

Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee

Meeting held 14 June 2023

PRESENT: Councillors Ben Miskell (Chair), Christine Gilligan Kubo (Deputy Chair), Andrew Sangar (Group Spokesperson), David Barker, Craig Gamble Pugh, Ian Auckland, Richard Shaw, Alexi Dimond (Substitute Member) and Sioned-Mair Richards (Substitute Member)

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Ruth Mersereau and Councillor Safiya Saeed.

2. EXCLUSION OF PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no interests declared at the meeting.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 **RESOLVED:** That the minutes of the meeting held on 16th March, 2023 and 17th May, 2023 were agreed as a correct record.

5. APPOINTMENT TO URGENCY SUB-COMMITTEE

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

(a) agrees to appoint Cllr David Barker to serve on the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Urgency Sub-Committee

(b) as respects the appointment of Members to serve on the Urgency Sub-Committee or other Sub-Committees of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, where vacancies exist or in cases of urgency to ensure quoracy or representation, the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the relevant political group whip, be authorised to appoint Members to serve on such Sub-Committees, as necessary, on the understanding that details of such appointments will be reported to the next or subsequent meetings of the Policy Committee.

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

6.1 The Policy Committee received two petitions from members of the public.

The Policy Committee received a petition 'Tesco Extra – Re-open main entrance'. Mousa attended the meeting and presented the petition to the committee.

The petitioner explained that the closure of the store entrance was causing inconvenience to disabled shoppers and the elderly and that the justification was anti-social behaviour outside the entrance.

The Chair thanked the petitioner for bringing the petition and advised that he was aware of the various issues being created by the closure of the Carlisle Street pedestrian access to the Tesco Store at Saville Street. The closure had created unacceptable impacts on local communities with respect to access and health and safety. It also created concerns with respect to equalities and fairness.

Councillors Hussain, Jones and Saeed, had been working to find a solution for the residents that they represented.

This Committee had already asked the relevant regulatory services in the Council to ensure the closure of this entrance was not in breach of any existing consents. If this did not resolve the situation, the Chair proposed to seek a meeting with Tesco's directly alongside local ward councillors and feedback the outcome of this to the lead petitioner and the committee.

- 6.2 The Policy Committee received a petition 'A One-way Idsworth Road'. The petitioner was not able to attend the meeting and a written response would be provided.
- 6.3 The Policy Committee received seven questions from members of the public. One member of the public did not attend to ask their question, a written response would be provided.

The Chair proposed to respond to all the questions relating to the Park Hill Parking Scheme as one.

Question from: Dorothy Dimberline

I'd like to start by saying that up to now I have been in favour of a parking scheme because of the problems of commuter and college parking in our area, and the increasing traffic and resulting air pollution. I could see that the original scheme area was perhaps too big and very unpopular with areas further out who don't have problems with commuter parking, but I think that the new area is now too small.

This amended scheme massively fails the areas that needed help in the first place, as it will move college and commuter parking to the smaller terraced streets nearby where the residents don't have off street parking. If you look at the scheme map you will see that the vast majority of the properties within it have their own drives - for example: Norfolk Road is included and, although it has a lot of commuter parking, all of the houses have drives so residents are still able to park at their house.

If the smaller scheme area is implemented then it's pretty obvious that the cars from Norfolk Road will just drive round the corner to the terraced streets without drives such as Fitzwalter, Stafford, Glencoe and Talbot, which are the very areas the scheme was meant to benefit. I just don't understand why the scheme covers an area where households don't need it but excludes the area that does - surely anyone can see how unfair that is!

I thought that parking schemes were meant to reduce congestion and enable residents to park near their homes but, as it stands, this scheme will do the opposite for those households that needed it most.

I believe that the council is committed to improving air quality in deprived areas in particular and that S2 has been identified as such an area. It would seem however that this does not apply to our terraced streets. If you approve the scheme as it stands you are in effect agreeing to increasing traffic and pollution and reducing air quality in the terraced streets.

We are also just outside the Clean Air Zone boundary so it's also likely that non-compliant vehicles will cut through our area in order to avoid the charges, by turning off Parkway before town and cutting through our streets, then down Granville Road.

I appreciate that parking charges will bring welcome revenue to the council, particularly from the large number of vehicles on Norfolk Road, but I don't think this should be the driving force behind a scheme. If this scheme isn't going to benefit the areas with the biggest problems, I think it should be amended or abandoned as this proposal is only going to make matters much worse for many residents.

If the scheme isn't abandoned then consideration should be given to extending the scheme area to include the terraced streets mentioned, to prevent the inevitable displacement and to improve rather than reduce air quality in those areas.

I appreciate that schemes are reviewed but I think we all know how long the process of review and any resulting action would take and I think it's pretty obvious that the detrimental effect I have talked about will be immediate, so residents will be left with long term problems.

