University of Sheffield – Campus Masterplan consultation summary

The consultation – what we did

The University of Sheffield published its draft Campus Masterplan in September 2014. As part of the process, views from students, staff and members of the public were sought through an extensive consultation programme.

Dedicated webpages with an online consultation form were produced, along with a summary video which attracted just below 14000 views on YouTube. Four public consultation days were held, two at the University and two in the city centre at the Winter Gardens. These were staffed by representatives from both the University and the City Council, and were advertised in advance in both the Sheffield Star and the Sheffield Telegraph. In addition, there were a number of targeted events for MPs and Councillors, city centre residents, Sheffield Children’s Hospital and the Students’ Union.

During the consultation period, we had direct conversations with more than 500 people, and more than 550 people completed the online feedback form. We also received feedback from a number of interested organisations, including Sheffield Children’s Hospital, Sheffield Students’ Union, Cycle Sheffield, and the University of Sheffield Library – these are included at Appendix B.

Who responded?

The majority of the respondents were staff of the University but there were a significant number from students and members of the public. The pie chart below shows the breakdown of respondents.
Key issues

The online questionnaire grouped the questions according to broad subject headings and this report summarises the responses received. A comprehensive list of all the responses is included at Appendix A.

Pedestrianisation

Pedestrianisation of certain areas of the campus was generally popular, with support from all groups of respondents. People felt it would improve access and safety. There was general support for continuation of the Gold Route, although a number of people said they didn’t know what it was, and others felt it should be more clearly signed. There was general support for better integration of the University with the city.

Concerns were raised about the need for access to University buildings, which often require access for large lorries for deliveries and waste disposal. Concerns were also raised about pedestrian safety after dark, with suggestions for improved lighting and security.

Concerns were also expressed over removing all parking from the centre of the campus. Some people were very supportive of the idea, but others worried, especially those with caring responsibilities or those living significant distances away from work. A number of people commented on the safety aspect of having to walk some way to their car if working late and leaving after dark.

Some of the comments included:

“I would like to see as much space given over to pedestrians as possible.”

“I greatly welcome the proposed changes – currently the Jessop West corner of Leavygreave Road is incredibly dangerous for pedestrians.”

“The addition of the improved pedestrian and cyclist route parallel to West Street would be a great addition to options of getting around the city.”

“The new Gold Route is amazing and I’d like to see this idea in most of the city – from the uni and also from the Canal Basin and maybe from Kelham too.”

“Think having a designated pedestrian route to key destinations in the city centre from the University that is pleasant and safe is very helpful.”

“It would be improved by links further into Broomhill, rather than terminating at Weston Park.”

“I support it. However strong links with public transport should be maintained as not everyone is able to walk or cycle.”

“I have to walk through the campus but hopefully the changes would make this safer and more pleasant.”

“The full pedestrianisation of Leavygreave Road would lead to huge problems for the Department of Music in terms of access and moving equipment.”
Response

The requirements for access to buildings will be taken into consideration when any pedestrianisation plan is put in place. Building users will be consulted and appropriate alternatives will be arranged if required.

Current modelling shows walking times to be no more than 8 minutes from car parks to most University buildings. Special consideration will be given to the safety of the walking routes to these car parks, including looking at CCTV and lighting.

The University aims to keep the number of parking spaces available to staff and students the same. Priority for parking permits will continue to be for those who need them the most due to caring responsibilities or lack of access to public transport.

Public spaces

The response to the creation of more and better public spaces was generally favourable. Specific concerns were raised over the practicalities of developing the Arts Tower frontage as a public space given the current issues with Veolia which have necessitated the space being dug up and out of action twice in the last year.

Some of the comments included:

“Your vision to transform the public spaces throughout the University is inspiring.”

“At the moment the campus doesn’t feel very family friendly. It would be excellent if you could address this through the masterplan, for example, if some of the proposed water features were playable and there was some provision of play equipment on campus.”

“More outdoor covered seating so that it is possible to enjoy the campus when the weather is nice, even if it’s raining.”
“The colonnade is crying out for shops and cafes to animate the edge of the concourse.”

“Removal of the vehicular access to the front of the Arts Tower will mean people with mobility-based disabilities will have to walk around the building to get in from the drop-off point at the back. Please consider either some way of vehicles being able to go from the back to the front or a way for people to access the building from the back to the lifts, thus making the distance to travel a great deal shorter.”

Response

The current design for the Arts Tower court includes a raised grassed area, beneath which services would be located. This would make accessing them easier and less disruptive than at present.

A definite desire of the Campus Masterplan is to create more active frontages around the campus, such as cafés and shops, where members of the public will feel welcomed by the University.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7. If there were more cafés and public outdoor spaces, would you be:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>More likely to visit the campus</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Road safety

Many people expressed concern over safety at the current crossings and there was widespread support for improved crossings at Western Bank and on Upper Hanover Street.

“The plans for a crossing outside the Arts Tower and improved crossing at Leavygreave are great.”

“Anything that makes Brook Hill Roundabout and Western Bank a safer and more efficient operation for motorists and pedestrians is essential.”

“A bridge over the road at Brook Street roundabout would be good. It is a very dangerous place and a fatal accident is likely to occur.”
Response

Road safety for pedestrians on the major roads which cross the campus is of the highest priority for the University. Although a bridge across the ring road would be ideal, this has been considered and due to the gradients required, there is not enough space for this. This means that street level crossings are necessary.

Bus routes

Comments in favour of and against the possible rerouting of buses were fairly evenly divided. Concerns included possible reduced reliability and regularity of buses, as well as worries over future location of bus stops and distance from final destination.

A number of people suggested additional bus routes, such as between Nether Edge area and the University, if we are to reduce people’s reliance on cars.

There were also concerns about re-routing buses down Durham Road, partly because of increased congestion and specifically because of access to the Students’ Union goods yard and the fact that Durham Road currently used as pick up and drop off point for coaches.

Some of the comments included:

“Avoid bus routes cutting through the campus on Victoria or Mappin Street; instead route them along the major roads.”

“A bus stop common to all routes and the University would be a good idea.”

“As long as the buses are frequent it will be fine.”

“Bringing buses down Clarkson Street would bring more chaos on Western Bank.”
“I sometimes use the 51/2 and this would be slightly less convenient for me but it would be worthwhile to have more pleasant pedestrian spaces without cars.”

“One of the most well-used bus stops is at Western Bank outside the Students’ Union/Hicks Building – if that stop were to be moved to Glossop Road, access to the concourse from the south side of the Students’ Union building would have to be seriously improved.”

“Durham Road is not very large – wouldn’t this cause extra congestion and potentially an extra pedestrian hazard?”

“I would be concerned about re-routing via Clarkson Street and Durham Road as this would add a bus route to what are already very congested one lane roads.”

Response

Changes to some bus routes have been suggested in this plan, as part of a wider plan to improve traffic flow and remove as much traffic from the heart of the campus as possible. These possible changes have been discussed with the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTE) and the feedback we have received will be shared with them. A further public consultation on the proposed changes will be undertaken and considered by the SYPTE before any decisions are taken. This decision will lie with the SYPTE and not the University.

It would be ideal for the University not to have buses crossing the campus at all, but the plan must consider the requirements of all users and routes must of course remain viable and useful to passengers. To allow for the increased bus traffic on Mappin Street, improvements would be made to the road and consideration to pedestrian safety given.

Pedestrian safety on Glossop Road will be looked at due to the feedback received.

![Bar chart showing responses]

10. If you use the 51, 52 and/or 95 bus routes, would the proposed changes make you:

- More likely to use these buses: 37%
- Less likely to use these buses: 13%
- The same: 29%
- 4% other
There was a lot of concern about the possibility of introducing a one-way system around the campus. Although some people were supportive, the majority felt that it would make congestion worse rather than better, with a knock-on effect on routes not immediately connected to the University.

There was also major concern over Brook Hill roundabout and its impact on congestion and safety. The proposed new crossings on Western Bank and Upper Hanover Street were almost unanimously welcomed, with many people expressing anxiety over the current situation.

A number of possible suggestions for improvement were put forward, including the possibility of small cars being allowed to use the tram subway and the development of bridges and/or underpasses.

Some of the comments included:

“Travelling to the city centre from the west is already a nightmare. Sending all the traffic onto Glossop Road will create massive congestion where it meets the ring road at Upper Hanover Street.”

“Anything which helps to improve this horrible road and the way it cuts the campus in two is welcome.”

“A really great idea and I’d also welcome this as a car user. Brook Hill is a horrible roundabout so I’d welcome any improvements there, and improving the Glossop Road junction at the same time is welcomed.”

“Am not an expert town/travel planner but can’t help thinking that if you are going to introduce three new pedestrian crossings on Western Bank then you will have to do something to make sure the traffic flows are not completely disrupted and delayed.”

“A good proportion of the traffic northbound on Upper Hanover Street turns west onto Glossop Road. If this is prevented there will be a big back up at the University roundabout. Just leave Glossop Road two way.”

“At present Western Bank divides the campus and it is a particularly ugly feature. A one way system would be a great improvement and might even encourage more people (including staff) to cycle or take the bus instead of using their car.”

Response

The University has included a suggestion for a one-way system in this masterplan. Sheffield City Council is responsible for the road network in the city and will investigate this option and others before any changes are implemented. No changes would be considered unless it was proven that they would improve the traffic flow. Sheffield City Council would have to carry out a further public consultation on any options before any changes would be implemented.

Sheffield City Council will work to synchronise new crossings to enable traffic to flow more freely.
Cycling

There was a great deal of support for improving cycle routes both to and around the campus. There was also support for the two proposed new cycling hubs, but concerns that there would be a lack of secure cycle storage at individual buildings.

Suggestions were made for more cycling friendly routes throughout the city, including from University accommodation to campus.

Many people expressed concerns about the proposed shared use by pedestrians and cyclists, citing safety concerns.

Some of the comments included:

“I’d really like to see a safe cycle route from Crookes Valley Park to the engineering faculty/city centre.”

“The key crossing on Upper Hanover Street should be placed directly in line with Leavygreave Road on the key desire line rather than offsetting it – the kink in this crossing will create unnecessary conflict between those cycling and those walking.”

“Please consider having designated segregated cycle paths rather than purely shared space which is lovely to look at but can be ambiguous.”

“The University seems to be expecting all staff to use cycles. Have they thought that not everybody can ride or wants to cycle to work? What about the disabled?”

“Sheffield definitely needs more dedicated, safe cycle routes.”

Response

We note the concerns about whether shared pedestrian and cycle space is safe and desirable and will look at this in more detail as we finalise the plans for these areas.
The University recognises that staff and students want to travel to and from work in a variety of ways. The proposed improvements aim to make it easier and safer for people to walk or cycle. It is not intended to hinder people from using other methods as they prefer.

Greening the campus

There was strong support for greening the campus, both from staff and students and the wider community. People wanted to see more trees, especially with flowers and fruit producing. Wild flowers were also a popular choice, with native planting to attract birds and insects. There was support for the idea of open water, but concern about the front of the Arts Tower and whether a water feature would be effective here. People also wanted spaces to sit, so they could enjoy the increased greenery.

People were also keen to see green spaces used for edible planting and requested better signage to show what plants are and what is being done to improve biodiversity.

Some of the comments included:

“Wild flowers to encourage bees and other insects, bird boxes, native plants and trees.

“Trees and grasses, but also what about some fruit and vegetable areas?

“Themed planting appropriate to the immediate area, which considers balanced benefits of amenity, wildlife, nutrition, watering burden and appearance.”

Response

Suggestions regarding edible planting and biodiversity are being considered and it is hoped to include these in the landscaping. The University has a biodiversity action plan.
New buildings

There was a fair amount of concern expressed about the size of some of new buildings and a desire to see coherent identity for the campus. A number of respondents wanted to see older buildings retained and refurbished.

There was some specific concern about the new sports centre and Social Sciences building with a plea for early consultation with the community when plans are being developed, rather than just before planning application is submitted.

Some of the comments included:

“Please do not build any more large buildings that dominate the landscape.”

“Please stop demolishing historic buildings that give different areas around the campus their unique character and sense of community.”

“It is exciting. The so-called ‘villa’ at 5 Favell Road must be demolished – it was our old office and is falling down.”

“Make the developments involving any listed or potentially valuable ‘heritage’ sites such as the Uni Arms or other old buildings.”

Response

The University continues to be successful and grow. It aims to use its existing space as efficiently as it can, but new buildings are needed in order for it to continue as a world leading research-led University, which positively contributes to the economy of the Sheffield City Region.

The University will continue to work productively with its neighbours on any plans for new buildings and will carry out further public consultation on any proposals.

The University of Sheffield is proud to take care of almost 40 listed structures and buildings within its estate. Over the last four years alone, we have spent more than £56 million on preserving and upgrading our heritage buildings, perhaps most notably the full refurbishment of the landmark Arts Tower.

Next to benefit from major investment is the grade II listed Mappin Building which will be extensively refurbished as part of a £153 million investment in our engineering estate over the next decade.

Major individual issues

Hounsfield area/University Arms

The potential removal of the University Arms was the single most mentioned issue throughout the consultation. There was virtually no support for options two and three for the Hounsfield area, primarily because of the loss of the University Arms, but also because of concerns over a very high building which could overwhelm the area.
In addition to many objections on the online form, we also received a petition with around 1700 signatures asking for the University Arms to be saved.

**Some of the comments included:**

“Please do not get rid of the University Arms. This place is one of the major plus points about this university; a perfect place to meet colleagues and entertain visitors. It does more for interdisciplinary research and staff morale than any number of fancy initiatives or ‘public realm improvements. I am generally very supportive of the campus masterplan but demolishing the University Arms would be a major mistake.”

“I notice one of the proposals is to demolish the University Arms pub in order to build new high rise buildings and form a green square to socialise in. I think the demolition of the pub would be a mistake and the University should do the opposite and refurbish/restore the pub and make it a focal point of that social area.”

“I would certainly like to be able to take research visitors to eat and drink at the University Arms after seminars and colloquium. It is in wonderful location (particularly for the Hicks and Alfred Denny buildings) and sustains a unique collegial atmosphere like no other place on campus. It is a standing symbol of academia.”

“Massing of new build developments around University Square needs more careful thought than indicated on the options.”

“It would be a sad loss to the university area to lose all the old buildings, particularly the University Arms.”

“The plans for the University Arms are truly shocking and should be rescinded. If you want to see ‘community engagement’ in action, go there.”

**Response**

The reaction to the possible demolition of the University Arms will be taken into consideration when making any decisions about this area. The initial massing studies in the masterplan were to show what was possible in this space, but were by no means firm proposals. Any detailed plans – which are likely to be produced within the next 3-5 years – will look at a variety of options and will be subject to full consultation.

**Church of the Nazarene**

Concern was expressed by a number of people that this building was not directly referenced in the plans. There were requests that it be brought into productive use as performing arts/music space, following a previous commitment that this would be the case.

**Some of the comments included:**

“I’m also intrigued that there are no plans to develop the Church of the Nazarene – as a listed building I feel the University should have an obligation to renovate this building. Why are there no plans for develop a performance space for Arts and Humanities?”
“There is no mention in this campus masterplan, which looks wonderful, of a performance space for music or the performing arts in general. The Church of the Nazarene is on our doorstep, yet there is no mention in the masterplan of this space.”

Response

The Church of the Nazarene has for many years been identified as a possible site for a performance space. Work is being undertaken to review all of the University’s current performance spaces and the requirements placed on those facilities both now and in the future to meet our academic plans in the years to come. The Church of the Nazarene will be considered as part of that comprehensive review, which will report early in 2015.

New sports centre

A few respondents commented on the proposed new sports centre, some in favour and some concerned about issues such as where it would be, what would happen to the sports offer while it was being developed, parking and costs of membership.

Some of the comments included:

“The current sports centre location is very convenient. I would be less likely to use it if the improvements meant it moving elsewhere or if membership prices increased.”

“Great concerns around developments around the Northumberland Road and Crookesmoor Road areas. This is a residential and conservation area.”

Response

The University will continue to work productively with its neighbours on any plans for new buildings and will carry out further public consultation on any proposals.

If a new sports centre is built, we will keep the existing facilities open during the construction period. They would only close once the new facility is fully up and running.
Hendersons

A small number of respondents commented on the Hendersons Building, all wanting it to be retained.

Some of the comments included:

“I have heard a rumour that the Henderson’s Relish building will be demolished as part of the masterplan. If this is the case I am strongly opposed.”

Response

The University is committed to retaining the Hendersons Building. We are exploring options for the space including the possibility of developing it for some kind of public use.
Appendix A – Feedback from questionnaires
Quantitative analysis from Campus Masterplan

Questions for the general public

Number of questionnaires received = 557

1. Do you work/study at the University or live nearby?

- Work at the University: 46%
- Study at the University: 24%
- Live close to the University: 17%
- None of the above: 13%

2. Are you familiar with the University of Sheffield campus?

- Yes: 97%
- No: 3%
3. Do you ever visit University Buildings?

- Yes: 93%
- No: 7%

7. If there were more cafés and public outdoor spaces, would you be:

- More likely to visit the campus: 43%
- Less likely to visit the campus: 3%
- The same: 51%
- Not sure: 3%

8. Do you currently travel through the University campus as a:

- Motorist
- Cyclist
- Pedestrian
- Bus or Tram Passenger
- Not applicable
9. Would an improved pedestrian/cyclist spine through the campus mean you were:
- More likely to travel through campus as pedestrian or cyclist: 49%
- Less likely to travel through campus as pedestrian or cyclist: 4%
- The same: 47%

10. If you use the 51, 52 and/or 95 bus routes, would the proposed changes make you:
- More likely to use these buses: 17%
- Less likely to use these buses: 4%
- The same: 37%

11. If you use these current crossings, do you think that the proposed changes would be beneficial?
- Yes: 12%
- No: 17%
- Not applicable: 71%
12. Do you think this one-way circulatory system would be a good idea?

- Yes: 34%
- No: 26%
- Unsure: 40%

13. Would these proposed changes to St George's Green make you:

- More likely to visit St George's Green: 55%
- Less likely to visit St George's Green: 41%
- The same: 4%

14. Do you use the University's sports facilities at the Goodwin Sports Centre, Northumberland Road?

- Yes: 36%
- No: 64%
15. Would the proposed changes to the Goodwin Sports Centre make you:

- More likely to use these facilities: 34%
- Less likely to use these facilities: 8%
- The same: 56%
Questions for staff and students

Number completed: 438

1. How do you usually travel to work/study?

- Walk: 47%
- Cycle: 13%
- Public Transport: 20%
- Drive: 20%

2. Would the introduction of these cycle hubs make you:

- More likely to cycle to the University: 32%
- Less likely to cycle to the University: 3%
- The same: 65%

3. Do you think that consolidating most parking in one location will make it:

- Easier to park: 26%
- Harder to park: 35%
- Unsure: 39%
Qualitative feedback from questionnaires

Questions to the general public

6. What kind of planting/developments would you like to see around the University campus?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Suggestion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More trees and seasonal plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Accessible&quot; green space for social + study use in summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A big exam hall with a superb sound system, adjacent cloakroom space and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>refreshment facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A few more trees and some open water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A good mixture of plant life both in terms of being evergreen or deciduous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and also in colour - cherry blossom trees etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A green rooftop cafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More study spaces like Weston library and the View Cafe Deli that provide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspiring-nature views while working</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A living wall on one of the buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A lot more native planting which will attract birds/insects/bees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A proper campus without busy public roads inside it</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A range of wild gardens; open land and copses; no roads: not only to</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>encourage bio-diversity but to ensure the safety of the fauna attracted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to such niches, as well as pedestrians.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Western Bank Road a giant walk-through/ride-through hothouse full of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diverse flora.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A sensory garden to promote mindfulness and to be in keeping with the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city’s commitment to meeting the needs of people with accessibility needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A student run herb allotment where students and lecturers can come and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pick herbs that they need for cooking, done reasonably so people are not</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greedy. Using the University of Leeds student herb allotment as an example.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A variety, to provide good ecosystems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional habitat areas, specifically wildlife corridors linking the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponderosa and Crookes Valley Park into the centre of Broomhill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also, park-like settings for the listed buildings in the Hounsfield Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>area, along the lines of the Collegiate Campus of SHU.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any additional trees/planting/landscaping would be welcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything that helps encourage biodiversity rather than just aesthetics</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apple Trees, Plum Trees, Cherry Trees ... any tree with beautiful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blossom and edible fruit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As described in your plan. Looks great. Flowers, trees, green spaces..</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>so many benefits to the wider community as well as the university.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As many green spaces as possible. Better cycling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As much as possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As much green as possible - the campus doesn't currently match our 'UK's</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>greenest city' selling point.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As much greenery as possible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As much planting as possible.  
Bee friendly plants.  Keep our interesting old buildings.  
Better architects as some the new buildings are not very pleasant to look at. The Edwardians did at least take pride in their buildings with character and fine workmanship. 

Better facilities for cyclists  
Better footpaths between different buildings. It is a nightmare to get from for example The Arts Tower to Mappin Street. It takes a very long time to get from The Arts Tower to Mappin Street, because you have to cross at least two roads (sometimes more than that depending on which route you choose) and the tram tracks. The crossings are always busy, and sometimes quite dangerous with students crossing on red or when there's so many people that there isn't enough physical space for everyone to stand on the sidewalk. Ideally it would be best to have pedestrians either under the busy main road or over on foot bridges. I realise this is a lot to ask, but I believe it would improve both the traffic for vehicles and for people. When it comes to making the campus greener, you could look at New York's highline - an old trainline turned into a garden. It stretches above the city and the busy roads for a few kilometres. It us well maintained and a good way of bringing plants and trees into the campus. 

Better options for cycling and walking around campus.  
Better ring road crossing  
Big green areas  
Big trees to hide the buildings a bit  
Birdboxes and wildflower beds  
Cactuses!  
Can't be specific but would really welcome the concourse are under the flyover being made more attractive,  
Careful thinking about the water opportunity in front of the arts tower - learning from the mistakes of the original water feature and associated wind vortex.  

Climbing plants  
Green is fine as long as there are places to sit amongst it all.  
Coloutful planting, a mixed offering of commercial activities not just catering outlets  
Continuity of developments, so that migration pathways for wildlife are established and protected  

Decentralised cycling hubs - not just two big ones. People need to park bikes near where they work. Disincentive to have to walk 10 mins from bike hub to office.  
Massively more greenery - more trees, especially, to provide shading in summer for having lunch outside comfortably  
Definitely more green spaces would be lovely!  

Development that puts people first rather than the prestige of the university. So far the campus has become disjointed through large scale, disconnected and incoherent buildings (Jessop West, Diamond, IC etc...) all of which look great individually as 'artworks' but when viewed as a whole fail to address the need for a common language and identity which would benefit users and the wider university. All do not address the human as a scale of design with facades which do not connect with people: closed of and a lack of interaction between indoor and outdoor space. There needs to be a strategy to promote people to use the spaces if they are created of which a key component needs to be the relationship between the buildings and spaces.  
The masterplan is great, just don't make the mistake of Jessop West: an artwork (a pretty horrible one) in a sea of concrete that has no relationship of acceptance of context or potential functions that could take place on the ground floor.
Developments that encourage students and residents to remain in the spaces, but not at the expense of good architecture and attractive design. Any existing buildings that add character to the area should NEVER be considered for demolition to make way for this space as this is what makes the area unique and attracts visitors.

Don't know

Easier road crossings. More cycle friendly transport links from student accommodation areas to uni and city centre. Bigger student budget friendly canteen area during the busy lunch period, space in main canteen in the SU is not optimised to fit all students, and not enough food choice, more breakfast items available would be good too. IC also does not hold enough computers for demand, either make the other computer facilities around campus more known or open up more space for computer areas.

Edible planting wherever possible as well- I know this is being discussed for the Arts Tower space and I feel strongly that it is an idea that should be spread across campus. Sometimes people worry people will pick edible plants but that's the whole point! A particular focus could be given to herbs, fruit bushes (strawberries, raspberries), fruit trees (especially local heritage varieties) & nut trees, as these are all relatively low maintenance. The Students' Union's "Green Space" team could help by recruiting student volunteers to help the Abundance project gather the fruit, process it and distribute it to local community groups.

Native species not only prioritised but signage around campus making it very clear what we’re doing. I know the Grounds Maintenance team already do a great job but this work is not communicated to the public- simple signage about our biodiversity actions would rectify this.

Within biodiversity work, more obvious provision for pollinators (plants that they love), & habitats too- Bug hotels are a simple concept that people engage with

In general, a move away from the idea that "flagship spaces" such as Firth Court, Regents Courts etc are best served by creating barren areas of short mown grass- these are effectively wildlife deserts and in an increasingly sustainability conscious age the idea that wildlife deserts look good will become increasingly outdated! Instead, these flagship areas could be flourishing "living labs" with the landscape dept and APS dept doing best practice planting, student volunteers and the local community helping tend for it and benefitting from what it produced

A particular

Edibles.

Provide spaces which the Sheffield student eats team could tend to and provide free food to the surrounding area. Such as fruit bearing bushes/ vegetables which would be properly labelled as to prevent any danger of students eating the wrong thing.

As the head gardener for the Student Eats society I would be more than happy to liaise with people for the creation of this project.

Firstly ones that encourage the Peregrine Falcons which now nest on St George's church. Secondly ones that maintain the functionality of external spaces (particularly St. George's churchyard) as informal teaching spaces. We use these spaces frequently throughout the year and it would be a great loss to the functionality of the Mappin Street area if spaces were designed in such a way that they were no longer usable as teaching spaces.

Floral displays always improve the look of a place

Flowers that are good for bees.

Flowers to encourage bee population growth

Flowers to encourage bee population growth

Fruit trees

Good vegetation to enhance the streetscapes. I am unsure of the concept of a 'campus'. The concept of a campus could be seen to isolate non-university people from academia. The environment should include what people want from the streets running through it and not create a piece of landscape that excludes others. I think if you asked what University Built environment specialists what they think of any area that is what they would tell you.

Grass, bushes and trees.

Green areas - grass to sit on in the summer; small trees and shrubs, wild areas; pocket gardens ...
Green corridors for wildlife to traverse the city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Green park areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Green roofs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More planting areas within buildings and in offices</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green stuff please</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green walls could be more prominent, and an encouragement of edible gardens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green walls, wildflowers, meadows, green roofs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green, clean and modern architecture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>green, pedestrianised areas are nice; sidewalks need to be improved a lot; avoid bus routes cutting through the campus on Victoria or Mappin Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to say, when you resurfaced the area between the Octagon and Union buildings and are now making such a fuss about the other side of the campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High quality, natural planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How about your students cleaning up after themselves instead of leaving detritus around the university areas and Broomhill.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t agree that car parks should be lost in order to provide green space. We can only be squeezed so much into using public transport. Sometimes and in some situations we must use a car to travel to work and not having parking available causes unnecessary stress. There are more than enough green spaces in and around the campus for example Weston park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t mind, just stop destroying our heritage sites to build ugly tower blocks in the name of profit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like it as it is but would like more greenery but not at the expense of any of the existing buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like the existing planting in general, so more of the same would be nice. If space permits, some meadow-style landscaping would be excellent for biodiversity - potentially achieved by leaving some existing grass to grow longer, and supplementing with wild flowers. A wildlife pond or wet / boggy area would also be excellent for biodiversity, and in keeping with our wider landscape in the Peaks. How about a gritstone boulder somewhere with associated planting (heather, bilberry, etc.), again to form a connection with our countryside?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to see trees and flower beds around fronts of buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love the church at St George’s. Making more of a feature of that would be lovely. The University Arms is the only bar/pub I go to in Sheffield and I would really love to see you keep it in line with option 1 or 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I quite like vertical gardens, but I think these can be quite expensive to maintain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see there is no plan for ‘greening’ Victoria street (Philosophy department, Alumni office). the street has only one tree in it, and while the philosophy department has a few nice and green front gardens, the street as a whole feels grey and gloomy. I hope Victoria street (above west) can be added to the ‘greening’ project, to which I am overall very sympathetic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it would be great if current areas of lawn were used to grow vegetables/herbs. If the university has medium sized areas of land they could be used as ‘biodiversity areas’ where you just let stuff grow over a period of time and see what grows and inhabits the area. This generally leads to a significant increase in biodiversity and the discovery of new or thought to be extinct species.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I think the Masterplan looks pretty decent on the surface. Western Bank/Brook Hill is a nightmare and so anything to make that area more appealing and safe is urgently needed. The City's done an excellent job with the Gold Route, and it's fantastic that our plans take that into account and plan to extend it. When bringing guests to the City, I always follow the Gold Route and then finding myself apologising when the physical environment goes rapidly downhill!

On a small note, the plans and campus maps often miss out the Management School (but they do include the Law School, which is equally far out!). Please don't forget that we're up the hill... Although a small thing, a crossing on Crookesmoor Road linking Conduit Road and Northumberland Road would be a really useful addition. I've seen far too many of our international students nearly get knocked down at that junction.

I think the University should concentrate more on content than image.

I think there is enough greenery around the campus we are fringed by 2 huge parks which is enough.

I think this is an excellent idea. Dedicated areas for wildflowers (with the odd pond) should attract a lot of wildlife. But this needs to be carefully thought through as we don't want foxes and frogs to end up under the wheels of cars.

I would certainly like to be able to take research visitors to eat and drink at the University Arms after seminars and colloquium. It is in wonderful location (particularly for the Hicks and Alfred Denny buildings) and sustains a unique collegial atmosphere like no other place on campus. It is a standing symbol of academia.

I would hope that with £81 million being spent on `the Diamond`, that a substantial amount of money & thought will be spent on sustainable Landscaping, throughout the campus. ‘Greening’ new or existing areas is great, but LINKING these areas will require more than token planting. The current major roads around the campus are a noisy, polluting factor which could be moderated with correct planting to screen noise, depollute & offer visual interest. Trees, shrubs, planting beds please.

I would like a careful layouting that balances a functional campus, integrating historical values with cutting-edge architecture and facilities.

I would like the look and heritage of Sheffield to be maintained. This does not mean more multi colour ed blocks. I would like the Uni Arms and Henderson's buildings to be retained. They are very important to the people of Sheffield and mean more than bricks and mortar.

I would like to see a lot more cycle paths incorporated with green spaces & water features

I would like to see a more accessible route from the IC to the Arts Tower. At the moment it is one road crossing which is a bit of a nightmare and doesn't do any favours for people crossing or the traffic.

I would like to see as much space given over to pedestrians as possible: at the moment, making your way across campus requires several v. unpleasant crossings of busy roads, and buildings are often surrounded by car parks, meaning you can never truly relax because you have to look out for careless drivers! Pedestrians should always be top priority (and care needs to be taken when designing 'shared spaces' with bikes as cyclists are not always the most considerate users of the environment either)

I would like to see large scale green spaces, but instead of typically urban small plants, I would like to see larger trees and show-piece landscape architecture. I think the most important development should be a traffic free pathway which can be used by bikes and pedestrians to navigate through the heart of the campus, and extend towards the residence buildings and town centre.

I would like to see native tree species such as birch, beech, ash, plane, rowan or plane. I'm also keen on seeing some of the wild flower mixtures that have been developed by Pictorial Meadows. I am not in favour of seeing the kind of traditional planters such as those that have been installed near the entrances of university buildings. I think these don't blend well with the surrounding environment/architecture, mostly because they have the university logo and are painted bright blue. I think the university should refrain from "branding" the new areas of the campus, i.e. with street furniture bearing the university’s logo or colours.

I would like to see planting that reflects the research going on in the university's landscape department. In addition to planting that supports insects and other wildlife I would also like to see an edible or useful element in the form of fruiting trees, fruit bushes and perennial herbs. Plus explanatory signage to educate students as to what the planting is for and how they might use it

I would like to see the greening go hand in hand with facility to sit, in large numbers maybe, for relaxation and refreshment (rest, not shops). I would like to see the spaces inhabited by humans, not just wildlife, providing engaging green spaces which are vibrant, encouraging creative expression (art, music etc). Existing buildings in the
Hounsfield area, which appear to face demolition, notably the university arms and the georgian terraces, could play an important role in this approach. I do think the current architectural artistic impressions show a distinct lack of creativity- poor to be frank - I expect more from the University of Sheffield.

I would like to see the Jessop West cycle shed put back. It was a great facility and taken away without any warning or replacement.

