

# **Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee**

---

**Wednesday 8 October 2014 at 4.30 pm**

**To be held at the Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH**

**The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend**

## **Membership**

---

Councillors Cate McDonald (Chair), Ian Auckland (Deputy Chair), Neale Gibson, Ibrar Hussain, Steve Jones, Alf Meade, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Robert Murphy, Joe Otten, Ray Satur, Martin Smith, Steve Wilson and Paul Wood

## **Substitute Members**

In accordance with the Constitution, Substitute Members may be provided for the above Committee Members as and when required.

---

---

## **PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING**

---

The Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Committee exercises an overview and scrutiny function in respect of the planning, development and monitoring of service performance and other issues in respect of the area of Council activity relating to planning and economic development, wider environmental issues, culture, leisure, skills and training, and the quality of life in the City.

A copy of the agenda and reports is available on the Council's website at [www.sheffield.gov.uk](http://www.sheffield.gov.uk). You can also see the reports to be discussed at the meeting if you call at the First Point Reception, Town Hall, Pinstone Street entrance. The Reception is open between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm, Monday to Thursday and between 9.00 am and 4.45 pm. on Friday. You may not be allowed to see some reports because they contain confidential information. These items are usually marked \* on the agenda.

Members of the public have the right to ask questions or submit petitions to Scrutiny Committee meetings and recording is allowed under the direction of the Chair. Please see the website or contact Democratic Services for further information regarding public questions and petitions and details of the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at council meetings.

Scrutiny Committee meetings are normally open to the public but sometimes the Committee may have to discuss an item in private. If this happens, you will be asked to leave. Any private items are normally left until last. If you would like to attend the meeting please report to the First Point Reception desk where you will be directed to the meeting room.

If you require any further information about this Scrutiny Committee, please contact Matthew Borland, Policy and Improvement Officer on 0114 27 35065 or [email.matthew.borland@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:email.matthew.borland@sheffield.gov.uk)

---

## **FACILITIES**

---

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in meeting rooms.

Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

---

**ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL WELLBEING SCRUTINY AND POLICY  
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA  
8 OCTOBER 2014**

---

**Order of Business**

---

- 1. Welcome and Housekeeping Arrangements**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Exclusion of Public and Press**  
To identify items where resolutions may be moved to exclude the press and public
- 4. Declarations of Interest** (Pages 1 - 4)  
Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting
- 5. Minutes of Previous Meetings** (Pages 5 - 16)  
To approve the minutes of (a) the special meeting of the Committee held on 28<sup>th</sup> August, 2014 and (b) the meeting of the Committee held on 10<sup>th</sup> September, 2014
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**  
To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public
- 7. The Future Role of the City Centre** (Pages 17 - 22)  
The Committee will be testing the economic assumptions that the City Council makes for the future of the city centre. This will include taking evidence from Council officers, experts and representatives of the private sector in the city. A discussion paper 'Sheffield City Centre: shaping the future' produced by the Sheffield First Partnership is provided as a background paper.
- 8. Date of Next Meeting**  
The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Wednesday, 10<sup>th</sup> December, 2014, at 4.30 pm, in the Town Hall

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

---

If you are present at a meeting of the Council, of its executive or any committee of the executive, or of any committee, sub-committee, joint committee, or joint sub-committee of the authority, and you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)** relating to any business that will be considered at the meeting, you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

You **must**:

- leave the room (in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct)
- make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of any DPI at any meeting at which you are present at which an item of business which affects or relates to the subject matter of that interest is under consideration, at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.
- declare it to the meeting and notify the Council's Monitoring Officer within 28 days, if the DPI is not already registered.

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your **disclosable pecuniary interests** under the new national rules. You have a pecuniary interest if you, or your spouse or civil partner, have a pecuniary interest.

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner undertakes.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period\* in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

\*The relevant period is the 12 months ending on the day when you tell the Monitoring Officer about your disclosable pecuniary interests.

- Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority –
  - under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
  - which has not been fully discharged.

- Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.
- Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) –
  - the landlord is your council or authority; and
  - the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -
  - (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
  - (b) either -
    - the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
    - if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

If you attend a meeting at which any item of business is to be considered and you are aware that you have a **personal interest** in the matter which does not amount to a DPI, you must make verbal declaration of the existence and nature of that interest at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. You should leave the room if your continued presence is incompatible with the 7 Principles of Public Life (selflessness; integrity; objectivity; accountability; openness; honesty; and leadership).

You have a personal interest where –

- a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing (including interests in land and easements over land) of you or a member of your family or a person or an organisation with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the Council Tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the Authority's administrative area, or
- it relates to or is likely to affect any of the interests that are defined as DPIs but are in respect of a member of your family (other than a partner) or a person with whom you have a close association.

Guidance on declarations of interest, incorporating regulations published by the Government in relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, has been circulated to you previously.

You should identify any potential interest you may have relating to business to be considered at the meeting. This will help you and anyone that you ask for advice to fully consider all the circumstances before deciding what action you should take.

In certain circumstances the Council may grant a **dispensation** to permit a Member to take part in the business of the Authority even if the member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest relating to that business.

To obtain a dispensation, you must write to the Monitoring Officer at least 48 hours before the meeting in question, explaining why a dispensation is sought and desirable, and specifying the period of time for which it is sought. The Monitoring Officer may consult with the Independent Person or the Council's Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from Gillian Duckworth, Interim Director of Legal and Governance on 0114 2734018 or email [gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk).

This page is intentionally left blank



**Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development  
Committee**

**Meeting held 28 August 2014**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Cate McDonald (Chair), Ian Auckland (Deputy Chair), Steve Jones, Alf Meade, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Robert Murphy, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Steve Wilson, Paul Wood and Pat Midgley (Substitute Member)

.....

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Neale Gibson (with Councillor Pat Midgley attending as his duly appointed substitute) and Ibrar Hussain.

**2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

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

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

4.1 There were no questions raised or petitions submitted by members of the public.

**5. CALL-IN OF HIGHWAY CABINET MEMBER DECISION SESSION ON  
PARKING PERMIT PRICES**

5.1 The Committee considered a report of the Policy and Improvement Officer (Matthew Borland) relating to the call-in of the Individual Cabinet Member Decision on Parking Permit Prices. The report attached a report of the Executive Director, Place, addressing the receipt of two petitions, one requesting that parking permit prices be returned to pre-2011 levels (£10 for the first permit, compared to the current £36) and the other requesting that permit prices be reduced for people on low incomes. The decision had been made by the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development on 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2014 and the report also appended the call-in form, to which Councillor Robert Murphy was the lead signatory.

5.2 The Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, on 12<sup>th</sup> June, 2014, agreed that:-

- (a) the requests contained in the two petitions be noted;

- (b) the permit prices already agreed for 2014/15 be endorsed without further change; and
- (c) officers be instructed to advise the petitioners of the decision.

5.3 In attendance for this item were Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, Paul Fell, Transport, Traffic and Parking Services Business Manager, and David Whitley, Principal Engineer, Business Management, Regeneration and Development Services.

5.4 Paul Fell made reference to the two petitions which had been received, stating that, although there had been price variations in between, the permit prices were now at the same level that they had been in 2008. The cost of the permits contributed to the Parking Permit Schemes' enforcement, maintenance and administration, and at current levels, the permit fees alone did not cover these costs fully. With this in mind, together with the fact that a parking permit allowed the holder a genuine advantage over other motorists, it had been recommended that the current rate of £36 for the first permit and £72 for a second permit be maintained.

5.5 Councillor Leigh Bramall stated that he believed that permit holders should have to pay a reasonable amount of the costs of enforcing and administering, for the benefit of parking within a permit parking zone and that the cost of the permits compared favourably with those in many other local authorities. He referred to inflation costs of around 5-6% since 2006 and reported on the benefits for permit holders, including the ability to purchase visitor permits. He concluded by stating that permit fees had not been increased for this financial year and, subject to the Council's budgetary position, there were no current plans for any further price increases.