Would the committee please amend or abandon the proposed scheme in line with my suggestion, to prevent even more problems than we have already.

Thanks for your consideration,
Dorothy Dimberline

I have marked out on a map of the scheme the properties with and without off street parking which I think highlights how unfair this scheme implementation would be.

Questions from: Graham Wroe

1. Why there has been no consultation on the revised parking scheme for Park Hill/Norfolk Park?
2. If they will please delay making a decision on this until a proper consultation has been undertaken.
3. If they realise that the revised scheme will undoubtedly cause severe problems to the streets just outside the scheme such as Stafford Street, Glencoe Road and Stafford Road due to displaced parking. These streets do not have facilities for off-street parking and it is already often difficult for residents to park near their homes. With the new scheme, it may become impossible to park anywhere near our homes. As my wife is disabled this will have a significant negative impact on us. To be equitable the scheme should cover the whole area, or not go ahead at all.

Questions from: Steve Burgin

I would also like the following question to be lodged in respect of the Park Hill Parking Zone

- 1) Based on the data provided in the report, 88% of respondents to the consultation were against the scheme in any form. If this committee approves the revised scheme today, ignoring the initial consultation and without further consulting the affected residents, is this the point where democracy in Sheffield died?

Questions from: Sandra France

Park Hill Parking Scheme

I am part of the Protect our Parking Group and these are some of the concerns they have asked me to submit and my own

1. Why does the report give the impression that there has been a consultation on this scheme when there hasn't ?
There was a consultation on the original scheme with over 1100 responses and nearly 90% were against it Apparently, they have just filtered the original consultation data to only show the comments from residents in the new scheme separate to the data for the original larger scheme. This is flawed as some of the comments just say Norfolk Park and no Road and some say yes but only if permits are free, so really a no. Officers state this Committee can decide to implement a smaller scheme without reconsulting should they choose to do so. How can this be right ?
2. This smaller scheme is only a third smaller and affects 17 Roads. We had a meeting in the Town Hall last summer where it was stated that it was the council's intention to reduce the parking scheme to a few roads only. Specifically, Castle Croft Drive opposite the school/college, Park Grange Croft and maybe one other.

The councillors and council staff were very clear on this. Our Councillors have all said if residents don't want the scheme it won't be implemented. What has changed?

3. This Proposal has been going on since February 22. We have asked many times for a public meeting, workshops, meetings with councillors and this has never happened. The former chair suggested a session with a small group of us on the 7th February and this actually only took place on the 7th June, a week before this meeting. Looking at the Crookes and Walkley scheme, residents have had 4 drop in sessions and online and face to face surveys. Why have we not been allowed this ?

4. This scheme encourages people to park on these roads by charging or they would be just permits only. The scheme will cost over £600000 and a significant amount will need to be borrowed at a time of cut backs. The expectations are revenue of £15000 a month, most of it parking charges so how does this equate to stopping non-residents to park ?

5. Granville Road, a main road in to the city where most residents do not have a drive, and Norfolk Road are included. This will displace a lot of traffic on to adjoining Roads who do not have any problems. Where will it all end? Also Norfolk Road is in a Conservation area, how will this look with signs and parking bays etc

6. This council keeps saying you want to listen and collaborate more with local people and learn lessons from the Lowcock report. The LAC's have been created to 'empower Sheffield communities and give local people a real say over decisions that affect them' We have attended these with our concerns and weren't listened to.

Lastly one of the points in the report is :

'The introduction of the Controlled Parking Zone goes against the consultation outcome and there is potential for public opposition to the Scheme'

So why bother consulting?

We ask this Committee to vote against this proposed scheme and abandon it. It is not what residents have asked for.

Questions from: Allison Rossiter

The committee have said that their 2 main reasons for implementing this parking scheme are:

- (1) to deter commuters from using our area as a free parking lot, &
- (2) to thereby ensure there is parking for local residents.

One of the main objections to - not to mention biggest expenses of - this scheme is the pay-and-display meters. If the goals are as above, why not instead make the area a "permit only" zone as they've done successfully in other Sheffield

areas?

This would have the following advantages:

- (1) significantly reducing costs of installation & maintenance, which would mean permit costs could be lower;
- (2) a clear "park-elsewhere" message to commuters instead of an implied invitation with city-centre meters (which are still less costly than city-centre-parking); &
- (3) preserving the residential nature of our Heritage streets.

Follow-up question:

If the only answer to this is "to offer a way for visitors, tradespeople, etc. to park here," don't the visitors' permits given to residents already provide this and if not, why can't the procedure for these visitors' permits be adjusted so it could adequately provide this?

