

Council Meeting – 6th September 2023

Questions Received from Members of the Public, answered by the Relevant Policy Committee Chairs

Name of Questioner	Question	Relevant Policy Committee Chair(s)
Abdul Raheem	<p>I would like to ask members of the Sheffield city council why I have been sent pcn letters for entering Sheffield clean air zone while my vehicle registration number is SF09A00 was exempt from Sheffield clean air zone charges. <i>[name redacted]</i> who works at Sheffield city council financial support applications for CLEAN air zone department e-mailed me that my vehicle was exempt from Sheffield clean air zone charges until 26th of July 2023 yet i still received pcn letters on the 7th of August 2023. All pcn letters are dated from 26th June 2023 and 27th June 2023 and 28th June 2023 and 2nd of July 2023 - all these pcn letters I received on 7th of August 2023.</p> <p>I have email evidence from senior officer <i>[name redacted]</i> of exemption given to my vehicle registration number of SF09A00.</p> <p>With this email i am attaching screen shots of pcn. If you need any further information please let me know.</p> <p><i>An answer was provided at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p>Agenda for Council on Wednesday 6 September 2023, 2.00 pm Sheffield City Council</p>	Cllr Ben Miskell (Chair of Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee)
Fiona Hinson	<p>1. A formal FOI request was made to Cllr Tom Hunt, following the Strategy and Resourcing Meeting 2nd August as the original questions posed at this meeting were not answered in required detail, and the response will be provided by 15th September which is too late for this meeting. These questions included:</p> <p>a) How did the Labour Mosborough ward councillors manage to have their site that was considered suitable from the local planners removed before the draft became public? The response was that concerns were raised about social cohesion - what were these</p>	Cllr Tom Hunt (Leader of the Council & Chair of Strategy and Resources Policy Committee)

concerns? we asked for specifics for reasons why other sites deemed suitable by local planners had been ruled out and the response was not adequate.

b) From the site selection methodology, the vast majority of sites in private ownership have been ruled out, and you have deemed this as the most suitable to sufficiently separate from sensitive uses nearby because employment uses would be taking place. So why were sites such as say Norton Aerodrome for example removed that met policy? This site has direct access to a strategic road, and accessible utilities and making provision for GRT community housing?

c) The site has not been measured, you have confirmed this, so how have you arrived that the gross site size is 6.8 hectares? from our own measurements of this site, it is considerably less and with the consideration of the environmental buffers - the developable elements are much smaller than the 3.4 you mentioned in your response.

2. Why do SCC never learn from their mistakes:

a) Tree Felling - where the independent review condemned and said 'strategic leadership failure' and of being 'dishonest' - where SCC didn't listen to the protests and strength of feeling, and are now making apologies

b) Abbey Glenn - where SCC approved light industrial use, as being promised at this site, yet they're having to apologise again 'after the event' due to the noise and disruption to residents because it wasn't what they 'expected' when approval was given

c) Pushing decisions that SCC 'feel' are best for the people, but without adequate consultation. The GRT site at Tinsley - Huntsman's Gardens - is a prime example where SCC used funding for a purpose built site that the GRT community didn't actually want and it was closed, after it ran at a significant loss. You mentioned at the February LAC you'd made contact with the Showmen's Guild and they'd shown an interest, but do you have clear confirmation this site is the right / appropriate site for them after your amendments are made, as we've been made aware that the GRT Travelling Showpeople don't actually want Beighton; a point which we as a panel are taking up with the Showmen's Guild for clarity. Have they seen the detail around the reduced site size with environmental buffer, provisions for privacy, the gas pipe and high voltage pylons that require 24/7 National Grid access - all issues you say will be addressed at 'planning stages'.