5.6 Members of the Committee raised questions and the following responses were provided:-

- The reason for not including the cost of City Centre permits in the table of comparisons with other local authorities was because the petitions related to the cost of permits within the Peripheral Parking Zones. City Centre permits represented a separate scheme. There were only around 20 permits in existence, which had been distributed historically to pub landlords, chaplains and vicars.
- It was considered that permits provided benefits for residents, particularly providing them with a priority to park within their parking zone, at a time when there was an increasing demand for parking on the City's highways.
- It was believed that £36 represented a reasonable charge for parking permits, and considered that this was a fair price to pay in the light of the average annual cost of running a vehicle.
- Income from parking permits was part of the Council's "parking account". Any surplus in this account could be used for a variety of transport purposes, as

set out in legislation. If the cost of the permits was not retained at £36, the lower contribution from lower permit fees would make new future schemes less viable.

- In terms of feedback regarding customer satisfaction, headlines in a report drafted in 2010/11 had indicated that parking for the majority of residents living within parking zones had improved and that the residents were reasonably happy with enforcement levels in the zones. Responses from visitors to areas such as Ecclesall Road showed that motorists were finding it much easier to finding parking spaces.
- The cost of parking permits for owners of low emission vehicles (Band A and B) were halved in 2009. Officers would look into the possibility of extending the criteria further so that the permit charges would be based on a sliding scale relating to emission levels.
- Details of the income and expenditure within the peripheral parking zone from 2010/11 to 2013/14 was made available at the meeting.
- In terms of the Equality Impact of the permit parking price increase, relative to the cost of running a car, it was not considered that individual groups of people were either advantaged or disadvantaged by the implementation of such a charge.

5.7 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the comments now made and the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) agrees to take no action in relation to the called-in decision, but consider whether issues arising from the call-in need to be added to its Work Programme 2014/15.

(NOTE: Prior to the passing of the above resolution, an alternative resolution was moved by Councillor Robert Murphy and seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, as follows:-

“That this Committee requests that the decision be deferred until the Committee has considered relevant issues and made recommendations to the Executive.”

The votes on the alternative resolution were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For the Resolution (4) - Councillors Ian Auckland, Robert Murphy, Joe Otten and Martin Smith

Against the Resolution (5) - Councillors Steve Jones, Pat Midgley, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Steve Wilson and Paul Wood

Abstained (1) - Councillor Cate McDonald.)

## **6. CALL-IN OF INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION ON THE STATEMENT OF COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT**

- 6.1 The Committee considered a report of the Policy and Improvement Officer, relating to the call-in of the Individual Cabinet Member Decision on the Statement of Community Involvement. The report attached a report of the Executive Director, Place, containing details of the proposed changes to the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (SCI), referring specifically to how the Council consulted on planning applications and planning policy. The decision had been made by the Leader of the Council on 28<sup>th</sup> July 2014, and the report also attached the call-in form, to which Councillor Ian Auckland was the lead signatory.
- 6.2 In attendance for this item were Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, Graham Withers, Business Manager, Development Management, and Laurie Platt, Planning Officer, Regeneration and Development Services.
- 6.3 Councillor Leigh Bramall introduced the report, indicating that the proposals comprised a package of measures to ensure that the Planning Service was self-sustainable and less susceptible to further budget cuts.
- 6.4 Graham Withers referred to the proposed changes to the SCI, indicating that the last review of the Statement had been undertaken in 2006 and it had been identified that there was a need to improve a number of the Planning Service's working practices, particularly with regard to how the Service engaged on planning applications. Mr Withers referred specifically to the lack of responses received to the numerous letters sent to residents and businesses, inviting comments on planning applications. He referred to some of the proposed changes, which included reducing the number of letters sent to residential properties, redesigning site notices in order to make the key content easier to read and ceasing to issue voluntary site notices. He concluded by stating that he believed that the quality of engagement with the public would not be adversely affected.
- 6.5 Councillor Ian Auckland stated that whilst he welcomed some of the improvements, and believed that Sheffield already went beyond the statutory requirements in terms of how it engaged with the public in connection with planning applications, he raised some concerns, specifically with regard to the plans to promote online services on the basis that a number of people did not have internet access. He also considered that pre-application consultation should be encouraged at every opportunity on the basis that it could resolve a number of issues prior to applications being submitted, therefore saving time and money.
- 6.6 Graham Withers responded by stating that he agreed with the principle of pre-application consultation, indicating that, although it was not a statutory process, albeit one that the Government encouraged, there would still be the necessary resources available to enable the Planning Service to provide such a service.