The Chair thanked all the questioners for their questions and the officers for their work on this project. It was explained that the committee was a cross party committee, and that the views of all members on this committee would be heard before a collective decision was reached.

The Chair invited everyone to stay for the discussion and vote to be taken by councillors and gave assurance that a written outcome of the meeting would be sent to anyone who had contacted him on this issue.

Questions from: Nigel Slack

On the 24th May 2023, Sheffield Star published an 'article' / advertisement for Robert Hill, the owner of the Salvation Army Citadel on Cross Burgess Street, a few metres from this Town Hall.

<https://www.thestar.co.uk/business/exciting-new-spa-cafe-bar-and-restaurant-plans-unveiled-for-old-salvation-army-citadel-in-sheffield-4154234>

After purposefully neglecting the building since 2007, possibly in the hope that it would fall down of it's own accord, Mr Hill is now lobbying this committee and public opinion in the hopes of undertaking a radical demolition of significant sections, causing damage to the heart of this grade 2 listed building. The building is only standing today due to the efforts of squatters in 2011 who discovered a water leak in the cellar, damaging the fabric, and holes in the roof, allowing pigeons to foul the auditorium space extensively. The squatters repaired both problems and removed sacks and sacks of guano from the very auditorium in which Mr Hill has the cheek to be photographed.

The fact that Mr Hill has engaged architects suggests he is in pre-application discussions with SCC Planning but feels entitled to breach the confidentiality expectations of these discussions. Mr Hill's historic stewardship of this heritage asset is doubtful and he is playing fast and loose with the planning process, something members of the public and heritage organisations are regularly reminded is not allowed due to the quasi-legal nature of the process.

This council has only recently agreed the importance of heritage to the economic and public health & wellbeing of the city and its citizens, with the adoption of a Heritage Strategy. Mr Hill seems to think he is able to ride roughshod over that strategy by lobbying this committee directly (“The proposal has been sent to the head of regeneration and development at Sheffield City Council ...” Sheffield Star 24/03/2023)

Can SCC confirm whether Mr Hill or his agents are in pre-application discussions with Planning and if so, what sanctions can be applied for his breach of the confidentiality expectations?

Will this committee reiterate a commitment to the Heritage Strategy and to ensuring the principle of 'demolition only as a last resort' is rigorously applied?

Finally, any planning application for this listed heritage building must be referred to National Amenity Society's, for their comments prior to decisions being taken, so will this council encourage Mr Hill to engage early with heritage organisations in the city in order to prevent this turning into a confrontation that would be potentially damaging to the city's heritage reputation and to his own?

The Chair thanked the questioner and confirmed that there was no live pre-application submission being considered by the Local Planning Authority at that time with respect to this building. It was explained that, whilst each planning submission must be considered on its merits, the committee would agree with the sentiment that it would not want to see the demolition – partial or otherwise – of Sheffield's listed buildings, and this should be an option of last resort. That Chair also sought to reassure the questioner of his commitment, and the commitment of the council, to preserving Heritage and the development of a robust Heritage strategy to help safeguard the city's assets, of which the Salvation Army Citadel building was a part. The Chair would continue to work with Cllr Janet Ridler, Heritage Champion, to ensure that all Sheffield buildings and heritage assets were given the protection that they needed.

Questions from: Holly Cutts

I am the owner of an independent business that is located within the ETRO / pedestrian and cycle area. I wish for the ETRO to be removed for the following reasons:

1.The signage at the entrance to the pedestrian and cycle area and also the ETRO states that-

“Permit Holder” means a vehicle with a permit provided for accessing the private parking facility off Canning Street for Division House, 87 Division Street, or which is permitted to access the service areas at Aberdeen Court, 95 - 97 Division Street or at Division House, 87

Division Street Save as provided in Article 5, no person shall cause or permit any Motor Vehicle to proceed in those parts of roads specified in Column 1 of Schedule 1 within the length of road described in Column 2 of Schedule 1 to this Order.

Save as provided in Articles 5 and 6, no person shall cause or permit any Motor Vehicle to proceed in those parts of roads specified in Column 1 of Schedule 2

within the length of road described in Column 2 of Schedule 2 to this Order.

We have had confirmation from SCC and the police that there is no or ever has been any permit scheme for this area. Hundreds of vehicles have been using this area weekly over the last 3+ years, how can they have done this legally when there is no permit scheme in place? I question the legality of the ETRO.

2. parking services have stated via email that "officers have to give a 10 minute observation period for vehicles that are collecting food orders and display a sign, this is a local agreement with management "

If no vehicles are allowed in this area between 10am and midnight , how can this arrangement with management be lawful?

My delivery drivers have to park legally and walk in which is very annoying as most if my deliveries are very heavy.

