. This would be considered when the final costs of the scheme were known.
- A suggestion which had been made previously but not actioned, that netting could be put on Heeley Bridge to stop birds fouling the pavement, sounded like an easy fix and would be looked into.
- Safety issues caused by people cutting the corner when turning right at the junction of London Road and Chesterfield Road had not so far been considered as part of the scheme.
- The effectiveness of the consultation website would be reflected upon and whether future consultations could be improved by use of animation or video graphics could be considered, but it was important not to overload people with too much information.
- Regular bus users had contributed to the consultation and their feedback would be compiled in due course.
- No direct engagement had taken place with local schools, but this was a good suggestion which would be taken up.

8.7 In response to several requests that the consultation be extended due to some of the public and local businesses only becoming aware of it recently, Mark Gibbons advised that this was not his decision to make but it was important to draw a line and move onto the next phase of the project, and a four-week consultation was considered to be the correct timeframe. Any comments made after the consultation deadline would be considered as far as possible. However, this could be discussed further with the Council's Communications Team. Further engagement with local businesses could take place after the public consultation closed.

9. DISCUSSION ON LAC PUBLIC MEETINGS

9.1 A presentation (published on the Council's website), on the future of Local Area Committee meetings, was given by Carl Mullooly (Head of Community Services - Local Area Committees, Sheffield City Council) who advised that the team was aiming to find out regarding the establishment of the Local Area Committees, what had worked well, what could be improved, and whether the aims to "engage, empower and enable" were being met. This would be fed into the Council's

“Future Sheffield” discussion.

9.2 Carl Mullooly invited comments from members of the public present as to whether they considered the Local Area Committee meetings to be successful and the following points were made:

- The meeting was held in Nether Edge, but the main agenda item i.e. the A61 scheme, was not local, and this limited the attendees’ ability to input. The topics discussed should be relevant to the ward they were being discussed in.
- It felt like watching a committee meeting just involving the Councillors, there had not been enough audience involvement.
- More effort should be taken to publicise the webcast and encourage the public to watch it.
- More engaging content would encourage more people to come.
- Social media should be used to promote the meetings.
- There were too many Councillors in attendance which meant that they dominated the discussion.
- A suggestion that there be double the number of meetings, each attended by half the number of Councillors, to increase the geographical spread.
- More thought should be given as to how to engage with all residents- not everybody uses social media.
- Not enough use is made of all forms of media to promote the meetings.
- It can feel intimidating to ask questions. The meeting at Meadowhead School where everyone sat around tables had been easier to contribute to.
- There were no young people present.
- Councillors campaigned on local issues to get elected and knocked on people’s doors. Why couldn’t they do this to get residents to attend these meetings? Councillors were only seen before elections.
- The meeting was taking place in Black History Month, and not having any activities relating to this was a lost opportunity to make people feel more represented.
- The meeting should be speeded up, it was too slow.

9.3 In response to points raised by the public, the Chair advised that the Local Area Committee’s budget for communications / social media had been cut and as well as publicity for the meetings, this also affected publicity for the rest of the work of the LAC Teams. For this to change, Councillors would have to argue for more resources. He added that the number of meetings and the quorum of Councillors (six) was in the constitution of the LACs but this could potentially be changed.

9.4 Carl Mullooly thanked the public in attendance for their useful comments which he said would be captured for the project.

10. LAC BUDGET REPORT

10.1 The Budget report which outlined the South LACs approach to its 2024/24 budget, was introduced by David Luck, Community Services Manager, South

Local Area Committee, Sheffield City Council), he also showed a presentation which was published on the Council's website.

10.2 RESOLVED:

That the South Local Area Committee:

1. Agrees the approach set out for use of the 2024/25 budget, using the £100,000 allocation to provide £25,000 per ward to develop projects in line with the South LAC Community Plan
2. Authorises the Community Services Manager to make decisions on expenditure from any budgets allocated to the Local Area Committee provided that:
 - The decision is taken in consultation with the Local Area Committee Chair
 - Spending is in line with any specific purposes of the allocated budget
 - The decision may not approve expenditure of more than £10,000
 - A report detailing the delegated spending decisions taken by the Community Services Manager is presented to the next Local Area Committee meeting.