Councillor Bramall added that whilst he accepted that the forecasted savings were not significant, if similar savings were replicated across the Council, they would add up.

6.7 Members of the Committee raised questions and the following responses were provided:-

- Whilst officers encouraged the practice of residents speaking to their neighbours prior to submitting an application in order to address any concerns, there would still be a requirement on the Council to notify the neighbours, and invite any comments from them.
- Information on pre-application consultation was not included in the SCI as it was a separate service provided for applicants, and not covered by the SCI. Councillor Bramall agreed to give consideration to the possibility of publishing pre-application advice given as part of any subsequent planning application, but was mindful that this might deter investment in the City, as developers need space to discuss options before finalising their proposals.
- The Planning Service sent information by email, where possible, and when they obtained email addresses, all future correspondence would be sent using this method, rather than by post.
- Officers would decide on which applications they deemed to be more controversial, which would result in more letters being sent out to residents and businesses, and notices posted, in the surrounding area. Appropriate development types were listed in the Code of Practice. This list has been extended following consultation responses and would be refreshed if necessary.
- It would not be possible to transfer the costs of distributing notification letters to residents and businesses to the applicants as there was no legal way of doing this. Also, the fees in terms of applications for planning permission were set nationally, therefore could not be changed by the Council.
- It would not be possible for officers to personally deliver notification letters when they visited areas to put up statutory notices as this would be inefficient and the Service had to follow its Code of Practice consistently in terms of notifications.
- Councillor Bramall agreed to consider where there was any justification for posting larger site notices, but noted that officers had adopted the suggestion of using coloured notices for amended schemes and had received favourable feedback on the improved design proposal.

6.8 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the comments now made and the responses to the questions raised; and

- (b) agrees to take no action in relation to the called-in decision, but consider whether issues arising from the call-in need to be added to its Work Programme 2014/15.

(NOTE: Prior to the passing of the above resolved, an alternative resolution was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland and seconded by Councillor Martin Smith, as follows:-

“That this Committee requests that the decision be deferred until the Committee has considered relevant issues and made recommendations to the Executive.”

The votes on the alternative resolution were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

- |                            |   |  |
|----------------------------|---|--|
| For the Resolution (4)     | - | Councillors Ian Auckland, Robert Murphy, Joe Otten and Martin Smith                      |
| Against the Resolution (5) | - | Councillors Steve Jones, Pat Midgley, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Steve Wilson and Paul Wood |
| Abstained (1)              | - | Councillor Cate McDonald.)   |

**SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL**

**Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development  
Committee**

**Meeting held 10 September 2014**

**PRESENT:** Councillors Cate McDonald (Chair), Ian Auckland (Deputy Chair), Neale Gibson, Ibrar Hussain, Steve Jones, Alf Meade, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Jillian Creasy (Substitute Member) and Peter Price (Substitute Member)

.....

