

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## CYCLE FORUM

**Draft Notes** of the meeting held on Thursday 21<sup>st</sup> December 2023

at 5.00 p.m. online

### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE/ATTENDANCE**

Apologies: Peter Marsh

In attendance: David Holmes, Cllr Richard Shaw (Chair), Paul Sullivan, Simon Ogden, Rosemary Hill, Simon Geller, Angela Walker, Helen Kellar, John Chapman, David Whitley Cllr Ruth Mersereau, John Armitage, Sam Farrington, Grant Martin, Peter Morgan, Anna Butler, Nicola Marshall, Sam Gregory

### **2. NOTES**

#### **Accuracy**

- a) **A point was raised about the counts on Weedon Street according to the consultant's report, the pedestrian cycle count was taken during lockdown not post lockdown. Was this not a totally unrepresentative sample when everyone was being told to stay at home? It means the crossing was downgraded from controlled to zebra.**

**Post meeting note** on count data from Mar-Oct of years 2017 through to 2023. These are the two closest locations to the site and suggest lockdown had a positive impact on numbers.

Five weirs walk at Attercliffe

Blackburn Valley at Barrow Road

2017	32826	23764
2018	35814	26036
2019	35507	26199
<b>2020</b>	<b>38001</b>	<b>42801</b>
2021	42670	34485
2022	43399	32536
2023	40730	30427

- b) **Could we include the name of the Active Travel Director in the October notes?** Completed

#### **Matters Arising**

- c) **There is a new planning application on the 'Tesco' Triangle on Penistone Road now where ALDI want to build a supermarket and not only not offering to do anything about the crossing of Herries Road, which is a noted danger spot for walkers and cyclists on what is a strategic cycle route. They're also proposing, as far as can be seen, to take out the existing cycle route and replace it by a deceleration lane on Penistone**

## **Road.**

**So we're hopeful that there will be a more robust response from the planners to say no, you can't take out existing cycle lane and not replace it and you should be doing something to make that crossing safe because more traffic will be generated.**

The Combined Authority are monitoring the application and will be commenting.

Transport Planning have been in touch with Highways Development Control who have been in discussion with the planning officer about what they're currently proposing and what we're going to ask for.

Transport have asked for a 5 1/2 metre wide (LTN compliant) stretch along Penistone Rd with a separated cycle track from the footway.

What needs to be determined is whether that's proportionate to the application.

What you see on the planning portal is just their submission. What's not visible is the background discussion that's going on and all the discussions regarding Section 106 works, 278 works, etc.

Transport will be in regular contact with relevant officers on this matter.

### **c) Action to request additional markings to reinforce contraflow on Portobello.**

That section of the route was designed on cycle street principles but doesn't meet cycle street criteria, needs to be a no through road (access only) and needs a significant number of cyclists. Cycle streets should be introduced at a later stage of network development. Any changes would need to be funded and that may be an issue depending on the intervention required.

**ACTION:** Transport to speak to the university about options to close it off as a through route

## **3. City Region Sustainable Transport Scheme (CRSTS) Chesterfield Road**

Sheffield City Council/Notabene Consulting presented details of the CRSTS scheme along Chesterfield Road.

Full presentation below.



Cycle Forum OBC  
Stakeholder Presentat

Predominantly a public transport scheme, the project team would like input from the Cycle Forum on the following.

- Active travel issues along the corridor
- Connecting routes
- Ideas to access to Woodseats centre

- Options to create an extension of the Sheaf Valley route through to Woodseats

These may not be funded from this pot but could be included in additional funding rounds.

In addition to this initial input, there will be a full consultation, including a short questionnaire, all will be made available via the Connecting Sheffield website.

We have already engaged the bus operators who would like several issues addressed. Bus stop size, lane width, junction improvement.

It was noted that Heeley Trust can help with any public consultation as they are the community anchor for Heeley and Meersbrook.

The approval process will take us to 2025 with construction to be complete by March 2027.

The strategic objective is to make it easier for people to travel along the A61 corridor and offer them better bus options, and to ensure that public transport is more dependable and on time by upgrading the corridor with new technologies, bus priority signalling, shelters receiving real time information, looking at improving junction flow possibly with camera enforcement.