10.3 Reasons for Decision

The South LAC is asked to approach to its 2024/25 budget outlined in the report to address the identified local priorities within the South LAC Community Plan.

10.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

The LAC could choose not to allocate budgets at this stage, but this would delay local projects and facilities for local communities.

Decisions on grant awards could be reserved to the LAC but this would inevitably delay delivery of priority actions to address specific issues identified in the Community Plan.

All decisions on expenditure to support Community Plan priorities could be delegated to officers. However, this would restrict and undermine the LAC's ability to monitor its delegated budget and delivery of the Community Plan.

11. ROSE GARDEN CAFÉ UPDATE

- 11.1 This item was withdrawn from the agenda due to speaker availability.

12. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

- 12.1 The Committee received the following questions from members of the public who had submitted questions prior to the meeting:

(a) David Bower

"I do not know if I will be able to attend the 1st of October meeting but would like you to investigate the following.

A controversial traffic scheme was implemented nearly two years ago and one of

the good things that came out of this was the traffic lights at Psalter Lane (and Osborne Road).

This work has still not been completed and the costly temporary traffic lights are still in operation.

I believe these are expensive to rent from SRL, so my question is "When will the scheme to finish the curbs and traffic lights be completed?"

Would you please investigate and/or pass on the question if necessary to the LAC South panel."

The Chair read the following response:

"Regarding Osbourne Rd, the work has started on the permanent crossing. There was an issue with the type of surfacing which has caused some delay, that was sorted out last week so things will now progress.

Regarding Psalter Lane, work on the crossing on Psalter Lane is due to start on site on 7th October."

(b) Lucy Ruck

"Hello, I would be grateful to have the following question raised at the meeting next week. It is in relation to the large Crossing at the top of Barkers Rd, going up to Lyndhurst and intersecting with union road.

Apologies for raising this again, and I do appreciate as a Sheffield city council staff member myself, the ongoing difficulties faced balancing resources against public expectations.

However, as this is an issue which concerns myself and several local residents, I feel that I wouldn't be doing my duty as a member of the community, unless I raised it again.

At the top of Barkers Rd there is no signage to slow cars down, and as you will be acutely aware, speeding continues to be an issue, particularly at this intersection where many cars don't stop as they speed up to Lyndhurst Road.

I have raised this issue before, and I'm aware that there often need to be collision statistics before action can be taken. I'm also aware that the issue of speeding is being addressed generally across nether edge. Also, that there are factors out of our control, such as not being able to directly influence the moral imperative of drivers desperately wanting them to slow down!

Having said all of this, we are not necessarily looking for speed bumps, or a zebra crossing - whilst these would be ideal to be placed at the bottom of Lyndhurst, (which is not a bus route). We are initially just asking is there a possibility of even some small signage such as a "slow children crossing" sign at the top of Barkers Rd. There is space for it. And to us, it does seem that it could contribute towards preventing a serious accident.

This is the junction at which many children cross by themselves, going to the various schools across the community, and also members of nearby hospitals and

nhs sites such as autism speech therapy and mental health support -are often accompanied by staff to walk through the community and crossing this road.

I have attached a couple of photos of the area and I'm raising now as obviously gives opportunity for anybody coming to the meeting next week to have a look in person whilst they are on their way as the meeting is literally around the corner!

Appreciate the time taken to read this message and for the ongoing hard work of councillors and Sheffield City council staff working to support our community."

The Chair read the following response:

"The objections to the 20mph scheme are being taken to the November TRC Committee

Thank you for your enquiry regarding speeding in Nether Edge and particularly Barkers Road.

I am pleased to inform you that there is a 20mph scheme planned for the Nether Edge area (which includes Barkers Road) and public consultation on the scheme is due to be released towards the end of May or first week of June 2024. We would anticipate that when the consultation has been completed and any objections reported to Council that the final approved scheme would be constructed in the Autumn 24.

I have asked for incident statistics for Barkers Road and in the previous 5 years there have been no reported incidents, we have a limited annual budget for highway improvements and, unfortunately, there are many areas of the City reporting high incident rates and our budget must be focussed on those areas.