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 Apologies for absence were received and substitutes attended the meeting as follows:-

<u>Apology</u>	<u>Substitute</u>
Councillor Helen Mirfin-Boukouris	No substitute nominated
Councillor Robert Murphy	Councillor Jillian Creasy
Councillor Tim Rippon	No substitute nominated
Councillor Steve Wilson	No substitute nominated
Councillor Paul Wood	Councillor Peter Price

**2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

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

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

**4. MINUTES OF THE PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 30<sup>th</sup> July 2014, were approved as a correct record, with the exception of (a) the list of Members present, which was amended by the addition of Councillor Joe Otten and (b) Item 1 – Apologies for Absence, which was amended by the addition of Councillor Helen Mirfin-Boukouris.

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

5.1 There were no questions raised or petitions submitted by members of the public.

**6. WASTE STRATEGY 2009-2020 - UPDATE**

6.1 Waste Resources Action Programme (WRAP)

- 6.1.1 The Committee received a presentation from Jenny Robinson, Recycling and Collections Technical Adviser, Waste Resources Action Programme (WRAP), on the work being undertaken by WRAP in attempting to change the behaviour of businesses, communities and the public sector on recycling issues, and aiming to turn awareness into action and deliver Government policies. Ms Robinson referred to a series of statistics and trends relating to methods of dry recycling schemes adopted by local authorities, recycling collection methods, the percentage of local authorities collecting dry material and organic waste at the kerbside and the percentage of local authorities collecting food waste in 2013/14. In terms of performance, she reported on quartile comparisons, in terms of yields by material, of different types of local authorities, including urban/higher deprivation against rural/lower deprivation, industrial hinterlands, against prospering southern England, and in respect of the whole of the United Kingdom. Further statistics were reported, including percentage totals in terms of materials recycled in England in 2011/12, the percentage of material sent for recycling in comparison with the total amount in residual, the capture rate in terms of all dry material, and a comparison of collection options by capture in respect of food waste.
- 6.1.2 Ms Robinson reported on the opportunities to increase the recycling of both food and materials, including what was required to assist with the plans to increase recycling rates, and referred to the Materials Facilities Regulations, specifically the key elements of the Regulations and what they meant for local authorities. Reference was also made to the support provided by WRAP, together with examples of good practice, specifically the support provided for local authorities.
- 6.2 Members of the Committee raised questions and the following responses were provided:-
- At present, the majority of food waste collected went through a process known as anaerobic digestion, where it was broken down and used to produce fuel. The remainder was used as compost.
  - Considerable work had been undertaken by WRAP in looking at the effects of collecting and transporting recycled material on the carbon imprint. This work had shown that transport represented a very small element of carbon use within the overall benefit of the recycling process.
  - Recycling rates for textiles were so low for a number of reasons, mainly due to no clear statistics being available in terms of measuring collection rates as a number of private companies were involved.
  - It was the case that a number of local authorities that charged for the collection of recycled green waste had seen a reduction in recycling rates of between 7% and 8%.
  - As part of its work, WRAP worked closely with a number of major companies, providing advice on how they could reduce packaging, in order to reduce the amount of waste created.



### 6.3 Waste Strategy

6.3.1 The Executive Director, Place, submitted a report containing details with regard to updating the Council's Waste Strategy 2009-2020. The report indicated that the Waste Strategy had been approved by the Cabinet in 2009 and since that time, there had been a number of significant service changes and other external influences that affected how much waste was produced in the City. The update to the Strategy reflected such changes and explored how the City would manage waste in the next period to 2020.

6.3.2 The report was supported by a presentation by Gillian Charters, Head of Waste Management. Also in attendance for this item was Nigel Wilson, Director for Veolia Sheffield. Ms Charters referred to the vision and objectives set out in the Waste Strategy in 2009 and reported on the service changes and other external influences since 2009. She referred to a series of graphs and charts showing the reduction in the amount of waste sent to landfill and the increase in recycling from 2000/01 to 2013/14, the total of tonnage of waste for the City, the total number of kilograms of waste per person, the total number of kilograms of waste produced per household in the core cities, and the total waste produced by month during the last three years. She then reported on the main objectives of the revised Waste Strategy, which included reducing the City's waste, helping residents and businesses to recycle more and minimising the level of waste that goes to landfill. Reference was made to the amounts of food and garden waste being thrown away in the black bin and Ms Charters reported statistics regarding black bin fill-up level by household size, expected increases in household waste, the effect on waste levels in the light of the forecasted population growth and waste budget expenditure.