3. Even first thing in the morning when I arrive at work and the road is empty and there is no traffic, cyclists insist on using the pavements unlawfully, this gets more persistent as the day goes on. This has been witnessed first hand by at least 3 of SCC members whilst attending meetings with us. These actions have caused injury to myself and a number of my clients on various occasions over the last 3 years. The incidents that I have been involved in have been reported to the police.

What is the point in having the ETRO if cyclists insist on riding unlawfully on pavements when areas have been created for them?

Also how do cyclists safely exit the ETRO at the Rockingham St end when they head out onto oncoming traffic?

3. Over the last 3+ years the pedestrian and cycle area has been in place I have lost a number of clients that are disabled or elderly because the vehicular access to my business has been removed. These clients have apologised for no longer using my services but feel discriminated against as they have had their access taken away. This has had a negative affect on my business as I've lost custom and earnings.

4. Also the ETRO is not a safe area for genuine cyclists or pedestrians as the police have pointed out to us a large number of cyclists are using adapted electric bikes needing a licence and insurance. These unlawful cyclists are riding through the ETRO at very high speeds on the road and pavements, the majority of which are take away delivery cyclists. That also congregate in the ETRO blocking the pavements and access to businesses.

For the reasons mentioned above I question the legality of the ETRO and enforcement of the area. The whole area seems to have been ignored by police and parking enforcement and have both been witnessed of turning a blind eye to unlawful vehicles using this area. My husband on a number of occasions has questioned both parties, the response from parking services was " we can't enforce against moving vehicles"

The response from the police was " not our job and not what we're here for "

This is totally unacceptable.

Over the last 3 + years there have been quite a lot of dangerous incidents 3 of which spring to mind. -- In the early stages of the ETRO we had a white van mount and drive along the pavement smashing the roller shutter door off my business, everyone's first thoughts were that it was a terrorist attack, which as there are no barriers could have been quite possible. My landlord had to pay for the damage.

- A Moped came down Westfield terrace in the wrong direction came head on with a vehicle travelling in the correct direction swerved to miss the oncoming vehicle mounting the pavement forcing myself and my husband who had come to help me with the laundry had to jump out of the way to avoid getting hit. They then continued to ride on the pavement entered and rode through the ETRO exiting at the far end. Breaking at least 3 laws.

-and then more recently on the 24th May at 6.11pm a black car came along Division Street did a U turn outside the pedestrian area mounting 2 pavements forcing me once again out of the way with the laundry who had a police car directly behind him who witnessed the incident turned up Westfield Terrace look straight at my husband who waved trying to stop him turned a blind eye and drove off at speed luckily as he always does my husband had his phone in hand and we have a photo of the policeman's face and registration plate.

All these incidents and more have been reported to the police.

My business has been around for approximately 25 years of which I've worked there for 21 years and owned it for the last 4 years. In this time we have never experienced the amount of problems that have arisen since the pedestrian and cycle area was originally put in place for social distancing during the pandemic to the present day.

Because of the ETRO we have lost all the parking on Division Street and Devonshire Street and has now been replaced with double yellow lines where every evening when I'm picked up from work there are vehicles parked end to end on the double yellows facing oncoming traffic, making the road a single lane creating chaos. We are constantly reporting the unlawfully parked vehicles to parking services and are told " they don't have the resources " when we do actually see enforcement officers they just tell people to move on, no Fixed penalties are given so they just drive around the block until parking services have moved on and park back in the same place. So to resolve this problem the parking spaces need to be reinstated. Also because of the ETRO the direction of Westfield Terrace was altered but not correctly, the one way arrows have been turned around and the no entry signs have been moved from one end to the other. So now you have to exit Westfield Terrace onto a tram stop. There is also a major problem with vehicles and cyclists using Westfield Terrace in the wrong direction. Which has also been witnessed by SCC members. As large vehicles e.g. Lorries can no longer exit Division Street onto Rockingham Street which is a wide road

,they now have to go up Westfield Terrace which is not so wide therefore the cab wheels end up driving across the pavement outside the Frog & Parrot the trailer wheels end up going across the opposite pavement, which if vehicles are parked unlawfully makes it even harder if not impossible for large vehicles to get around the corner. Only the other day 8th June there was a collision with an articulated lorry and a black van on this very junction.

As I've said previously for the last 21 years I haven't witnessed as many problems as what I have since the Etro was put in place.

Now I have no vehicular access to my business I have to drag bags of laundry across the pavements avoiding cyclists, then across the so called pedestrian and cycle area avoiding the vehicles illegally using it up Westfield Terrace to the nearest place my husband can legally park to pick me up. This is absolutely ridiculous after doing a 9 hour shift. We have had to do this and put up with it for the last 3 + years so that we are not breaking any laws unlike the vehicles already mentioned. This is a huge inconvenience to us and clients.