I would like to see the preservation of older buildings on campus. These buildings are valuable assets and a major part of the city's heritage. Students at the university are proud of these buildings and appreciate their beauty. They provide a visual continuity to the campus that is lost when they are replaced by increasing numbers of disparate modern buildings that often clash and compete for attention. The end result is that the area looks like an imitation of any number of cities in the US.

Tearing down useful buildings is a wasteful practice that contributes to increase in the landfill sites and represents poor management of resources. These buildings should be cherished and maintained for future generations rather than be torn down for the latest architectural fad.

I would like to see the University petition the council to stop cutting down all the trees in Weston Park. Other than that, the University doesn't need more construction or development work. You cannot possibly dress up further development as an environmentally friendly thing. The most friendly thing is to patch up what is there. Make it energy efficient, etc.

I would like to see the university stop knocking down historic buildings to replace them with cheap and nasty architecturally worthless buildings.

I would like you not to knock down beautiful buildings and replace them with a tower. And absolutely not to knock down the University Arms.

I'd like to see key pieces of Sheffield history kept in tact and not destroyed by the university to create horrendous pieces of architecture! there are so many places in Sheffield with either disused land or decrepit buildings that are not safe to use, you plan to knock down historical buildings, some of witch perfectly fine for years of extended use or have just been recently refurbished (eg, uni arms..) not only do you seem to think its acceptable to destroy all these buildings, you also expect to be able to cause so much havoc to every other person that may drive, walk or get on a bus in that surrounding area just for the "safety" of your students. if your students looked up from their smart phones when crossing the road then maybe they would be alot "safer" i think that the whole plan is rather selfish and only seems to be for the benefit of the university and not Sheffield as a community.

I'd love to see the restoration of a traditional Victorian vision with wide parkland, natural waterways and ponds thriving with wildlife and trees lining streets with good wide pavements. Make the greenest city greener, maybe with birch and English oak.

I'd really like to see more permanent or maintained seasonal planting. Each development on campus seems to remove some green space. In particular there seems to be a trend towards removing established planting. This is often replaced by less hardy / more ornamental plants, which I suspect do not provide the habitat for wildlife as larger areas of established hedges and undergrowth. Around graduation time and some open days it seems established plants are often replaced with seasonal bedding that provides very short term interest, but is then not cared for substantially and visually and environmentally deteriorates providing a worse environment for the majority of the year. The green roofs proposed as part of the masterplan are a welcome enhancement to new building work, but are hidden and unless overlooked (green balconies / green walls would be preferable?!) do little for the visual environment and appreciation of green space.

If it was green all the way through from Mappin to the Arts Tower that would be awesome :)

If possible maybe some trees around the arts tower in an attempt to create some shelter from the wind

I'm generally in favour of more trees and greenery

Increased number of deciduous trees, water features

Increased tree planting and public spaces with seating etc. There are far too few comfortable outdoor spaces or properly thought-through transitional spaces between buildings. Road crossings are, dire, dangerous and mostly poorly spaced.

It is my understanding that the West Wing of Dainton building is scheduled for recladding in the near future. By recladding in solar panels (which I am assure is feasible) it
would not only generate power but would be a clear commitment to the University’s green energy policy.

It would be nice to see more plants around the campus, more green space in general. However, the proposed garden on the current Arts Tower car park seems foolish considering the current issues we have had with the pipes. If the university spends a lot of money on redoing this area of land and then needs to dig it up again every few years because of pipe issues it would be a huge waste of money. Also the proximity to the park does make a new green garden seen superfluous.

Its fine as it is

Keep our parking and the university arms. Sheffield's history does not belong to you!

Leavygreave road and arts tower forecourt in desperate need of greening

less 'modern' buildings the architecture is appalling...and more cultivation of heritage stop knocking down the old to bring in buildings that resemble badly built lego and cultivate the heritage of this city more!

Less urbanisation. I get a sense, when I walk around the campus, that it is still very much 'industrialised' compared to some campuses. Additionally, this is a problem that urgently needs to be addressed: there need to be more seating for study made available. There is a distinct lack of seating not only in the Information Commons, but also in Western Bank and in the other areas that have been made available.

Limiting cars/motorised vehicles wherever feasible.
The University Arms is used extensively by University staff and postgrad students. I also take MS applicants there. It should remain open.

Living walls

local plants, shrubbery and meadows attracting bees, trees alongside car lanes and all roads that divide the campus

Lots more greenery and water features.

lots of trees and water ways

Lots of trees!

Lots of wildflowers

Lots, particularly enjoy the smell of elaeagnus this time of year!

Love to see more garden space that encourages an interesting, diverse city-centre ecology

More benches and places to sit to enjoy the space - especially St Georges; people sit on grave stones as there is no seating. Shame as nice place to go for a break but disrespectful.

low maintenance

Low maintenance soft and hard landscapes ( which will not turn into an unkempt eyesore, as on the ring road to the Wicker, after the initial attractive planting )

Maintained planters and/or small shruberies around the café areas ( where possible) Edge of car parks to have maintained low flower beds/shrubberies .

Maintenance of historic buildings. Some of the new university buildings, e.g the Diamond look great but the new developments need to be balanced with the preservation and maintenance of the older university buildings, e.g Firth Court and University Arms.

Mature trees, lawn, wildflower meadows, woodland, habitat areas

Mature trees. Pictorial meadows, Green roofs. - areas the University is supposed to be an expert in

Maybe St George's Green could be developed a bit more

More bike lanes and safer bike routes
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Proposed Changes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>More bushes and trees - although I think it's a nice campus.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More dedicated cycle lanes - separated from pedestrians and road vehicles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More development of lovely green areas and beautiful features such as the Church on the green would be perfect. More features made of the beautiful architecture in the city already would be great, as opposed to building new blocks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More easily accessible road crossings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More flowers or wildflowers could encourage bees. Perhaps other ways of encouraging bees and insects could be considered, like insect houses or beehives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More grass not just trees in concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More grass, less concrete</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More grassed areas and flower beds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More green roofs, small wildflower meadows with seating areas, allotments and other food-growing areas/projects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More green roofs, more pedestrian areas, more trees, safer ways to cross Western Bank and Hanover Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More green sounds good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More green spaces and trees with places to sit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More green spaces would be nice - a lawn of some sort where students can spend time in nice weather.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More green spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More green spaces, more plants, water feature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More greenery - trees and planting. A lot of the university developments in recent years have been very concrete / open space based with little biodiversity (e.g. around the union building and Jessop West)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More greenery and pleasant places to sit during the day combined with easier access to the main university buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More greenery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More greenspaces, less car parks. Better connectivity of walking and cycling routes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More in general, as long as walkways are not obstructed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More indoor plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complementary house plants for residents in halls</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Green/ compost bins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More infrastructure for bikes safety, more trees, more green areas to meet with other students (which you are doing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More large forest trees!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More leafy avenues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More long-term planting than we currently have around Firth Court and the Concourse, where plants seem to be replaced before every graduation ceremony.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More mature trees; low level planting (foliage and flowers) with adjacent seating; modern planting schemes with year round interest; green living walls on suitable buildings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More outdoor covered seating so that it is possible to enjoy the campus when the weather is nice even if it's raining.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More perennial flowers that attract bees and butterflies, more trees.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
More planting of forest trees to replace the many that have been removed in recent years rather than replacement with smaller, short-lived trees/bushes.

More plants inside buildings. Green space by arts tower.

More seating and green space/plants

More shrubs/tall plants rather than simply trees.

More small trees. Raised shrub beds.

More student friendly environment, bike renting hub and station, more green area

More trees

More trees - many to the East and North of the Students Union were removed/killed recently (some of which were memorials!).

More trees and flowers please.

More trees and fountains would be pleasing to the eye

More trees and general green spaces (grass or similar), more flowers and hedgerows/bushes where possible.

More trees and grass

More trees and green areas around major campus buildings

More trees and green spaces to sit.

More trees and greenery

More trees and lawned areas.

More trees and plants which support insect life such as bees and butterflies

More trees, especially near the overpass and the what is now the arts tower car park as this area seems very grey and dull at times. Evergreen plants would be good too so that they provide colour to the area even in the winter months.

More trees, Grassed areas

More trees, green spaces

More trees, more grassed areas, less hard paving.

More trees, more original buildings and features, less new buildings

More trees, water, green roofs, meadow-style planting. Also, retain the university roundabout - even though you can't access it, it's refreshing to see this lovely green space in the middle of such a large and busy junction.

More trees.

More trees/small green spaces. Small water features may also enhance any 'lost spaces' around campus

More water features!

I notice that most of the old buildings around the new development will be going - what will happen to the University Arms? It would be a real shame if this were to go. I also think it would be a shame to lose all of the character which some of the existing buildings lend the area.

More well built red brick buildings with sensible layouts (see the clusterfuck that is Mappin) with a nice ratio of building to garden/greenery.

More wild type meadow areas/bulb planting i.e. less need landscaping. The current bedding flowers and tubs of flowers that are changed so often seem like such a waste of money to me. Less maintenance would be great! All the lovely lavender that came back every year was removed from firth court would love to see its return in other areas
of the university! Blossom treat would look great in the spring time!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N\a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Native plants & wildflowers, good for pollinating species. Mixture of trees but also some grassed areas, not just hard paving with the odd plant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nice places with seating at lunchtime for the summer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No new ones, Sheffield has lots of green spaces already</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>no strong opinion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>None that mean the University taking over PUBLIC streets - you DO NOT OWN THIS CITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not being any expert, I can't truly specify but highly commend any attempt by the University to improve humanity's relationship with nature on a localised level. Given Sheffield's reputation in general as a green city, this would enhance it even further and perhaps also minimise the risk of more extreme effects on our climate.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nothing specific, but the general aim seems like a good thing.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ones that are in both useful for wildlife but are also keeping with Sheffield's Victorian and Edwardian past</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ones that don't require historic buildings to be flattened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Open access green spaces, where people can get involved in gardening and sustainable green projects. I'd be particularly keen to see 'useful' gardening, i.e. growing vegetables, rather than aesthetic gardening.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Open Weston Park onto Mushroom Lane, as once promised, to permit access to central campus from Crookesmoor, Elmfield and Sports Centre without recourse to main roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outdoor cafes.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outdoor Seating/ Communal area.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrianisation and improvement of public realm</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pedestrianized, human scale, in keeping with the area's Victorian suburban roots</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>perennial planting similar to that in Devonshire Green and Peace Gardens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perhaps you could reverse the weird decision to turn the nice green hill opposite the student union into an apparently mostly unused ampitheatre thing then...</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Planting which supports wildlife. Planting to encourage bees. Spaces which are useable by all - spaces to sit and enjoy the wildlife. Places for children to enjoy the wildlife on campus.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants around buildings would be enough, not whole roads!</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Plants specifically for encouraging endangered wildlife such as bees or butterflies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Plants to attract and provide food and shelter for pollinating insects such as bees and butterflies, and sheltered protected places for birds to nest and roost. Pleasant seating areas, not cold seats made from stone. Seats with an interesting view and which aren't in places where there’s too much traffic noise to talk.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Please don't demolish University Arms, I visit it weekly and it serves really good food.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
Please stop removing all the car parks as it makes life difficult for carers and people who are not fully mobile or have other ailments.

Please stop tearing down Sheffield beautiful old building & replacing the with soulless concrete & glass is there no way you can adapt the historical parts of the city to fit in with modern needs for student. Besides it’s not just students that live in this city students are around for 4 years max we are residents I’ve lived in Sheffield my whole life & it’s the heart of Sheffield your ripping out plenty of trees to keep this city the greenest in England.

Plenty of wild flowers to encourage bees/insects etc. Lots of trees with various colours of foliage ie different shades of green, reds, variegated. Not too much shrubbery which collect litter and encourage rats to nest.

Plenty...especially planting which would attract birds and butterflies if possible.

**Pond**

- Ponds, edibles, fountains, green roofs, living walls, wild flower meadows, heathers - as much greenery as possible.
- Poplar trees; wildflowers & bee hives
- pubs and clubs

Reduction of the use of GREY - the new area outside the octogon may have planting round it but it looks very grey especially on a grey day (which we get a few of in Sheffield). Since it seems that GREY is the current university colour of choice inside the buildings please can we have something other than GREY outside. I know that in new light and airy buildings grey can look modern but in older buildings with less natural light it is just depressing - staff and students work better in light, uplifting environments not grey ones.

Retain as many of the remaining gold quality old buildings as possible. They are as much a part of the University's image as the shiny new glass and steel buildings. For example, the University Arms should be a landmark bar with an outdoor area that links better into the university land behind rather than just one entrance from Western Bank.

Sheffield needs more visitor attractions in the city centre. The University could support an art gallery. Although it doesn't teach art there are art-related activities in many depts. Perhaps a collaborative venture could produce something innovative.

I'd like to see a link up with Henderson's to provide a small shop/visitor centre for them and a better frontage to the roads. It's an interesting historical part of the university campus and should be retained and upgraded sympathetically.

**Roof gardens, allotment sections, green areas, increased number of beehives, massive ant farm.**

**Roof meadows!!!**

Save the listed buildings

**Sensible greening up.**

Try and keep as much as can be kept of the older buildings. for instance please try and keep the University Arms but the Henderson's relish building can go.

**Shrubs and water features**

**Shrubs/trees, grassy areas**

- Some red berry bearing bushes like pyrocanthus, favoured by waxwings. Some bee and butterfly-friendly flowers. Native/local tree species such as ash, birch, field maple (good autumn colours). Some small ponds for newts and frogs, and hedges for nesting birds.
- Some trees for Victoria Street!

something like Weston Park, clean and organised. wouldn't like to see messy "natural" planting like some of the new public spaces in Sheffield. they easily become waste bins... and yes ... there are never enough bins in public spaces in the UK.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Part of the Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Something that reflected Western park better and not just concrete everywhere.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spaces that are open and yet enclosed to block out such as vehicular traffic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop destroying what is already there. Many of the old buildings are being used by wildlife anyway, bat roosts, nesting birds etc. Enhance what is already there &amp; stop the wanton destruction of my city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student friendly roads/ stuff for bikes in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>especially fed up with the one-way system around the hospitals eg. Northumberland Road. When the car park gets built I would hope to see one side of street parking removed on all one streets there to make way for a counterflow bike lane - Like they already have on Brunswick Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see valuable and historic buildings and gardens and social areas retained e.g. The University Arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stylish with not too much colour - think Westminster Abbey at the Cambridges' wedding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUDS and tree planting; contemporary designed streetscape and landscaping as for example the treatment at Thames Barrier Park</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sustainable, things that encourage wild life. Supporting the peregrine falcons!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall grasses that waft in the breeze (provided they do not end up as litter traps. Shrubs to encourage nesting birds. Flowers that attract plenty of butterflies and bees etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tall trees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The campus should be exemplary for food production, wildflowers and biodiversity. Many more trees are needed to cut down wind and we need much more grass and green areas to absorb water and reduce flood risk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation of the ampitheatre has resulted in a loss of green space. I dislike that. It is well known that Sheffield is one of the greenest major cities already, getting rid of popular established businesses (WHICH HAS A BIG BEER GARDEN ANYWAY) should not be a priority of any redevelopment strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The current planting and spaces are good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishment of large trees, although I know these are expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The establishment of large trees, although I know these are expensive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The great architectural building owned by the University must be maintained and looked after. Not simply knocked to make way for new ones. These builds were often given or the funding provided by Sheffield industrialist who made this city great in the past and by not looking after them you denigrate there memory. This University was funded for many years by the people of Sheffield and should not simple be treat as a soulless government institution. From Sheffield people to all of those in search of knowledge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This of course includes the University Arm which has been part of the campus for a very long time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The maintenance and preservation of historic and listed buildings such as the University Arms and the ex-Henderson's Relish factory.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation of green corridors, planting of trees and nectar-rich flowering shrubs and perennials, the planting of native species only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Plan is full of good ideas for planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Themed Gardens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Themed planting appropriate to the immediate area, which considers balanced benefits of amenity, wildlife, nutrition, watering burden and appearance. Planting which delivers something beyond just 'looking nice'.

Trees and shrubs which support biodiversity of plant and animal populations and support research and education in these aspects.

Then why did you pave over the green space outside the octagon? This including removing a bush during the nesting season, which I had seen robin's frequenting. An e-mail to the Estates department at the time met with no response.

There are 5 roads leading to the University Square with 2 roads being major trunk roads the A57 and A61. The least used road is Bolsover Street which is used by local traffic only. This road should be made one-way and should be used as an exit and bus services using Netherthorpe Road to gain access to roundabout.

There certainly could be more deciduous trees all over the central campus. More bike racks. More recycling bins.

There needs to be more trees and more facilities for cycling.

This proposal is of no particular interest to me.

Trees and other types of sizeable greenery, to make campus seem more partitioned.

Trees that encourage local wildlife to flourish. Flowers which smell nice.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>urban vegetable initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees, more flowerbeds like there are usually on the Western Bank dual carriageway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees, shrubs/flowers, water features, grassed areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees, water, seating areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees; wild flowers: plants which are attractive, suitable to our climate, and which encourage bio-diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two of the world's leading planting designers are lectures in the university Landscape department. They designed the planting at the Olympic Park and many other high profile sites. It is important that they lead the planting design for the new masterplan to ensure it is modern, exciting, sustainable, and provides ecosystem services such as storm-water retention, animal habitat and pollinator provision. Some of the current tree planting is not appropriate, e.g. many Acer saccharinum around Jessop West. These grow large and are prone to wind damage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unsure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urban meadows, grass/lawn, small designated wildlife zones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of wildflowers / nature flowers and trees. A commitment to keeping them tidy and litter free.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Various green spaces to ensure that biodiversity is encouraged. Spaces for staff and students to utilise the campus and to encourage the public to use the university spaces</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We could start by replanting the trees that were cut down around the Durham Road car park. Then, as I suggested in the staff survey, instead of building a multi story structure for cars on the site, the University of Sheffield should have constructed a multi story structure for trees, shrubs and plants, in conjunction with the colleagues of the department of Animal and Plant Sciences. It would be like a twenty first century version of the Hanging Gardens of Babylon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild flower areas to encourage wildlife; water and natural rocks / stones.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild flower borders, Pergolas with climbing plants eg honeysuckles, clematis, climbing roses, spring bulbs, rose garden, beehives, lots of seating areas (please provide bins), well maintained paths, no cobbles, unmown grass areas and some lawned areas, water feature, some art eg glass mosaic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild flowers - Roof gardens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Wild' flowers and similar would be great. More trees!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild Flowers and traditional varieties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wild flowers to encourage bees and other insects, bird boxes, native plants and trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild flowers, hedges, things that mirror the Peak District. Limestone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildflower areas would be a relatively easy, low cost and maintenance way of attracting more species. Leafy, tree-filled areas would be great for biodiversity, air pollution reduction and noise-baffling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild-flower meadow planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any insect-friendly plants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continue to service the peregrine nest box</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildflower meadows, deciduous trees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildflower, sustainable, encourage wildlife. It drives me mad in the park when flowers are dug up and new ones planted 3/4 times a year!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildflower/bee friendly areas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildflowers, trees. I'm disappointed you cut down the magnolias between the Interval Bar and the Hicks building, including at least one which was a memorial.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wildlife friendly planting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife garden - with bird feeders, insect hotels, log piles etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allotment/vegetable garden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Willow trees. Flowers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would be good to see plants that attract bees, especially around Firth Court to help the Weston Park Museum bees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would be nice to have more outdoor open spaces to eat outside and spend time there during breaks in study, or even study outside in the warmer weather.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Any comment on the plan to extend the Gold Route?

A clear continuous cycle route through the campus avoiding Brook Hill roundabout is badly needed. This needs to include dedicated crossing facilities at the maker roads. The walking and cycling routes from Crookes/Walkley via Whitham Road and Crooke Valley Rd which take thousands of students and others in and out of the campus should also be looked at for pavement widening/resurfacing, better crossings and cycle lane extensions.

A good idea in principle.

A good idea.

A good idea.

How about a wheelchair/pushchair-accessible route from Weston Park Museum down to underpass near Students' Union?

A great idea - it's horrible to try and walk through the University site! Brook Hill and Upper Hanover Street are just horrific.

I'd be more inclined to cycle if a) there were facilities to keep your bike safe and not have it stolen; b) the roads seemed a little safer and you're less likely to get hit by a bus; c) there were fewer hills (but probably little you can do about that one!).

A great idea, it will help integrate the university with the rest of Sheffield.

Again, just don't knock down the city's heritage to do so.

Again, my experience in this area is limited, not being a cyclist. Conversely, I do sympathise with any cyclist who finds themselves pedalling uphill with a bus crawling up behind them - as I often tell myself on my journey home in the evening, hardly a heavenly match. As such, any attempt to reduce the risk of such a scenario in University territory and also minimise the risk of possible accidents, again, makes sense.

Altering the bus routes may cause problems for others who use the buses.

amazing!

An excellent idea. Makes a lot of sense to have the route end in Weston Park.

An EXCELLENT plan.

As a graduate of Sheffield I am horrified that the senior management can contemplate demolition of ones the university's best loved historic buildings, the 197 Club, more recently called the University Arms. I am all for advancement into the future but this is a callous disregard of the past and the feelings of current and past staff and students.

As above the wanton destruction of the city's old buildings does not make for a better city. Enhance what you can then incorporate the new with the existing.

As long as it doesn't create major disruption it can only be beneficial.

Brilliant.

Brilliant idea.

I am fully behind the University's idea to extend the Gold route and prioritise cyclists and pedestrians more.

See my impassioned answer above for my views on what the priorities should be when designing planting schemes for these new spaces.

Brilliant idea.

Buses should be banned from Mappin Street.
but I would enjoy it more

Can't see what is wrong with it. Please stop building stuff and digging stuff up and ruining Sheffield you bastards

Can't you just leave things as they are. Why break something that works!

Closing Western Bank is crazy. Move the university instead, there's empty space in the east end.

Concerned about the lack of on-street parking if changes go ahead

Cycle lanes preferably need to be well separated from both cars/buses and pedestrians as trying to combine any of the 2 does not work and is dangerous. Look to Copenhagen or Amsterdam for an ideal situation. Consult with actual cyclists when planning cycle lanes. Provide more safe and covered storage areas and places for cyclists to change and clean themselves.

Cyclists and pedestrians don't mix. Adding more cycle access increases the risk of injury to Pedestrians due to inconsiderate riding.

Do not demolish old heritage buildings!
Dept of Music, Mappin and Firth Court are what adds to the Uni of Sheffield.
Do not become a ultra modern box building collection.

Don't demolish the University Arms!

Don't even know what the gold route is. It feels lethal cycling to work. Extreme measures are needed to make it feel more safe.

Don't know what this is.

Don't try to cover up the university's greed by pretending it's to improve networks for environmentally friendly commuting methods. Leave the historic buildings alone. The university has already sullied its hands by demolishing listed buildings. Don't embarrass yourself any more.

Ensure sweeping/cleaning standards are kept to the same level throughout route.

excellent idea

excellent idea

excellent idea

Excellent idea (I wasn't aware there was an existing Gold Route until reading the document)

Excellent idea!

Excellent idea. The new pedestrian crossings on the major roads are essential, to make them safer as well as more convenient—if you do only one thing, that should be it.

Fantastic idea.

Find a way to make this happen alongside keeping our heritage - save our interesting old buildings, they are part of what makes Sheffield University what it is, not to mention Sheffield city centre.

Generally a good idea. The campus needs far better, high quality link routes. The plan, however, focuses just on a single 'Gold Route' spine, and does not consider movement into the campus from the west, north, or the principal access from the city centre via Glossop Road/West Street. Better cycle links through to the west of the city, to student residences etc. needs consideration for safety reasons. A clearer entrance that signifies a point of arrival at the University should be considered from the city centre - make it apparent that you are entering the University area. In addition, steps running from University Square towards Leavygrave Road would prohibit cycle movement - there needs to be thought about providing accessible routes not only for cyclists but also wheelchair users.

good idea
Good idea but could create congestion on other roads in the area.

Good idea but make sure the identity is of the University. Put people first and make the most of the potential.

Good idea except you will need to divert existing traffic away from St George's church area. Also is Mappin Street is busier and two-way it will cause problems for students and staff from that area.

Great idea!

Great - linking it together would be good. Already many people walk from campus down through town to the station and travel from all routes around, making it easier to get around (and improving major pedestrian crossings) could only be a good thing. Sometimes being a pedestrian is precarious.

Great idea - the university is so close to the city but currently feels disconnected.

Great idea.

Great idea. I live 27 miles away so have to drive to work at uni, but if I lived in Sheffield I would definitely be looking forward to being able to safely cycle and walk around the campus. The Uni Square roundabout is devilish at the moment.

Great plan

Great, but what about all the pedestrian crossings, bridges & underpasses that will entail?

Hope that the quality of the gold route is maintained both in its provision but also in its upkeep

How dare you take the roads from Sheffields motorists. The city is about so much more than you and your students.

I am concerned about plans to create some pedestrian-only routes --- they should be motor-vehicle-free but open to cyclists.

I am concerned that the pedestrianisation of large areas of the campus will make it much more difficult for delivery vans to have access to the teaching buildings, not to mention disabled people.

I believe there should be cycle lanes from the university accommodation through to the campus. This would encourage me to cycle more as currently I am a bit deterred due to the enormity of the traffic and not particularly safe cycling routes.

I also think there should be bridges/underpasses surrounding the large roundabout near the information commons. I feel that this would improve safety enormously, ease traffic congestion and could even provide an inter-faculty project for engineers, architects, art students etc. I feel a large bridge connecting the campus' could be used as a special landmark in the university and provide perfect advertising space for the university too, where many cars drive past.

I cycle through here a lot. It isn't always clear which is the best way to go to stay on the cycle lanes and avoid pinch points, hills etc.

Need clearer (preferably on the road) signs, the small blue signs are often easy to miss when cycling.

The uni round about and tram stop are horrible for cyclists to cross. I avoid them or have to get off and push/run across the road. It isn't clear how to get across here.

Need to separate the cyclists from the pedestrians at the uni roundabout as it is too busy to cycle on the pavement but far too dangerous to cycle on the road. in general there does need to be separation or at least some way to stop students just walking out without looking and getting hit by cyclists. this is a common occurrence! the lanes around mappin court/regent court are fab and very relaxing. avoids the tram lines too which are lethal!

I do not mind taking a longer route as long as it is quite, save and nice (proper ground, no breaks, good light after dark e.g. walking around the University roundabout (along the Information common) is n't nice at all.

I don't know what the Gold Route is, but I hope you will extend it and make it more visible.

I don't know what the Gold Route is.

I don't live in Sheffield and have to commute everyday to work, where I live it isn't an option to use public transport either. My worry is that looking at the plan alot of the
| staff car parks will be taken away. Is there a plan to replace these spaces as it is already a little bit of a struggle finding a spot in the morning. I actually have to park a 10 minute walk away in a University Car Park for work as it is.

I don't think it is needed

I enjoy walking or cycling from the station up to the university along this route - the traffic-free/ low traffic nature of it is something I really appreciate. If a further stretch of the city up towards Firth Court and Weston Park could be incorporated this would be really good as it incorporates places I would visit more often (or more willingly) if the walk was more pleasant, eg Weston Park and Museum, the library and Firth Court, and the University Arms

I find it upsetting that 'improving' the campus involves the knocking down of heritage buildings that give the campus the history and charm that so many enjoy.

I have children to drop at school in the mornings, I am already dropping them early and paying additional money for breakfast club to enable me to get a Category B Parking Space [which I also pay £36/month for]. I can't possibly drop them any earlier than 7.30am as the breakfast club doesn't open until then. This means that I am sat at my desk at 7.45am and I don't officially start work until 8.15am. I am worried about where working mothers, like myself, who cannot pile 2 kids on the back of a bicycle are expected to park in the new masterplan, as it appears that you are favouring pedestrians and cyclists! Where is the work/life balance, is this not discriminatory to working mothers?

I have heard rumours that the University Arms may be in the crosshairs for demolition as part of the development plans. Please don't get rid of this well-used, recently refurbished meeting space!

I have never felt that we were not well linked to the existing Gold Route.

I have to travel through the campus as the only place I can usually guarantee parking is on Northumberland road, and I work in north campus.

I have to walk through the campus but hopefully the changes would make this safer and more pleasant.

I like the idea but I am particularly concerned about Durham Road which has cars coming in both directions, often at speed and buses parked which limits vision. There have been several accidents on this road.

It is also dangerous when the area is icy.
I note that, despite cycling getting lots of mentions in the general blurb, and pictured on the video, there is no mention of it in the detail for any of the crossings! - its all re Pedestrians.

In particular, the 'Upper Hanover Street Central Crossing' - see p85 (5.1.2) the bisected Leavygreave Rd one.

This is the arterial cycle crossing that Supertram got away with severing, and is now a pedestrian xing and a beggar to use even when as i do now, dismounting and pushing bike across.

As far as I can see, this is the one that most needs the needs of cyclists to be taken into account when upgraded. This is the route cyclists use trying to follow this main route from the NW into town (it basically provides the best join from Crookes Valley/Arts Tower/Concourse/Houndsfield/Leavygreave/Upper Havover Xing/Leavygreave/Portobello etc into town route, which currently is the safest/quickest/most 'desirable' route).

There is also the the issue of the statistically dangerous Right turn off Winter St into the Uni Arts tower car park after the Star and Garter - this could be a good chance for the Uni and SCC to work together and provide a safer option.

Options could be:
1. A Left hand drop kerb 'cycle run off’ after Weston St to deliver cyclists to a new Toucan Xing over to the Arts Tower entrance. (Prob where Pelican is now?) AND
2. For more experienced/confident cyclists who will not want to spend ages 'Toucanising' one of those red right turn 'haven' strips in road centre, just prior to Toucan.
   - Both leading the cyclist over to a dedicated cycle entrance lane into the Arts Tower area, separate to the pedestrian one, going into the Uni, avoiding cycle/pedestrian conflict as you leave the Xing/Winter St.

(I know these strips - like the Glossop rd one for the R turn into Brunswick st aren’t to everyone's liking, but I'm ok with them, and in reality I would do this manoeuvre before choosing toToucanise, but feel Toucan option is impf for less confident cyclists - if in fact money/Dft guidelines dictate these 2 options conflict, then go with Toucan+dedicated cycle entry point and the rest of us will have to take our chances turning right as we do now).

I see little value in it apart from to the University. Nothing for the wider community

I support it. However strong links with public transport should be maintained as not everyone is able to walk or cycle. Also, I realize it's a long shot, but can the university exert any influence to reduce public transport prices as part of this overall strategy? The streets are clogged with cars, whereas if there was more emphasis on walking/cycling and public transport the overall experience would be much better for everyone - and would affect Sheffield on a much wider scale because people from other areas of the city would be more likely to use buses. The university should aim to extend its reach beyond 'university' areas which, in general, tend to be quite leafy and pleasant anyway, in order to try and effect improvements for people who live in more industrial and run--down parts of the city..

I support the pedestrianisation of Leavygreave Road, however the more direct route to the Western campus is along Glossop Road and up Hounsfield Road, which is not sufficiently addressed in the current proposal.

I think it is a fantastic idea. I walk to work at the SU and would really appreciate feeling valued as a walker. I think making spaces where cars and go and collegaues can park more accessible has to be part of this as I acknowledge that some people do have to use their cars on campus/to get to work.

I think it is a great mistake to treat pedestrians and cyclists as if they were the same, and as if they can use the same spaces safely. The fancy picture in the Masterplan of Leavygreave Road pictures a few cyclists, including a racer even: these will never be able to get from one end of the campus to the other safely and comfortably, because of all the pedestrians cluttering the cycling lane in the same picture (please think of the difference between 15 mph and 0 mph. Is it not significant?). Cyclists belong on the road; pedestrians on the pavement: and your Masterplan should encourage such cooperative and safe behaviour.