6.3.3 Ms Charters referred to further statistics on the total tonnage on paper and card collected since April 2005 and the blue bin and blue box fill level by household size in respect of the collection of paper and card. She concluded by reporting on proposed changes to the recycling services, based on the responses following a recent consultation exercise, together with the actions required in order to achieve expected recycling targets.

6.4 Members of the Committee raised questions and the following responses were provided:-

- Whilst there had been no obvious increase in levels of fly tipping following the introduction of the alternate weekly bin collections, there were issues as to how levels of fly tipping were recorded in the City, therefore it was difficult to determine such rates with any certainty.
- There would have to be changes in terms of what and how dry recycled material was collected, as well as further educating organisations and individuals in all aspects of recycling if the Local Authority was to achieve the 50% target rate. One change likely to be needed to enable this target to be met was the need to collect food waste separate.
- As well as looking at plans for improving the kerbside recycling service, there

were plans to improve the City's Recycling Centres, by reviewing the location of the Centres and the services available.

- The existing waste contract was not seen as a barrier, although additional services would need to be paid for.
- In terms of the anaerobic digestion process, the most cost-effective method was to use the gas produced to produce electricity to sell to the National Grid, rather than use the gas as a fuel for vehicles.
- Whilst any changes to the service, such as increased sorting facilities and new bins, would require additional funding, such outlay would hopefully be offset by the savings made in terms of the improved service.

6.5 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the information contained in the report now submitted, the information reported as part of the presentations and the responses to the questions raised;
- (b) thanks Jenny Robinson and Gillian Charters for the presentations now made, and for responding to the questions raised;
- (c) makes the following observations in connection with proposed service changes to the Waste Strategy 2009-2020:-
  - (i) need to reduce the amount of waste produced;
  - (ii) need to encourage more home composting;
  - (iii) need for improvements to recycling centres, including potential income from business customers;
  - (iv) need to aim for zero landfill;
  - (v) whilst not a statutory target, the Local Authority needs to aim towards achieving the recycling target of 50%; and
  - (vi) food and garden waste appear to provide the bigger opportunity, but there are financial implications; and
- (d) requests Gillian Charters to submit a further report on the Waste Strategy to the meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2014, prior to its consideration by the Cabinet, and including information on:-
  - (i) the observations and suggestions now made at this meeting;
  - (ii) financial costings; and

- (iii) best practice.

## **7. WORK PROGRAMME 2014/15**

7.1 Matthew Borland, Policy and Improvement Officer, submitted a report on the latest draft of the Committee's Work Programme 2014/15.

7.2 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the comments now made; and
- (b) agrees:-
  - (i) that the Waste Strategy be considered as a single topic at the meeting on 10<sup>th</sup> December 2014;
  - (ii) that Devolution to the City Region, and specifically the Capital Programme, be added to the list of topics, with a date as to when it could be considered to be confirmed;
  - (iii) that any suggestions on what could be considered as part of the future role of the City Centre, to be discussed at the meeting on 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014, should be forwarded to the Policy and Improvement Officer; and
  - (iv) the Policy and Improvement Officer to circulate the draft scope for the Task Group on "House Building and the Local Economy" to members of the Committee, and Members to send any comments to the Planning and Improvement Officer.

## **8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

8.1 The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Wednesday, 8<sup>th</sup> October 2014, at 4.30 pm, in the Town Hall.