As the ETRO was put in place for the prohibition of driving, this obviously hasn't worked as can be proven with the many thousand of photos that we have and has been witnessed by police and SCC members and also most of my clients , many of which have recently signed the attached petition which I have only had time to do over 13 days, which is when we had a meeting with a SCC representative who informed us of the date of the committee meeting and suggested we do so. The 13 days I have been in work I have already got 66 signatures opposing of the ETRO, if I continued with this petition I have over 1200 clients on my books of which the majority would sign as this has been the topic of conversation over the last 3 years.

For my business to hopefully survive another 20+ years and hopefully get back my elderly and disabled clients and once again have vehicular access to my business morning and evening for loading and uploading and again make the area safe and flowing the ETRO needs to be removed , the parking spaces reinstated and Westfield Terrace put back to the direction it was before so that all the original infrastructure can work and be used how it was originally designed for.

I do apologise for the length of this email but I'm a normal everyday person trying to run and continue to make a success of an independent business with no chain or backing from anyone but myself and my clients. My business was the last business to open after the pandemic which I fought to keep open and I will continue to fight for independent businesses.

The questioner was not able to attend the meeting and a written response would be provided.

7. WORK PROGRAMME

- 7.1 The Committee considered a report of the Director of Policy and Democratic Engagement on the Committee's Work Programme detailing all known, substantive agenda items for forthcoming meetings of the Committee, to enable this committee,

other committees, officers, partners, and the public to plan their work with and for the Committee.

7.2 Discussion took place around the priorities of the new committee post-election and how these could be incorporated into the work programme. The extensive workload of the committee was also noted and the number of projects that were already underway with a considerable amount of officer time already having been spent on them.

7.3 It was moved by Cllr Gamble-Pugh and seconded by Cllr Sangar, as an amendment, that the recommendations submitted be amended by the addition at the end of paragraph 1. of the words “subject to the removal of the Green Parking Permits item”. The amendment was put to the vote and carried.

(NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR – 7 Members; AGAINST – 2 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members.)

7.4 It was moved by Cllr Dimond and seconded by Cllr Gilligan-Kubo, as an amendment that the recommendations submitted be amended by the addition at the end of paragraph 1. of the words “subject to the addition of a feasibility study into a workplace parking levy for Sheffield”. The amendment was put to the vote and lost.

(NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR – 2 Members; AGAINST – 7 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members.)

7.5 During the discussion of the above item the Committee agreed, in accordance with Council Procedure Rules, that as the meeting was approaching the two hours and 30 minutes time limit, the meeting should be extended by a period of 30 minutes.

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

1. Agree that the Committee’s work programme for the meeting of the 19th July, 2023 as set out in **Appendix 1** be agreed, including any additions and amendments identified in **Part 1** subject to the removal of the item Future of Green Parking Permits.
2. Agree that all items listed for consideration at the meeting of the 20th September, 2023 and those for which no date is set, be reviewed by the committee before being confirmed on the Work Programme.

7.7 **Reasons for Decision**

7.7.1 To give the committee members an opportunity to consider the direction of the work programme, align it with their key priorities and create a manageable workload for the committee.

7.8 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

7.8.1 It was determined that the work programme presented by officers did not meet member priorities and required further consideration in terms of the workload of the

committee.

8. 2022 - 23 FINANCIAL OUTTURN

8.1 The Head of Accounting introduced the report which brought the Committee up to date with the Council's final revenue outturn position for 2022/23.

8.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee note the updated information and management actions provided by this report on the 2022/23 Revenue Budget Outturn.

8.3 Reasons for Decision

8.3.1 To formally record changes to the Revenue Budget.

8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

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

9. PARKHILL PARKING SCHEME

9.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures on the consultation response to proposals to introduce a Controlled Parking Zone in Park Hill. The report detailed objections to the Traffic Regulation Order and set out the Council's response and recommendations.

9.2 Discussion took place around the reduced area of the scheme following the results of a post-pandemic survey and the potential impact that would have on displacement. It was acknowledged that this was difficult to predict but officers were confident that action was needed to deal with the parking issues in the area and the review process would address any potential displacement.

9.3 Members discussed the consultation work that had been carried out on the amended scheme and the involvement of the ward members. It was noted that although discussions and briefings had taken place, no further public consultation work was undertaken

9.4 It was agreed that although a parking scheme was required the proposed measures did not provide an appropriate solution to the issues. It was essential to conduct additional consultation with local residents in order to develop a scheme that fit with the Council's parking strategy, acknowledged the needs of local residents and dealt with the issue of parking in the area.