I think it would be a shame if these plans meant an excellent pub was demolished

I think more people need to be made more aware of where exactly the existing Gold Route is.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I think the plan to extend the Gold route is good, it would encourage me to cycle more to work from Crookes, instead of walking.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think the area, particularly the Arts Tower/Western Bank towards the concourse bridge should be really lighted well. I work until 7pm and there are dodgy people hanging around at night, there are lots of dark areas at the moment and these should be incorporated into this new plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the proposal is very good. I would suggest another crossing in the corner of Mushroom Ln and Winter Street for people coming or going to the gym. I would also suggest that Sheffield becomes the first UK city to adopt european standards in roads for &quot;pedestrian first&quot; and help our roads be safer for local and international students.. but also show less aggressiveness while driving.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think the route should extend along Whitham Road to the main gates into Weston Park, instead of only connecting from the Arts Tower. This would make the route more obvious to people outside the University and more accessible to people coming and going from Children's Hospital, too. Integration of the campus with the surrounding area would be welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this is a great idea. The busy roads and busses cutting through campus are unpleasant and dangerous.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think this is an excellent idea. Putting in additional pedestrian crossings around Western Bank would improve the ease of movement around campus - especially in between lectures when there are the most amount of people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think you need to encourage more road sense in students. I drive to and from work and often see them walk across roads without looking in the campus area. I often have to stop otherwise they would get run over.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would certainly like to be able to take research visitors to eat and drink at the University Arms after seminars and colloquium. It is in wonderful location (particularly for the Hicks and Alfred Denny buildings) and sustains a unique collegial atmosphere like no other place on campus. It is a standing symbol of academia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would happily cycle in to work if a safe cycle route from my home (Westfield) existed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would happily cycle in to work if a safe cycle route from my home (Westfield) existed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn't mind if they fix Mappin Street in the process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>if the university really wants to support public transport then make cheap or even free tickets available to students and staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If this involves the demolition of the University Arms it is likely I would hardly visit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm completely unaware of a 'gold route' in Sheffield. There are certainly no cycle paths that links any high quality parks through the city. The city is a dangerous place for cyclists - it's a very stressful experience. Since becoming pregnant I no longer cycle out of fear for safety for my unborn child.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impressi. Although I have concerns about removing buses from Western bank (see below)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In general the plans look great. I particularly like the improved crossings over western bank.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My main concern is the amount of planting of trees suggested around the IC (i.e. Leafy greaves road, hounds field road). I use these routes a lot, often at night. At the moment it feels pretty safe, but if there were lots of trees I would be concerned about my personal safety and less likely to use the route after dark (I currently avoid st George's area and Weston park for this reason at night).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In principal it is a good idea; however the link between the existing route to Devonshire Green on to the campus area is problematic and does not hold together. It may be better to have a new route coming up from the Town Hall/Barkers Pool area up to the Trippet Lane area and so in to the heart of the university campus rather than encouraging people along to Devonshire Green and then up into the university campus through nondescript and rather ugly side streets up to West Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction of a continuous dedicated pedestrian/cyclist space through the campus (and beyond) would greatly improve my commute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is this going to cause congestion?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It doesn’t go far enough, geographically, environmentally or imaginatively. The only transport used in this area should be non-motorised ones or ones like mobility scooters. This would radically reduce congestion, pollution, deaths and injuries, and make the entire city centre a place to be in rather than just a place to travel through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is fantastic and has my full support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is not clear what extending the Gold Route beyond the Arts Tower into Weston Park implies. Improved pedestrian access from the Arts Tower to the park was provided during the Weston Park refurbishment a few years ago. I would not like to see further changes which encouraged cyclists to use the park paths as a short cut between the Arts Tower and Western Bank/ Whitam Road as this would be to the detriment of other park users on these paths.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It looks great!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It looks like a good plan. I think more work needs to be done by the University &amp; Council on finding a solution to the congested pedestrian crossings all around Brookhill Roundabout - not just on Western Bank. Trying to cross Broad Lane as a pedestrian is a nightmare - cars queuing for the roundabout will often block the pedestrian crossing, and impatient pedestrians (mainly international students from my experience) will also try to dangerously cross the road on a red light.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It makes perfect sense to try and link up the main university campus buildings better especially with the other improvements to the town centre.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It seems unnecessary and will just make driving in the city centre harder.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It looks like a good idea, although the demolition of certain old buildings such as The University Arms would be a disappointment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It still crosses Hanover Street which is a major obstacle.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will be great to have a pedestrian/cycling only route, with no cars allowed, providing greater safety for all students and staff members.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It will make Meadowhall and Leeds a boom town as no one will want to come to Sheffield. We will have more charity and betting shops in the city centre. It is bad enough having to come to work but to them not have a parking area. Not everyone is able to get on a bus or tram. It won’t take long until bus and train fares are increased. What happens when someone has to leave work early? I have to look after children and elderly parents and have to be able to travel home 7 miles at short notice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be improved by links further into Broomhill, rather than terminating at Weston Park.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be wonderful to see sections of the previous layers of cobbles that were covered with tarmac exposed once again.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>However, I do think that there needs to be a better connection across the dual carriageway.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a good idea in principle, but there are large areas of the route that need looking at and re-greening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a good idea to link the university to the city centre. But I feel Division and West Street let this walk down, they could do with some redevelopment themselves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a good idea. Please don’t always assume cyclists and pedestrians have the same needs though.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s a good idea: it would add to the sense of Sheffield being an attractive city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Its a great idea but the steps on Leavygreave Rd to the University Sq are a bad idea - see general comments.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It’s always good to see improvements to pedestrian access.
With regard to crossings, I think it would be much better to plan systems that remove all pedestrian and traffic interaction. A large bridge type structure over the ring road connecting the two halves of Leavygreave Road would be much better than any 'super' crossing. This would allow better traffic flow and pedestrians would have to wait to cross.

It’s an interesting idea.
It’s fine as it is.
I’ve never heard of the Gold Route, so it wouldn’t make much of a difference to me.
Looks good
LOVE IT
Make the bike paths clear. Pedestrians can be in a world of their own and cultural differences in spatial awareness mean that international students from China and Japan can endanger themselves and cyclists.

My only concern is Option 3 for Hounsfield Site. This seems to destroy the University Arms. This unique space for rest & socialising is valuable - especially for older postgrads & teaching staff. The main union building doesn't provide so much escape from the hustle & bustle of undergrads.
And also the building is structurally appealing. So please don’t get rid of it.

n/a
need for better access from Bolsover Street/Weston Street to university campus as the road is very busy and difficult to cross (for example to access the campus by bike from Weston Street.
also when leaving the campus via cycle path down Hounsfield Road it is then difficult to get onto Glossop road to join the contra flow cycle path down Brunswick street.
Needed! Current public realm is an embarrassment to the university and city compared to what I’ve seen at other leading universities.

no
No
Not probably as key part of the plan as improving pedestrian safety
Not sure your commitment to cycling or claims to well planned change is credible. See above.
Only that it is a good idea.

Pedestrian routes are in real need of improvement, as most of us on campus get around on foot. I walk from the University tram stop to central campus every day, which involves crossing Upper Hanover St, where there are two inadequate crossings which take forever to change. The one opposite Sainsbury’s is dangerous because of the slip road from Hounsfield Rd / Glossop Rd, so even when it looks clear cars can come around the corner unexpectedly. Last week I saw a student knocked down there. Most mornings I take my kids to nursery on Brunswick St, which requires crossing Glossop Rd, where there are no safe crossing points between Hanover St. and the Hallamshire, so I take a deep breath before walking out with the buggy every day. (The alternative, using existing crossings on Upper Hanover, Glossop (West St Side), then Upper Hanover x 2 again to get back to the correct side, is a significant detour and involves crossing 4 roads.) This week I had the same issue when leading a group of 40 L1 undergraduate students across Glossop Rd en route to a field site. Anything that could be done to improve safe pedestrian routes - working on where people actually want to walk (and do already), rather than where is convenient, would be highly beneficial.
Please stop demolishing the wonderful old buildings in our city, to replace them by unsightly building that do not fit in. Just because you bring money to this city does not mean you should railroad your plans for unsightly buildings. Visit york and see how their heritage is also a part of their present and future, perhaps you idiots may learn
Proper well marked and segregated cycle routes - not mixed use pavements which only cause aggravation between pedestrians and cyclists. Cycle ramps throughout and no requirement anywhere to have to lift your bike.

Rethink the termination point of the Gold Route - by terminating at the entrance to western park, the route loses opportunity to extend into other areas, for example Broom Hill, especially in wet and muddy winter months.

save the listed buildings (University Arms)

Shared pedestrian/cyclist space is a REALLY bad idea. It causes unnecessary conflict between the two groups and makes cycle journeys slower and longer. The plans will be vastly improved with the introduction of segregated cycle paths which will allow both groups to travel safely without hindering each other.

Sheffield definitely needs more dedicated, safe, cycle routes. Please ensure that the cycle route doesn't double up as parking spaces, like a lot of the paths in the city, e.g. Clarkehouse Road, as that just forces cyclists further into the middle of the road. It's annoying and unsafe for both cyclists and drivers.

Some cyclists are totally irresponsible when using area designated for both cyclists and pedestrians. How will this make it safe for the pedestrians?

Some of the building you have in your radar are of great interest in the city sounds brilliant

Sounds good

Sounds like a good idea if it makes it easier to walk from town / the university Tram stop

Sounds like a great idea.

Stop destroying Sheffield's beautiful buildings

Strong opposition to option 3 on page 72 of the developments options for the Hounsfield site. Save the University Arms! Old style pubs are preferable to the soulless multi story building proposed in option 3.

The crossings over the ringroad are terrible. Anything to improve any of those will be good.

The cycling route needs improvement across Upper Hanover onto Leavygreave Rd

The existing Gold route is reasonable except at the point it crosses the ring road (Leavygreave Road/Upper Hanover St "crossroads"). This is a very poorly planned area for pedestrians and especially cyclists. The Leavygreave Road cycle track connects very poorly at the point it crosses Upper Hanover Street and cyclists must dismount, walk and wait at pedestrian crossings. The tram also presents an additional hazard at this crossing. Ideally, I would like to see a bridge that connects the two halves of the Leavygreave Road and travels over the Upper Hanover Street ring road.

The Gold route is good, but by no means perfect, running on roads where it is not clearly marked to all and therefore cars and pedestrians both obstruct the cycle paths throughout the day. By creating a wider purpose built cycle path and pedestrian walkway, which runs through green spaces in the city, the experience of cycling would improve significantly.

The Gold route is one I use frequently, and broadly speaking, is a joy to ride along. It has really encouraged me to use my bike more in the city centre and visit things near it e.g. shops, cafes etc. rather than just eating my lunch at work. I fully support the plans.

On the drawings for University Square it shows a 'stepped link to Upper Hanover Street'. How will bikes negotiate this? Will there be another way?

Please consider having designated segregated cycle paths rather than purely shared space which is lovely to look at but can be ambiguous. Often pedestrians don't realise you're allowed to cycle there and make comments about "riding on the pavement" etc. To see a great example of wonderful bike facilities, see Utrecht University Campus here - http://bicycledutch.wordpress.com/2014/07/31/cycling-in-the-utrecht-science-park/
The Gold Route plan is good as far as it goes. However, a lot of foot and cycle traffic comes in from the west and north of the campus. How can this better catered for?

The Gold Route: walking from Western Bank/ University Square to the City Centre and Rail Station via West St and Division St, already a pleasant route, needs much more attention.

The heritage buildings of Henderson and University Arms should be protected. The loss of the Jessop Edwardian building was a disastrous own goal for an insensitive University to support. The Tapton Hall development is another own goal against the local community. Please let's be more sensitive to local community views and needs.

The joining cycle path from Hannover way to the main campus would be nice. Also more actual paths rather than spaces on roads as motorists often ignore them.

The notion of "routes" through the city is a relatively daft idea which is counter productive for the overall quality of a city as it creates an unnecessary polarity and limits choice. Gold routes or the like are marketing plots but have little to do with meaningful urbanism.

The plan is 10 or 15 years too late, as it often the case in Sheffield. All this should have been in place before the University expanded to the east and north. Is it because the University was not able to charge £9,000 p.a. 10 or 15 years ago?

The plans are making it worse for motorists in a city already bad.

The plans for a crossing outside the arts tower and improved crossing at Leavygreave are great, as a cyclist at the minute it can be really difficult to dismount and get across at the A57 when its busy and cycling across the roundabout can be pretty terrifying. However please choose appropriate paving for road bike tires. As an example, the cobbled section of Surrey Street isn't great for cycling with skinny tires.

The street environment in the University Area is of a high quality. I would rather see street environment changed in other places. For example a 'Gold' Route through Broomhall linking the Moor with Eccleshall road could up lift a forgotten area rather than trying to guild a lilly.

The uni arms should be part of it. The old buildings around it should be knocked down and more space given to an open socialising area.

The University seems to be expecting all staff to use cycles. Have they thought that not everybody can ride or wants to cycling to work. What about the disabled?? What about the other businesses in the area?? ie Hendersons who have been here for years.

The video i've seen seems to prioritise the gold route, closing roads to traffic, planting trees and having more pedestrian crossings / pedestrian friendly areas.

The problem is the campus is split by major public highways. This kind of sucks for people trying to walk around the campus, but the changes would appear to suck for the rest of Sheffield trying to get around the ring road North/south or from the south of the city up to Crookes or out to A57.

The wider Sheffield community would appreciate you leaving Sheffield heritage alone. The university has already done enough to decimate it.

There are a lot of students and residents in the lydgate lane area who have no bus, I think a route perhaps 1 per hour incorporating the whole of lydgate would be useful.

There are currently footpaths on the route which are available for pedestrians to use, these rarely get congested and so are currently suitable for use.

There is lots of reference to the Gold Route, nowhere is it actually explained what it is!!

There is still no safe or convenient way to cycle between the St Georges/Engineering area of campus and union area.

These are not 'your' roads and routes. They belong to the people of Sheffield. Any proposals for road changes should come from the planning department at the council. Or has the University taken over the whole of Sheffield?

These plans don't appear to connect to the 'gold route' at all. While I'm all for knocking down concrete dividers and planting trees and green spaces, that's simply landscaping concerns... safety can be addressed with lighting.

These questions should surely be extended to all residents of Sheffield? Those of us born here, more than those who weren't or ar transient members of the Sheffield population would surely be mortified, at how total disregard to our local heritage is being manipulated to the Campus' main gain. Major routes are being discussed to be pedestrianised...not everyone is a student or campus user...what % of actual Sheffield population would benefit as a whole? Irreplaceable heritage buildings, once again are
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>being discussed to be destroyed. Is everything all about the money / students? We all have to work with change, but these changes are major, benefit a small minority, and will have knock on effects over a great area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think this is a good idea - crossing some of the roads can be quite dangerous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think this is an excellent idea, I love all the spaces included on the gold route. Will be great to have the university becoming even more embedded in the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this city belongs to the residents not students, so keep the roads for cars / buses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is a sensible proposal. Would the gold Route from Station Square to the University be extensively used by pedestrians?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is an excellent idea. The work done already on the Gold Route through the city has vastly improved those areas and has highlighted the work which needs to be done elsewhere in the city to bring it in line with how an attractive, modern city should look and feel. The extension of this to the University area can only be welcomed and will hopefully encourage the council and other interested parties to work together to extend it further around the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the first I've heard of the Gold Route. The route from the Star and Garter to the Mappin Building is currently a bit of a mess for cyclists. It is constantly being blocked by contractors in the Arts Tower car park. To describe the crossing of the tram tracks to get from one section of Leavygreave Road to the other as being part of a Gold Route requires a rather strange sense of humour. The &quot;shared space&quot; for pedestrians and cyclists on Portobello Road is often rammed full of pedestrians going between lectures who have no idea that they are supposed to be sharing it with cyclists. I would hope that these things would be improved considerably before extending this.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This may be better for pedestrians but it is very limited access for drivers and taxis at night through here as it is without making it worse as this will.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This seems a very good idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would be a good idea; the pedestrian crossings around the big roundabout and the IC urgently need updating. More support for cyclists and pedestrians is always positive in my eyes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This would be wonderful - really would encourage me to cycle to work!!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travelling to the city centre from the west is already a nightmare. Sending all the traffic onto Glossop Road will create massive congestion where it meets the ring road at Upper Hanover Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very good proposals for linking the heart of the city to the University and up to Weston Park; at present it is difficult for direct pedestrian access between the two areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very impressed by plan for students and city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very pleasing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wasn't aware there was something called the &quot;Gold Route&quot;!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think having a designated pedestrian route to key destinations in city centre from the University that is pleasant and safe is very helpful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We need more parking spaces.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What's the Gold Route? Never heard of it. See comments later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whilst many of the recently created public realm spaces are of a fantastic standard, not all of the gold route is of a high quality and there are improvements that could be made particularly to bring some improved amenity to the Division Street area. The addition of the improved pedestrian and cyclist route parallel to West St would be a great addition to the options for getting around the city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would be good. I'd really like to see a safe cycle route from Crookes Valley Park (north side) to the engineering faculty/city centre, since many who live in Crookes, Crookesmoore, Hillsborough or Walkley travel that way and it's pretty dicey currently. I have to either risk Brook Hill roundabout or enter the arts tower car park the wrong way, travel across the concourse (which is ambiguously signed but appears to be shared use) then dismount for the pedestrian area outside the Hick's Building, remount</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
once back on the road, travel to the tram stop crossing, dismount again, remount at Leavygreave, ride until I hit St George's terrace, take the badly marked cycle only turning onto Portobello, which doesn't have a sloped kerb at that point, ride to the bottom and onto Mappin St, then finally back onto myself up Pitt lane and into the Regent Court car park. There is a lot of room for improvement in terms of safety there.

Yes!

Yes, any safer way to get round Sheffield on my bike would be great and if it can be traffic free even better.

Yes, do extend the Gold Route, blending it in with existing historic buildings.

Yes, the new Gold route is amazing and I’d like to see this idea in most of the city - from the uni and also from the canal basin and maybe from Kelham too.

You can take your plans and stick them where the sun doesn’t shine. You are not and WILL NEVER BE a campus University so stop trying to take over MY city with your stupid plans. I will fight you EVERY STEP OF THE WAY.

Your vision to transform the public spaces throughout the university is inspiring. I completly agree with the statements throughout the consultation masterplan that motor traffic dominates much of the space and that this needs to be rebalanced. I think that your plans will make the whole campus area a much more livable environment and a place where people are much more likely to want to spend time. The design reminds me of the Utrecht University campus and I’d recomend reading this blog post and video to see just how well a central spine focussed on cycling and walking links their Unversity up and also to the city.

http://bicycledutch.wordpress.com/2014/07/31/cycling-in-the-utrecht-science-park/

Removing surface car parking and relocating it to mutliastory car parks is a very important part to freeing up this space and making it more livable.

I particularly like the crossing designs on the Western Bank flyover. They seem to be designed around the needs of people who are walking and cycling from the outset rather simply fitting them around the needs of motor traffic (as we see all too often in Sheffield in my opinion). They are wide and direct, I hope that you'll be able to make them responsive so that people don't have to wait for too long, when this happens at other places in Sheffield you see people ignoring the crossing facilities because they don't meet their needs and they end up crossing against red signals when traffic is still moving (as you see at the crossing next to the University Arms pub at the moment).

The crossings you've presented are very good.

The crossings on Upper Hanover Street are OK and are a definate improvement however I don't think that they will meet the needs of people using the gold route, travelling from the University campus onto the city, especially if you're cycling. The key crossing should be placed directly in line with Leavygreave Road on the key desire line rather than ofsetting it. The kink in this crossing will cause unnecessary conflict between those cycling and those walking. I see that there are some proposed steps on the new square outside the Information Commons leading down to Upper Hanover Street. I think this will seriously hinder the Gold Route and that it should be step free so that people can cycle it. I can see the problem with the different elevations however and would suggest that you take inspiration from the Copenhagen 'snake bridge' that was recently built in Copenhagen. Building a bridge like this to link the new square, across Upper Hanover Street, to Leavzgreave Road could solve all these problems and create a really nice architectural piece linking these two halves of the campus. Please see this website for some more information


I think that one of the problems you'll face with your plans is conflict between cyclists and pedestrians. By improving your environment so much, it could become the defacto standard cycle route from the western parts of Sheffield to the city.centre. The roads around the campus will still remain hostile to cycling and may even become more so if they are narrowed and people will be drawn to cycle through the university campus even more so than they are now. Ultimately I think Sheffield City Council need to start making the road network more cycle friendly by providing protected space on main roads and reducing through traffic on other roads, but they seem unwilling to do this if it had any impact on motor traffic capacity. Please take a look at the Utrecht example to see how they reduce potential conflicts between people cycling and walking.

One last note, I really hope that your plans get delivered, they are a real step change. They are inspiring and I'm really happy that Sheffield University has presented something this good. Please don't let these plans get watered down, they're the best thing that Sheffield has seen in transportation planning for a long time.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Buses comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>avoid bus routes cutting through the campus on Victoria or Mappin Street; instead route them along the major roads;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus route via Durham Rd sounds dangerous. You should see how fast cars travel now. You need to slow it down and introduce sleeping policemen and a zebra crossing over to 301 building. Tray and save students lives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>more zebra crossings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95 is god awful, so bad I bought a car, I would love to see an improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A bus stop common to all routes and the University would be a great idea!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A terrible idea as there is already too much traffic on Glossop Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A web page about travel to and from the university would be good, one which outlines the routes would be good. As it stands we just have a link to the website for the bus company. I think a personalized take on how to get in and out of campus would be better (as the bus website isn’t great).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Already 120 route on Glossop Road and heavy traffic to and from the RHH and Childrens. Adding 51 and 52 route to this would not be a good idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An EXCELLENT plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a local resident I am very concerned about these proposals, and would like to know what is being proposed to make access to local streets better during the tram gate restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as the buses are frequent it will be fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As long as the proposals don’t adversely impact on the 51 bus service I have no feelings either way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Better signage required</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bringing buses down Clarkson St would seem to cause more chaos on Western Ban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buses should go to the interchange via the ring road unless going through and to the north.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t make head nor tail of this information. Give me a map.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can’t see how a right turn down Clarkson Street would work. This would only increase delays as there is only one lane straight ahead (owing to the bus lane). This would be stopped by queueing right-turners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>changes to timings, frequency and the location of bus stops all need to be addressed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changes to Western Bank are likely to lengthen journey times on the 52 as Western Bank is a bus lane with bus-activated traffic lights. Clarkson Street and Durham Street are not bus lanes and the additional left-hand turn onto Glossop road is likely to take longer in periods of heavy traffic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No objections to routing the bus away from Leavygreave - the 51 route also seems a sensible diversion option for the 52.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Also one of the most well-used bus stops is at Western Bank outside the Students’ Union/Hicks Building - if that stop were to be moved to Glossop Road, access to the concourse from the south side of the SU building would have to be seriously improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changing the bus routes is OK to improve the area outside Jessops but not for general vehicle movements. It puts more traffic and pollution from queues on less suitable roads closer to houses and hospitals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarkson Street and Glossop Road are often congested, for all buses to have to divert this way is only going to lead to further congestion. Quite often you can walk down to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
West Street far quicker than going by bus.

Closing Western Bank is crazy. Move the university instead, there's empty space in the east end.

Coming hard on the unpopular (in the city) demolition of the Jessops Edwardian building and subsequent building of the Diamond, I feel this may seem like further evidence that the University is prepared to ride roughshod over the convenience and feelings of the general Sheffield public.

Current bus routes take too long - any improvement would be great!

Does this not involve an awkward right hand turn?

Durham road is not very large. Wouldn't this cause extra congestion and potentially a extra pedestrian hazard for people approaching the west end of the central campus from Glossop road.

Durham Road is too small to be a bus route. Many people go between the Union/Octagon and 301 and the Husband Building, therefore you are just moving the problem to their.

Durham Road is very narrow and considerations should be made with regard to how appropriate it is to divert buses every 5 minutes (as per the current peak time routes) and also the safety of staff, students, and members of the public outside the Bar One area as traffic flow would undoubtedly increase, although I appreciate that diverting away from Brook Hill roundabout is good because I think that it gets too congested.

Good idea to get buses out of main campus routes.

Good luck!

I can catch either the 52 or the 95 home (whichever comes first). These plans look like they make this more difficult because there will be a lot more bus stops not shared by the 52 and 95.

I currently frequently use the bus to get to children's hospital using the accident and emergency entrance. Somewhat concerned about access to museum and Accident and emergency entrance of Children's hospital if these changes happen.

I didn't know the University had the power to re-route buses! I live in Heeley and only occasionally catch the 51 home from Western Bank Library where I work - normally if it's dark or raining. I work till 6pm at weekends and it's not a pleasant walk home after dark either along the dual carriageway or through the back streets of Broomhall etc. I normally prefer to drive in such cases. I'm concerned for the safety of myself and other staff working late (I occasionally work till 7 or 9pm) if the buses are re-routed away from Western Bank and car parking is taken away from us at the Arts Tower and Info. Commons.

I do believe this will cause more traffic. Plus using the 95 to Upper Hanover on occasion I am not sure how the new route benefits.

I do not walk well in snow and would not want the bus route to be further away from my building. Selfishly stated perhaps!

I don't drive so have to use the 51 bus to get to and from work. As long as this stops somewhere close to the University that's OK.

I don't have a choice whether I use the bus routes so will have to use it whatever the changes. It will mean I have to get off a stop earlier and walk 5 minutes rather than 1 minute but that's not the end of the world.

I don't see any problem with re-routing the 95 route this way. This is the route that it took during the tram works, and it was fine. The only thing is that it would be important to have a suitable bus stop, as over the summer there wasn't a nice place to wait on Brook Hill.

I don't think it will much of an effect at all.

I don't understand these reroutings and couldn't find a picture in the masterplan.

I don't use the bus services and I won't in the future as I have to drive in from Buxton anyway.

I greatly welcome the proposed changes: currently the Jessop West corner of Leavygreave Road is incredibly dangerous for pedestrians, particularly when crossing from the Jessop West side of the road towards HR/ Henderson's Relish, as it's very hard to see vehicles turning left until you're actually in the road (and many vehicles take that corner quickly).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I had to pick the same choosing as the 51 is the only bus i can get home, so even if these plans are to go through i will still have to travel on this bus, i think it is a horrible idea to redirect the 51’s as they have already been redirected due to the new &quot;diamond&quot; building causing it to now have to go up west street, getting stuck in traffic on that street due to the other number of buses that have to go up that road but also cars. this being when i am waiting to get a bus into town from my house they are usually late as they have been stuck in traffic on west street and surrounding areas, i think its pretty disgusting that you think you have the right to play god with our city.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have real concerns about any more traffic down Durham Road. It is dangerous enough as it is. It definitely needs a pedestrian crossing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have to catch two buses to get to work so I bring the car - i am concerned about the impact this will have on the campus as a car user.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I mainly use my bike or walk. I occasionally catch buses and trams.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I sometimes use the 51/2 and this would be slightly less convenient for me but it would be worthwhile to have more pleasant pedestrian spaces without cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I support these as pedestrians and cyclists should be prioritised as number one, and none of the proposed routes inconvenience bus users, the distances involved are fairly minimal- go for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it will create more traffic on glossop road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that the bus routes at the minute are very good, however the focus on pedestrianisation is to be embraced.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use 51. The change won't make much difference to me in terms of travel time or access to the university. It doesn't make any difference to me whether I walk to class from West Street or Mappin Street. As a matter of fact, Mappin Street is horrible. It is busy and the road is bad, get the away from there!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the 51 bus to get from Crosspool to work in the City centre. The bus route has been improved over the years particularly by bus lanes and changing the route. However there are still problems of reliability as regards the timetable. On the face of it the changes sound like they would increase unreliability. Glossop Rd, Clarkson St, Western Bank and Upper Hanover are bottlenecks at rush hour. It would need more than a simple one way system to avoid these problems. The changes proposed would feel only increase the problem of congestion at peak times. A more radical solution is needed, such as a more extensive one way system, overpasses for vehicles over Brook Hill Roundabout and less traffic lights!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the 52 sometimes, and would be less likely to if the Western Bank stop next to the Hicks Building was no longer in operation. In addition, this proposal would send more traffic down Glossop Road, accentuating the problems of crossing that road that I raised in my previous comment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I use the bus to go to West Street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be concerned about rerouting via Clarkson Street and Durham Road as this would add a bus route to what are already very congested one lane roads.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would certainly like to be able to take research visitors to eat and drink at the University Arms after seminars and colloquium. It is in wonderful location (particularly for the Hicks and Alfred Denny buildings) and sustains a unique collegial atmosphere like no other place on campus. It is a standing symbol of academia.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would have further to walk to my bus stop/destination (52)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it causes more delays it's not a good idea.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If it will give more green areas and a more pleasant area to walk then I am for it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If the bus routes were moved from Western Bank, traffic would get worse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you made the walk down from these areas nicer, it would definitely encourage me to walk it more.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I'm more likely to cycle / walk than use the 95 these days. Mainly due to cost and the lack of punctuality of the 95 (eg on the open day Saturday I used the 95 as it was raining and I could have walked back to Walkley more quickly as it was running 20min behind schedule)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improved signage would be appropriate. Temporary signage in terms of cardboard cable tied to lamp post proved hopelessly ineffective during the tram works as most were blown off, fell off or fell apart in the rain.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
inconvenient to car drivers who go home that way if area is pedestrianised!

It depends if the bus routes and times are disrupted. If so, then it would make a change to how much I use the bus. It would also affect how much I use it when going into town at the weekend.

It is very clever how the changes to these route have been shown on the proposed maps. They do not show that the routes will cross over the flow of traffic when the routes are changed to travel down Durham Road. This will obviously slow traffic down in both directions in an already heavy route in and out of the city especially in the morning and evening commuter periods.

It would be annoying personally, but the campus probably would look better.

It would be helpful if the 51 route was more frequent and the 52 less so.

It would be more convenient for me, but bus passengers would no longer see the centre of the Campus (Firth Court & the Students' Union) when passing by, and so may perhaps forget we exist.

It would make it more awkward to catch the buses.

It would make the buses untenable as an option for me.

It would not alter my use of these buses as they are the only ones which travel from my house into town however I think you may add a large amount of time onto these journeys. The 95 provides a very fast route into town your changes will increase this journey time particularly at peak times - not good if you are trying to get people out of their cars and onto public transport.

Just what this city needs - more traffic chaos just so STUPID students can carry on ignoring the green cross code and walking into the roads with head phones on and texting without looking where they are going.

leave the bus routes alone

Leave well alone

Let's not desecrate a historic site where as a student 50 years ago I treasure happy memories of walking down Leavygreave from the students union to St Georges

Living on the 52 route I believe and I am sure that the for residents of Handsworth and surrounding areas it would be a disaster to re route the 52 route as this route services 3 hospitals. Not everybody is able to walk the

Looks good to me. Sometimes use the 52 and 95 and the new plans wouldn't really affect me too much.

Lydgate lane please

Making the buses one way would be very disadvantageous to anyone travelling to and from the hospitals.

Many people use this bus to get to weston park hospital, therefore it would be a bad idea

Mappin Street is not a suitable road for buses due to the width and speed humps

My reaction to that particular aspect was one of uncertainty. As much as anything, imagine the upheaval that a change in bus roots might incur! I’d need to be sure exactly how that would happen. Plus, as someone who would gladly support any proposal to extend the Supertram system in the future (which I would use, if only it came to my particular area), I wonder if any proposal concerning that would be affected by these changes. Would it truly reduce congestion or concentrate it? But that's not to sound destructive - I do welcome the idea, as long as the route chosen is suitable for use by buses. And pedestrianising the streets around the Information Commons will almost certainly make it a safer walking environment for people in general.

n/a

none

Not sure if the 52 would change it's route in the city centre. My main concern it that it should still be easy to travel by bus from the city centre (preferably West Street) to Goodwin Sports Centre.
Not sure that the bus changes to the 95 will be beneficial to me

Only slightly more likely to use them, as I do sometimes use the 51, get off at the Hospital and walk through to Barber House Annexe.

plans need to show new bus stops serving the campus and shops

Please stop demolishing the wonderful old buildings in our city, to replace them by unsightly building that do not fit in. Just because you bring money to this city does not mean you should railroad your plans for unsightly buildings. Visit yor and see how their heritage is also a part of their present and future, perhaps you idiots may learn something from them.

Seem fine to me

Seems pointless.

Shocking idea and will dramatically affect the traffic flow in this area. The 120 service which already follows this route struggles with the volume of traffic in this area. These are all high frequency services and it would damage service provision in this area. This idea might benefit the uni students but it will cause problems for everyone else - fair?

No

Should be positive for all

Shouldn't be an issue with redirected routes.