Officers did look at a previous request to provide children crossing signs but we have to adhere to the DfT TSRGD (Traffic Signs, Regulations and General Directions) when installing signs and the directions for this type of sign is detailed for you below. We do not currently have any plans to install signs here due to the relatively low footfall using this particular point to cross and the distance from the nearest schools but, we will continue to monitor this area.

I hope you agree that the implementation of a 20mph will be a significant step in increasing driver awareness of the need to drive at lower speeds on City roads and particularly the roads in Nether Edge."

(c) Peter Garbutt

"Having been a councillor sitting on the South LAC, I realise this comes a bit late for the next meeting on 1st October.

Nevertheless, I wish to bring up the proposal to establish a Climate and Environment subgroup, on behalf of the Gleadless Valley Climate Action Network.

This is a wide-ranging and increasingly necessary topic for local residents to have their say and to access help and advice."

The Chair read the following response:

“Several other LAC’s have environment groups though these appear to be more focussed on managing green spaces than climate change. The South LAC team will convene an initial meeting to gauge the level of interest and will support any group that develops from this”.

12.2 The following questions were asked by Members of the public who had submitted the questions during the meeting:

(d) Max Fawcett

“What actions will the Council take to address the following serious issues in the Nether Edge Conservation Area

- *Pavement driving on narrow roads unable to take two-way traffic*
- *Speeding*
- *Parking on pavements, blocking access for wheelchairs and families*
- *Rat running*
- *HGV Vehicles”*

The Chair confirmed that a written answer would be sent to the questioner and published on the Council’s website.

(e) Owen Atkinson Jones

“Given the Council’s decision to re-open Archer Lane, is it the Council’s position that it is in favour of rat runs?”

In response, a Member suggested that this was a decision which had been taken by the Labour and Liberal Democrat Councillors prior to the election.

(f) Owen Evans

“What can be done to combat/ resolve anti-social and dangerous parking outside schools. Specific repeated issues have been reported to Police on a number of occasions, but no resolution or improvement has been forthcoming”.

Members gave the following information in response:

- Some work had been done to improve signage and prevent parking in school zones, but given it was the parents of the school children illegally parking, it was an ongoing battle.
- The School Streets programme was being rolled out, which included use of barriers. Also, parents were being encouraged to walk to school.
- An enforcement camera at Carfield had been effective and more funding was needed to have more such cameras at other schools.
- A pilot had taken place in North Sheffield where the public could report anti-social parking to the Police by sending in photos/ videos.

(g) Shahid Ali, Alma Cricket Club

“Mount Pleasant cricket nets have been neglected over the last number of years. Whilst the current consultation of cricket nets is welcome at Carterknowle, the majority of the community who use Mount Pleasant nets will not be accessing

those nets. Why has Mount Pleasant Nets become neglected even though it is one of the most used public facilities in Sheffield?

Millions have been drawn down to rebuild the adventure playground site but this facility has been neglected, which has acted as a real hub for the community. Combatting anti-social behaviour and drug dealing in the park. What will it take to be a priority?"

The Chair confirmed that a written answer would be sent to the questioner and published on the Council's website.

The following questions were asked verbally by members of the public present at the meeting:

(h) Maggie Young

Ms Young asked why the Number 11 bus from Heeley had stopped running, with no prior warning, so that residents were left with a much poorer half hourly service and couldn't get all the way back to Heeley at all at night.

Members gave the following information in response:

- The Mayor of South Yorkshire had been invited to a meeting on the subject, but no response had been received from his office. There was little the Council could do as control of the buses was with the Combined Regional Authority.
- There were two live petitions, and the matter had been raised at the Transport Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee. It was hoped to get representatives of the combined authority to a Policy Committee meeting.

(i) Marion Gerber

Ms Gerber asked whether the pavements on Sheldon Road could be cleared of leaves during the Autumn.

The Chair confirmed that a written answer would be sent to the questioner and published on the Council's website.

13. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 13.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the South Local Area Committee would take place on Thursday 3rd December.

This page is intentionally left blank