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

- Welcomes the development of a parking scheme, however it does not approve the officer recommendations
- Requests that a new scheme is designed and developed in consultation with local residents and all appropriate stakeholders

9.6 **Reasons for Decision**

9.6.1 The proposed Park Hill controlled parking zone will:

- Improve conditions for local businesses residents by ensuring the availability of convenient parking spaces for residents, business and visitors and giving them a greater level of priority where appropriate through issuing permits;
- Improve access through the area and loading and unloading opportunities for all vehicles (especially larger ones) by removing parking at or near junctions; and
- Improve conditions for sustainable travel modes.

9.6.2 Specific responses to the points raised in the feedback to the consultation are addressed earlier in this report. On balance, it is considered that the Council should proceed with the implementation of the Park Hill Controlled Parking Zone in the amended form set out in Appendix C to this report as its benefits are considered to outweigh the concerns raised.

9.6.3 It is good practice to review any highway scheme after it has been active for a period of time to ensure that it is delivering on the benefits expected. Parking behaviours are constantly changing post covid so reviewing the boundary of the scheme after around 12 months will ensure that the scheme on site is the best scheme to achieve our objectives.

9.7 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

9.7.1 Consideration was given to limited waiting, without charging (e.g. 4 hours, no return within 2 hours), with permits considered where appropriate. However, this was discounted for the following reasons:

- Enforcement of the restrictions are more resource intensive and time consuming;
- Puts pressure on existing enforcement resources as limited extra income through enforcement may not cover additional costs;
- Lack of consistency of approach with other areas of the City;
- Residents and businesses could feel that they are being charged to park in the area where visitors (and potentially commuters) may not; and
- There is anecdotal evidence from schemes around the City that suggest that people may move their vehicles part way through the day to avoid the 4-hour restrictions.

10. **REPORT OBJECTIONS TO THE EXPERIMENTAL TRAFFIC REGULATION ORDER FOR BROOMHILL SHOPPING PRECINCT**

10.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director of City Futures on the

consultation response to the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order for the Broomhill Shopping Precinct, including the receipt of objections to the Order and the Council's response.

10.2 Discussion took place around enforcement in the area and the officer explained that as this was a controlled parking zone there was a regular resource available although they were aware that enforcement was an issue.

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

- Approves that a Traffic Regulation Order be made so as to make permanent the restrictions within the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order, as advertised and implemented, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Objectors will then be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team and the order implemented on street.

10.4 **Reasons for Decision**

10.4.1 Before the intervention was implemented in August 2020, there were a few issues with the public space at the Broomhill Shopping Precinct. Cars were often queuing along the A57 to pull into the parking bays causing congestion. Safety was also a concern insofar as cars were also reversing out into the main road out of the parking bays and, in addition to this, there were also issues around the narrow pavement adjacent to the parking bays. This led to pedestrians often walking down the middle of the road.

10.4.2 Since the changes were implemented the air quality has improved, with nitrogen dioxide levels decreasing by 14% in the area. If the changes were made permanent, this would create an opportunity to enhance the public realm in the area with the additional space (Appendix B). These enhancements could lead to more people visiting Broomhill and staying for longer.

10.4.3 The intervention is also a good strategic fit with the objectives within the Visions and Aspirations for the BBEST Area 2021 such as:

- Encourage economic activity and growth
- Enhance the public realm
- Improve the function of pedestrianised areas
- Improve the environment (including air quality and noise) for Visitors

10.4.4 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the Broomhill ETRO be implemented as, on balance, benefits of the scheme in terms of safety and sustainability outweigh the concerns raised.

10.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.5. Considering the objections received, consideration was given to

1 recommending the retention of the parking spaces on Fulwood Service Road. However, such a recommendation could result in many of the benefits outlined in this report being lost such as improved air quality and a more attractive environment for pedestrians. As a result of these benefits being lost more visitors may travel by car, instead of more sustainable modes, and therefore stay in the area for less time due to the spaces being free for 20 minutes.

11. EATF LEGACY PROJECTS: DIVISION STREET

11.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures detailing the consultation response to the Experimental Traffic Order for Division Street, to report the receipt of objections and set out the Council's response.

11.2 It was acknowledged that an incorrect signage plate was in place within the ETRO area. The officer explained that the Council had carried out the enforcement of waiting restrictions at Division Street where double yellow lines were in place – these were existing restrictions unaffected by the ETO. It had not enforced the restriction indicated in the incorrect plate and therefore it had had no effect on the operation of the experimental scheme.

11.3 During the discussion of the above item the Committee agreed, in accordance with Council Procedure Rules, that as the meeting was approaching the end of the 30 minutes extension period, the meeting should be extended by a period of 30 minutes.

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

Approve that the Experimental Traffic Order be made permanent. Objectors will then be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team. The order will be made permanent by way of a Traffic Regulation Order which makes the provisions of the Experimental Traffic Order permanent, in accordance with the procedure set out under the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984.