Students are not the only people using these buses or streets. Other major Sheffield facilities are in the same area. Here's a great idea - do not increase student numbers - or how about charging more fees for students who in their hoards seem to be able to afford their very own cars! Also teaching students how to cross a road (eg. waiting for the green man to appear at crossings - or indeed making sure they even use a crossing on the main city centre roads) I live at Norton Lees, work on Broad Lane/ Mappin, and public transport is poor. I cannot get to Hunters Bar / Crookes / Broomhill etc easily on public transport - the changes you propose will have expanding effects to the surrounding areas. Being born in Sheffield over forty years ago, you should not be trying to make this even more difficult for me.

Thanks a bunch, I love walking for an age to get the bus just because you are a bunch of despots.

The 51 and 52 buses would be delayed because of the red light on Glossop Road due to the Supertram.

The 10/10A and 95 buses should be diverted if Bolsover Street becomes exit only.

The 52 bus currently has a stop off the main road on Western Bank, westbound direction, with a large shelter for people to wait. This is necessary as this tends to be a busy stop. There is not space for such a stop on Clarkson Street and the bus stopping on this street would significantly delay other traffic. A stop on Glossop Road would involve passengers having to cross Glossop Road a busy periods to access the stop and anyone who gets off would then have to climb the steps to access the main university campus.

The 52 currently had the best access to a stop on all bus routes, and moving it could be problematic

The 95 through Mappin would very useful!

The 95 would replace 51 for Sheltered Scheme (St George’s Court) residents going into town but the changes would not help with us having recently lost an outward bound service using Broad Lane. We now have to walk from Glossop Road. We are 65 to 104 years old.

Mappin Street must be the worst road to drive on in Sheffield. Hurry up with the improvement.

The access to the Students Union goods yard is restricted. Large vehicles have to reverse into the yard by backing up at the bottom of Durham Road. Using this as a bus route will cause congestion problems and unsafe for pedestrians. Durham Road is also used for coaches to collect and drop off students groups, loading and unloading for conferences, gigs, etc in both the Octagon Students Union.

The Arts Tower stop would be missed out and many people currently use this stop. Will there be an alternative provided? Given the topography change between Western Bank and Glossop Road, how does this impact disabled access from and to buses?
The bus routes in the plan are out of date, the 123 no longer serves the campus, instead this bus and the number 30 that used to run to campus are now only taken through the centre of town, not all bus services currently serving campus are good whilst they have a frequent timetable, especially the 52 there can often be nothing for more than 20 minutes than 3 come together.

The buses are quite unreliable anyway so a minor adjustment to routes will make little effect.

The changes seem to allow better use of space with minimal disruption to services.

The changes wouldn’t affect my starting point or end point on the bus, but might make my cycling and walking journey more pleasant.

The choice of answer above in the drop-down menu is useless, as anyone using these buses will still have to use them, they have no other choice. It would have been better having the option to agree or not agree.

This is a completely unrealistic proposal. Glossop Road cannot cope with the amount of traffic using it now. The road outside Bar One keeps collapsing and the traffic is held up for long periods of time when the tram leaving town goes through the Upper Hanover Street junction. If all traffic is coming down onto this route, the pollution from standing traffic will increase massively as there will be huge queues impacting on areas such as Brocco Bank, Hunters Bar, Ecclesall Road South, Broomhill, Fulwood and further. These routes already suffer at peak hours and have long traffic queues existing already.

The crossing of glossop road and clarkson road is terrible at present. there is no pedestrian crossing. this is the main route between the hallamshire and the tramuni etc. currently you have to run across the road! this needs to be traffic light controlled.

The designated bus lanes are very important to travel times and a major motivator for people to use public transportation. Any changes must incorporate bus lanes where they exist now and, if possible, include bus lanes in the outbound direction as well.

Some thought should also be put into how disabled and mobility impaired people on public transportation will be able to get to the centre of campus without bus stops where they currently are, outside the Arts Tower. Since there is a significant level change between Whitham and Glossop, this may pose difficulties that are devastating to certain individuals.

The monstrous scheme would make me ashamed again of Sheffield and its inefficiencies.

The only viable option is to take the routes down Mappin Street, but this would cause significant extra traffic along Mappin Street. I would prefer to see the route down Gell Street maintained, but as a bus only route, close the road off to other traffic by all means, but don’t force all the bus routes down Mappin Street.

The plan is likely to make the 51 route worse

Regarding crossing Western Bank below. It is currently easy and safe to cross Western Bank using the underway which is already available as part of the University Campus. The crossing at the bottom of Western Bank is overused and congested and this needs to be moved away from the roundabout and designed to cope with a larger flow. However university students and staff need to be encouraged to use the underpass. Proper traffic flow traffic lights need to be installed at the roundabout once the existing crossing is moved.

The re-routing of the 95 to Mappin Street may reduce activity levels in shops at the far west end of West Street/ Glossop Road (e.g. Oxfam, Sinclairs); it will also make it more difficult for people living along the 95 route to access the first class Gell Street playground.

The routes would take me out of may way.

Rather than encourage my use of buses, this would put me off.
The suggestion to route bus services onto Durham Road is stupid beyond belief! The road itself is very narrow. It is the entrance to three car parks (Education building categories A and C and the large category B). Deliveries vehicle to the Students Union regularly park on it. On street disable parking bays are present and there is a small car park behind the Octagon Centre which also holds disable parking spaces. During major events at the Octagon, the Category B car park is used for exhibitor and visitor parking. Exhibitors also make deliveries of equipment by parking on the road at the rear entrance to the Octagon. Coach parking on Durham road is a regular feature of University Open days and for Student Union activities including as a pick up point for Student Society events.

All this activity currently takes place on Durham Road. Much of it out of the control of the University and likely to have an adverse impact on other road users. For the activity which is under university control it is impossible to believe this could all be located elsewhere on the campus. Indeed, the use of Durham road for events taking place at the Octagon could not simply be relocated.

Altogether a suggestion which is impractical in the extreme and shows an utter disregard for all the people who currently use Durham Road.

The traffic on Glossop Road is already very bad at rush hour. Virtually at a standstill a lot of the time and I believe this would make the problem worse.

The University should "stick to knitting". As far as I am aware, you have no influence on how or where private bus companies operate their services. This is 2014 not 1974.

There is no need to have buses coming so close to the campus, or the town centre. Alternative forms of socialised transport which have low or no fossil footprint should be used: bikes; scooters; skateboards, etc.

There is nothing wrong with the current bus route and major changes such as the ones the University are 'proposing' are naive and lack the foresight of the traffic hell which will occur should the masterplan go ahead (which of course it will). The current bus routes serve Charles Clifford, Childrens and Jessop Wing hospitals - any consideration to members of the public with mobility problems who won't be able to make the additional walk from the new bus stops?

These routes are currently very busy with traffic which may impact negatively on the journey time for both public transport users of these routes and other motorists. Further to this, increased volumes of traffic then cause futher issues for pedestrians to use the roads safely and could also increase road traffic collisions.

They seem like fair diversions with little impact.

They should be changed if it means that the campus is pedestrianised.

I sometimes get the bus, occasionally, and it is so slow anyway that diverting it won't make any difference to me.

This doesn't seem too disruptive as long as new stops are well lit and open so as to protect students travelling home after dark.

This is likely to cause a lot of congestion on Glossop Road near the tram stop.

This is madness and would create havoc for the traffic flow. There is an underpass people have legs and can walk there are also pedestrian crossings at the bottom next to Brook hill roundabout and near the top middle & bottom next to the park and children's hospital.

This plan does not take into account the inconvenience to Sheffieldders in changing bus routes, bottle-necks and traffic congestion.

This will involve a longer walk from the bus to certain departments - this could mean some staff using their cars more to get to work.

This will only increase traffic congestion and pollution so shouldn't go ahead.

This would make the 52 bus much less convenient, as it would be further from the main buildings.

Traffic queues on Glossop Rd going towards town at the Ring Road junction, already very bad, would become worse if the 51 and 52 buses joined these queues and unless a higher priority is given to traffic crossing into West St.

Traveling along Mappin Street or any small streets with a lot of bends (and hoesl in) makes me sick on the bus.

TUOS needs to work much more closely with the city council to campaign for better bus routes from aroundthe city to the campus. There is very little connecting Meersbrook, Heeley, Netheredge to the campus - there is one very small bus (the no 10) with standing room only, so walking and cycling is the only option. The cycle paths are terrible / non-existant, and pedestrians are not provided for in terms of safe crossings. Pedestrians and cyclists are constantly being placed in dangerous positions.
because of the terrible planning. If TUOS is going to reduce car and bus access to the campus then TUOS needs to work with the council to improve transport links (that is bus, cycle paths and improved pedestrian access) to the campus. (i.e. Improvements before you get on campus)

Very good idea. The mentioned roads need to be more pedestrian friendly.

We need more accessible roads for cars.

We would be more likely to use buses if staff were given financial incentive to use them. This year my Citywide Annual Travel card cost £695.00. If the university wants to spend money on green initiatives, some of that should be subsidized by them.

Well worth it if it improves pedestrian safety around Brook Hill roundabout.

Who do the University think they are imposing changes to bus routes on the general public? I think it is outrageous that the University feels they have the power and right to influence lives of people who are nothing to do with the University.

Why are you interfering in bus routes? It has absolutely nothing to do with you. As residents our greater requirement is for a reliable bus service.

Why not have more permanent 24 hour bus lanes? drop-off hubs (plural) on the outskirts of the campus? rather than through the campus...

Why remove the 51 from Mappin Street and reroute the 95 there? That’s a substitution that’s disadvantageous to 51/52 users, of which there are many.

Will be extremely annoyed if the 95 was rerouted to not go past the university health service.

Will create more congestion and slow down the buses. Levygreave Road isn’t exactly busy with traffic anyway.

Would this increase traffic congestion as you approach the circle?

Would be very wary as those buses are used frequently by the public to access the Childrens Hospital and Weston Park Hospital. Driving to hospital is restricted by the council as visitors and patients can’t park. The idea was they use the buses. If you divert them away from the hospitals you’ll have quite poorly people who can’t get easy access. If the buses still serviced the two hospitals then yes, its a great idea.

You propose changes to the 51 and 52 bus routes to travel down Clarkson Street. There are also Hulley Transport from Derbyshire who need to have access to Upper Hanover St. If Western Bank is closed to town traffic how will Hulleys get across to Hanover St. There is no right turn from Glossop Road, only via the roundabout at Brookhill.

you will cause traffic jams Clarkson road cannot cope at present without adding more traffic
Would you like to provide any comments on the proposed one-way circulatory system?

*Anything* which helps to improve this horrible road and the way it cuts the campus in two is welcome. It’s a matter of time before there’s an accident at the bottom of Western Bank, with pedestrians crowded onto narrow pavements and central reservations and lights with no logic or connection, often two or three minutes between changes to allow crossing.

A better idea would be to build bridges/underpasses surrounding the large roundabout near the information commons. I feel that this would improve safety enormously, ease traffic congestion and could even provide an inter-faculty project for engineers, architects, art students etc. I feel a large bridge connecting the campus’ could be used as a special landmark in the university and provide perfect advertising space for the university too, where many cars drive past.

A bridge over the road at Brook Street roundabout would be good. It is a very dangerous place and a fatal accident is likely to occur.

A convenient excuse to bulldoze more of Sheffield’s history.

A good proportion of the traffic north-bound on Upper Hanover Street turns west onto Glossop Road. If this is prevented there will be a big back-up at the University roundabout. Just leave Glossop Road two way.

Timing at the crossings is crucial. Some are poor. For example the pedestrian wait at the N side of the Brook Hill east crossing is to long, leading to impatient and dangerous crossing against the lights, whereas the vehicle wait on the S side, going into the roundabout, is too long leading to traffic backup. This has been reported but there has been no action so the dwell times after changes may well not be monitored.

A really great idea, and I’d also welcome this as a car user. Brook Hill is a horrible round-about so I’d welcome any improvements there, and improving the Glossop Road junction at the same time is welcomed. I guess my only worry is with increased queues - but I'll leave that to the fancy traffic model wizards.

Absolutely necessary-- it’s very dangerous now.

Again shocking idea. How this will benefit any drivers or people driving through the area to access the hospitals or to get from one end of town to the other without getting stuck in even heavier traffic? This is very extreme to help some students cross the road when there is already both an underground crossing and one near the roundabout.

Suggest education on using them.

All this will do is move congestion from Western Bank to Glossop Road. What about traffic that needs to go down Netherthorpe Road. How would they get to that Road if Western Bank was closed to traffic coming down.

Although the plan is primarily to improve the pedestrian experience I believe that car users have totally been overlooked. There are people who have to travel by car. The one way system, in my opinion would increase congestion. By comparision look at the Inner Ring road at West Bar, this was created to ease congestion, it has only served to clog up routes that were already struggling.

Am concerned that the right turn from Broomhill down to the Octagon Centre along Clarkson Street would make the crossing less safe for pedestrians and cyclists.

Am not an expert town/travel planner(!)....but can't help thinking that if you are going to introduce three(!) new pedestrian crossings on Western Bank then you will have to do something to make sure the traffic flows are not completely disrupted and delayed, e.g. alleviate this potential problem by introducing one way traffic only and/or synchronized red/green lights on all three crossings.....

Any sensible way of a one way system would be avoid any cross over of trafic which would create problems. It’s like sending traffic round a roundabout the wrong way which was tried and caused chaos by the City Council some years ago at the Brook Hill roundabout. If a one way system is to be created, to help the flow of trafic it would be better for the traffic into the city to travel down Western Bank and the traffic out of the city to travel via Glossop Road/Durham Road.

Any way to reduce congestion must be a good idea

Anything that helps improve the pedestrian crossing at Western Bank/Brook Hill roundabout is good. It is an accident waiting to happen as it operates now and I've seen our students and members of the public forced into the road because of lack of space at the various waiting points.
Anything that makes Brook Hill Roundabout and Western Bank a safer and more efficient operation for motorists and pedestrians is essential. The removal of the concrete barrier/existing central reservation on Western Bank is long overdue and these proposals would improve the area enormously.

Anything to make that roundabout safer, especially to cyclists. I think you would need to think about cycle routes to Walkley etc, to ensure that they are satisfactory is a one way system is imposed.

Anything to reduce traffic on the roundabout. Preferably remove roundabout and change to a couple of junctions or slip roads.

Anything which can be done to improve traffic flow around the University and make Brook Hill safer for cyclists in particular is a good idea.

As above. the uni roundabout is terrible for all traffic. I also think it should be traffic light controlled. At the moment in a car you have to edge your way out hoping for the best! The pedestrian crossings mean that cars back up onto the roundabout causing chaos.

For bikes: this roundabout is terrible and extremely dangerous. Despite this people still cycle over it because there is no alternative. The barriers at corners to stop pedestrians crossing are at high risk of squashing cyclists if they need to get off the road quickly. They can't use the pedestrian crossings because they are too busy (And currently illegal as not bike lanes). Needs complete separation.

A one way system would reduce the traffic but I guess it has to go somewhere. It might use the roads around more which are already quite busy.

As I do not drive I have no useful opinion on this subject.

As long as it doesn't block the exit onto Bolsover St so access to Walkley and beyond is maintained.

As long as travel times are maintained then a good thing.

As mentioned above: if Durham road is used as a bus route, the road would need to be widened to make safer for pedestrian usage and the Students Union goods yard access/egress needs addressing.

At present Western Bank divides the campus, and is a particularly ugly feature. A one way system would be a great improvement and might even encourage more people (including staff) to cycle or take the bus instead of using their car.

Because, in actual fact the traffic isn't that bad. The council seem obsessed with traffic calming measures. I use those roads at peak times and the traffic just isn't that congested - its rush hour, so you expect a few minutes wait. The crossing needs to be addressed for pedestrians but please - leave the motorists alone. If we want to sit in a queue, let us.

Both these routes get very busy at rush hour and only being able to use one of them would, I believe, significantly increase traffic jams further up the hill.

Brook Hill Roundabout can be very busy and confusing, but I don't know if a one-way system is any better. One-ways often lead to people getting lost and frustrated, which can't be good for road safety.

Brook Hill Roundabout is currently dreadful and requires improvement however I am not sure this is the correct solution, I think there is just to much going on in a small space!!! I wonder if there is an option that could involve re-routing the tram away from the roundabout and using the tram tunnels to route the ring road traffic under the roundabout. Whilst this would be more expensive it would offer a much better long term solution.

Brook Hill roundabout may benefit from a redesign too - how about putting a lane in each direction on a widened tram underpass?

But please see comments about Durham Road.

Careful lane identification would be required to ensure safe driving around the roundabout. Consideration should be given to traffic lighting the roundabout to create a safer entrance onto the roundabout itself as opposed to the frequently dangerous free for all pull out system currently in place.

Circulatory systems can be very unfriendly for walkers and cyclists, creating a "race-track" effect. This needs to be carefully designed to keep traffic speeds low. We would expect given the space that would be saved to see protected cycleways installed along these roads.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Closing Western Bank is crazy. Move the university instead, there's empty space in the east end.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congestion is a major issue - surely there's a wider issue which needs to be tackled in order to get this approved?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently Brook Hill roundabout is dangerous for drivers and pedestrians alike- some junctions have traffic lights not others, which encourages drivers to use the roundabout at great speed- yet they then quickly hit a pedestrian crossing... it definitely needs sorting out, and a one-way system would go some way to achieve this</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Currently there is a choice of routes depending on the level of traffic. One way system would remove this element of choice funnelling all traffic the same way. Any blockage/problem would completely seize up the system whereas currently there are alternative routes available. There are much better ways of improving the flow of traffic at the Brook Hill Roundabout. For example, proper traffic control traffic lights would make it safer and more efficient. The current traffic light system is bizarre and completely useless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depends if the bus gate on West Street is still planned to be in operation - if so where would incoming traffic have to go?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know road planning well enough to confidently predict the impact of a one-way system - but anything that tackles the problems with the brook hill roundabout are welcomed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreadful idea for local residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Given the traffic jams on other one-way ring roads around the city, I would think that this is a poor idea. The idea also contributes to waste of petrol in that the one-way systems make it more difficult to get directly to a destination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossop Road and Clarkson Street already suffers from rush hour traffic and this proposed one way would make it worse and also difficult for ambulances to access the hospitals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossop road is already congested enough as it is!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glossop road is only two lanes - can't see how it would cope with even more traffic. Also it is a major pedestrian crossing route for students/staff coming to work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good that reducing traffic congestion on the roundabout is being addressed - not sure how the one way system would work, but any change is likely to be an improvement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great idea, so long as it is properly implemented.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great lets add more confusion to people visiting Sheffield. The main problem with the roundabout is the placement of the crossings being too close to the exits. As for the volume of traffic as a car driver the congestion is generally caused by the crossings position. maybe reducing the number of crossings by the tram stop from three to one making this one larger would help. It should also reduce pollution because vehicles won't need to keep stopping.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having used one way systems in other places, my concern is that this will be confusing to people. I think signage would be vital - obvious info which is easy to understand, clearly indicating it's oneway. Also, I think our website should show this information when you look at a building on room booking and other systems - this will help visitors and staff alike.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would this affect the ring road?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would traffic coming up from Penistone road be able to travel in the direction of Broomhill or Hunters Bar?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a driver, I understand these roads; This is definitely a good idea, the current roads are atrocious and Brook Hill is a nightmare with drivers not knowing where to go, if it would ease congestion then it is a good idea. Please do this!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a reasonably confident cyclist, but I do not feel safe cycling on Brook Hill roundabout so I always avoid it or dismount and use the pedestrian crossings. Several of my friends who don't cycle cite Brook Hill as an example of why they think cycling is so dangerous and why they say I am mad to cycle! As a pedestrian, it's frustratingly slow to cross, and it makes you feel worthless because you're a second class citizen to cars.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am also a driver that uses this roundabout. It is really horrible as a driver, even more so than for pedestrians. So anything to make it easier to negotiate will be very welcome. The council should remodel the roundabout even if it was just for motorists.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am not particularly fond of the sheep crossing control system (with gates) ... I find it inefficient and especially if you are trying to cross from information commons there is always the risk that you don’t even make it into the flock.
I would like a university that treats us like human beings, not like animals ... able to choose and decide.. and understand safety as a matter of responsibility and not as imposition. Therefore, I don’t believe in the policy of “gates and punishment” for pedestrians... I believe in GOOD DESIGN... it works in any culture. and it needs no signs or warnings... just common sense.

I am unsure how this will work, if (like on a number of times over the last year) if the bottom of Glossop Road is blocked off, how to get around as many of the side roads are dead ends. Some more information would be useful

I am VERY concerned by this proposal. It will divert a large amount of traffic past the main entrance to the Children’s hospital. In addition, most of the parking for the hospital will be on THE OTHER SIDE of this now very busy road, and this will be the main car park for the University!
Children will be put at risk.
Your plan should be reconsidered or include a dedicated elevated footway from the new car park to the Children’s hospital.

I am very concerned indeed about the proposed demolition of the University Arms pub which seems implied in the plan for Leavygreave Road/Hounsfield Road. This would destroy a building that has been an important part of the University for many many years and I am opposed to this kind of destruction of such spaces in principle. I think improvements to the Western bank traffic system are crucial but not at the expense of this building.

I avoid driving in the area and I don’t imagine I’d be any more likely to drive through if the proposed changes went ahead.

I believe it would cause massive tailbacks for cars and buses, approaching the Glossop Road/Upper Hanover Street traffic lights...N.B. I regularly do timings at these traffic lights, which for some reason have green for only 10 seconds in every minute for Glossop Road and 50 seconds in every minute for Upper Hanover Street!!

I believe this would make crossing Brook Hill significantly safer.

I can envisage problems for inbound traffic turning on to Glossop Road: it seems likely that any change in the circulatory pattern could impact heavily on congestion in Broomhill.

I can only see this being beneficial if the junction where Glossop road meets Upper Hannover street is improved.(next to the sainsburys). Currently cars cannot turn right from Glossop onto upper Hannover and the left turn is across a hashed grid, slow and causes backlogs if traffic does not give way. The proposed one way system would mean all the traffic that did come Eastbound along both Glossop and western bank would then go via this junction. Without improving the left an right turning situation this would cause havoc.

The proposal to put more pedestrian crossings onto western bank is also counter-productive if the system is to become a one way system. If extra flow of traffic is being circulated around western bank as a ‘one way’, (i.e both westbound volumes from Glossop and Western) extra pedestrian crossings would just hold up the flow of traffic, especially when there is easy access walking underneath western bank near the students union.

I can see that there is too much traffic coming around brook hill roundabout but the one way system could be very confusing and take people on a long diversion from where they need to go.

I cycle up Glossop Road daily for my commute, and already it is quite congested with no cycle path at the bottom part of the road. Complicated by busses that whizz by with virtually no extra space, I worry that more traffic would mean a much more dangerous commute for me on cycle.
Why not just make pedestrian bridges? These can be covered and work very well. If they are wide enough, you could have cycle lanes in the middle and walking on the sides (e.g., 4-6 pedestrian lanes wide).

I do not think there would be any advantage to this and it would make driving/taking buses more frustrating and commutes longer.
I don't use this road often but would be very annoyed if this happened. Why can't the pedestrian crossings be moved further away from the roundabout? Also, I personally think the roundabout should work in the same way as the Park Square roundabout, where by each exit is controlled by traffic lights and motorists are meant to keep to their lane. This works really well and is no longer the nightmare it once was. I can't see what benefit this one-way system would have for motorists.

I find Brook Hill roundabout horrific at busy times as a driver. I often cannot see what is coming and just go when the next car does.

I guess you ruled out a bridge or two?

I have experienced one-way systems in various places that I have lived, especially in London. It is my understanding that TfL has moved to restore London's one-way gyratory systems to two-way. I have found that traffic moves through one-way systems at greater speed and more aggressively and does nothing to solve congestion. I also think it confuses motorists as to the route they should take, leading to greater disorientation and increased risk of accidents. I think it is also worth bearing in mind that Sheffield roads were designed as two-way and that conversion to one-way can lead to clumsy junction designs, confused priorities and an unattractive street scene because of the increased road signage.

I like the idea in general but I'm worried about vehicle speeds as these seem to go up on gyratory systems. I'd also have concerns about maintaining routes for cyclists. Eg look at the situation round the Halamshire Hospital where the preferred cycle route has been severed due to one way streets.

I think a subway system would be more beneficial under the roundabout for crossing.

I think it does not go far enough. Really Western Bank should be closed altogether and made into a pedestrian shared space. Taking out one lane still makes Western Bank difficult.

I think it is sadly impractical given the extremely high flow of traffic in this area.

I think it would make it safer in that area for pedestrians and cyclists but I think it will just cause problems in other areas with traffic.

I think it's a good idea in principle, I just worry about the use of Claremont Pl. as a cut through by even more cars, as I've been knocked off my bike there. If this was sorted then I'm am for the one way system.

I think just making it one-way would only add to congestion. I think more important is to make pedestrian and cycle ways easier and more attractive to incentivise people to opt for alternative forms of transport.

I think Sheffield already has too many one-way systems, but it's also clear that something needs to be done to ease the congestion on Brook Hill roundabout.

I think that this proposal puts a plaster on the problem, rather than solving it.

It is not the direction of traffic, or the quantity of it, which is the main problem (though some traffic easing measures would be welcome). The main problem is that unlike other campuses, such as those of the other White Rose Universities, the Sheffield campus is just not a very pleasant place to be. The main cause of this is that almost the entire campus is carved up by huge roads, and seems to have a roundabout as its center.

The best thing that the University could do, in the next 10 years, in my opinion, is to put plans in case to either submerge the roads, or put them around the outside of the campus.

This is really such a shame. Sheffield is a beautiful city, and the campus is well situated, but the roads and the roundabout prevent it from being a destination for those from rest of the city and beyond.

I think the best way would be to separate the pedestrians from drivers completely, but I realise this will be a much bigger job (it'll probably be more expensive and require
I think the current plans would create a traffic nightmare. Traffic already backs up to past Tapton School in the mornings, making Western Bank one way would only make this worse. And then that would clog up Glossop Road, which is already too busy. Plus it would make the traffic back up past the Botanical Garden and down to Hunters Bar - in fact it already does, so this plan would make the traffic even worse! This plan needs serious reconsideration otherwise the whole of the west side of the city will grind to a halt.

I think this could work well. However, again it would push more traffic down Glossop Rd, and I'm not convinced this is a good idea - it would make traffic passing by the inadequate existing pedestrian crossings on Hanover (below Brook Hill) more congested, and again would make crossing Glossop Rd more problematic.

I think this idea is ludicrous!! It is obviously a design purely for the convenience of the university and to the complete detriment of the rest of the city centre and the majority of the populous that use these roads. The change in traffic flows to accommodate this proposal would only move the problems elsewhere in the city....but I suspect the university doesn't care about this as long as it gets its own way!!!!

I think this will significantly increase traffic congestion around the crossroads of Glossop Road and Upper Hanover Street, an area that is already prone to traffic jams.

I think this would increase congestion on other roads. If you actually monitored how many cyclists use this roundabout I think the number would be very small as it is so busy. Most cyclists try and find another route so making it safer for cyclists or providing alternative routes for them is a good idea. But I don't believe reducing the flow of traffic from and to Western Bank will solve this it will only create other problems.

I travel in via Western Bank on the H1 bus not sure how they would re-divert traffic inward onto glossop road without make the journey even worse than it is.

I travel on Glossop Road a lot and there have been a number of times that for one reason or another it has been closed. I am concerned as to where traffic will be rerouted to if this occurs after the changes.

I use that roundabout a lot, both as a driver and as a pedestrian. Anything that will help the flow of traffic be less frantic would be great, and as a pedestrian, would feel a lot safer - at the moment, even with the lights, it feels like you're taking a chance every time you cross. The pollution that settles around that roundabout also feels really heavy.

I would certainly like to be able to take research visitors to eat and drink at the University Arms after seminars and colloquium. It is in wonderful location (particularly for the Hicks and Alfred Denny buildings) and sustains a unique collegial atmosphere like no other place on campus. It is a standing symbol of academia.

I would like to see how this could work without drastically increasing commuting times between Broomhill/Ranmoor/Crosspool to the city centre.

I'd like visualisations and data on why this is thought to be better.

if new one-way running is instated on Western Bank and Glossop Rd it should include bus only lanes and cycle lanes diverting buses onto Glossop Rd will create conflict with existing services which use this route -

I'm unsure about this, ultimately if the system remains permeable to walking and cycling in both directions then it would be fine. Another option to consider is the significant downgrading of Broad Lane and Tenter Street. These roads are still used by people avoiding the inner ring road, driving through the city centre instead of using the road going around it. By downgrading Broad Lane and Tenter Street we could further reduce the number of cars using each entrance/exit of the Brook Hill Roundabout and focus the traffic across the two inner ring road arms.

I think the ultimate problem is the amount of traffic flowing on these roads and the need to keep capacity high to cope with it all. If we adopted the ideas you have for walking and cycling more widely then I think this traffic volume would reduce and it would be less of an issue.

Impacts on alternative routes through the area should be considered carefully as this proposal may push more traffic through the surrounding residential streets. One way systems tend to increase the length of travel routes and this should also be considered. Additionally, consideration of how this links into a wider traffic pattern should also be mandatory. Such a significant change could have far reaching consequences through the wider road network. As such, additional interventions could be found to
improve the situation, resulting in the success of what may be found to be problematic on initial review. For example, contributions to create a park and ride facility on the west side of Broomhill could alleviate adverse affects of this proposed change. Wider schemes in partnership with the council should be considered to make this ambitious and ultimately beneficial proposal successful.

In principle this is a good idea BUT it is currently very difficult to turn into upper hanover street from glossop road at certain times of the day. With the proposed increase in the volume of traffic, as a regular user of this junction, I cannot see how traffic flow would be improved. In fact, with enhancement of the pedestrian and cycle crossing facilities on UHS, I forsee tailbacks along glossop road, well past the Hallamshire and down upper hanover street right down to the roundabout by waitrose. There would be knock-on effects for emergency services and bus services.

In principle, anything to reduce the traffic flow away from Brook Hill roundabout would be desirable (this is a wider issue of reducing car use in the city). Whether this provides a practical solution, acceptable to transport planners, is another matter, especially if it causes congestion on surrounding roads.

In reality, the same amount of traffic needs to get from A to B, so traffic would not decline..just be re-routed which could inconvenience many people.....and where will staff park?

Incorporate safe lanes for cyclists

Instead of merely introducing one-way system, public roads should be removed from the campus.

Introduction of one-way circulation systems requires buses to be re-routed and increases the distances bus users have to walk. This is fine for younger and able people, but can be a burden for older and disabled people.

Intuitively, it doesn't seem that flows would be balanced out since the traffic there's heavily influenced by commuters; halving the road space for incoming (mornings) and outgoing (evenings) would probably make traffic worse. I'd need to see data to be convinced.

It could make it more confusing for motorists as there are already many one-way systems in Sheffield. Although it could be beneficial for pedestrians.

It is a major route to the Children's Hospital, could this be detrimental to ambulance/emergency access to the hospital?

It seems to me that there is enough room on the roads for two way traffic in each direction on all the relevant roads. Moving to a one-way system will increase the distance travelled by vehicles, and thus the pollution they cause. It would also no doubt be expensive. I'm not sure the benefits outweigh the costs.

It will be good for pedestrians crossing Western Bank but will cause problems with create a bottle neck with traffic turning right onto Clarkson street

It will cause a huge amount of road congestion on surrounding roads and will be very disruptive.

It will channel a huge amount of traffic down Crookesmoor Road and down Crookes Valley Road. People from Crookes will choose this over fighting their way through Broomhill.

It will create more bottle necks, Sheffield Council have already caused major problems on Penistone Road with changes to the road layout. If more changes are made the entire City will grind to a halt damaging it's economic viability. To help traffic flow building pedestrian bridges or underpasses would be better to keep the traffic flowing rather than grinding it to a halt. If you want a "green" campus the University needs to do want the UEA have done and build the campus away from the City centre and have large open green spaces, they even have wild rabbits running around.

It will slow the WHOLE CITY DOWN. And it's already slow enough as it is.

It would be a disaster. You need to think bigger. Overpass from wetern bank onto broad lane and/or an overpass/underpass from upper hanover to netherthorpe road would both significantly reduce traffic onto brookhill roundabout. A small one way system would only cause further problems where it need to go back to a two way system. There are also 3 hospitals which require significant parking for staff and visitors so there would need to be an increase for parking to avoid significant parking on roads that need to be kept clear.