	<p>d) Never look at the 'wider picture' but silo project approvals - just see all the development approved in this area over the last 10 years period, with absolutely no change to infrastructure. A problem you recognise, but make no attempt to address in your draft local plan around transport, only the perceived minimal impact of additional elements. So, you acknowledge there's a problem, but you'll do another review on this - so we have no clear plan on what you will do in terms of actions which traffic congestion was one of our key objections.</p> <p>Finally, the whole process of the public consultation is disputed. The result had already been pre-determined, from when the draft was issued, as the responses to all objections are the same presentation slides we saw at the LAC in February. Any 'removal' no matter how flawed the decision around this specific site for the provision of GRT housing would be classed as a major amendment, and as you have no 'Plan B' to fall back on at this stage, and say this is your professional judgement, it would mean SCC don't meet their objective of delivering a local plan that is already years late. But, you can tick a box to say it's been submitted, and all the problems will be kicked down the line to 'planning stages'.</p> <p>But, as the Green Party have already commented, if the site is not here it has to be elsewhere in the City. This is based on the planners 'clear advice' - the same planners who at the February LAC meeting said they had not actually visited the site, BEFORE, the draft plan was made public. They say they have since visited, but, cannot provide the dates (not sure why when professionals use Outlook calendars?) but still feel the site is the best of the worst options they came up with, but this would be expected if removal with no alternative meant the rest of the draft local plan was delayed as a result of addressing all the 4,000 petitions and objections raised by local residents, councillors and local businesses.</p> <p><i>An answer was provided at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p><u>Agenda for Council on Wednesday 6 September 2023, 2.00 pm Sheffield City Council</u></p>	
Ibrar Hussain	Question 1: Taxi/ Phv drivers are receiving pcn notices whilst they are exempt for 90days period, why is the	

	<p>Council not aligning the system to avoid the costs, loss of time and total headache for driver.</p> <p>Licensing service provides data to parking services of all licensed vehicles as taxis / phv in Sheffield for use of bus gates, lanes that helps avoid unnecessary issues of pcn.</p> <p>So why is the Council not adopting this method for caz scheme exemptions?</p> <p>The current system has made driver's lives a total misery and full of stress.</p> <p><i>Answer – We are sorry for any stress drivers are experiencing and are working hard to ensure the processes are as clear and smooth as possible. In relation to the question, Sheffield Taxi Licensing do supply all current Taxi and Private Hire Vehicles details to Parking Services to load their registrations into the bus lane enforcement system to prevent them receiving bus lane penalties. This is only possible as there is a blanket exemption covering all Taxi's and Private Hire Vehicle driving through enforced bus lanes and some bus gates. There is no need to apply for the exemption as taxi licensing have all the criteria and information needed to set up the exemption once a license is issued.</i></p> <p><i>However, the same process cannot be applied to the exemption for the clean air zone as it is based upon drivers who have had their application for financial support measures approved and passed on to the finance provider. There isn't a blanket exemption automatically provided to every driver, as some drivers may not chose to apply for financial support measures to replace or upgrade their vehicle to achieve compliance.</i></p> <p><i>When drivers have their application approved by the financial support measures team, their details are loaded into the clean air zone enforcement system, and the vehicles are exempt from enforcement for a period of 90 days. Where officers have been made aware of PCN's being issued in error the Financial Support Measures team have worked hard to resolve issues and review processes and systems, and provide further information to Parking Services to cancel any incorrectly issued PCNs.</i></p> <p>Question 2: Taxi access in bus priority measures in Sheffield - when will the Council provide the funding</p>	<p>Cllr Joe Otten (Chair of Waste and Streetscene Policy Committee)</p>
--	--	---