11.5 Reasons for Decision

11.5.1 The prohibition of driving on parts of Division Street creates a safer environment for cyclists on this section of Division Street. Before driving was prohibited, people could not cycle safely with a high flow of traffic travelling along the route and a lot of parked cars. The changes made significantly reduce the number of cars travelling along Division St creating a safer cycling environment. This should help encourage more people to cycle along the route and through the city centre.

11.5.2 The prohibition of driving on parts of Division Street creates a safer environment for pedestrians. There is not enough space for groups of pedestrians to stay on the

pavement on the closed section of Division Street. This becomes a safety issue in busy periods with pedestrians often having to walk on the road, increasing the risk of conflict with motor vehicles. The changes allow pedestrians to safely walk through this section of Division St.

- 11.5.3 Since the changes were implemented, many street cafes along the closed section of Division St have taken the opportunity to offer outdoor seating. This was initially in response to covid restrictions however many have continued to offer this since restrictions have been eased. This has allowed them to increase their capacity and improves the local street scene.

The scheme is also a good strategic fit with the key aims of the third core objective of the Sheffield Transport Strategy (2019):

- Sustainable safety, safe walking and cycling as standard
- Improved air quality and working to manage congestion
- Improving poor health and poor access to jobs and services

- 11.5.4 Having considered the response from the public and other consultees it is recommended that the Division Street ETRO be implemented as, on balance, benefits of the scheme in terms of safety and sustainability outweigh the concerns raised. It is also recommended that a re-deployable enforcement camera is installed to enforce restrictions in the pedestrianised area. It is also recommended that a review of the changes be undertaken once the Kangaroo Works construction has completed.

11.6 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 11.6.1 Considering the objections received, consideration was given to recommending the removal of the modal filters and allowing motor vehicles to drive along all of Division St again. However, such a recommendation could result in many of the benefits outlined in the report such as improved safety for cyclists and pedestrians and space for outdoor seating being lost.
- 11.6.2 Consideration was also given to implementing a westbound one-way restriction through the currently pedestrianised section of Division St, keeping half of the road pedestrianised or for outdoor seating. However, such a recommendation would increase the flow of traffic travelling along Division St and reduce safety and accessibility for cyclists.
- 11.6.3 Consideration was also given to re-instating the original one-way on Westfield Terrace to southbound. However, such a recommendation would result in traffic travelling east on Devonshire St having to make a U-turn when at the junction with Westfield Terrace. This option could be re-assessed once the Kangaroo Works construction has finished.

- 11.6.4 Consideration was also given to fully pedestrianizing the section of Division St between Rockingham St and Westfield Terrace. However, such a recommendation would remove access to the private car park on Canning St. This option could be re-assessed once the Kangaroo Works construction has finished.

12. HERDINGS 20MPH SCHEME TRO CONSULTATION REPORT

- 12.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures detailing the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Herdings, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

- 12.2 A question was raised regarding the signage requirements for the scheme and it was explained that there were signs in place on either side of the road plus road markings in the locations where this had been implemented. Any examples where this was not the case could be as a result of a legacy scheme.

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

Approve that the Herdings 20mph Speed Limit Order be made, as advertised, in accordance with the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984. Objectors will then be informed of the decision by the Council's Traffic Regulations team and the order implemented on street subject to no road safety issues being identified through a Road Safety Audit (RSA) at the detailed design stage.

12.4 Reasons for Decision

- 12.4.1 The adoption of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy established the principle of introducing sign-only 20mph speed limits in all suitable residential areas. Reducing the speed of traffic in residential areas should, in the long term, reduce the number and severity of collisions, reduce the fear of accidents, encourage sustainable modes of travel and contribute towards the creation of a more pleasant, cohesive environment.

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

12.5 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 12.5.1 In light of the objections received, consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Herdings. However, such a recommendation would run contrary to the delivery of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. This would also mean that pedestrian and cyclist safety would not be improved, and this would be detrimental to the Council's Active Travel ambition and vision of Safer streets in our city.

13. WESTFIELD 20MPH SCHEME TRO CONSULTATION REPORT

13.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures detailing the consultation response to proposals to introduce 20mph speed limits in Westfield, report the receipt of objections to the Speed Limit Order and set out the Council's response.

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

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

13.3 Reasons for Decision

13.3.1 The adoption of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy established the principle of introducing sign-only 20mph speed limits in all suitable residential areas. Reducing the speed of traffic in residential areas should, in the long term, reduce the number and severity of collisions, reduce the fear of accidents, encourage sustainable modes of travel and contribute towards the creation of a more pleasant, cohesive environment.