It would cause endless problems for non-university traffic, affecting everyone in Sheffield who needs to get to the Childrens hospital, Jessops Hospital, Western Park
Hospital and beyond. I do not see how making this a one way system would benefit anyone other than students whatsoever. Sheffield is already a nightmare to navigate in a car and buses are terribly expensive. Please do not make things any worse than they already are. Perhaps offer a traffic awareness course for students who are unable to cross roads safely.

It would lengthen journeys by car and increase CO2 emissions

It would make no difference. Traffic will be congested one way in the morning and the other way in the evening during the rush hours. Sheffield is a very car unfriendly city and has a bad reputation for this. The University always gets its own way (look at the Jessop Hospital). You will force the residents around the university to have to move home and then it will just become a university student area. There are some areas around the university that would benefit from pedestrian areas but on a smaller scale. The suggested area outside Jessop West for instance.

It would take car drivers a long way out of their way and increase time to get to work and get home - so causing more congestion!

It's already difficult to access the hospitals by car. I'd want any proposals to take into account problems that car using patients and their families face.

It's OK to give priority to pedestrians but what about car owners too? The car owner seems to come at the bottom of the list all the time. Would the new proposals mean that cars can go through the tram gate at the Glossop Road/Upper Hannover Way junction - this would then impact on the tram and slow those down.

Just don't demolish historic parts of the city to do it

Leeds has a one way system & it's a nightmare trying to drive to Leeds City centre if Sheffield had the same system it would make life harder for people who work & live in the city centre & around the university & also shoppers & visitors to the city

Less congestion would also be reached by taking away the pedestrian crossing and the Western Bank/University roundabout - and if there will be new ones further up the road this one might not be needed anymore anyway.

Likely to increase congestion on Glossop road and add to confusion to bus passengers as pick-up and set-down stops will be different. Clarkson Road and Durham Road would have to be upgraded in order for this to work.

Living in Wakefield, I have seen the catastrophic effects that one-way systems can have on a community. This needs to be approached with care.

Make it safe for cyclists

Many of the roads indicated on the plan contain high volumes of traffic. It appears that the proposed system is forcing the same amount of traffic into a smaller space and cutting off some of the key routes into the city centre and directing them elsewhere. Particularly the closure of Leavygreave Road. This is used both to enter and exit the city centre from/towards Brook Hill roundabout. These motorists would then be forced to take longer journeys to reach their destination, on roads not suited for the current traffic level let alone one which would also include increased traffic from other road users including the redirected bus routes. I would expect this to cause a lot of frustration with the Sheffield residents, and again could lead to further road traffic collisions.

Motorists have rights too!

Much better idea - will help pedestrians also - much easier to watch out for traffic coming from one direction only.

My solution would be to have a tunnel under Hanover Way for cars on the ring road and move the tram stop close to West Street allowing the tram route to emerge closer to West Street and cove over about half of Hanover Way. This would give an unimpeded pedestrian an cycle route down the whole campus axis.

To deal with the other traffic a larger gyratory system going as far Rockingham Street in the opposite direction would be needed.

n/a

No. However, I would like to suggest that if a new pedestrian crossing is created on Western Bank it should link the top of Hounsfield Rd with the Art's Tower carpark.

none

Not entirely convinced that this wouldn't just move congestion into the more residential areas nearby/create rat runs on already pretty overcrowded roads.
Not in the form proposed.
This could be improved by re-directing inbound traffic along Mushroom Lane. This would require the left turn to be made less sharp and therefore giving up some land in Psychology and Human Communication. This would remove the traffic/student conflict when 300 students leave Richard Roberts at 10, 11, 12 am most mornings and try to cross the road. Putting more crossing higher up will not change this as has been proven in many studies of the behaviour of crowds.
Diverting the traffic down past the Children’s hospital is NOT a good idea
1) Traffic has to turn right and will therefore cause long delays as traffic lights would be needed to halt the outgoing traffic. It is better to send it left at Mushroom lane, resulting in less congestion. The no right turn rule is generally accepted as a good rule for traffic flow (more commonly no left turn in the USA/Europe)
2) If the traffic that is diverted right, it will just turn left at the Harley and become a problem again for people crossing at the tram stop. You have not solved the problem just moved it on. This traffic will then link with the ring road traffic.
You need to survey the traffic at the round-about and find out where most of it goes. A great deal goes left down to Penistone road. Then the next busiest (my observation no proof/evidence) is traffic going straight on in the morning and afternoons. Your current plan does not address this.
The outbound traffic could then use the routes as planned or more likely they would continue up Glossop Road to Fulwood/Crosspool. Therefore provision must be made for this excess traffic on Glossop road.

One way systems can be a nightmare for motorists

One way systems seem to be a good way to confuse and irritate people. Do you have good examples of places where such systems are working well?

One way systems tend to add to the journey. Making places less car friendly is often counter-productive.

One ways are often featured amongst European capitals, and in theory they should ease congestion, though considering the influx of airheaded students (and-equally-so staff) jumping from one building to the other; my humble opinion is that an overpass or subway may be a better solution. Sadly, the subway option is already taken by the tram in the IC roundabout.

One ways seem to create traffic because half of it is going around in a circle.

Only if it is done right & not just a longer route that causes more pollution because of the longer journey

Parking in front of the childrens hospital is already an issue, funneling more traffic through the route could cause congestion by cars trying to turn left (in the direction of Broomhill and Northumberland Road) and queuing in busy periods, thereby not allowing vehicles to turn right down Brookhill to University roundabout. Road widening may be required to alleviate this, is there enough room for these works?

Particularly with reference to the effect this would have on transport, I'd imagine this would be a nightmare for new and visiting students.

Pedestrian crossings need to be added on the cross road outside the Harley, on the road coming down the back of the union. This is a hazardous junction to cross by foot!

Please see comments above as my comments are the same. Plus, what will happen with the emergency vehicles when they have to use the Glossop Road route which will always be blocked with traffic if these proposals go ahead. How are they going to get through? At least with the dual carriageway, there is easy access through the campus.

Please stop demolishing the wonderful old buildings in our city, to replace them by unsightly building that do not fit in. Just because you bring money to this city does not mean you should railroad your plans for unsightly buildings. Visit york and see how their heritage is also a part of their present and future, perhaps you idiots may learn something from them.

Parking in front of the childrens hospital is already an issue, funneling more traffic through the route could cause congestion by cars trying to turn left (in the direction of Broomhill and Northumberland Road) and queuing in busy periods, thereby not allowing vehicles to turn right down Brookhill to University roundabout. Road widening may be required to alleviate this, is there enough room for these works?

Particularly with reference to the effect this would have on transport, I'd imagine this would be a nightmare for new and visiting students.

Pedestrian crossings need to be added on the cross road outside the Harley, on the road coming down the back of the union. This is a hazardous junction to cross by foot!

Please see comments above as my comments are the same. Plus, what will happen with the emergency vehicles when they have to use the Glossop Road route which will always be blocked with traffic if these proposals go ahead. How are they going to get through? At least with the dual carriageway, there is easy access through the campus.

Please stop demolishing the wonderful old buildings in our city, to replace them by unsightly building that do not fit in. Just because you bring money to this city does not mean you should railroad your plans for unsightly buildings. Visit york and see how their heritage is also a part of their present and future, perhaps you idiots may learn something from them.
Pushing vehicles off on a longer route is going to cause frustration to road users and residents seeing more traffic.

Have you considered building a bridge or subway for pedestrians instead?

Reducing flows on one road just increases them elsewhere as people try to find a way through. The supposed improvements to the Wicker actually mean that we all have to drive through a potholed back street which isn't wide enough for 2 cars to pass each other because of the legally parked cars, past a 'massage parlour', queue to turn right to get onto a road we could have gone straight onto 5 minutes ago if there wasn't a needless 'right only' sign forcing us round this loop, wait at several sets of traffic lights while going in the wrong direction before finally turning left to progress back to the Wicker Arch. All these drivers wasting time and fuel and causing congestion on unsuitable roads which they didn't even want to be on all to avoid a couple of hundred yards of straight, wide road.

Reducing the amount of lanes flowing into/out of the roundabout would, I think, make the roundabout less intimidating for drivers, as well as having a benefit for pedestrians/cyclists on the adjoining roads. It could well ease congestion at the roundabout too.

Refer to comments above re access to hospitals. As long as poorly cancer patients and parents with poorly children can still get easy access then yes, thats fine.

Same reasons as above.

see general comments

See my comments above regarding the rerouting of buses. Many Sheffield residents feel that the University has too much say in what happens to their city

Sheffield does not need more confusing one-way systems. Visiting parents have a hard enough job navigating the roads, and mine were hit with a fine when the satnav directed them into a bus lane.

so long as the University Arms is not affected by this

Some improvement measures have been required for years, as the traffic volumes have increased.  
Sometimes one way systems can make it more difficult for a motorist and provide further congestions. Also, (Derek Dooley Way) has lots of traffic lights which make it harder to get in and out of Sheffield, this is useful for pedestrians but not for motorists.

Sounds like a bad case of NIMBY to me - let's push the traffic away and cause chaos elsewhere!

Stop interfering in how the city is run. The University is a small part of a much bigger whole which operates at best 30 weeks of the year. You should be looking for solutions before erecting so many new buildings and then expecting everyone else to fall in line. The city operates just fine without the involvement of the University. Maybe a better plan is to move the university to a green field site outside the city.

Tackling the traffic flow around the campus could make significant improvements to the environment. The plans laid out in the masterplan seem to make sense. Often in modern transport and parking planning, motorists appear to suffer, to the benefit of pedestrians and cyclists. Cycling and pedestrian facilities around campus have great scope to improve - it is good to see the masterplan appears to propose these as genuine enhancements, and they are not made at the expense of motorists. Vehicle traffic is the only feasible commuting option for many, and the University has an essential requirement for contracted buses and delivery vehicles in order to function well - restricting the access for 'professional' drivers (buses and couriers who typically can't alter their schedules to accommodate our changes) we would make the place run less efficiently. I hope visitor parking, and private coach pick up / drop off facilities can be improved. Adopting Durham Rd as private, with barrier controlled access for deliveries and coaches could create a useful, safe and efficient facility for lots of users of nearby buildings.

That roundabout is a nightmare.  
Is a bridge not a possibility?
The "proposed one-way circulatory system" - i.e. a "wrongwayroundabout" - might make things worse. The University campus is, unfortunately, crossed by major, very busy and very necessary highways. The underpass is a brilliant solution to much of this problem but reducing the capacity of these congested roads is just not acceptable for road users however attractive it might make the campus look.

The conflict of traffic at the children's hospital corner seems wrong. I once was first on the scene of a very serious RTA on this corner and had to give evidence in court. This memory stays with me.

The one-way routing would require traffic to cross by another route and likely move the congestion elsewhere as well as making access to some areas even harder than it is now. A simple solution to increasing flow on the roundabout is to make all of the immediate left turns (or a selection of them) into dedicated left turn filters isolated from the other traffic, so that no giving way is required and only straight on and right-turning traffic have to yield.

The one-way system in Sheffield already seems to cause a lot of traffic issues, and I'm not sure how this would help.

The one-way system is insane as all the traffic will end up on Glossop Road where there are currently traffic restrictions, bus/tram gates, no-right-turns etc because it was already too busy! This will make it worse with no benefits. How on earth will reducing traffic onto Brookhill roundabout to 4 lanes make it safer for cyclists? There are already pedestrian crossings over every lane so it's safe enough for pedestrians if they use them. There would be no benefit to this, it will just make it worse.

The only way to find out if it would work, is to try it.

The roundabout is horrible and congested whether you're a driver, bus passenger or pedestrian and moves to make it less so would be welcome. However, we still need to be able to get to and from work and sometimes a car is the most realistic option, so please don't make it too difficult!

The Sheffield one way system is enough of a nightmare already - the very last thing it needs is to be extended.

The traffic flow around that area is large at peak times so having one way systems might help, however the crossing system needs to be improved for definite as at lecture changeovers the sheer amount of people moving over those few crossing is too many for them to handle.

The traffic on both routes in and out of the city can be quite bad as it is.

Forcing everyone to go one way out and one way in to the city would make it even worse and bad for the people who need to get to the hospital.

The traffic problem isn't that bad and a one-way system would make it worse.

The university roundabout is busy anyway so as long as it does not become worse.

There already too many one ways in sheffield

there are 5 crossing near the university just learn students the green cross code and stay sober.

There are already enough frustrating one-way systems around the city.

there are already too many one way systems in place. what is needed are traffic lights to control all the roundabouts on the ring roads . this approach seems to work in Rotherham.

There would be much less traffic on mornings along western bank where there are a lot of pedestrians. There are a few schools, nurseries and hospital along glossop road which could become very congested in the mornings. There is also lots of pedestrian traffic of students from The Edge along glossop road.

There would need to be changes to the current priority given to trams over inbound traffic at the junction with the ring road, or traffic will be backed up to Glossop or beyond!

There would need to be quite a dramatic reduction in traffic flow in this area to make it safe for both pedestrians and cyclists and there should be more speed restrictions that are heavily enforced.

These questions should surely be extended to all residents of Sheffield? Those of us born here, more than those who weren't or are transient members of the Sheffield population would surely be mortified, at how total disregard to our local heritage is being manipulated to the Campus' main gain. Major routes are being discussed to be pedestrianised...not everyone is a student or campus user...what % of actual Sheffield population would benefit as a whole? Students are not the only people using these buses or streets. Other major Sheffield facilities are in the same area. Here's a great idea - do not increase student numbers - or how about charging more fees for students
who in their hoards seem to be able to afford their very own cars! Also teaching students how to cross a road (eg. waiting for the green man to appear at crossings - or indeed making sure they even use a crossing on the main city centre roads) I live at Norton Lees, work on Broad Lane/ Mappin, and public transport is poor. I cannot get to Hunters Bar / Crookes / Broomhill etc easily on public transport - the changes you propose will have expanding effects to the surrounding areas. Being born in Sheffield over forty years ago, you should not be trying to make this even more difficult for me.

This is a specialist area and analysis by competent planners is important. No opportunity was provided to comment on Hanover Way crossing improvements. A single location for a high-volume crossing point seems logical here, to connect Leavygreave Road and the Information Commons, in the style of that at Station Square and as suggested by the artists impression for the western bank crossing. I would like to see all of the other traffic-light controlled crossing points removed as they are a disruption to the amenity of the immediate environment for everybody and could improve safety at the major highway intersections by removing obstructions that are currently too close to the traffic intersections ie Glossop Road/Hanover Way, and Western Bank/Hanover Way.

This is only a partial solution which pushes traffic elsewhere and will only encourage more vehicles who are going the 'right' way to use it! It is completely counter-productive and will probably have little or no impact on pollution or safety. The answer is to remove the car from the equation by providing innovative socialised transport across the whole of the city centre which makes it easy to move around. Cars, roundabouts, dual carriageways, parked cars etc. are obstacles to such change, not solutions.

This is yet, again, an area where I can't claim to have any academic or personal experience. That said, I've always wondered how much of a mental headache motorists in general get on the Brook Hill Roundabout and, in fact, I've always thought the congestion to be detrimental to emergency service vehicles out on call in particular. Whenever I see them go past the windows at the Information Commons, at times fighting a solid traffic jam, I wonder if a hold up would be critical to an already seriously ill or injured would-be hospital patient. Whether a circulatory traffic system would be beneficial or not, I haven't the expertise to say for sure but, put the way it is, I have no rational reason to object to it.

This may ease traffic flow at the Brook Hill roundabout; but will increase pressure on the junctions around the Hospitals further up the hill; which is already heavily congested at peak times. Have the hospitals been consulted about this? Numerous one-way streets, no-entry & dead ends around the vicinity, which funnel traffic onto the main roads.

How about the Big-Dig in Boston? If we can spend £81 million on one building, can't we spend on putting the roads UNDER the pedestrians? It is a 10 year plan...

This proposal wouldn't solve the problem of simple volume of traffic, it would simply push the traffic back up Whitham Road and onto Bolsover Street creating problems there. The proposals would increase congestion outside Sheffield Childrens Hospital which would impede access to this by emergency vehicles. The junction of Glossop Road and Upper Hannover Street would be unable to cope with the additional level of traffic. It would significantly increase congestion and journey times. The cost to the rest of the city in terms of congestion, journey times and air quality would be too great to justify the benefit to the university.

This will just make more congestion to Glossop Road which is already very busy. Having traffic from Whitham Road crossing traffic from Western Bank will cause more congestion. Where do you think people will drive from Broomhill and beyond go to get to Netherthorpe Road or towards the East End.

This would improve Western Bank but ake Glossop Rd impossibly congested

This would just cause total traffic chaos! This change would frustrate local residents, drivers, visitors to Sheffield and only create a back-up of traffic in Broomhill/Crookes.

This would not be beneficiary to a lot of users of these roads, either car users or pedestrians. The traffic system is Sheffield is shocking anyway and whatever the planners do seem to make it worse. This will affect many people and a lot of the plans seem to be about benefits to University staff and students

This would require changing the junction at upper hanover street and glossop road if I understand correctly. I would want to see how that would work. I wonder how this affects access to childrens hospital.
To improve traffic at Brook Hill Roundabout, utilising the tram underpass as a peak hour only, car (and small vehicle) only tunnel. It could be signal controlled to not adversely affect the trams and would alleviate of queues at Brook Hill RdBt. This may be not particularly pedestrian friendly but it would offer a pragmatic solution to the traffic hotspot near the Uni.

It puts more traffic and pollution from queues on less suitable roads closer to houses and hospitals. The queue from Brook Hill Roundabout to Broomhill will extend further into the suburbs reducing air quality in Broomhill and sensitive areas (outside the Childrens Hospital). Similarly the Queue back down the Ring Road would reach Moore street roundabout and create gridlock more often.

Western Bank already has some degree of segregation from pedestrians, its on a flyover. Why move traffic where it is more in conflict with pedestrians (Glossop Road). You could improve the pedestrian place under the viaduct.

Traffic currently backs up from the University roundabout to Firth Court in the morning rush hour. If the traffic were turning down Clarkson Street and stopped by traffic lights at Glossop, this congestion would simply move to Clarkson and Whitham Roads, in front of the Children's Hospital. This could pose problems for the new Clarkson Street entrance to Children's Hospital, which is under construction now, as well as the Durham Road car park that the university plans to build. Given that the new car park will have many more spaces than currently available on campus, it is likely to attract additional traffic into the system. Any traffic modelling done should take into account reasonably expected increases in traffic due to these two developments. Moving the traffic from the University roundabout to the front of the Children's Hospital will be a very bad outcome. It is also important to consider pedestrian crossings (in both directions) at the intersection of Clarkson and Glossop Road. This is currently a very difficult intersection to cross, which could be made worse by this new traffic system. Incorporation of a signalled crossing in the traffic modelling should be a mandatory part of analysing the proposed traffic circulation changes.

Visitors arriving at Sheffield Station are faced with NOT ONE BUS STOPPING OUTSIDE.

These new ideas fit that same bankrupt philosophy. It is a selfishness and a lack of care.

We have enough one way systems

We have to do something about the roads that divide campus, and this is a good start.

Western bank is currently a dual carriageway and is congested as it is. Glossop Road is not dual carriageway. Are you not proposing to just move the problem from view rather than reduce it?

Western Bank is dwalled (SIC) both ways which is why it is the priority route. Glossop Road isn't and it has junctions and pedestrian crossings which make it very slow. The proposals are ridiculous.

What we need is over or under passes for pedestrians in the roundabout.

When Glossop Road has it's piping issues and a pipe burst which happens every now and then, this would cause real issues. The road is congested enough as it is and I am not sure making it one way will make this better.

Where to begin? One way systems never solve anything. Specialist transport planners are never specialists in transport planning. Time and again, we have all seen the problems they cause. In order to reroute downhill traffic along Clarkson Street, uphill traffic will have to be held on Western Bank. Along with three new pedestrian crossings. How will this reduce congestion?

Where would the traffic which currently goes from Glossop Rd/West St area up to Regent Street and George St go?

Whilst it sometimes makes getting from A to B slower as having to go round in circles, something should be done to address congestion.

Whilst pedestrian safety is obviously important, the university needs to consider that employees often need to use their cars to get to work at the university because of caring responsibility (e.g. school run). By making it more difficult for employees to get to work and park at work, the university should at the same time extend its flexible working (working at home) options. The university also needs to consider that it is a city not a campus based university. The closing off of roads (by complete closure or
new one-way systems) smacks of prioritising its needs over the local community.

With the caveat that the trams currently cause major tailbacks on Glossop Road - it can take 20 minutes or more in rush hour to get from the hospital to the West Street side of the ringroad. A creative solution would be welcome and in principle the proposal is excellent - especially for Western Bank.

Working alongside dual carriageways is not a wonderful experience. Taking motor traffic away from the campus would be great, but the new car park near the Education Department suggests you want to do the opposite.

Would be so much better for both the hospital and university

Would create more congestion especially with more crossings and traffic lights. Look at the ring road in rush hour it is exactly the amount of congestion same as before it was built.

Would imply heavy traffic on Glossop Road, which is narrower than Western Bank and buildings are close to the road.

Would lead to more congestion. Bus gate at top of West Street should be removed as all traffic as to go round Brook Hill roundabout instead which adds to congestion. Please no more one way streets in Sheffield.

Would there be a contraflow cycle lane? It would make quite a difference to cyclists I think.

Would worsen traffic flow around the university area, adding to the rush hour gridlock and reducing air quality as more cars sit pumping out fumes

Wouldn’t it be better to create a ring road that doesn’t go right through the city centre and move the whole thing further out so people crossing the city don’t have to use this route as the main thoroughfare through Sheffield in the first place?

Wrong proposal. We simply need better and more developed system of roads.

Yes, but see note above. Also important is to get rid of the lethal pedestrian crossings only a few yards from the roundabout.
16. Is there anything else you would like to feedback to us about the Campus Masterplan?

The University must guarantee the future of the University Arms. This is a much-loved and much-used pub with lots of character and the best beer garden in the city centre! If the University knocks it down they must replace it with something better or they will lose a lot of trade to the city centre pubs. The Interval / Bar One just do not compare.

Yes, don't make this plan all green.....some of us drive and unless you introduce flexible working life is a nightmare

This is an extra comment on behalf of staff who drive. We are concerned about personal safety for drivers. We are concerned at the distance to walk from ONE car park. We are worried about value for money as a driver and being made to feel like a social pariah. We like the green campus but do you realise how many staff do live away from Sheffield and cant always rely on public transport especially if working late

"Now is the winter of our discontent made glorious summer". Compare the picture of Leavygreave at present on page 102 - bare trees, grey skies, students in winter coats - with the proposed new look on page 103 - trees in full leaf, blue skies, students in shorts and t-shirts. Who could not be impressed by such creative architectural vision?

1. Disappointment that cars are being encouraged by the building of the new car park.
2. Concern about my safety each time I use Durham Road. It is one of the most dangerous roads in the area, with taxis and coaches parking and pulling out with great frequency at times, pedestrians just strolling across without looking. Parked cars add to the confusion as you can't safely see round them.
3. I would like to see improvements in the cycling park area near the Careers entrance. It could be improved and enlarged quite easily.

1. Increasing safety for pedestrians and cyclists would be good
2. I would be very sorry to lose the University Arms
3. The current Sports Centre location is very convenient. I would be less likely to use it if the improvements meant moving it elsewhere. I would also be less likely to use it if Membership prices increased, as the City has plenty of good deals elsewhere.
4. Closure of the Sports Centre for any length of time for alterations would be extremely inconvenient and would tempt customers elsewhere.
5. A single central carpark would cause massive congestion, and block bus routes etc at peak times.

A major gap is the provision of a designated cycle crossing across Upper Hanover Street, to replace the one lost when the tram line went in. This has been proposed and promised' in the past and is long overdue for staff and students who cycle between classes and meetings on both sides of this major divide. The present shared crossings are too narrow and require cyclists to dismount (which most do not)

A pity that neither Edward Street flats nor St George's Court were included in the venues for the exhibition. As a then Broomhill resident I was involved in the big argument and eventual public enquiry over the University expansion plan into that area. Happily this is a much more sensible approach which, as a local resident and engineering graduate of the University, I am happy to support.

A serious suggestion would be to teach students, particularly foreign students, how a pedestrian crossing works, i.e. not to push button and walk straight across. Also not to walk on the road when in a large group. The other problem is students using their phones and wearing music headphones. They're in a world of their own and have no
perception of vehicles when crossing side roads in particular. They just walk straight across. This may seem a silly idea, but driving around is extremely hazardous when looking out for students all time. I have lived in this area for around 50 years and the problem is getting worse. For clarification, this happens at any time of day or night. Pedestrianisation/more crossings will not solve this problem, it just paper over the cracks.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a) Where will current sports activities take place during the rebuild of the Sports Centre? How long will this take? Could we not split the facilities, and keep the existing excellent centre?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b) Will we have more parking spaces in total on campus, or less?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All these alterations are solely for the students. What about the general public that live here 52 weeks a year. It is going to cause a lot of disruption. If this council could get rid of every car on the road they would be happy. With your support they would cause as much disruption for the motorist that they can. I don’t agree with your proposal. Leave things as they are.

Although I generally support the University’s aim of reducing car based travel to work I think it needs to be taken into consideration that many of us travel from areas with no realistic public transport option, for example many Peak District locations so we need to drive in. If I could not guarantee a parking space I would not be bale to work full time hours. Please do not penalise staff for living outside Sheffield!

As a city resident, I am not convinced by the plans to draw me to the University. It’s a good idea to ask city residents what they would like, but the first event felt more like ‘this is what you’re going to get, like it or lump it’. As a promoter of Sheffield to visitors, this is a missed opportunity to enserse (sic). As a consultant I hope the above enforcement issues are reconsidered.

As said before - as a member of the public the only thing I have to do with the University is to frequent the University Arms at least once a week. Please do not knock this down for the 14 storey tower block, that is not beneficial to the public.

Avoiding the destruction of the University Arms would be a good idea.

Be careful about planting types and design unintentionally hampering social interactions (e.g. rows of planters segregating cafes from thoroughfare)

Car parking is already stretched to the limit at the University so I would be concerned about any loss of spaces. The University’s recruitment of academic staff compounds the problem as academic departments are encouraged to appoint staff from anywhere in the country (for reasons of prestige) and these staff are not required to relocate.

Closing Western Bank is crazy. Move the university instead, there’s empty space in the east end.

Comments from CycleSheffield re University Masterplan. We have something to say about A. Cycle Hub, B. Air quality, C. Consideration of displaced parking, D. Gyratory, E. Crossings or it is all at http://www.cyclesheffield.org.uk/2014/10/07/comments-from-cyclesheffield-re-university-masterplan/ for everybody to see. So we have done our bit and responded with as much detail as we felt necessary; we would appreciate you using it.

Thank you Mick Nott, Chair, CycleSheffield, chair@cyclesheffield.org.uk

Concerned about the traffic flow around the Durham Road once buses are re-routed and the new multi-storey is built. Will there be significant congestion/queuing when staff are arriving/leaving work at core hours in their cars.
Concerns about the University Arms being demolished

Congratulations on putting together such a visionary set of proposals. I think that they will make the campus a safer and more attractive place to work, visit, and study, and will have benefits for the surrounding areas too.

Consider putting a pedestrian bridge over Brook Hill roundabout instead of more ground-level crossings. I don't see any point putting a pedestrian crossing over the Western Bank flyover. The concourse is vibrant when the students are around, diverting them over the flyover would detract from the atmosphere.

Cycle hubs would be great!

Cycle lanes through the pedestrianised areas would be greater as well.

Do NOT demolish the University Arms! This university has already destroyed too many nice buildings and has a bad reputation with Sheffield residents as a result. Incorporate it into a nice garden area with an extended outdoor beer garden/cafe.

Do not demolish the university arms!!

Do not destroy any more of the historic buildings on the campus - Sheffield has lost too many of its buildings of character, quality and distinction in recent years and these have generally been replaced with cheap, shoddy alternatives that bring nothing positive to the cityscape. Whatever plans you have for the campus, they should work with the existing buildings and should not involve further demolition. The design of new buildings also needs to be improved - the current fad for 'Infantile Modernism' is deplorable and the results to date are a disgrace.

Do not destroy the beautiful University Arms which is one of the few 'character' building we have that has a lovely garden area at the back for summer etc.

One car park will be really busy at rush hour times and as it is a large campus it means parking further away from where I work. I use my car to carry stuff so would mean having to carry things further which is not ideal.

Do not get rid of the University Arms as excellent real ale pub

Do not knock down the University Arms building! It’s one of the nicest pubs in the area, especially the beer garden, and it looks much MUCH nicer than any of the new buildings that the university have built in recent years.

Don’t demolish the university arms pub - it is a fantastic social venue/eating place.

Don’t get rid of the University Arms

Don’t get rid of the University arms! Or any of the old buildings. It will ruin the character of the university.

Don’t knock down the old buildings, especially the University Arms!

Employability is a key theme for the university yet the university does not have provision comparable with competitor institutions. Look at the Careers Service at Newcastle, the employer facilities at Leeds or even at SHU

Ensure that the University Arms Pub is not affected by the plans - it is a great feature of the university and must not be lost.

Existing heritage buildings (i.e. the University Arms) really must be kept. These buildings represent Sheffield’s history and are still used and loved by staff, students and local residents - why demolish them? When I show people round the university it is these buildings that I highlight and which visitors like to see. The facilities of the new developments are obviously fantastic - but it is these heritage buildings that people connect. They are also far more memorable and, for many, far more architecturally appealing than the shiny new buildings. I don’t question the facilities the new developments (IC, Jessop West etc.) have to offer but they should be in addition to the wonderful existing and historical buildings we have - not instead of. I used to give tours and the new music department was widely admired as a beautiful building by prospective students and parents as it gives some feeling of history and history to the university (despite it having been a hospital...). It is short-sightedness to think that towering new developments are a replacement for historical buildings. Option 3 for the Houndsfield site should not seriously be considered for this reason. The best cities work around the wonderful buildings (which in this case are very much in use) and don’t simply flatten them.

Extremely bias towards pedestrians and cyclists and to the detriment of all locals who drive/catch the bus in this area. These plans are not for the benefit of locals but solely to benefit walking students. Sheffield University is a part of Sheffield life, not the only part of it and as such should consider the impact on local people driving and catching
buses.

Fantastic! Can't wait to see it all

FEEDBACK PART 2

On P89, point 16 indicates another potential outcrop of trees. Please don't dot trees around just to make your drawing look greenier. If you study the relationships between the Western Bank Library and the Arts Tower, you will understand the necessity to keep this area clear of unnecessary, fussy planting. If you observe the two buildings, particularly at night, you will appreciate this exceptional architectural connection. There are some excellent pictures from the early 60's which illustrate this beautifully. Edge to edge granite sets, for example, would give a clean, crisp, quality hard landscaping that would support the formal juxtaposition of the Tower and Library, without over-cluttering the site. PLEASE put some serious consideration into this going forward.

Point 6 illustrates a new Cafe to the Arts Tower Court- this is an essential component of the new space and will provide much needed amenity. The University should make this element the subject of an architectural competition, rather than just let Bond Bryan, or Twelve Architects design it and assume that it is 'iconic' architecture. If we are to continue to compete in the global market, we must move on from this desperately misguided assumption. Their contribution to the University Estate is simply not good enough. Look around at the competition- we are falling short.

The central, symmetrical plan to the Arts Tower Court is an odd move and a little naive- I am hoping that the detailed scheme will be much more imaginative. It is excellent to see the use of the ground floor of the Alfred Denny Building. This colonnade is crying out for shops and cafes to animate the edge of the Concourse. Would it be possible to add a cafe beneath the road itself? This is an unusual space and it seems that this is another opportunity which will add greatly to the unique character of the Campus- we MUST stand apart from our competitors.

P97 is an excellent image and describes exactly what is needed. If the detailed proposal matches this image, we will achieve a campus to be proud of.

The potential demolition of the University Arms must be carefully considered. Increased density on this site does make sense, HOWEVER, the Campus has precious little character remaining from its early twentieth century origins. The Uni Arms is not the best pub in Sheffield by any means, but it is a very important feature of the Campus.