Today we want to talk about making the road safer for everyone, creating a more lively and successful area for people who live and work there and predominantly extending the Sheaf Valley route from Athol Road through to the junction of Abbey Lane and Woodseats. We need to understand the barriers and how do we create an attractive link between the two.

To date the project team have looked two options:

One of them being to carry on down the main road and then linking to Woodseats Road, which is a little bit difficult. The other option is to try and get the cyclists off the A61 earlier utilising the residential area.

**Are options for The Dale being considered, as this road has a significant impact on through traffic?**

It wasn't but that is the purpose of stakeholder engagement, so this will be looked at.

**Experienced cyclists tend to use the A61, as it's the most direct route, a significant number of the other options have double parking which can be a challenge in itself, less of an issue cycling into town as downhill so moving at a speed that makes you feel safe, and the bus lane provides a relatively safe route in.**

**Uphill the cycle lanes that do exist are often parked on, so can be pointless, especially those between Heeley Bridge and the retail park, and there are some issues further up near Abbey Lane.**

**Cartmell Road could be an option if something could be done about the steps at the end.**

**The Dale could do with a contra flow - any quiet one-way roads could be used if they allow contra flow cycling.**

**Are you looking at an extension to Totlely using Archer Drive and Hutcliffe Wood? There are some facilities that just need joining up.**

Not with this scheme. That extension formed part of the Active Travel Fund 4 bid for which we did not receive funding.

However, we are about to pull together options for development funding from CRSTS2, but we need to factor in what strategy and policy team say, political input, input from South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority and input from Department for Transport.

**Can we utilise some of the space in the middle of the A61, that is hatched remove some parking , create central car lanes with extra width created for buses and cycles?**

**Fraser Road is an option for heading out of town, and can we investigate segregation up to Meadowhead.**

**Does it have to be either or, can we not have a main road route and a residential route?**

We are trying to move away from squeezing all modes of travel into one corridor, so each corridor would have a predominant mode.

Relocating A61 parking is an option being explored, in order to widen footway, provide additional cycle parking, creating better crossing points in the local centre, signalising Meadowhead roundabout, reducing rat running.

#### **4. CRSTS Upper Don Valley**

A quick introduction – Public transport focused, a few steps behind the Chesterfield Road corridor, it may present opportunities to improve active travel. The schemes scope covers an area from Rutland Road along both Penistone Road, and Langsett Middlewood Road corridor.

Several provisional options have been identified - a series of interventions. but it will not be a full route treatment as Penistone Road was improved for Public Transport a few years ago. Once the options are sifted and reduced in number than they will be brought back to the forum.

The reason for bringing it up today is that we have feasibility funding for improvements and extensions to the Penistone Road corridor active travel route, which will have an interaction with this. So, we want to reassure you the relevant project teams are speaking to each other about said interaction.

#### **5. CRSTS Northern Communities**

A quick introduction - This is an Active Travel and Public Transport scheme - while there is a significant amount of funding the timescales dictate, as with CRSTS Upper Don Valley that it will be a series of interventions as opposed to a full route treatment.

The active travel element will seek to create a connection between Northern General Hospital and City Centre, we currently have around seven options, but we are looking at Pitsmoor Road/Barnsley Road, Carlisle Street corridors.

In addition, we are looking at options to connect the communities north of the Northern General Hospital, most likely traffic management measures to create improved active travel links, and possibly looking to link in with design options from the Penistone Road scheme funded from Active travel Fund 4.

In terms of public transport this could involve re modelling junctions through Chapeltown, which may give opportunities for active travel improvements.

## **6. CYCLE MATTERS**

### **a) Clean Air Zone (CAZ), will any of the income be spent on active travel?**

A report has recently gone to committee detailing the latest financial position including uncertainty associated with forecasting future surplus CAZ funds and the approach for future allocation / expenditure - ([Public Pack](#))[Item 12 Clean Air Zone - 6 month review Agenda Supplement for Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, 11/12/2023 14:00 \(sheffield.gov.uk\)](#).