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

13.3.3 It is also recommended that a part time 20mph limit on Westfield Northway outside Shortbrook Primary School be approved.

13.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

13.4.1 In light of the objections received, consideration was given to recommending the retention of the existing speed limit in Westfield. However, such a recommendation would run contrary to the delivery of the Sheffield 20mph Speed Limit Strategy. This would also mean that pedestrian and cyclist safety would not be improved, and this would be detrimental to the Council's Active Travel ambition and vision of Safer streets in our city.

14. MODESHIFT STARS - ACTIVE JOURNEYS TO SCHOOL

14.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures that sets out the aims of bringing together all school related Active Travel projects under one team managed by Sheffield City Council to maximise efficiency. We will use funds to enhance active travel in primary schools by commissioning external support from additional project officers to so as to deliver the ModeshiftSTARS award scheme. By expanding the current Modeshift STARS support provision for Sheffield Schools, we would be able to maintain and build on the successes and achievements of 2022 in increasing Active Travel in schools.

14.2 The Chair recognised the significant achievement of Phillimore Community Primary School in being recognised as the National Modeshift STARS Primary School of the year and the committee thanked the officers for their hard work on this scheme.

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

- i. Approves the use of funding to support the continued delivery of the Active Travel in schools scheme.
- ii. Approves an increase to the total funding for the scheme to £289,960.67.
- iii. Approves the commissioning of additional external staff to support the delivery of the scheme at a cost of £273,460.67.

14.4 **Reasons for Decision**

14.4.1 The investment in supporting schools to promote and enable active journeys to school will ultimately help to address the ambitions of Members and delivery against the requests of the Sheffield public to improve safety on the journey to school for all.

14.4.2 The expected benefits from this project are multiple. Including an increase in safety, and perception of safety, enhancing environmental amenities and improving health by supporting safe active travel movements.

14.4.3 The programme takes advantage of utilising external funding sources where possible to deliver impactful change to the transport system, considering environmental, economic, and societal needs.

14.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

14.5.1 'Do nothing' has been considered but is not deemed appropriate.

14.5.2 Without this approval Sheffield will see a drastic reduction in resources. From September, we will go from having a team of three to a single part-time officer working on the project. This is insufficient resource to support Sheffield's 180 schools in any meaningful way. The impact of this would also include:

- a significant reduction in outputs
- little or no activities delivered in schools.

- a significant reduction in the number of schools engaged in the project.
- detrimental impact on the strategic running of the project
- unable to build on past success due to lack of resource.
- difficulty in re-engaging with schools in the future once confidence has been lost in SCC to deliver this project.

15. CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON THE PUBLICATION DRAFT SHEFFIELD PLAN

- 15.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director-City Futures providing an overview of the public consultation carried out on the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan, including some of the key issues. It also sets out the process for responding to the issues raised and the timetable and process for submitting the Sheffield Plan to the Government for public examination.
- 15.2 It was clarified that the report had highlighted the key themes of the consultation responses but there were many other comments and these would be included in the report to the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee.
- 15.3 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee:
- a) notes the issues arising from public consultation on the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan;
 - b) notes that a 'schedule of suggested amendments', compiled in response to the comments on the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan, is to be considered by the Strategy and Resources Committee and full Council prior to submitting the relevant documents to the Government in accordance with recommendation (d) of the decision of full Council dated 14th December 2022
- 15.4 **Reasons for Decision**
- 15.4.1 Once adopted, the new Sheffield Plan will make a major contribution to the future development of the city and will guide development over the next 15-20 years. It is important that the plan is adopted as soon as possible.
- 15.4.2 The documents that are the subject of this report (Part 1: Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations, Part 2: Development Management Policies, Annex A: Site Allocation Schedule, Annex B: Parking Guidelines, Policies Map and Glossary) comprise the draft development plan documents for Sheffield. They were published under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). The submission documents will include such documents as fall within the definition at Regulation 17 (as agreed by full Council on 14th December 2022).
- 15.4.3 The Draft Sheffield Plan represent the Council's firm proposals for the development of the city over the period to 2039. The public consultation, seeking views on the 'soundness' of the Plan was a

required stage before the Draft Plan is submitted to the Government for public examination. Comments received with respect to this consultation process are currently being reviewed before amendments are proposed to the Strategy and Resources Committee in August and full Council in September.

15.4.4 The recommendations reflect earlier decisions taken by full Council on 14th December 2022 for decisions on any desired amendments to the Plan to be taken by the Strategy & Resources Policy Committee and then full Council.

15.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

15.5.1 The options available to the Council in terms of proposing amendments to the Sheffield Plan have already been outlined in paragraph ## above. This will be a matter for the Strategy & Resources Committee and full Council to consider.

This page is intentionally left blank