BE CAREFUL. Simply proposing alternative, new social spaces for staff and students is not sufficient. Without a decent budget and an innovative, insightful architect, ultimately these new buildings will become the soulless, mediocre environments we have to endure in the new Student's Union, totally lacking in character. With care, consideration, attention to detail AND the right architect, you can cleverly incorporate the University Arms into the Masterplan, retain a little local heritage and achieve all desired objectives for increased density and improved public realm.
FEEDBACK PT 1

There are 3 options illustrated for the Hounsfield site - Option 1 retains the Uni Arms pub, but creates a strange, corridor like space. Options 2&3 describe a new open square. This is a very positive move, and will help create a ‘collegiate’ feel to the campus, which is currently lacking- however- this space will not work without careful planning to ensure animation and activity at ground level. We need FAR more Cafe spaces and small bars on campus- the current offer is NOT sufficient and is a huge missed opportunity by the University to increase revenue and create life and activity across the campus. Is there an opportunity to place the tall block at the NW corner of the Hounsfield site rather than directly opposite the new square? This would increase density but allow an option to preserve the Uni Arms. (more of this chat later) Excellent proposals to increase crossings over Western Bank. Broad, pedestrian friendly, shared surface crossing are so important and will totally change the way the Campus is used. This works very well where the Gold Route crosses the Ring Road at Sheffield Station.

The MPPlan shows far too many trees dotted about the top of Leavygreave Road- This area is potentially a MAJOR urban space and a legitimate new threshold space to the Campus. Dotting trees everywhere is a lazy approach to masterplanning- this must be a carefully designed public space which will have a complex brief. Its success, or course, will depend on the detail.

Some of the precedent examples feel tired and recycled from the 1000's of images in the FCB precedent library. There is (or was) an opportunity here to develop this key piece of Sheffield through the use of a detailed precedent study, showing aspirational examples of good collegiate masterplanning revealing both strategy and detail. I'm sorry to say it, but consequentially the Masterplan document falls short of what is needed here.

The Area around the Arts Tower is desperate for large scale redevelopment. Connection from the proposed 'Arts Tower Court' to Western Park is paramount and currently shamefully undervalued.

I fully appreciate that the proposals are just a masterplan, and will be worked up to detail later (possibly by others) but chucking trees everywhere is LAZY planning and not at all helpful. You could take the opportunity to illustrate the possibilities for each area with carefully selected precedent images.

For Hounsfield Site, 4.3, I favour Option 1, saving the University Arms (an important resource for staff and visitors and, like the villa, an important part of the redbrick heritage), and allowing the retention of existing mature trees, while avoiding hiding it behind a new building and blocking its connection to the garden (Option 2), or the creation of a monstrous new tower (Option 3).

The Henderson's Relish building is a Sheffield icon, and I think it would be missed.

For me, the most serious omission is any reference to re-siting the English Language Teaching Centre, where many international students currently begin their career at the university. It is located away from campus which marginalises these students, cutting them off from action on the concourse; it is already cramped and numbers are rising so is unlikely to be adequate if current recruitment practice continues. It would benefit these students if space could be found for a more pleasant, better-designed building on the main campus, near the main action.

From what I understand, it has been proposed that the University Arms be demolished as part of the University's Campus Development project, although the questionnaire fails to mention this. I should like to express my disapproval of this proposal in the strongest terms possible. It would: represent a loss of a social hub of no little significance for students, staff and locals alike; demonstrate a callous disregard by the University for Sheffield's heritage and the quality of life of its residents; dent Sheffield's global (yes, global- see recent article, New York Times, 52 Places To Go In 2014) reputation as centre of fine ale appreciation; worsen a growing rift between the University and Sheffield’s residents, and significantly increase the perception of the University as a venal behemoth, the primary concern of which is the acquisition of money and assets. I urge you to reconsider this proposal.

Go for It!!!

Goodwin is ridiculously overpriced. The swimming pool is good value but gym membership is preposterous for the quality of the facilities. I am surprised that many undergrads can actually afford membership. I somehow am skeptical that a rebuild would make it any better value for money.
Goodwin needs cheaper prices for staff and students to encourage more physical activity on campus. Example: more free initiatives under the Juice scheme, such as gym trials, badminton, outdoor pitch sports.

Also, cycle storage facilities need to be more secure - e.g. CCTV, as I recently had a bicycle stolen whilst using one of the University's cycle storage facilities.

Great concerns around developments around the Northumberland Road and Crookesmoor Road areas. This is residential and in a conservation area. Pedestrian access along this road is very, very poor and it is already severely congested with commuters and students walking in the mornings. There is also heavy commuter traffic in this area and is already a potential to be an accident hotspot. Recent speed limit changes to 20mph have helped but by no means solved a problem, especially where new developments will increase pedestrian and car traffic significantly.

Great to see the addition of green space and connectivity.

Have decent cycle lanes in city.

Here is an alternative to crossings on Western Bank:
Instead of having traffic above our heads on the concourse, we could replace the road with a tunnel. This project could pay for itself: the area above the tunnel could be built on and sold to raise funds for the project.

The advantage of this alternative is that it eliminates traffic instead of finding ways around it. It also has the potential to be self-funding.

How about spending time ridding roads round Northumberland Road of all your parked cars by building a multi-storey car park there. And what are you doing about that eyesore which was previously Tapton Hall at Crookes? More space wasted.

I am a resident of Harcourt Road & I was disappointed to hear about these future developments via a general University Master Plan. As far as I'm aware, no other neighbouring residents have been consulted on this matter. I work at Sheffield Children’s Hospital (after graduating from Sheffield University) and I have concerns regarding the lack of information relating to this matter. Some questions I have (which were not answered by your roadshows) include: How big will this facility be? How many more students are you expecting to use the facility? Will we be provided with any 'facilities' to account for the increase in students numbers using the area, e.g. Waste bins, parking spaces? Will the facility be open late at night? If so, how much light/noise/general environmental impact will this have? Will the facility be created to keep in the style of the neighbouring buildings (i.e. Victorian housing dating back to 1880) or will it be a modern building like your 'ugly' Information Commons? In general, I have to say that this matter, and the nature in which it has been communicated, has created some uneasiness within the community, which is a shame. Ultimately, I cannot support the future developments, given the lack of thought & clarity in which it has been proposed.

I am absolutely against your plans for University Square, Hounsfield to get rid of the University Arms Pub. Be aware that the University Arms is one of the few places, if not the only one, where staff and students but also members of the public actually get together outside of University working hours. Getting rid of it would mean a further divide between the public and TUoS.

I am concerned as to the redevelopment of the arts tower car park. This is a valuable space for people who NEED to drive into work and for visitor parking. The is a huge park next door that people can use as a green space (and would probably prefer to given the view). In the last year, 2 holes have appeared in the car park due to hot water pipes underground. The situation has been so unsafe that the car park had to be closed for a long period of time and extra measures put in place to protect pedestrians and incoming vehicles. How can we plant trees on this area? The roots will surely interfere with the pipework?

I am deeply concerned about the threat to the University Arms and feel it would be a great loss to Sheffield & the University if this very popular building was demolished. This would further alienate the working people of Sheffield, many of who view the University with distrust and feel that the University will do whatever it wants with scant regard to the wishes of the citizens.

I am disgusted at the plans to demolish historic buildings to increase the campus?

I am extremely unhappy about the plans to knock down The University Arms. By removing this you are destroying a characterful building with award winning green space as its garden and we at the University and the wider general public will be losing a great asset.

I am filling in this form as I am a regular user of the University Arms as it is a place (as a member of the public) I can come and meet friends (some of who work at the
University and some of whom don’t), have a meal and most importantly we can bring our children. It is (unusually for the city centre) a family friendly and yet traditional style pub.

I am fine with improving things as long as it does not involve knocking down historical buildings. Redevelopment should be worked around our heritage not bulldozed through it like the University seems to insist on doing.

I am sorry to burst your bubble, but there is a growing feeling in the city that the University of Sheffield is getting too big for its boots. The University and Sheffield City Council are two completely separate institutions. One is democratically elected, the other is not. First the University acted like the city's planning authority, forcing through the proposal for the new engineering building, in the face of huge public opposition, landing the city with an ugly monstrosity. Now the University is attempting to become the city's highway and public transport authorities. It is not the University's role to decide where I drive or what route a bus takes. Please stick to education and research, the things you are best at.

I am strongly against the plans of (even possibly) knocking down the University Arms. This pub is an important part of our University, historically and also culturally, and it would be a huge shame to get rid of it. The other cafes/restaurants on campus do not offer the particular atmosphere of a food-serving pub, and I have always enjoyed my visiting to the University Arms.
I am the chair of the University's Cycle Forum, and have collected the following feedback from University Cyclists:

Please put your comments and questions in here and I will collate them into a coherent response.

The University of Sheffield Cycle Forum welcomes the proposals to make the Campus more pedestrian and cycle friendly.

Modelling of flow should take into account numbers of people, not numbers of vehicles as private cars in particular are most often single occupancy.

Re the proposed gyratory system - how will cyclists be catered for? Concerns about increase in vehicle speeds on gyratory system.

Is focusing on a single ?Gold Route? really the best idea? What about permeability throughout the campus?

Shared space works well when there is plenty of it. Where space is restricted cyclists should have demarcated cycle routes. This was particularly true of the short clip that showed the area between Jessop West and the HRI building.

Where there are steps e.g. leading down to University Square there has to be ramped access as well.

The plan focuses on the route between the City Centre and the University (Gold Route). However, a lot of foot and cycle traffic comes in from the west and north of the campus. How can this better catered for?

Crookes Valley Rd - A segregated uphill cycle lane could be put in using dead space alongside the road. The sole barrier to this is the bus stop which is not well used as it is not close to any properties. Could it be relocated closer to Harcourt Road if lots of wasted road space at the junction is reclaimed for peds / cycles in the safety scheme?

Don't touch the University Arms! It is a highly attractive feature of the University.

There is a danger that the new Faculty of Science building will create an unfriendly canyon effect along Western Bank.

See also the CycleSheffield Response:

https://docs.google.com/document/d/1VHRw0AO4kJ3TMWQ8EF4-8VvNeOiUOxsRT9BXd7Zbs/edit

We have some reservations about the use of ?Specialist Transport Planners?. If this refers to the Council?s Transport, Traffic and Parking Services, we have found them to be focused on getting the maximum amount of motor traffic through the city?s streets and not on the needs of pedestrians and cyclists. The current very poor conditions for peds & cyclists around Brook Hill are the result of the implementation of this policy over many years.

With regard to the consolidation of parking on the Durham Rd site, we would support this as long as stronger measures are taken against people who currently park in the cycle lanes on Glossop Rd, Clarkehouse Rd and Winter St. Many of these people arrive from 9 a.m. onwards and sit in their vehicles until 09:30 when the bus and cycle lanes are no longer operational. Having discussed why the undertake this dangerous and anti-social behaviour it is apparent that many of these are University and Hospital staff who can't claim that they can't find anywhere to park. Clearly they will no longer have this excuse and we would expect stronger measures to be taken against them.

We support the overall aims of the Masterplan but with many schemes of this nature we have found the devil to be in the detail, with the functional needs of walkers and cyclists often poorly understood by designers. The city and the UK in general has many cycle "facilities" that are regarded as a laughing stock by ordinary cyclists. We would like to be closely involved with the detailed design of all cycle facilities.

- Simon Geller, Chair, University Cycle Forum
I am the Director of Performance at the Department of Music in Jessop Building, Leavygreave Road.

3 points:
1. The full pedestrianisation of Leavygreave Road would lead to huge problems for the Department in terms of access and portering of equipment. This point is linked to the fact that we do not have a dedicated performance space. As a result porters have to transport big, bulky, heavy instruments a number of times a week from the Soundhouse to Firth Hall and back for large scale rehearsals and the great number of concerts and student performances we hold there. They also have to transport equipment to and from the Department Building.

2. There is no mention on this Campus Masterplan, which looks wonderful, of a performance space for music (and the performing arts in general). In a month where the Music Department in Sheffield came sixth in the Times Good University Guide for Music, it must be stressed how hard our Department is working to provide our students with a stimulating and productive time here. But we do not have a dedicated performance space, yet pride ourselves in performance being central to our work here.

3. The Church of the Nazarene is on our doorstep, yet there is no mention in the Masterplan of this space. The Leavygreave Ryoad area could be a focused Music Department space, with the Soundhouse across the road too.

I am very much against destroying The University Arms. I'm not convinced that knocking down established buildings (and their open spaces) is necessary, and don't believe it's desirable.

I appreciate and support the push for better cycling routes, but most people - even those who cycle into University - get around campus on foot. Safer routes for pedestrians are therefore, in my view, a much higher priority than improved cycle routes.

I do not agree with the tearing down of the old buildings on campus for the Hounsfield site.

I do not think having a fountain in the current location of the arts tower car park would be a good idea. Consider the number of students returning towards Crookes (one of the major residential areas) in an inebriated state following a night out in the students union. What would happen if you decided to push your friend into the water for a laugh?

Having a larger lawn in place of it would be just as nice, and safer.

I do occasionally have to drive to work. Unfortunately, like many other members of staff I only qualify for a Category C parking permit which in itself allows very limited parking due to the small number of parking spaces available. By closing the number of surface car parks and transferring these to one place, even though there will be more spaces in theory, will make matters worse. I truly believe that staff needs have not been fully considered.

I do very much like the idea of more trees and more pedestrianized areas, but I've heard that it may mean closing down the University Arms. The Uni Arms is one of the best pubs in town - for students, postgraduates, and staff, and it would be devastating to the University community if it were closed down.

I don't think you should make Leavygreave Road edge into a pedestrian only route as well as this will just cause more havoc on Sheffield traffic in the center the only thing I agree out of this whole plan that is a good idea is the crossing on western bank as it is pretty inconvenient when wanting to get to western park from the roundabout.

I don't use Goodwin as I perceive it to be too far away from campus (even though it's not that far!) and it is not competitively priced compared to closer sports/leisure centres. Is would depend on whether the new site was closer to the I.C. area and if the prices went down. I do not wish to see the University Arms pub demolished as it is an important part of campus and integral to the university as a whole.

I have heard rumor that the Henderson's relish building will be demolished as part of the master plan. If this is the case I am strongly opposed! Sheffield's heritage should play an important role in any future master plan!

Further to this I love the red brick buildings of the University and would be sad to see them demolished any further!

Creating more crossings on western bank, is a really super and really important idea! The current crossing at the bottom on western bank just after brook hill roundabout is an accident waiting to happen!! It dangerous for all road users!
I have heard the plans will involve getting rid of the University Arms. Please do not do this as it is a good, reasonably priced real ale pub that is friendly to students and an important cultural landmark in Sheffield because of its history.

I have heard via the Liberal Youth that the University Arms may be under threat in the proposed development. I think it's removal would be an enormous shame, and would very much like to see it protected.

I have to travel between the Northern General Hospital where I work for the University of Sheffield and main campus and Royal Hallamshire Hospital almost daily, but cannot use the shuttle bus at peak times. This is very inconvenient and puts the whole way we work in jeopardy as we have to pay for public transport and the journey time can quadruple. Please, please work out a way for staff and not just students to benefit from this service.

I have heard there are considerations for getting rid of the Uni Arms, which I don't see any good reason for. It is regularly used by staff, students and alumni and always seems a popular venue as well as a staple of local life.

I have heard there are plans to demolish the university arms, which I am very much against. It is a lovely pub which I am very fond of and would be a great loss to see it gone. If the plans could happen where this would be preserved then I think that is a far better solution.

I hope as a swimmer that any redevelopment of Goodwin would include a swimming pool.

I love the idea of greening areas, it's a dream come true and the arts tower green court is brilliant.

I note that, despite cycling getting lots of mentions in the general blurb, and pictured on the video, there is no mention of it in the detail for any of the crossings! - its all re Pedestrians.

In particular, the 'Upper Hanover Street Central Crossing' - see p85 (5.1.2) the bisected Leavygreave Rd one.

This is the arterial cycle crossing that Supertram got away with severing, and is now a pedestrian xing and a beggar to use even when as i do now, dismounting and pushing bike across.

As far as I can see, this is the one that most needs the needs of cyclists to be taken into account when upgraded. This is the route cyclists use trying to follow this main route from the NW into town (it basically provides the best join from Crookes Valley/Arts Tower/Concourse/Houndsfield/Leavygreave/Upper Havover Xing/Leavygreave/Portobello etc into town route, which currently is the safest/quickest/most ‘desirable’ route).

There is also the the issue of the statistically dangerous Right turn off Winter St into the Uni Arts tower car park after the Star and Garter - this could be a good chance for the Uni and SCC to work together and provide a safer option.

Options could be:
1. A Left hand drop kerb ‘cycle run off’ after Weston St to deliver cyclists to a new Toucan Xing over to the Arts Tower entrance. (Prob where Pelican is now?)

AND

2. For more experienced/confident cyclists who will not want to spend ages ‘Toucanising’ one of those red right turn ‘haven’ strips in road centre, just prior to Toucan.

- Both leading the cyclist over to a dedicated cycle entrance lane into the Arts Tower area, separate to the pedestrian one, going into the Uni, avoiding cycle/pedestrian conflict as you leave the Xing/Winter St.

(I know these strips - like the Glossop rd one for the R turn into Brunswick st aren’t to everyone’s liking, but I’m ok with them, and in reality I would do this manoeuvre before choosing toToucanise, but feel Toucan option is impt for less confident cyclists - if in fact money/Dft guidelines dictate these 2 options conflict, then go with Toucan+dedicated cycle entry point and the rest of us will have to take our chances turning right as we do now).

I notice one of the proposals is to demolish The University Arms pub in order to build new high rise buildings and form a green square to socialise in etc. I think the demolition of the pub would be a mistake and the University should do the opposite and refurbish/restore the pub and make it a focal point of that social area. This would make for a unique selling point to future students etc...

I strongly believe you should keep the University Arms pub as it is a lovely, unique addition to the campus and to Sheffield.
I strongly object to the proposal to demolish the University Arms. 

Whilst I highly value education and the positive contribution Sheffield University and its students make to my workplace and my community (we have many students on placement within my workplace), I do not believe that progress should be to the detriment of my local heritage or to my highly valued leisure time within this pub. A new replacement pub is not acceptable to me as it is the character of this pub and the links with my past and my heritage, in addition to the quality of the pub experience, that draw me here rather than to any other pub in Sheffield.

This is a beautiful old pub, recently refurbished, a splendid beer garden, rich in history. I would be greatly affected by the demolition of the University Arms and request that you consider retaining it within your Campus Masterplan.

I strongly oppose plans to demolish the University Arms. This pub is popular with colleagues and postgraduate students, and visitors to the University have enjoyed being taken there.

I strongly urge you to consider the plans which would preserve the University Arms Pub, which has an important history and is a much-treasured place to go for faculty, students, and the Sheffield public in general. It offers a special atmosphere, local beers, and a peaceful beer garden, it's a respite from the built up areas of the campus, and it's loss would be a great tragedy. There is no other quite like it, in the heart of the campus.

I think before the masterplan looks at external features such as walkways, greenspaces etc we should be looking at the building space and whether this is adequate and meets the needs of our staff/students. The Careers Service (a student facing service) is currently based in the husband building which students describe as ‘the one that looks like a car park’ when we are trying to describe where we are located. It is not fit for purpose. Students find it difficult to find us and we do not have enough space to see students on a 1-1 basis in a confidential space and often struggle for meeting space. This is also a place where we bring external employers to try and build relationships with them. Employability is high on the university's agenda yet our facilities as far as the Careers Service space goes does not reflect this. I feel these are issues that should be addressed before external spaces which do not directly impact on the work of the university are looked at.

I think it all sounds great, and will be an attractive and safer environment for our students as well as attracting prospective students even more. Be good if the uni could keep pressing SYPTE for cheaper, more frequent and fully integrated public transport though, cos unless you live near the students, the rest of the city is poorly served in parts (eg North of city where I live) and makes it expensive and slow to try to use public transport to work.

I think it is absolutely disgusting that the following buildings are listed for demolition or ‘managed decline’, as the euphemism goes under the SU's proposed 'Option 3' for the 'Hounsfield Site'. These buildings are of great historical importance and are aesthetically much more pleasing than any new building the University proposes.

- University Arms
- Hendersons' factory
- Various Victorian 'villas'.
- Church of the Nazarene

In addition, it is the University's plan to get rid of many historic green sites (e.g. the Uni Arms garden. A sickening plan, especially after how the old Jessop Wing on Leavygreave Road was demolished. Why not use and expand on features of the existing environment rather than bulldozing down historic sites?

I think it is outrageous that you plan to demolish the University Arms.

After the removal of the staff coffee rooms in most buildings and the closure of the staff restaurant in the student union, this is the only place on campus with affordable food and drink.

It is also a very important meeting place and social hub on campus for staff.

I strongly feel that the management of this university only thinks about students but forgets that they need staff as well.

I think it looks fantastic overall. Please do make sure all equality and diversity aspects are considered in every stage of the planning and build, not just accessibility in terms
I think it sounds fantastic and much of it is much needed... especially the large multi-storey car park. I think we all know how much of a nightmare parking is. I'm an external contractor working very regularly at the university with a lot of equipment I have to bring with me. Some way of guaranteeing parking nearby would be of huge benefit. Secondly, I'm a big fan of The University Arms and think it is a really special 'alternative choice' for socialising and meetings and would be concerned to think that the university is looking to make more coldly uniform/efficient social spaces along the lines of Jessop West cafe etc. I think any opportunity to preserve some of the historic and unique aspects of the University should be embraced. The pub is a pivotal part of the social fabric of this university and would be sorely missed should it be bulldozed.

I think it would be a huge shame if the University Arms and all other older buildings in that area were removed. The campus is quickly becoming dominated by large modern buildings (except for Firth Court) and it would be a loss of character. In addition there would be the loss of mature trees and plants.

The University Arms is also an important campus resource and a true bridging point between the University and the wider population of Sheffield.

I think it would be a tragedy for you demolish The University Arms, it is a historic building with a rich history and currently the only Real Ale pub in the area. I can see the need for redevelopment in the area, and of your three options for that zone, option 1 makes most sense. This retains the historic pub and includes a nice green space for communal student and staff relaxation.

However tearing down the pub, would deprive staff and students alike of the only mature drinking establishment in the area. It would cause great anger amongst staff and students alike.

I think it’s outrageous that the new car park on Durham Road is including public parking. I just wish that for once the University would put it’s staff first and actually think "yes, it would be nice for our staff to be able to park close to work without having to get here at 8am to ensure that they get a space". My entire childcare and family life is centred around the fact that I need to get to work in the Mappin area just after 8am in order to park - it’s often the most stressful part of my day! The car does exist, is very convenient for a lot of people and it would be nice if just occasionally the university would acknowledge this.

I think the main area for development should be green spaces. There is currently little green spaces within university land and I believe that it is quite important. The proposed development site for a green space in the current car park next to the arts tower is an ideal place for this.

I think the concept of improving the campus is excellent but the devil is in the detail and it depends how the developments are implemented as regards improving social interactions between students and city residents.

I think the loss of access for vehicles to the Arts Tower car park is a huge blow. It makes it very inconvenient for visitors to the University to have to park remotely and find their way around. The current problems with the main barrier to the Arts Tower carpark have highlighted how problematic it is for delivery vehicles to enter from the Bolsover Rd entrance. This has not only created traffic problems on Bolsover St and in the car park but there is also the issue of large vehicles getting under the library bridge. I also think it creates a more dangerous pedestrian space when you move from a wide pedestrianised area in front of the Arts Tower to a narrower area which is used by large delivery vehicles at the back of the Arts Tower. This entrance is a very busy entrance for students and at lunchtimes.

I think you must keep in mind that many people live in Sheffield who don’t work at the University and use the roads around the campus. The city is not here solely for the purpose of the University. The public need to be with the University and not against it.

I totally fail to see why the University should dictate to the citizens of Sheffield what happens with the highway and pedestrian network. They should fit in with what is required to make the network operate most efficiently. No other commercial organisation would receive such beneficial treatment from Sheffield City Council.

I was very happy to hear about the Masterplan and I feel proud to be studying in such a great University.

I work for the Careers Service and we really need to be in a central location so that students can find us and get to us easily. At the moment we are hidden in 388 Glossop Road and students struggle to find us through the car park.
I would certainly like to be able to take research visitors to eat and drink at the University Arms after seminars and colloquium. It is in wonderful location (particularly for the Hicks and Alfred Denny buildings) and sustains a unique collegial atmosphere like no other place on campus. It is a standing symbol of academia.

**PLEASE DO NOT DEMOLISH THE RECENTLY RENOVATED UNIVERSITY ARMS PUB.**

I would keep University Arms, it's good to mix old and new, and it's looking as if too much old is being displaced to make way for new

I would like the University Arms to stay as it is under any new development.

I would like the University to keep the University Arms pub and not knock this down in place of a high rise building. I feel that the University should make an effort to keep the older buildings as a contrast to the newer buildings.

I would like the University to retain the University Arms pub.

I would like the University to take stock of its existing successful spaces and to realise that most of these spaces have something in common - the simple combination of well designed landscape and listed buildings. With this in mind, the University should consider carefully the issue of quality over quantity in its decision about which option to pursue on Hounsfield Road. There are two lovely listed buildings there that could significantly enhance the campus experience, bringing quality and a sense of history that cannot be achieved without them.

I am also concerned about the lack of information regarding the proposed Goodwin Sports Centre redevelopment and the new Social Sciences building on Northumberland Road, which are both nestled within a dense residential community. There is no timescale or any plan showing exactly where these developments are likely to be. My questions to the University staff at the Winter Gardens regarding this omission were answered with the reassurance that these were early days and that a full planning application process would be followed once plans were firm. Given that the proposed developments are nestled within a residential community, the University should engage in a formal conversation with the neighbouring residents long before any time or money is invested in 'firming up' these development proposals for a planning application. It is almost too late to consult the community when a planning application is submitted. The time to talk to the residents is when the idea is germinating and throughout the early design stages. That way, the resolution of any community concerns can be interwoven into the design proposal without undue burden on the development. This should result in fewer objections at the planning approval stage and an improved relationship with the community.

Without any detail or dialogue to respond to regarding these two developments, it is difficult to know what comments to make at this stage. However, some general concerns are as follows: preservation of the mature trees along Northumberland Road; maintaining appropriate scale and density for a residential neighbourhood; respecting the conservation area and the history of the landscape; avoiding increased traffic and noise; impact on the existing habitat areas and wildlife corridors that link into the Crookes Valley Park and the Ponderosa; further erosion of the residential fabric resulting from a wedge of new non-residential development that would effectively divide the neighbourhood; increased development pressure on the Harcourt hole; and the direct impact on the residents whose gardens back onto the sports centre and the site for the Social Sciences building.

I would like to get a clearer picture of how any of the proposed changes to the roads on Western Bank and the Brook Hill Roundabout might affect nearby buildings such as University Arms and other old buildings in that same area. I find that little plot of old-fashioned in the midst of campus very lovely, and would hate to see it go.

I would like to see a lot of points in the new car park and other car parks to charge electric cars. This to me is essential for the future. I know you are trying to remove cars BUT some people esp those with young children have to use cars and this is good all round.

I would really like to ensure that, as part of the plans, the University Arms remains. It is a focal point for both staff and students alike, and it would be a real detriment to the users of the Campus if it was removed.

It would be great to as many safe routes for pedestrians through the Campus as possible.
I, like many, think most of the proposed changes in the Campus Masterplan are exciting and very much welcome.

However, I’d like to voice my opposition to the proposal of knocking down the University Arms pub. Don’t get me wrong, I like progress, and the idea of the University building new world-leading facilities is very welcome. But, the University Arms pub is one of the only spaces on the entire campus where staff and students can comfortably informally mix. It is one of the only spaces that feels genuinely collegiate.

Every great university in the world - Harvard, Cambridge, Oxford and Yale has their own great pub(s). It's more than just a pub really. It's the idea, spirit and character of what a great university is - a warm and welcoming melting pot of ideas and cultures. Removing one of the only places on campus that allows this to thrive will substantially undermine the community and collegiate spirit from the University - and a university without a soul is really only a research institute or polytechnic.

I think the University's EFM department has done a great job over the years, despite occasional controversy. I think they've generally made good decisions. But I think they really need to look at the University through the eyes of a student or academic member of staff for this one. I might not be giving them enough credit, but I doubt a professional or executive member of staff would truly understand the spirit of the university in the same way as a student, alumnus or member of academic staff. I hope they don't overlook this when they come to make their final decision.

I have one other piece of input that I’d like to formally make - which isn’t a negative point against the university’s plans - but actually some encouragement. If we are to increase the cycle-friendliness of the campus - fantastic - but most people live off the campus. Many people choose not to cycle into work because many of Sheffield's roads are too dangerous for cyclists. I would love the university to try to make more in-roads (pardon the pun) to really push the 'cycling culture' right across our city - and work with the council to try to seriously, once and for all, start planning the best cycle options from each of the major suburbs into the city (and university).

If the university does not secure the future of the University Arms, then the Campus Masterplan is a complete failure; it is a beautiful building and a great pub and should remain so.

I'm concerned about the plan to turn the Arts Tower car park into a green space. It has needed to be dug up twice this year to fix water mains; wouldn't putting trees and planters mean it is more difficult for Veolia etc to gain access for maintenance and repairs?

I'm disappointed that the demolition of the University Arms is being considered. In its current form, this is a very convenient place to take visitors to the University and for University staff to socialise. Its Victorian architecture also provides a bit of a change from the modern buildings which increasingly dominate the campus, and I would hope that a way can be found to retain it in the new plans for the Hounsfield area.

I'm not sure if this is applicable in this plan but as a female cyclist I would benefit from better provisions in my department for showering, storage for clothing and a changing area. I have to clean and change in a toilet which is not ideal.

I'm still pissed off you knocked down the Jessops building, don't do it again to other parts of our city (including the hendersons building)

I'm very enthusiastic about what is being planned.

IMPORTANT: Please do not demolish, or change the character of, the University Arms. This is an excellent social space for staff and students, particularly post-grads. It is well-known, well-used and well-remembered. The range of Sheffield beers has impressed many an academic visitor. It is one of the factors that persuaded me of Sheffield’s quality of life, and attracted me to apply to work here.

In addition to the proposed bike storage buildings there needs to be plenty of additional places throughout the campus and near to main buildings where you can lock your bike beneath a shelter. If bike storage is restricted to the proposed buildings I believe it will discourage students and staff from cycling to the university.

In siting new building(s) for the Social Sciences, it would be helpful to place them near the Arts and Humanities Faculty (in the new square near the IC), rather than far away on Northumberland Road.
In the Masterplan the following description is used: 'The Halls of Residence are concentrated to the west of campus, primarily in the Ranmoor and Endcliffe Villages, and further north in Tapton Hall on Crookes Road. The context for these buildings is one of leafy streets lined with Victorian terrace, semi-detached or detached houses; many of which are owned by staff, students or private landlords letting to students.' This is misleading. The majority of housing in the region of the student accommodation is privately owned and occupied by local residents. The implication in the text is that this is a predominantly student or university staff area, which as you well know is not the case. This needs to be acknowledged as it appears to be yet another case of the university ignoring local residents, in this case by airbrushing them out of the demography.

Inspiring, pushing the boundaries, a real breath of fresh air. I really hope that Sheffield City Council learn from this and start proposing designs more like these. I really really hope that the needs of motor traffic do not scupper these plans. Please don't let the good pedestrian and cycling environment in your masterplan be sacrificed to the needs of motor traffic.

It doesn't go nearly far enough as an exemplar for sustainability. Why are the buildings that we see in the images and the current ones being built 'the diamond' not demonstrating cutting edge sustainability, social as well as environmental. It is good that there is yet another masterplan but really we need our University to be an exemplar client who understands the power of good places to attract staff and people.

It is a great idea. Getting rid of the underpass would hugely improve the landscape of the campus, and improved cycle routes are sorely needed to improve safety and efficiency. Anything to improve the slow, dangerous and unpleasant pedestrian crossing on Brook Hill beside the roundabout would be a huge benefit.

It is essential not to alienate the car users who travel to and from the University for business and study. Not everyone has the opportunity to walk or cycle and not everyone chooses to do so. Consolidating parking in one location will cause more congestion, probable expense and less options of where to park. I also would not wish to walk from my work place to Durham Road car park on my own on a dark Winter's night.