The zone has not been operational for a year yet, we've recently undertaken a review based on current available information to understand impact of the CAZ to date. The proportion of CAZ complaint vehicles has increased and PCN contraventions are declining – good indicators in terms of reducing nitrogen dioxide. This also shows that income, as predicted, declines – in the first instance the Council needs ensure that sufficient funds are retained to cover future operational costs for the forecast period of the CAZ operations. In respect to use of any surplus funds, there will be work early next year with committee members to plan the investment approach and allocation in more detail.

To note we have from an active travel aspect submitted a shopping list of items that some of it could be spent on.

There are no identified priorities.

**ACTION** The Project Manager for the scheme will be invited to the March Cycle Forum to go into more detail.

### **b) Asline Road -is anything more to be done to prevent parking on the cycle track?**

We investigated several options to solve this problem, while trying to maintain access to the U-Mix centre and allowing larger vehicles to turn from the side roads, unfortunately with no clear solution. We are also concerned we'd push the parking onto the narrower footway on the opposite side of the road. If we install anything on the track that will reduce the width back to what it was before. As it stands its reliant

on enforcement. That said designers have gone back to the drawing board to revisit options.

**Did the original design include double height kerbs?**

No, this was not accurate and was reported incorrectly, double height kerbs were a later thought that were rejected due to the turning issue, ability for people to cross and maintenance issues. Whatever happens there, needs to be maintainable.

**c) Moving traffic offences update**

Last year a colleague in transport planning came along to talk about moving traffic offences, and how we now have powers to do this. We've gone through our internal approval process. Cameras will be ordered early in the new year, installed late spring, with a summer start for enforcement.

**d) Connecting Sheffield schemes latest position Can we have an update on the schemes as they should all be built by now, but only one is on site, it doesn't feel like the others are ever going to be built?**

It is still very much the council's aspiration that they will be built. We have had some significant challenges, both engineering and cost based.

Phase one of Magna Tinsley will be on site early in 2024, phase two will follow in the autumn.

City Centre route - business case to be submitted in April for construction to hopefully start Autumn 2024

Nether Edge is a few months behind city centre despite being delivered by the same contractor, business case submitted around August, on site late 2024 early 2025.

Darnall Attercliffe the largest of all the schemes, Amey undertaking design, again business case to be submitted August 24, on site early 2025

As with all things that don't quite go to plan there is no one thing delaying progress, it is a series of issues, resources, the staggered tender process (Undertaken at the request of contractors), engineering issues, for example in Nether Edge we have significant issues around retaining walls and trees, and resolving the public transport route in the city centre slowed the city centre scheme.

In terms of cost increases we are working with SYMCA colleagues how we manage that.

**The Kelham island scheme still has no information as to what is happening, this was raised at the last forum**

There is definitely a sign on Neepsend Lane at one end of the scheme. The image below suggest there's a sign on Tenter Street.



**Matilda Street works** There was a historical issue about the design and road safety, has that been resolved?

We have an outline design which is now with Amey to work up to full design. Once we have that we can come back to the forum.

**e) Tram track safety**

**Where are the council with tackling this, given the hidden costs of anyone coming off their bike on trams tracks. Certain parts of the network feel very problematic.**

**Is the solution to separate out the two routes - public transport and active travel as per Portobello?**

**Given the operation and tracks will now be the responsibility of the SYMCA, does this present an opportunity to do more over and above the signing?**

It's still very much in our thoughts, and separating out networks is the way forward, and will be our approach, we realise routes need to be developed parallel to tram tracks.

Unfortunately, our funding streams have strict criteria that doesn't always allows us to tackle all the road safety issues. The dedicated Road Safety Fund tends to be spent on those hotspots with the worst collision record. While we know there are a

significant number of incidents along the tram track there is no one hotspot that makes it into that shortlist.

It is a difficult issue not just here and we keen to understand international best practice and have asked to be kept informed of the ongoing Ghent study.

**f) Stocksbridge Towns Fund**

**There is to be a stakeholder workshop in the new year to explain why the original trails project is not going ahead this will involve the Project Manager and designer**

There is a desire from the Upper Don Trail Trust to look at whether there are other ways of progressing that scheme, unless the reasons that will be presented are complete game stoppers .

We've had some good discussions with the SYMCA commissioner Ed Clancy as well.

**7. AOB**

None raised.

**Date of next meeting: Online 5pm 15<sup>th</sup> February**

-----