	<p>and assist the taxi trade so unnecessary stopping and issue of pcn issued by police at eg West St bottom, Upper Hanover St right turn, Shoreham St etc are avoided, officers have been made aware but taking forever to resolve, we needs members support in this regards.</p> <p><i>Answer - The Service has only recently been able to identify a funding source to undertake this task. Officers are working with Amey (term contractor) to resolve the matter but at this stage further development work on the programme will be required before we can confirm a timescale. Officers are aware of the issues you have raised and we will consider these fully as part of the development work required.</i></p>	<p>Cllr Joe Otten (Chair of Waste and Streetscene Policy Committee)</p>
<p>Julie Pearn</p>	<p>Now that the Council has admitted that it wrongly characterised my remarks about twinning with Nablus on 20th February as antisemitic; and did not mean to falsely imply that I was antisemitic: will the Council now move forward with twinning arrangements with Nablus without any further unnecessary delay?</p> <p><i>An answer was provided at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p><u>Agenda for Council on Wednesday 6 September 2023, 2.00 pm Sheffield City Council</u></p>	<p>Cllr Tom Hunt (Leader of the Council & Chair of Strategy and Resources Policy Committee)</p>
<p>Banner Cross Neighbourhood Group (Viv Lockwood)</p>	<p>The introduction of the Nether Edge Active Neighbourhood scheme was meant to make changes to streets “creating a safer, cleaner and quieter environment for local residents and businesses to enjoy.” It has done just the reverse by closing Archer Lane with consequential hugely increased congestion, traffic chaos everywhere and pollution levels soaring. Given that accidents and air quality were never thought important enough even to evaluate when the scheme was first implemented, does the council agree with the overwhelming number of local residents that it should now be brought to an end and that a thorough assessment be undertaken into how such an ill thought-out and badly delivered scheme ever saw the light of day in the first place?</p>	<p>Cllr Ben Miskell (Chair of Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee)</p>

	<p><i>An answer was provided at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p><u>Agenda for Council on Wednesday 6 September 2023, 2.00 pm Sheffield City Council</u></p>	
Mohammad Maroof	<p>It is understood that a report on the future of the Archer Lane closure, along with other transport initiatives will be submitted to the Transport Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee on 20 Sept 2023.</p> <p>Will you agree with me that this report must be withdrawn until proper consultation on the results of the monitoring data and other issues are shared in a meaningful way with the affected community as promised during public meetings</p> <p>The way the initial consultation was carried out meant that a very small number of residents knew a lot about the scheme, but the vast majority of affected residents knew little or nothing about the scheme. The community for months had to continually ask for public meetings to explain the scheme, these meetings eventually happened in October last year. At these meetings the Officers promised to come back to the community with full details of all the monitoring data before any report went to committee. This has not happened.</p> <p>I hope you will see the sense in saying it is not acceptable to release vast amounts of data with no explanation days before a committee and expect a community to respond in any meaningful way.</p> <p>Throughout this part of the overall proposals Officers have said they are not accountable to the community/residents, hopefully, the Council is - Do you agree with officers comments?</p> <p><i>An answer was provided at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p><u>Agenda for Council on Wednesday 6 September 2023, 2.00 pm Sheffield City Council</u></p>	Cllr Ben Miskell (Chair of Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee)
Marion Gerson	<p>In the 2021 consultation process for the Nether Edge Active Travel Neighbourhood, 5 desired outcomes were identified. The third of these was improved air quality.</p>	Cllr Ben Miskell (Chair of Transport, Regeneration and Climate

	<p>However many of us live in residential streets that have been seriously affected by a big increase in traffic pollution since Archer Lane and Little London Road were closed. In spite of our asking, no attempt was made to measure air quality on our roads directly.</p> <p>There are monitoring stations on Abbeydale Road at Butterworth Cycles and Carter Knowle and in Nether Edge outside 13 Osbourne Road and 35 Montgomery Road that may at least give some indication of the consequences of the closures.</p> <p>Traffic Officers from Connecting Sheffield have not reported data from these and did not respond to my request in July for this data. Instead I was pointed towards an interactive map on the Council's website but that doesn't have data beyond 2021 which is, of course, useless.</p> <p>Can we please have the up to date air quality data from these locations made available both to us and to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee at least a week before that committee considers the decision as to whether to continue with the closure of Archer Lane or not?</p> <p><i>An answer was provided at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p><u>Agenda for Council on Wednesday 6 September 2023, 2.00 pm Sheffield City Council</u></p>	Policy Committee)
Michael Mullin	<p><i>12 questions were received, on the topics of non-ionising radiation risks from Mr. Mullin. The Lord Mayor took the view, after receiving advice from the Council's Monitoring Officer, that he would not accept these questions on the grounds that he deemed them to fall within the category of "matters of an irrelevant, repetitious, defamatory, frivolous or offensive nature or a general misuse of the opportunity", as they were rather repetitious of a series of questions which had been asked and answered at the previous Council meeting, and sought to maintain an ongoing dialogue on a matter which had been substantively answered by the Council and on which the Council had made its position clear. The categories under which the Lord Mayor may not accept questions are set out in Council Procedure Rule 15.1 (e) of the Council's Constitution.</i></p>	