It is exciting. The so-called "villa" at 5 Favell Road MUST be demolished (it was our old office and is falling down). I strongly support the plans to redevelop the triangle including 5 Favell Road, the "white house" and brook hill hall. Removing parking facilities to one central location has to be an enormous advantage to reduce "hunting time".

It is great that you keep these things under review but I think the university and the council should always remember that these roads are major through routes with no alternatives. Students can go over bridges without too much difficulty.

With the new plants and trees etc, please make sure there are not areas that will be dark in winter for people to congregate and be a nuisance to people leaving work.

It is not acceptable to demolish the University Arms. You know perfectly well that many people will object to this. It is even more unacceptable to sneak this into the final pages of the plan rather than consulting openly about it.

It is not clear what is happening to the University Arms. One map indicates its disappearance but other options imply its retention. It would be a pity to loose this much admired and envied (most especially by visitors from other universities) facility from the central campus area ---- the bar in the students' union is not a substitute.

It is too conservative and does not address the need for Sheffield to push ahead with the greening and socialisation of the entire city centre area, compromising over cars and buses when this type of transport is the problem rather than the solution. We need to free up road space, pull up concrete, plant flora, encourage fauna and thus make moving around in this space exciting, fun, relaxing, safe and stimulating.

It looked from one of the diagrams as if the University Arms was going to disappear. This would be a great shame as it is a highly valued part of the campus. If it could be avoided that would be very much preferable!
It looks absolutely brilliant! Do all of it!

It looks like a very exciting major development that could really improve and modernise the public face of the University environment and its wider surroundings. Particularly like the idea that the campus would look much greener with more trees and plants - this will give the whole environment a more relaxing and positive edge.

It looks really exciting and I hope it all happens! At the moment it's a real shame that our campus is split apart by an ugly and busy road that's very difficult to cross, and it will be excellent if this ceases to be a problem. We definitely need more green spaces in campus - I visit a lot of universities and it's noticeable how the car-park-to-green-space ratio at Sheffield does not flatter us at the moment.

It seems that the demolition of a number of characterful buildings in the Hounsfield area is envisaged - including the newly-refurbished University Arms! This is very wasteful and I am sure the loss of more heritage buildings will work to the University's disadvantage in terms of a deterioration in our relationship with the general public. Apart from the single phrase 'consolidation of performance spaces' for the Arts Faculty, there is no mention at all of developments that would improve the current situation in regard to performance. Fully costed plans for developing the Church of the Nazarene have long been in position but these do not feature at all. In a 'public realm' statement of the vision for the next ten years surely a performance venue should be prominent. What indeed is more 'public realm' than a space which would regularly draw the public in? I note that the Nazarene is depicted in the visualisation of a future Leavygreave Road, but without any attention or management surely it will not be standing in ten years' time!

It sounds great!
Cycle storage: secure storage is really important, especially if you travel to different parts of the campus. Could a fob/card activated system work. The two proposed locations sound like a good idea, but would be nice to have more secure storage at the medical school. Also need lots of space for showers. Usually they are about the size of a disabled toilet. This is too small to get changed, dry out etc. Need somewhere to hang clothes and towels. A larger communal changing room is actually more appropriate (in an ideal world obviously!!).

It will be very unpleasant working in The school of education in an office facing all those cars in the multi storey car park. The people in the School of ed have been overlooked totally in their needs in this respect. Not only is their building the least pleasant in all kinds of ways, it is about to worsen. Not good for morale.

It would be a sad loss to the university area to lose all the old buildings, particularly the University Arms. While the plan puts forward 3 proposals for this area (2 of which retain the University Arms) it is clear from the rest of the plan that the demolition of the University Arms is a foregone conclusion as it is removed from other proposals such as the changes to Western Bank crossings and pavements. This will be another bit of bad publicity for the University, like the demolition of the listed Edwardian Jessops Wing, and a sad loss to the diversity of the campus.

It would be great to get rid of the pedestrian crossings at the dangerous roundabout at Jessop West altogether.

I can't wait to have a green space instead of a pocket car park outside Bart House. That will be hugely life-enhancing for students and staff alike, as well as visitors to our pro bono law clinic.

It's brilliant

It's important that the needs of pedestrians are carefully thought through. The concourse underneath Western Bank is currently rather dangerous for two reasons. Firstly, the brick surface gets very slippery in just a little ice or frost. Careful thought needs to be given to pedestrian surfaces, particularly as we tend to have cold winters in Sheffield with ice and frost. The surface on Howard Street in town is similarly unsuitable for winter. Rough surfaces (eg tarmac) are much better underfoot than smooth (eg bricks, flags). The second reason is cyclists on the concourse and down the side of the Arts Tower. The problem with bikes is that you can't hear them come up behind you until it's too late. Many cyclists go far too quickly across the concourse, even when it is crowded. They also often cycle on pavements which is dangerous. In order to make campus wheelchair accessible (which is a good thing!) this means that there are ramps on all slopes which cyclists then zoom down. Most do not dismount if they are using pedestrian road crossings to cross a road and many go through red lights at pedestrian crossings if they are on the road (which is very dangerous if they come down the side of a large vehicle and therefore are not visible). Any measures which can be taken to force cyclists to ride safely for pedestrians (who are vulnerable in a crash with a bike) would be appreciated.
It's not a campus. The appeal of Being a student at Sheffield (I'm former student who settled here) is that it is a city university not a campus university, and always you hope to encounter buildings that are part of the city as much as part of the uni. I would seriously go back to the drawing board on anything that gets rid of fit-for-purpose buildings like the University Arms. A lot of us who were happy to see the Edwardian Wing go (because it was derelict and not a great building in the first place) would be a lot more bothered by the disappearance of something like the Uni Arms which is a good-looking building, well re-furbed and still in use. It is a place for students to go and be reminded that they are, mercifully, among the public and not at some self-serving academic outpost.

It's really important to keep and add to the bike shelters across campus. A central bike facility is no good at all, because then you have to walk, carrying all your stuff, which really isn't easy. So do get rid of the car parks - please get rid of all the ugly car parks - but please KEEP the bike shelters so that people can really easily use bikes, and can cycle right up to any University building and keep their bike safely there while at work or studying.

I've heard of issues with the proposals surrounding the university arms and would simply like to register a protest in that The University Arms is an integral part of the university and it's culture. It would be shameful to damage or remove this piece of upstanding tradition purely in the name of modernisation.

I've mostly came to fill out the feedback in regards to the University Arms. This is one of the loveliest pubs in the city, with a wonderful garden area in the summer. It's one of the few places older students and staff members can particularly feel part of. To block the sunlight in the garden or to reduce the garden would be terrible. Please do not destroy the Uni Arms or ruin its garden with the addition of tall buildings or ones that may reduce the space available. Keep the pub!

Keep the staff and students and the city informed of plans as much as possible and as early as possible to avoid rumours and misinformation. Overall it is a great plan.

Keep the uni arms!

Keep the University arms

Keep the University Arms it is a key point in the campus

Keep the University Arms, keep any other part of our history ie Hendersons. Just improve the rubbish bits!!!

Keep the university arms.

Knocking down the University Arms is a dreadful idea

Knocking down the University Arms pub has been proposed as one option within the Masterplan. It would be idiotic to do so and to lose a building with character, history and a longstanding association with the University. While I agree that it is important to improve campus this should not be done at the expense of buildings that have long been part of the soul and character of our wonderful University. Any attempt to replace the Uni Arms or move it elsewhere on campus would not work because you can’t rebuild history and memories. It would only be a pale imitation and anything that replaced the Uni Arms would be resented by many. If you want to retain the respect of the University community then don't be foolish enough to think that The University Arms is disposable.

Leave the University Arms pub as it is; it is such an important part of the university culture, for staff and students alike.

Let the University get on with what it does and leave the roads alone. The city centre is already dying unless you use the bars in the evening. I already have to cross the Ring Road to get to the city centre what you are proposing will only make it more difficult. We need more roads to improve traffic flow not less.

Looks good overall, but I was very upset to hear that the University Arms is in danger of being demolished. Surely keeping this well-used traditional-style pub could be fitted into the plans?

Looks great!
| Make the developments involving any listed or potentially valuable 'heritage' sites such as the Uni Arms or other old buildings. Also, freshen up the eyesore that is the education building. |
| Make the University Arms and grounds a protected area. |
| Massing of new build developments around University Square needs more careful thought than indicated on the options. What are the 'active frontages' around the University Square - it appears that they will be fairly impenetrable, standard office style blocks. A few chairs in front of glass, curtain walls doesn't make an active frontage. The visualisation makes it difficult to read how the blocks will be aligned. Careful thought is required for this highly significant development site. |
| More on bus routes: we don't all live in Crookes or Broomhill! If you have the power to re-route buses, please re-route some so they go near my house if you don't want me to drive! I live in Heeley - a cross-city bus from there to Uni that doesn't go via the city centre would be great if it was reliable and quick - I've known the 51 to not turn up, or not to stop due to being full, so I can't rely on it (and it's a 10 min walk from home to the bus stop). Also it trundles through the city centre then up West St etc meaning it takes ages at busy times. It's a 35 min. walk to work and while in principle I like walking and cycling, there are times when I need an alternative - when it's wet, if I'm not feeling well etc. My main concern though is SAFETY FOR STAFF AND STUDENTS NEEDING TO GET HOME AFTER WORKING LATE. |
| Needs a rethink to consider all users and not just cyclists and pedestrians. |
| Needs full commitment to reduced impact of resource use during its implementation and use re-used local materials, not just recycled materials, where possible. Embodied energy can have a huge impact on the University's carbon footprint. |
| No |
| No |
| No mention of Arts facilities - discussions about converting St George's Church into a concert hall/rehearsal space have been discussed in the Arts Faculty and with the alumni development office for years, and it is disappointing not to see them included in these plans. They could connect well with the idea of Leavygreave Road being pedestrianised, so I hope a 'Cultural Quarter' can be placed strongly on the agenda. |
| Not sure whether in plan but you need to consider pedestrian crossing from Northumberland Road to Conduit Road - this cross roads is unsafe for staff and students alike sooner or later somebody will get hurt or killed here....please consider if not already in plan please. Busy and parked cars mean this is increasingly dangerous especially at rush hour and with lots of new O/S students. |
OK. Where to start.

1. Congratulations, this really is a huge vision and it’s comprehensive.
   BUT

2. There are some really disappointing mistakes and omissions with
   3. One omission - the Church of the Nazarene - suggesting that somewhere in this institution a decision has been taken that is COMPLETELY DIFFERENT to the visions held by HODs, FPVCs in the Faculty of Arts and Humanities over the years. The fact that this information has NEVER made it to colleagues suggests a COVER UP.

   It is plain to see from:
   4. (p28) The car park opposite (not the Nazarene) highlighted as potential development site with a (p56) green roof
   And the mistakes
   3. (p32) The 'Jessop Building' is 'Jessop East' in your listing.
   4. (p33) The 'Soundhouse' has been called the 'Black Box' - I mean I know it's black, and a box but YOU'RE KIDDING RIGHT???

   And finally.

5. (p68) 24 projects and no mention of the Nazarene. This is really disheartening news. Both the lack of mention and the lack of consultation prior to huge sums of money being spent on this plan.

   Meanwhile our NSB is 50% of what it was 5 years ago. More for less indeed.

   Sheffield University is known for it's down to earth, pragmatic solutions. Despite the best intentions of this project, I think money could be better spent giving us the tools and time to do our jobs so that we can enjoy them like some of us used to three/five years ago.

   On page 58 of your 'Masterplan' it states..."The aim of the Masterplan is to transform the University campus to a pedestrian / cycle friendly space whilst maintaining the historical elementsof the campus." So why is the university proposing to demolish the University Arms and other important Victorian buildings? These buildings were erected at a time when the city of Sheffield was booming and have a historic relevence to those years....when steel made this city what it is known for. To me they are as relevant as Kelham Island and the Little Mesters, and they university should not be riding roughshod over MY city's heritage. I was born and raised in this city, I have seen it change greatly during my lifetime, much of it for good.....but not all! It's the destruction of that which made this city great that appalls me, the university seems to think the people of Sheffield should be beholden to its every whim and will due to its financial clout!!

   One of the development plans for the Hounsfield quarter involved demolishing the University Arms. Are there plans to relocate or replace the pub if this development was to go ahead?

   Option 3 on the plan (which seems to be the preferred, being the only one for which there is an architect's rendering) would remove The University Arms and replace it with a vast and overbearing tower. This would be a travesty. The University Arms has for a long time been the preferred venue for celebrations, after-hours socialising and events and is an intrinsic part of the social fabric of many departments (with particular reference to the staff and post-graduate community), as well as providing a visual and architectural link with the historic environment of the city. Another tower block would just another tower block, which many would feel would be putting profit insensitively ahead of tradition, character and the unique facility provided by our very own public house.

   Overall I think it is a good idea, however I feel that the improvement of Goodwin needs to be combined with greater investment in sports by the university. Compared to many other Russell group universities sheffields sport seems to many to be under funded.

   Overall it looks a really positive plan for the university and for Sheffield.

   Overall very impressive. Building work is massively disruptive though and having worked in the middle of a building site now for some while, quite stressful so this is a long
term plan that's great, but don't forget the impact on staff/students. Constant noise and disruption are sometimes hard to cope with.

planning of these new buildings needs careful consultation with surrounding community who are directly affected. The Goodwin Playing Fields also include significant 'wild' corridors which link to similar spaces in the Crookes Valley and Ponderosas parks and provide good wildlife habitat. Care must be taken to protect some of these from over-development.

Please can we keep the University Arms? While recognising that it may be an 'inefficient' use of space it does provide the University with some character and a sense of its history and heritage. We lost the Jessop building and a lot of University friends with it. It would be good evidence to the heritage and history of the University and the city if the University Arms could be retained.

(If it isn't, then the PR activity surrounding the development needs to be a lot better than for Jessop!).

Please consider the university arms a valuable asset; it's traditional pub setting provides something quite different to the other university bars.

Please do not build any more large buildings that dominate the landscape. The diamond is not so bad, but the idea of having a social sciences building to house 13 departments - is not a good one. Faculties do not have to be in one place to encourage interaction!

We need more lecture theatres and large seminar rooms - we should be planning for that on that Car Park - not putting everyone into one huge building - like an eyesore on the landscape. The residents do not want this - in a green belt and residential area it is not good.

I am worried about the loss of so many car parks. Snow days and walking longer distances increases the risk, of slips and falls, and adding time to people's working day (arriving earlier so they are at their desk on time, and when they leave it will be several minutes to reach their car and start the journey home).

Please do not demolish the University Arms; I enjoy going to this pub as it has a certain charm and character to it. It is always very busy and popular and since it has been refurbished I will be going there more regularly. Looking at the number of people that have signed petitions to save the pub, I think it would be a great shame and would disappoint many to see it gone.

Please do not demolish the University Arms.

Please DO NOT get rid of the University Arms. This place is one of the major plus points about this university: a perfect place to meet colleagues and entertain visitors. It does more for interdisciplinary research and staff moral than any number of fancy initiatives or 'public realm improvements' - yurrrk! I am generally very supportive of the campus master plan, but demolishing the University Arms would be a major mistake.

Please do not knock down the University Arms. It is not only one of the nicest pubs in the city centre and one of the few I ever go to, but it is one of the few places we can go to as staff that also fully caters to the public, is less surrounded by students, iit has a very great atmosphere and it would be a real shame to lose such an asset to the city and University.

Please do not remove the University Arms pub---it plays a significant role in social/academic life of many departments!

We (School of Maths and Statistics) take our research visitors and seminar speakers there to discuss and exchange ideas in an informal/social setting. Such a setting also provides an excellent opportunity for our PhD students to talk to the experts, outside of the seminar room where they might have been more reluctant.

Please don't close the uni arms!

Please don't demolish the university arms
Please don't demolish the University Arms pub!!

Please don't demolish the University Arms. It is a nice pub and a nice building.

Please don't destroy any more of our beautiful old buildings. The citizens of Sheffield don't want them demolished to make way for ugly tower blocks, like you did with the Jessop’s Edwardian Wing. That box you're replacing that unique, beautiful building with is vomit-inducingly hideous. We won't be mollified by green roofs. Please protect our history and heritage.

Please don't forget about the Husband Building. If redirecting traffic is a serious consideration, then this building and part of University needs some serious upgrading. It will be seen by thousands of travellers and it is not an attractive building. Not a great first impression.

Please don't get rid of the University Arms! A lot of the recent changes at the university, though streamlined and commercially attractive, risk eroding the heritage and essence of the university. We still want cozy spaces, dusty books and old stone to keep us grounded in the companionship of shared history and values. Replacing some outmoded systems with hot-desking, white spaces and perching stools may be appropriate; replacing it all will do nothing but harm.

Please don't get rid of the University Arms! I was a PhD student in Sheffield for four years and it was a very much valued meeting space. I would be extremely sad if this vital piece of the University was demolished.

Please don't get rid of the University Arms. Although Endcliffe, Ranmoor and the Students' Union are great buildings and setups, they do lack a bit of character now. We need to keep characterful buildings and spaces, and not have endless glass-fronted, shiny, colourful buildings. That said, there are small tokens here and there: at Endcliffe, the villas around Endcliffe Crescent and the old lodges help retain a bit of this; and at the SU, the Graves Building helps give a little bit of character.

Please don't knock any of the original buildings down

Please don't knock down the University Arms. It’s a beautiful, old, central, red brick building reminiscent of a lot of the buildings recently destroyed in that area to make way for more modern facilities. It would maintain a visible link and reminder to the University's heritage as a distinguished 'Red Brick' institution.

Please don't knock the University Arms down! I can't believe you acted in such bad faith with the Jessop Hospital, now you want to get rid of all those lovely Victorian buildings around the Leavygreave area and you don't even have a question on this form about it. Sheffield is sorely lacking in beautiful, period architecture compared to most major cities in the UK, please don't get rid of even more of it. As an alumnus, I am ashamed to be associated with a university that ignored a wonderful building's listed status and replaced it with what is, frankly, an eyesore. I know this consultation is simply a PR exercise, and you'll do what is most profitable for you, but please, please, think about your reputation as an enlightened place of learning, and how much Sheffield has had to work to get rid of its "grim" Northern stereotype before you deny us more aesthetically pleasing architecture.

Please don't tear down the University Arms. It's one of the only great pubs in the area and it would affect a lot of the students, especially the postgrads and lecturers that frequently go there.

Please ensure any new buildings are high quality and as striking in appearance as The Diamond.

Please keep the university arms. This is a characterful pub with both pleasant interior and exterior grounds. It is a real asset to have this in the heart of the city when so many other places are modern and characterless. Only a handful of pubs remain like this especially for staff. The beer garden is a very much valued outdoor space.

Please leave alone the wonderful old architecture we have in this city. We do not want to be a soulless city of concrete & glass that have no character & are merely fit for purpose but does nothing to please the eye or spirit

Please make sure that full consultation is made and that the views of the people of (especially (West) Sheffield are listened to constructively

Please please do not destroy the few historic buildings we have left around the university

Please preserve the University Arms

Please put proper temperature controls and taps on the showers in the swimming pool and make sure they drain properly.
Please retain the University Arms pub on Brook Hill as it caters for a different audience to the Students' Union or West Street bars and clubs, and it enhances the University campus.

Please save the University Arms! It's a beautiful building and a wonderful pub, different to others nearby. It would be a terrible loss to the character of the university area! Also, if the university is really looking to improve something, the interior of the Octagon (both upstairs and down) is in a pretty poor state these days. Making this a more pleasant and usable space would give a great resource for students, and improve the experience of people who currently use it. After all the improvements to the union building, the Octagon has been sadly neglected and is looking very shabby, which is a great shame! The creation of a new multistorey car park is a good idea, because parking on the campus is currently a horrible nightmare, but I think this should be in addition to existing car parks. The campus is a large area, and parking needs to be well distributed across it. The number of parking spaces in general, especially for visitors and occasional users, just needs to be increased.

Please stop demolishing historic buildings that give different areas around the campus their unique character and sense of community.

Please stop demolishing the wonderful old buildings in our city, to replace them by unsightly building that do not fit in. Just because you bring money to this city does not mean you should railroad your plans for unsightly buildings. Visit York and see how their heritage is also a part of their present and future, perhaps you idiots may learn something from them.

Re the pedestrianisation of Leavygreave Road - please ensure that the Jessop Building (Music Dept) retains vehicular access along Leavygreave Road - we have students/staff/instrumental tutors and performers who bring LARGE pieces of musical equipment to the Dept (eg Harps) which cannot be carried any distance. We also require access to allow the transfer of grand pianos to and from venues on campus (eg Dept to Firth Hall and back). Access must not be restricted to University vehicles only - we have specialist removal contractors who move our pianos. I'm also intrigued that there are no plans to develop the Church of the Nazarene - as a listed building I feel the University should have an obligation to renovate this building. Why are there no plans to develop a performance space for Arts and Humanities - what does "consolidation" mean? We are currently under-resourced, and consolidation implies reduction in facilities.

Re. Goodwin, a larger pool which offered women's only swimming sessions would be absolutely AMAZING. (Also without a sauna by the poolside, because the sauna makes the whole pool smell of feet!)

Ref Goodwin Sports - I did join the gym only to find that as a staff member I can't have a permit to park. I live too near apparently. As I can't carry all my gear to and from the gym and then go to work and carry it all home again I cancelled my membership. The University REALLY needs to re-assess its parking policies. Its the one thing that really upsets staff more than any other issue. Its totally discriminatory and does not take into account lifestyles, outside commitments etc. I'd ask why the 'Broomhill Action Group' are so powerful? Who is on that committee that the university doesn't want to upset???? Ignore that group, let them move house if they are so bothered. Build a multi-storey on either the existing Goodwin area carpark or in the large hole already there! Now that WOULD cheer staff up!

Regarding Goodwin Sports Centre: I am disappointed by the lack of a basic gym-only membership, which is why I opted out of it this year. I do not want to pay extra for facilities I will never use. Adding more facilities doesn't give me extra confidence in the gym, which where it stands, is rather overcrowded and mediocre.

Removal of the vehicular access to the front of the Arts Tower will mean people with mobility based disabilities will have to walk around the building to get in from the drop off point at the back. Please consider either some way of vehicles being able to go from the back to the front or a way for people access the building from the back to the lifts thus making the distance to travel a great deal shorter.

Remove all or as many public roads as possible from the campus by consulting the Sheffield Council. Why do we have to suffer from reckless British drivers when we are supposed to be in the university area? Sheffield University hardly has a proper campus compared to most other universities and I do not feel that I am in a university when I am in the university area.

Review your ideas but be conscious of their general effect on the community.
Try to approach this with wisdom not just cleverness.

Save the buildings off of leavygreave road. The villa's and university arms etc. . they are Part of Sheffield history and are nice architecturally. They would improve the area if they are kept and the grounds maintained/improved rather than being demolished and replaced with a modern soul-less building.

Save the University Arms!
Save the University Arms! - this is a unique and valuable feature and extremely popular with especially post-grad students and staff. We regularly take overseas visitors there and they are delighted and charmed by it. It is an important part of the Number One Student Experience.

SAVE THE UNIVERSITY ARMS!!!!!! Don't demolish it. We need to preserve more of our old buildings instead of knocking them down. The University Arms is a well loved, popular pub with students, staff and local residents. It's a meeting place for local groups and live bands. Its loss would be a serious detriment to that area of the university campus.

Save the University Arms.
You do not need a new public space
Use the tram underpass for cars at busy times to get rid of polluting queues
Don't be a campus university
Linking cycle hire at the uni with other ventures (e.g. Station) to create a city centre boris style bike hire scheme

See my comments earlier about the lack of sensitivity by the University to the rightful constructive suggestions of local residents regarding a number of recent developments including Tapton, Leavvgreave and Jessop. The University steamroller appears unstoppable and that is very sad for local residents. The arrogance displayed by the University is reminiscent of post war Eastern European cultures and not of a caring British compromise acceptable to the wider majority of local residents who have to suffer from these failures

Several points.
1. please don't knock down the University Arms. It is a great pub, well loved and used by students and community alike and a beautiful old building.
2. please don't knock down any more listed buildings. The breathtaking arrogance of the university in the Jessop Hospital affair has left me feeling pretty ashamed of my twice alumni status.
3. the cost of changes at Goodwin need to not be passed on to students. I'm old enough to remember just turning up, showing my U-card and being allowed to use the facilities for free. The last refurbishment was so slow and costly that the facilities were never free for students again. Given the need to encourage people to exercise, this is a big shame.
4. very specifically: I am a music graduate, and the department is falling behind nationally because it doesn't have a dedicated performance / concert space - something that was promised when the dept moved from Crookes. The Church of the Nazarene is owned by the university, part of the music department site, empty and falling into disrepair. This is a listed building the university could save, as well as improving prospects for one of its oldest departments and providing a fantastic space for both students and the community of Sheffield. I know the department has researched the use of the space and even provided fully costed plans. Why is this not mentioned at all in the masterplan?

Signage within buildings is really bad across the campus. I was in Pam Liversidge building for a service user event and was really shocked at how badly signed this building is. Given that it has no entrance of its own, it would make sense to have big, clear signs explaining this so that visitors and 1st year students understand how to get in. Also, inside the Mappin building there are very few signs which indicate how to get through to PL site. This building is new so it was particularly frustrating signing hadn't been thought through. Please make sure any new buildings take into account that every year a load of people come to these buildings for the first time - not being able to find where you are going is stressful.
Some positive elements, particularly for students. However, as the campus plan has, as with much else in the University, been made with a disregard for the working lives of its employees. It also pays scant regard to the people who live and work in the area outside the university. This university is rapidly becoming a faceless, uncaring employer and neighbour, keen only on pursuing its own grand ideas to the detriment of anyone unlucky enough to work for it or to get in its' way.

With regard to question 3 for staff below (why no text box for such an important idea?). Has no one thought of the impact of consolidated parking for staff who work at the far ends of the campus, e.g. The Management School or North campus? No? Well, it's only staff that would have to carry materials from a central car park to one of these locations. I'm sure it's not an important consideration in saving university money and making the campus look nice for visitors. Staff don't seem to be a consideration in any of the university plans at the moment (other than where money can be saved. Number one for student experience, bottom of the league for staff experience.

Speaking as an architecture undergraduate, if you intend to make a big open green space in front of the Arts Tower, I'm concerned that it will attract unwanted visitors at night and make it more dangerous for architecture students to enter the building as they require to use the building on a 24/7 basis.

Stop building stuff you horrid horrid people. Sheffield University has a great charm. Part of that charm is the fact that it is generally not plagued by rampant development obsessed capitalist. Don't ruin it!

Stop reducing car parks. We need car parks for staff and more importantly visitors. It's all very fine having a green dream when it won't affect your parking but will make hundreds other peoples lives that bit harder. Also you are not replacing the lost parking spaces only the ones lost from Durham road.

Stop the destruction of Sheffield's old building, look at the likes of Leeds, Manchester & Newcastle where their old building have been incorporated with any designs. This makesa visit to these cities a much more pleasant experience. Just knocking down building that have been there for 100 years and more to put up a modern eyesore that will have a much smaller shelf life that the existing. Improve, Incorporate, Enhance!!

Stronger relationship between University / Design team / Built environment students (architecture, landscape etc...)

Strongly hope the Victorian villas including the University Arms are kept, don't create a clone-town university that looks like every other. It needs to respect its roots. Quirky and historic is good. 60s town planning was bad.

Definitely need to remove the patchwork of surface car parks and the edge-of-campus multi story is a good idea for the foreseeable car-user era.

Thank you for coming up with such an ambitious and inspiring vision. I hope Sheffield City Council will see this and take inspiration from it. The dramatic change in emphasis from always putting car travel first, to encouraging active travel not just by asking people to do it, but by making it easy and pleasant for them to do so is what we so badly need in Sheffield. Well done, and thank you. Please don't be beaten down and compromise. These plans are such a good thing for the city. The overlooked 47% of Sheffield households who do not have access to a car are crying out for this, they have been bottom of the pile for too long.

That the campus masterplan involves the removal of heritage buildings (Jessup Hospital, the University Arms), and the seeming intentional omission of discussion of this topic in the feedback form is misleading.

The archery society really needs a new place to shoot but we'd need a guaranteed place to shoot during the rebuilding process.

The biggest problem is trying to cross the roads around the roundabout - this really puts me off travelling around campus, and I only go when I absolutely have to.

The facilities are fine, there are better things to waste money on

The immediate areas outside the masterplan boundaries seem to have been ignored, other than to acknowledge gateways. More concerning is the continued efforts to destroy one of the rapidly disappearing classic buildings in the area. The gains from demolishing the building will NOT improve the area in either space or appearance, so far the buildings in the immediate vicinity are not of a high enough standard of design to stand any test of time (think Winter Gardens or The Gherkin for example, where modern design is not just a square glass block), especially Jessop West and the Diamond, which on plans alone both already looked outdated and inappropriate for the area, on completion Jessop West is a bland and faceless building that detracts from Sheffield's heritage.

I am truly disappointed that the planning authority did not have the backbone to turn down this proposal straight away due to the wanton destruction a beautiful building for the sake of less than 10% gain in usable space. I ask, why does the University have Firth Court on ALL of the literature advertising the university and not Jessop West?
What encourages photo's more on Graduation day? An old building showing the character and heritage of this area, or the modern soulless box that is the arts tower?

Rethink this area, add to it, develop it, many parts of this master plan work well with the city and will only add to it's charm, but not at the expense of what is there.

The improvements to the crossing on brook hill in my opinion is very much needed, currently it is difficult to change lectures from the Richard Roberts building to one on Mappin street due to the large crowds of people trying to do the same.

The indicative architecture shown in the artists impression for University Square seems sterile and unengaging. This opportunity should be taken to develop a timeless theme more reflective of the diversity of the city's architecture and in the spirit of civic engagement. The University will need to strongly challenge and deeply support its' professional teams to get the right result. If the sterile late-90's style is preferred, the new civic offices for Doncaster Council could provide some useful inspiration for ideas to subtly increase depth and meaning in the built form.

Whilst it certainly increases capacity, a multi-storey car park doesn't fix everybody's issues with parking.

Tangible and visible inclusions to manage environmental impacts and resources including energy and water were not readily evident in the video. Big plans were mentioned which is great, but their deliverability and benefits are still to be proven, particularly as University emissions continue to rise and are likely to increase further as the jessop site building goes live.

As the highways works in particular will cause significant disruption, every opportunity should be taken to put in place all measures to mitigate the need to dig again. Perhaps the University could go so far as to promise to the community of Sheffield that it will never dig up western bank or hanover way again, unless there arises an unforeseeable and unavoidable need. This should include consultation with neighbours and stakeholders (eg utility companies) to arrange any foreseeable replacement or re-routing of infrastructure to occur at the same time as University works.

For operational reasons, this should include taking advantage of the opportunity to create accessible below-ground structures for installation of current and future infrastructure connections at locations where the highway is currently a barrier. The ability to connect groups of buildings together with resilient infrastructure is a key strategic enabler to future energy, utility and communications supply scenarios and presents opportunities to improve research impact, thereby better serving the city. Equally important, creating these infrastructure routes as part of a strategic masterplan is the most cost-effective approach, and enables improvements in the efficiency and cost of maintenance activities. The potential scale for recovery of resources of finite availability (eg water, helium) is also assisted by having an accessible route between groups of buildings.

The master plan is good but is not as important as the staff whom students see daily and from whom they learn. Many teachers are employed as hourly paid workers with only statutory entitlements. This is not good for a university moving into the 21st century. The university must value its teachers. Those who make decisions should know what a teacher actually does but unfortunately many of the university's managers have not a spent much time teaching. Teachers are important and crucial to the success of the university. How many firms would employ a member of staff for 15 years and fail to acknowledge that he is an employee?

The masterplan should make great use of the idea of the university as a Living Laboratory

We are currently well behind other Russell Group universities in this respect

We have many researchers who are looking into highly relevant topics, e.g. School of Architecture, Landscape, Engineering, APS, yet in the past EFM has either not consulted them or struggled to find the time to seriously consider and incorporate their views. Other unis find ways to do this, to the benefit of everyone, and we can too. Every effort should be made to use our own internal expertise on this project

The most important change needed is to provide a proper way for cyclists to cross the ring road *without dismounting* between the two main parts of the campus. A toucan crossing is required.
All changes to reduce motor vehicle access should result in routes for pedestrians *and cyclists*, not pedestrian-only.

The option 3 proposal for the development of the Hounsfield site and the creation of a University Square includes levelling the existing University Arms in favour of new buildings, and is the only option featured with an ariel plan and more detailed discussion in the masterplan, which suggests it is the favoured option. This is, I feel, a gross oversight. The University Arms is well used and well liked by students and staff, hosts fantastic events including comedy nights and PuBHD, and is a regular venue for events such as tramlines and I strongly believe that getting rid of it would not be an improvement of the university.

The plan does not seem to address the serious need for better and more teaching space for seminar groups. Most rooms currently used in the Arts and Humanities are the wrong size and/or do not have adequate equipment and/or can be difficult to access.

The plan to demolish the University Arms is not sensible. This is a very popular facility for both staff and students. It already has a garden area. Why not incorporate that into the Green vision so that staff, students and visitors can enjoy a nice pint and/or working lunch within an area enclosed by trees and bushes?

The plans for the University Arms are truly shocking and should be rescinded. If you want to see 'community engagement' in action, go there. There is a genuine encounter of, to use an old-fashioned expression, 'town and gown': University staff and students and local Sheffield residents in the same space, something rarely seen on such a regular and informal basis (I myself have become acquainted with some of my neighbours not because we live in the same street but because we go to the University Arms). The pub offers meeting facilities for numerous groups, not only university/union-based organisations but also non-university bodies such as the Sheffield branch of the British Humanist Association; it has a good selection of drinks both alcoholic and non-alcoholic; it has one of the best beer-gardens in the city; the staff are unfailing friendly and helpful; people from all walks of life and all ages feel welcome there. As a regular I can attest to all this and would also note that over the past few years the pub has become increasingly popular and I don't doubt that this will continue following the recent refurbishment. The University Arms is an asset to the University of Sheffield and to the wider community and it is frankly astounding that its destruction should even be contemplated.

The possible removal of the University Arms would be more than a shame. Hopefully there will be a way of delivering what is needed without demolishing any buildings.

The problem is the campus is split by major public highways. This kind of sucks for people trying to walk around the campus, but the changes would appear to suck for the rest of Sheffield trying to get around the ring road North/south or from the south of the city up to Crookes or out to A57.

The problem with goodwill is that it doesn’t offer significant enough discounts to staff - like any decent university would.

That is the only thing that would make me use it more often.

The proposed demolition of The University Arms pub seems like quite a bad idea. This is a pub which is very commonly used by academic staff and mature students (amongst others) and the demolition would leave that group with no immediate or adequate replacement.

The proposed development on University Square, Hounsfield would be acceptable to an extent- I see it as incredibly foolish to have the University Arms demolished and not necessary. The green areas proposed could be easily put in around the University Arms, still preserving the pub- it is a favourite among students, staff and academics, is an integral part of the University’s history and should be kept. Additionally, the proposed glass building (page 102) looks bad.

The problem with the new building development is that it is not clear what the university is trying to do. Are they trying to expand their teaching space? Are they trying to improve their research? Are they trying to create new places for students to socialise? The plan does not address any of these issues.

The proposed new science building is important, but smaller developments are not mentioned. In particular both University and city would benefit from a smaller performance space for music and/or other arts. Possibilities include a development plan for the Church of the Nazarene and/or the Mappin Hall, both conveniently situated in the St Georges area near the Dept of Music.

The public transport connections from Nether Edge and that side of the city (such as Millhouses) are appalling. You cannot rely on all staff walking or cycling and more work needs to be done on improving bus routes. The only bus which I can catch, if I do not walk, is the number 10, which runs hourly, and the nearest stop is at the Hallamshire hospital. Given the number of staff who must live in that area of the city, it would make alot of sense for the University to lobby for better bus routes.

The so called master plan - just as your questions - doesn't suggest that you actually have a well-structured strategic plan but rather a series of ideas. The 'plan' as it stands is a culmination of these disjointed ideas but does not portray an underpinning position towards the city and its future, the university within this future or indeed any
spatial concept for a university of the future from which a master plan could be established. It is purely reactive. As such, the plan is already outdated before it is even implemented.

The suggested demolition of the University Arms seems to add absolutely nothing to these plans and would deprive the area of a beloved public house. Do not demolish the University Arms.

The university arms is a central meeting place for students and is a major part of the student experience. Demolishing it would be a real shame.

The University Arms is a focal point for academics and students to meet in an informal, cosy, traditional setting. This traditional pub is the only of its sort on the campus and speaks to the history and development of the university. Its removal would be a big loss to the spirit and tradition of the university. So, any development of the Hounsfield site should certainly aim to incorporate and celebrate the University Arms.

The University Arms is integral to my well-being as a postgraduate student. Without the University Arms, my student experience would be irrevocably damaged; the University Arms is integral to life at the university of Sheffield.

The University Arms is the only pub in the Area with green space. It would not be appropriate to build over this space.

The University Arms pub MUST NOT be demolished to make way for any of these proposed schemes. It is essential that this space, much loved by staff, students and the public, is maintained. It is a part of both Sheffield and the University's heritage and should not be bulldozed in the name of "progress".

The University Arms public house should be retained as it is a valuable community asset for both university staff and local residents.

The university arms should not be knocked down. It is a central feature of the campus and is not just used by staff and students but by all Sheffield residents.

The University campus is restricted by the other areas which surround it. You can’t keep expanding/growing indefinitely. Ever increasing numbers of students means more pedestrian traffic between buildings and their accommodation so in years to come moving about the campus will become more difficult. There will always be difficulties associated with a mix of cyclists and pedestrian in the same area, especially if the cyclists are allowed to ride through the "pedestrianised" areas!

The University must think about the wider implications of the infrastructure changes, especially taking away the much needed car parks used by staff and students. No thought has been given to those whereby travelling by car is a necessity in order to get to/from work either because:
1. they do not live on a public transport route;
2. they are parents/carers of children/elderly and must be able to get home quickly.

Regarding the proposed changes, will anyone manage/patrol the new green spaces? Devonshire Green has recently been in the press this week because of alcoholics/drug addicts using the space; last year Western Park was the cause for concern. Jessop West is currently a skateboard hotspot and the planned peace and tranquility of the new green spaces may be disturbed by the skateboarders. The University campus is already close to the green spaces of Western Park and the Botanical Gardens - are more green spaces actually needed? Surely roof gardens could be established for wild flowers, bee hives, etc? Please think about the long-term implications and effects the major changes in the Masterplan will create, and not the fact that the University may win an award or boost the egos of those who devised the plan.

The University needs more teaching, lab and research space. This is what the plan should focus on. We have crowded lecture theatres, narrow stairs where people may wait for 10 minutes before able to pass from one lecture theatre to another one. Recently built new buildings are badly designed with awful colours and wasted space.

The University of Sheffield main campus is surrounded by main arterial roads that the city as a whole is dependent on. Congestion and air quality are already pressing issues for the city. Proposals that include removing lanes on roads (particularly Upper Hannover Street) and increasing pedestrian crossings will exacerbate these issues. Many of the proposals, including the greenification of the area and the proposals for St Georges Green and Leavygreave Road are welcome. Whilst the expansion of the Goodwin Sports Centre and facilities is welcome in principle the masterplan seemed to lack detail on this issue. Too much of these plans would have a detrimental effect on the thousands of people who have to drive past the university.

The various proposals for Hounsfield / Brookhill / Leavygreave / Favell Road area, include demolition of the nineteenth century villa and vicarages currently on site, I am
surprised by their RICS classification as these seem entirely viable for adaptive reuse with the right design team appointed, and given their contribution to the historical spatial development of the area there is no reason that these cannot be properly integrated within a new urban realm proposal given the architectural calibre of Feilden Clegg Bradley. The University Square proposal turns its back on Western bank, continuing the poor streetscape relationship at Brookhill initiated by the IC planning of plant room/substation access adjacent the pedestrian crossing. This is potentially a retrograde design move, if the traffic calming of Western bank is a key objective, and the 'courtyard' would be over-dominated by the scale of development in option 3. A building proposal to reinforce the corner of Hounsfield Road and Western Bank which addressed the level changes and the ill-defined space currently used as a carpark is a better option to give architectural clarity to the extended gold route.

There are many fine cities throughout Europe where tourists flock to visit buildings of both architectural and historical interest. Sheffield isn't one of them. Not because we haven't had buildings of historical or architectural interest, but because we haven't had the foresight to use them to our advantage. The fact that the old Henderson's building isn't even mentioned would lead me to assume that there are no plans for it? Before we know it, Sheffield will be completely homogenised in exactly the same way as some of the other cities where insufficient thought went into their regeneration.

There are no improvements to the top end of campus i.e. around Northumberland Road / Claremont Crescent.

There are three options for the area which includes the University Arms. The Arms would be preserved under the first two options (the second less favourable to it) but it would be destroyed under the third option. I think that the destruction of the Arms is a deplorable idea. It is an excellent meeting place for staff and students, and for interaction between them, and I believe it fulfills a unique role. Please keep it! Preferably with the garden (option 1).

There is a lot in the masterplan about reducing traffic and removing parking, however very little about safety of pedestrians after dark. I often have to work after dark in the winter (Oct to March) and the campus is not especially well lit. If I am going to have to walk further to my car and within a multi-storey car park I need to feel safer walking round campus than I currently do. I know there is some CCTV on campus but it always seems to be pointing in the wrong direction when something happens. I also think it is very important that access for disabled drivers is maintained; for some students and staff being able to park outside their building is essential.

There is insufficient detail in the Masterplan about the Goodwin Sports Centre rebuild to answer Q.15 with any certainty or to know how it might impact on nearby residents. There is a risk that a larger, redeveloped Centre would increase the amount of light pollution and noise affecting residents in houses backing onto the Centre. Similarly, there is insufficient detail to judge the impact of building a new Social Sciences building on the University car park in Northumberland Road. This proposal would potentially overlook and overshadow residential housing - so there would be important questions about scale and, again, light pollution and noise in a residential area. Both the redevelopment of the Sports Centre and the emplacement of a new Social Sciences building would also effectively close-off the green corridor that runs through this area and down to the Ponderosa via Crookes Valley Park.

There is no information on the proposed enlargement and improvements of the Goodwin Sports Centre or the proposed new Social Sciences building. Without additional information on these two proposals, this portion of the masterplan cannot be considered to have been properly consulted on.

There seems to be a headwind blowing up behind the demolition of the university arms on the facebook site dedicated to saving the Jessop Edwardian wing. People behind this need to be reminded that within a mile radius there are numerous pubs and bars. They are also stating, falsely I think, that the Hendersons building is to be demolished. To take the sting out of what will be a growing campaign to preserve everything and everything that is supposedly "Victoria heritage" the university would be wise to state that the Hendersons building will be preserved. The plan is marvelous, "master plan " is the correct way to describe it. To name it in some old sino/soviet language such as "the ten year plan" would not do it justice.

There seems to be a headwind blowing up behind the demolition of the university arms on the facebook site dedicated to saving the Jessop Edwardian wing. People behind this need to be reminded that within a mile radius there are numerous pubs and bars. They are also stating, falsely I think, that the Hendersons building is to be demolished. To take the sting out of what will be a growing campaign to preserve everything and everything that is supposedly "Victoria heritage" the university would be wise to state that the Hendersons building will be preserved. The plan is marvelous, "master plan " is the correct way to describe it. To name it in some old sino/soviet language such as "the ten year plan" would not do it justice.
There seems to be very little mention of car-parking. It is naive in the extreme to think that people currently using cars will just stop over night. It is also arrogant to assume that the only reason people want to park in the area of the university is to use the university and would thus have access to university car parks.

There was no chance to comment on Q11. The current crossing outside University Arms is a death trap. I worry about my students crossing there. How about putting in a bridge?

In Q8 why is there not opportunity for multiple answers. I frequently use most of the modes of travel mentioned.

This City will not stand by and watch The University take over. Prepare for a fight.

To keep the university arms open, everyone I know who goes to this pub loves it.

We could do with updated sports facilities. Recently some of us visited the Sheffield Hallam strength and conditioning facility and it is much better than our equivalent. S10 gym could also be bigger - often have to wait for equipment. The pitches etc. are very good. Also, the gym never seems to have hot water!

I really like the plan, how it includes more green space and how it is more accommodating for cyclists.

We must retain nice old buildings like the University Arms that are part of the city’s heritage as well as that of the university. We want a blend of old and new. Don’t demolish everything in sight.

Well done to everyone involved. I think it all looks wonderful - with one reservation: I’m concerned about the potential loss of the University Arms. It’s not just a well-loved and widely used pub, and a building with charm and character - it offers something distinctive and different from the cafés and union bars. And it’s particularly Sheffield. I know academics who take guests and visitors there because it impresses them that the University (ostensibly) has its own pub. Please build the new University Square around rather than over the Uni Arms!

What about including outdoor cafes that also provide cover from the rain?

What I’ve seen so far looks impressive.

When the vice chancellor comes to work on his bike or on the bus, then perhaps more people would be inclined to follow his example.

Where is all the money coming from?

How about upgrading the buildings you have before you start building new ones.

We keep being told that the University has no money and all of a sudden this is a Campus Master Plan.

Whilst I appreciate that the university is committed to becoming more "green" it seems that once again motorists are being seen as the enemy. There is currently a serious bias towards cyclists throughout the university and we are constantly bombarded with more and more provisions for cyclists. The university is not the slightest bit interested in the members of staff that drive to work (regardless of their reasons for doing so). Public transport is also becoming more and more expensive (the constant rises in train/bus fares) but does not provide a reliable service. Although for the past 18 months/2 years I have driven to work, for the previous 8 years I used public transport and depending on the reliability of the service it could sometimes take over 2 hours - adding an extra 4 hours or more to my working day - so I am speaking from personal experience.

Your insistence on removing parking facilities from around the university campus (whilst raising parking permit fees - which I have no doubt goes to fund all the extra cycling provisions) does not take into account those members of staff who have responsibilities in their personal life, for example getting children to and from school, which does not allow for them to either get to the university very early in order to find a parking space, or have additional time added to their commute to allow them to use public transport.

I appreciate that as a motorist and not a cyclist my comments are no doubt going to fall on deaf ears and be ignored however I am sure I am merely echoing the thoughts of many other members of staff.
Whilst I approve the idea of enhancing pedestrian and cycling routes, traffic management and improvements to public realm, I would strongly urge reusing current buildings more than building new. Creative solutions can be found which cost less. Money should be diverted towards improving staff-student ratio; freeing up research time; enhancing overall reputation based on quality of academic work rather than "shininess" of the Campus. Also, please retain the University Arms pub - it has a lot of character and is a link to Sheffield University's past worth retaining. It would be very sad to see it go.

Why are you proposing demolishing the University Arms? - it adds diversity and inclusivity to the Campus.

With reference to option 3, the future of the University Arms should be secured. Aside from being a social space for students and academics alike the university ownership of the pub is a unique social counterpoise between the life inside and outside of the University and a compliment to the university's red brick history (particularly the nearby Firth Court).

With the introduction of green areas to replace carparks in front of certain buildings, will disabled parking be still available in these areas, specifically Bartolome House. Working in an external facing department it is important that our office is able to book parking for visitors that is easy to find. I would hope that the new parking plans will take this into account.

Would it be possible to include sustainable energy features as well

Would it not more sense to complete the multi-story car park at Durham Road and then proceed with pedestrianizing the other areas of the campus. In the interim where will people be able to park?

Yes - the proposed demolishing of the university arms is not acceptable. The sight of the Edwardian building nestled next to the IC is a fantastic way to show how far the university has developed, and a charming pub with a green beer garden can hardly be replaced by the cut&paste decor and multicoloured seating in bar one. That pub is a fantastic place to relax, and as such I would be saddened - and more than a little angry - to see it pulled down for another glass-fronted affair.

Yes this city belongs to all people of sheffield and you do not own it, you have already knocked down a building (jessop hospital) that was paid for by private money for the people of sheffield. I shall campain to stop this plan.

Yes, i feel very proud of my university and it makes me feel like I made the right choice coming here. I can see the future and that gives me certainty. I believe that the master plan is a very good opportunity to integrate the university with the city and contribute to make it better, safer and more liveable. The only thing I think is missing is paying attention to the human scale... the inner spaces... adequate spaces for students to rest, have lunch, study, work with others... but in their own buildings. I find hundreds of square meters of unused space in old buildings being used to store old furniture, boxes with old paperwork. I find square meters underused for supposedly evacuation routes that are hard to find in real life emergencies. it is nice to have nice new buildings with proper lighting, furniture and modern space layouts... but wouldn't it be nicer if old buildings had the same attributes?

Yes. Do not demolish the University Arms. It is extremely popular for both students, staff and the public and it should be kept and the designs built to incorporate it. The University's reputation is not good and you should take account of Sheffield residents opinions.

You need to consider delivery routes to all University buildings - and hence allow access for large lorries to get to not only stores in different departmens but also facilities housing large equipment and in need of supply of repair, gas etc. For example at the moment there are major problems with liquid nitrogen delivery due to the closed entry to the Arts Tower car park. Also waste streams need to be taken into consideration - labs tend to produce more waste than you can store in an 'office waste area' and they also need usually some safety fences around them.
Appendix B – Written feedback from organisations and individuals
University of Sheffield Campus Masterplan: Response from the Students’ Union

The Students’ Union welcomes the opportunity to comment on the University’s Campus Masterplan. This submission focuses on our response as an organisation rather than as a representative submission on behalf of our members/the students, which is separately submitted.

We support the key principles set out in the Masterplan, in particular the aims to improve public spaces, to develop an integrated transport strategy and to make a positive impact in developing a sustainable environment.

We have a number of specific comments and concerns, which are set out below.

Travel and Access

In particular, we support the proposals for increased pedestrianisation of the campus and for improved pedestrian crossing facilities on Western Bank.

We do however have concerns over the proposals to re-route buses along Durham Road. This proposal, combined with the planned new multi-storey car park, will significantly increase traffic flows on Durham Road. This is a concern to us because of the location of the goods yard on Durham Road and the need for access for deliveries for the Students’ Union and the Octagon Centre. Large vehicles have to reverse into the yard and this manoeuvre will be made more difficult if there is an increase in traffic.

There is also a significant flow of pedestrians across Durham Road from Glossop Road towards the Students’ Union building and the main campus and this would need to be considered in any proposals for Durham Road.

Durham Road is also used as a waiting area for coaches for sports clubs away travel and Students’ Union trips. A dedicated off-road coach park would help to improve vehicle access and pedestrian safety on Durham Road.

Parking

The Students’ Union supports the aim of reducing car usage on campus and encouraging more sustainable methods of transport.

However, there are some staff and students who do need to travel by a car, perhaps because of the length of their journeys, or because they need to use their vehicle for travel during the working day, some will transport children to school or childcare, and others cannot use other means of transport due to a disability. We urge the needs of these groups to be accommodated as part of the proposed changes to car parking provision.

In particular we are concerned that the proposals to replace most on-street car parking provision with one multi-storey car park may make it more difficult for people with disabilities to access some parts of the campus.

Sports Facilities and Student Activities

We strongly support the proposal for new and expanded sports facilities at Sport Sheffield, since there is an increasing demand for sports facilities and the current sports provision is in need of improvement. We would like to be closely involved in the plans for the proposed new development.

We would also argue strongly for an increase in rehearsal and performance space for student groups. There is currently a significant shortage of such flat floor space and there is increasing demand from performing arts groups for large spaces for dance and drama. There is also a high demand from student societies and clubs for storage space. We would like to see an increase in both performance and storage space for student groups. There will also be a need to replace the current temporary provision of space for societies on Hounsfield Road if use of the current building is lost as part of the redevelopment of this area.
Students’ Union Nursery

The need for an improved Nursery facility has been acknowledged. We believe this should be considered as part of the Campus Masterplan. The current building, on Brunswick Street, is not big enough to satisfy demand for places and its current size is not the ideal economic model. In addition, it is in need of significant refurbishment, is not very accessible (being spread over four floors) and does not have much outdoor play space. A new and purpose built building would allow us to provide more places, a better quality of provision and to run the service more efficiently.

Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre

We are interested to see the plans for this site, but there is a need to consider facilities for the apprentices and students who will be based here. It will be difficult for any students based at the AMRC to access student support services and social provision on the main campus, so we request to be included in timely discussions about how these services will be provided.

Retail and Catering Outlets

The plan suggests a permanent café facility under the concourse bridge and new coffee bars and social or retail space at the Hounsfield University Square. As one of the main current providers of coffee and catering outlets on campus, the Students’ Union would be keen to be involved in the discussions about these new outlets and would also potentially be interested in providing them.

Students’ Union Building

The Masterplan rightly acknowledges that the Students’ Union is at the heart of the student experience and that the Students’ Union is rated the number one students’ union in the UK. While parts of the Students’ Union building have benefited from significant capital investment in recent years, there is still a need for improvements to the Graves Building.

The Octagon Centre

There is also a need to clarify the future of the Octagon Centre. Currently the Octagon is heavily used by the Students’ Union and by student groups to deliver student activities and events. We recognise that there is a need for investment in the Octagon Centre, but it is crucial for the student experience that student usage of the space can continue. We request therefore that we should be closely involved in any discussions about the future of the Octagon.

Future Involvement

We recognise that the current Campus Masterplan is only the first stage in the development of plans for the University. We request that the Students’ Union, both as the representative body of students, and as a major service provider, should be closely involved in future discussions both about the Campus Masterplan and the Estates Strategy.

University of Sheffield Students’ Union

14 October 2014
Students’ Union Officer Feedback into the masterplan, on behalf of the wider student body.

Sustainability
Overall students have been really positive about the plans to make a more green and sustainable campus, we want to feed in some particulars relating to this:

- Students and officers at the union, alongside staff at the university were thrilled to hear about the plans to turn the arts tower car park into a more sustainable green landscape. We propose that this space actually be a growing space, which could be designed by students and staff from Landscape architecture and maintained by groups like the Students’ Union green space and Student Eats (the allotment society), alongside landscape staff from the university. This interactive sustainable space would be great for existing students but would also provide a great opportunity for the local community to engage with the sustainability work we’re doing on campus.

- The plans for a greener campus have been received well and something highlighted was that ‘greenery’ can be introduced without sustainability. Namely that a space that is aesthetically green may not actually be environmentally friend or financially sustainable. EFM should work with students, staff and city groups when designing these green spaces as they may be able to provide more cheap and sustainable alternatives to create green space.

- The plan shows the roofs of current and planned buildings in a shade of light green. Does this give potential for “green roofs”, this would be an excellent idea as part of the masterplan.

- We would like to see a low emission zone from Endcliffe and Ranmoor down Broomhill, EFM should work with Bbest, other local resident groups and the council to create this in Broomhill.

Commercial

- The planned commercial outlet development at a ‘university square’ would need to be developed in consultation with both the union commercial arm and ACS, to make sure there is no crossover and consequently loss of business.

- It is important that this square does not take away from the students’ union space as a hub on campus, as this is where vital services such as the student advice centre and student services are based. Moving campus life away from this centre may mean students do not know about these services and consequently tarnishes their student experience.

Accessibility

- The Students’ Union welcomes the idea of a more foot and bike friendly campus, however we have concerns as to the ramifications for disabled students, staff and those utilising our buildings and services. Currently campus is already very difficult to access for many of those with mobility issues to irregular parking, hills and uneven walkways. With the new masterplan is paramount that cars will still be able to be used for those with mobility issues who cannot cross campus easily on foot. This is particularly the case but not limited to the health centre where it is vital those needing to use the service are able to access it.

Western Bank

- The masterplan should create an opportunity to develop art and great ascetic on the sides of Western Bank facing the University and Students’ Union

66 Leavygreave

- If this current studio was dismantled an equivalent space for creative arts would need to be found.

AMRC

- If the AMRC is to become a “second campus” then student provision needs to be built there as well. This should include, but is not limited to, an outpost of the students’ union big enough to include all the vital services. A centre for student services including SSID, the counselling service, financial support and Health. Facilities for a wide range of accessible sport and activities.
Broader student Concerns

- Large numbers of students have expressed concerns over the destruction of the university arms as a useful study and social space for post-grads, as well as a historic institution for the university.
- Lastly, a more broad point raised by many students is about building works. Many students have complained that they've spent the majority of their time at university with departments, libraries, halls and their students’ union as a building site and this has meant their student experience has been less vibrant and complete. We want to request that although the masterplan visions a bright future will it end up creating a perpetual building site across in campus rather than a comfortable and welcoming space for students to learn and develop.
The Library has submitted its Estates Strategy document (which sets out our vision for the Library's Estate through to 2015) to EFM and we know that both Keith Lilley and Andy Fallon are aware of the priorities we have identified for future development during that period. We’d like to take this opportunity to reiterate the key elements of our strategy as part of the feedback process for the University's Estates Masterplan.

Provision of high quality study spaces for students and researchers is the top priority for our Estates Strategy. Our total number of study spaces will increase by approximately 700 in twelve months time due to around 1,000 new spaces in the Diamond and a loss of just over 300 spaces in St George’s Library. Whilst this represents a welcome increase, our benchmarking evidence shows that the UoS will still be placed lowly in a table of Russell Group institutions for the number of student ftes/study space. As a consequence we see the proposed extension of the Information Commons providing an attractive, efficient, long-term option for the addition of 400-500 more study spaces at the heart of the campus.

As well as increasing the numbers, we are keen to ensure that we maintain the high quality of the spaces we provide. The IC is now in its eighth year and some of the furniture, fittings and finishes have begun to deteriorate. We believe that it is essential for the University to invest in a mid-life upgrade in the building to address these issues. Further refurbishment work is also required in the Western Bank Library and we will seek support to continue the transformation of the spaces within the building as well as looking at options to develop the numbers and types of spaces to meet the needs of our users.

Our strategy includes a theme on 'Support for researchers'. Work is currently ongoing with colleagues from across the University, including Research and Innovation Services, to put forward a proposal for dedicated, central space for our doctoral students and early career researchers to respond to the University's ambition to recruit increasing numbers of PGR students.

We fully support the emphasis, within the Masterplan, on creating a campus that will be more pedestrian and cycle-friendly and we are pleased to note the attention that will be afforded to external spaces, pedestrian routes and improvements to the public realm. We would be happy to contribute to any working groups or project groups that are set up to take these proposals forward. The early prioritisation of improved pedestrian crossings over Western Bank is particularly welcome. With regard to the extension of the IC and the proposed landscaping of the Arts Tower/Tower Court plaza, we would like to retain some provision for dedicated parking spaces for the use of our evening teams.

Finally, the Library is now playing a more active role in the development of central teaching spaces thanks to a change in role for Rene Meijer (previously the IC manager). Our close working relationship with CICS is enabling Rene to offer his experience and knowledge to inform how best we could improve the teaching and learning spaces that the two departments are responsible for. We are hopeful that the role with extend to include input to the development of other such spaces across the University, including, for example, any new-build learning and teaching spaces on the Hounsfield Road development site.
Hello

Here is my feedback regarding the Campus Masterplan.

(1) For several years now there has been a desire to create a performance space associated with the Music Department, based in the Church of the Nazarene in Victoria Street. It is surprising that this does not feature at all in the masterplan, although this would seem the ideal opportunity to crystallise this and give it momentum. The building itself is in poor condition, and as I understand that the University owns it there is really no excuse for allowing it to decay further.

(2) The University is continuing its policy of removing as many 19th and early 20th century buildings as possible and replacing these with monolithic blocks of doubtful quality. Although 3 options are given for the Hounsfield Road area which variously keep and remove the University Arms and the Favell Road villa, in the most destructive option 3 a large tower block has been introduced (which will significantly detract from the impact of the Arts Tower) so as to greatly increase the floorspace and position this to be the winning option. Repeating your disgraceful behaviour over the Jessop hospital, I am confident that you will select option 3, employ consultants to rubbish the quality of the older buildings, claim that your entire plan is under threat unless you are allowed to demolish them, and bully the council into permitting this. There are other attractive buildings on Hounsfield Road which you have made no attempt to keep at all, even though their replacement will be low-rise and any space advantage is likely to be small. The Jessop scandal showed that the University is not to be trusted with the city's built heritage, but you could do something to repair trust by developing a 4th option which preserves these buildings in addition to the University Arms and the Favell Road villa, so that you are doing something to preserve and enhance the streetscape rather than simply trying to cram as much floorspace into as small a footprint as you can.

Yours sincerely

Robin Hughes

I would like to make the following feedback about the campus masterplan:

It is incredibly disappointing that it stops just to the West of Firth Court and ignores the massive pedestrian traffic generated along the A57 outside the psychology building and through the parts of the University on Northumberland Road and up to the Management building on Conduit Road. (Not to mention this area as such a huge flow of pedestrians to from key student and staff housing areas).

The following crossings are simply awful for pedestrians:


b) Where Harcourt Road meets Northumberland Road (Frequent conflicts, especially from right turning traffic off Northumberland Road that sweep into this very wide opening).

c) Where Mushroom Lane meets A57. (Frequent conflicts, especially from right turning traffic off A57 that sweep into this broad opening from behind pedestrian sight lines).

Were these areas surveyed in the pedestrian surveys noted on p36 of the document?

These are all well within areas of significant University estate. Until these are dealt with then the exercise will look very cosmetic.

Regards
Dear relevant department,

**Campus Masterplan feedback**

I agree with the Vision & Masterplan Objectives.

The University Campus needs to deliver a safe, secure & attractive environment.

I agree that the A61 ring road cuts the University campus & Leavy Grave Road in two; this needs to be addressed to improve connectivity.

I support the extension of the Sheffield Gold Route to / from the University campus & Weston Park.

**Public Realm**

I strongly support the public realm enhancements, especially the square in front of the Arts Tower and along Leavy Grave Road.

I support the planned landscaping & connectivity improvements.

I agree that the University campus is dominated by surface car parking and cut apart by busy main roads.

I support the creation of a green corridor from Weston Park through the University campus into the city centre, as shown on page 49.

The Grade II* Listed Arts Tower is a landmark building, but its setting needs to be improved.

Due to its height, it needs to be viewed from a distance, so views towards it are important.

I support the Public Realm Design Guide.

**Shaping a Response**

I support and agree with the issues / objectives mentioned in section 3.1 (pages 46 & 47).

**Concept**

I agree with the Design Guide for the Public Realm (section 3.2, pages 50 to 57).

**Transport & Infrastructure**

I support the re-routing of the number 52 bus, allowing Leavy Grave Road to be pedestrianised.

I’m aware of previous proposals to extend Supertram into the University campus, as part of the Broomhill extension 10 years ago, although this failed to gain government funding.

**Proposed Projects**

I support the public realm projects (see page 69); especially the Leavy Grave Road shared space.

**New Buildings**

I agree with the Design Brief that all new buildings should be sympathetic to their context.

I support the use of green roofs (as at Jessop West) and other ‘green’ energy saving design features.

**The Diamond**
While I gather the Jessop Hospital extensions were in poor condition and were not covered by the Listed Building designation, I feel that The Diamond is more in-keeping when viewed from the A61 roundabout and Broad Lane.

**Hounsfield Area**

My preferred choice (page 72) is **Option 1**, as it retains the existing historic buildings and is not high rise.

I would like to suggest the retention of the historic buildings in this area (boundary marked in red in the attached image).

This site borders the Glossop Road / Botanical Gardens Conservation Area and I object to the loss of the Victorian Buildings in this area.

I understand these are in poor condition.

I feel there are enough tower blocks in Sheffield already (although the Grade II* Listed Arts Tower is a landmark building).

I also feel that enough of our historic buildings have already been lost (such as the Jessop Hospital extension) without any further destruction of our priceless heritage.

Many historic buildings around Weston Park, Glossop Road & the University Campus have been successfully converted for University and student use; this is what I suggest here.

Regards,

Hi,

I've already submitted a response to the Sheffield University Masterplan but wanted to see if you would be interested in some more information.

Last week I was in Tilburg in The Netherlands and saw a pedestrian crossing which seemed to be almost exactly what you've proposed to build across Western Bank.

I took some photos and videos of it and have written a quick blog post about it here [http://www.greatgasbeetle.com/crossing-the-road/](http://www.greatgasbeetle.com/crossing-the-road/)

I hope that this information is useful. I thought it might be helpful for you to have a real life example of what I think you're proposing.

Thanks,

Seems to be good. No problem from a resident's point of view (Riverdale Road)