<p>Annie O’Gara</p>	<p>On July 14th, a Sheffield Coalition made up of the city’s Trades Council, Palestine Solidarity, Labour Friends of Palestine and Kairos groups, sent a formal letter – our first official communication with the Council - to every member of the Council and to the Leader, Tom Hunt. We specifically asked him to reply.</p> <p>The letter concerned the Government’s proposed legislation (“Economic Activity of Public Bodies (Overseas matters)) – known as the Anti-boycott bill.</p> <p>This bill is anti-democratic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It limits the ability of public bodies to make ethical choices about spending and investment that reflect widespread public support for human rights, climate goals and international law. • It violates the rights of individual pension holders to invest their pensions in line with their values. • It gags individual Councillors from expressing sincerely held views, unless these fit in with the Government’s agenda. <p>The bill applies very widely from climate change issues to human rights and international law. Despite its serious implications for Sheffield City Council, and for the citizens of Sheffield, we have received no reply, even though a response was promised on July 17th and a reminder of this promise has been sent.</p> <p>When will Tom Hunt reply on behalf of the Council he now leads?</p> <p><i>An answer was provided at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p>Agenda for Council on Wednesday 6 September 2023, 2.00 pm Sheffield City Council</p>	<p>Cllr Tom Hunt (Leader of the Council & Chair of Strategy and Resources Policy Committee)</p>
<p>Abid Hussain</p>	<p>Creating adequate burial provision is a city wide issue in Sheffield, with land at cemeteries depleting at an alarming rate. Representations have also been submitted from across the City as part of the Sheffield Local Plan consultation which closed on 20th February 2023. Could Sheffield City Council provide an update on what progress has been made in identifying new sites for burial provision and timescales for making this provision available to the communities of Sheffield.</p>	<p>Cllr Richard Williams (Chair of Communities, Parks and Leisure Policy Committee)</p>

	<p><i>An answer was provided at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p><u>Agenda for Council on Wednesday 6 September 2023, 2.00 pm Sheffield City Council</u></p>	
<p>Shirley Bagnall</p>	<p>I am the lady who wrote the letter of protest about the bus service we are receiving on Chancet Wood and that is our priority.</p> <p>But I would like to ask a few questions, who is in control of the money funded by the Government? Is this money being monitored so it is going to the right departments and areas where it is needed and spent wisely?</p> <p>I was speaking to the Security Manager in the Sheffield Market, and he told me the artificial plants scattered around the market had cost £20,000. To me that is a waste of money and could have been spent on better things. And also the roadworks we are constantly getting on Greenhill Avenue. We understand these jobs have to be done, but there are days and good weather when there is no work being done at all. Does the taxpayer have to pay them when they are not working as well.</p> <p>And I also heard on the news the Manchester Mayor had received funding, so why haven't we. They are a Labour controlled city like Sheffield. Come on Sheffield Council you have to do better than this.</p> <p><i>An answer was provided at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p><u>Agenda for Council on Wednesday 6 September 2023, 2.00 pm Sheffield City Council</u></p>	<p>Cllr Ben Miskell (Chair of Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee)</p>

This page is intentionally left blank