This page is intentionally left blank

# Sheffield City Centre: shaping the future

## A discussion paper

Sheffield Executive Board (SEB) discussed the future of Sheffield City Centre at its March 2013 meeting. The Board agreed that the last decade had seen significant improvements throughout the city centre but that there was still much work to be done. It was felt that we need to work together on the development of a bold and ambitious vision for the future that reflects changing trends and takes advantage of new opportunities. Despite the challenging economic environment the SEB is certain that there is significant scope to define and shape the future for our city centre.

This paper is both a response to the emerging city centre master plan refresh, and a reflection of the issues discussed at Sheffield Executive Board. We encourage you to contribute to the discussion and welcome your views and ideas on how we can all help to shape a strong and distinctive vision for Sheffield.

### 1. A multi-functional centre

Sheffield city centre has many functions. It is a place to learn, work, live, relax and shop. Yet we know that many people who live in or close to the city only use the city centre on rare occasions. It is important that we ensure that these multiple functions can attract all generations and the widest possible range of communities and end users. The city can develop all these elements, offering high quality opportunities and experiences for people who work, live and visit the city.



### Key questions and challenges

How can we further diversify the uses of the city centre? How can we make the city centre more attractive to those that use it only rarely? How can we make the most of complementary functions so that the city centre offers a distinctive and entirely different experience from Meadowhall or other northern cities such as Manchester or Leeds?

### 2. A distinctive identity

Our city centre should reflect what makes Sheffield distinctive from other cities. The landscape, heritage, architecture and cultural infrastructure, including festivals, are key components as is the widely acclaimed public realm design and green spaces, which are well used by local people. With the new market due to open in 2013 and an emerging range of creative and independent shops there should be further scope to strengthen a strongly differentiated experience.

**Key questions and challenges**

Is there more we can do to enhance the distinctiveness and unique qualities of Sheffield city centre? What are the functions that help make Sheffield different to any other city? Should we compete head-to-head with other UK cities that have larger or more prestigious stores? If the city centre is about more than shopping, how can we encourage more people to see the centre in a new light?

**3. The new retail experience**

With on-line shopping increasing every year and expected to reach 30% of all retail sales within 3-5 years, city centres and high streets will need to adapt to this fundamental change in the way people buy goods. It is widely recognised that shopping will need to be more directly linked to on-line purchasing and provide a richer experience for those choosing to visit high street shops. Many commentators predict that shopping will need to be more closely linked to leisure, cultural and more rounded experiences and that our city centres will need to adapt to this if they are to continue to be attractive to end-users.

Whilst this is a threat to the status quo, it is also an opportunity to develop a new type of retail experience, working with online and retail companies to showcase and experience their products. It may also offer more opportunities for independent and new retail businesses, operating on a local or regional level. Sheffield can plan for future trends and work with local, regional and national retailers to combine online shopping with an exciting and vibrant day out experience, offering leisure, retail and cultural (including sports) packages as a distinctive product mix.



**Key questions and challenges**

Do we need more independent (local and regional) retail businesses in the city centre or should we focus on larger national chains and prestige brand names? What types of collaboration between relevant sectors might help Sheffield compete to offer a more distinctive package? How can the city centre and Meadowhall collaborate more to take advantage of each other's strengths and pulling power?

**4. City centre and technology**

With smart phones and tablets now widely (but by no means exclusively) used, the technologies deployed by consumers, visitors and citizens have changed radically in the last 10 years. In many parts of the world, city centres are introducing applications and technologies which reflect the way people use mobile computing as an integral part of their city experience. Equally, access to digital resources and to the learning potential of the internet remains a key issue for equality of opportunity and access to the best resources for all of Sheffield's communities. With bus, train and tram services providing real time information, there is scope for new initiatives in other areas of the city centre.



**Key questions and challenges**

What other initiatives could be developed to better harness the power of new technologies in Sheffield city centre? What outstanding examples are you aware of from other parts of the world? How can new technologies contribute to improving the visitor experience (whether student, business, tourist or South Yorkshire day tripper)?

**5. City centre workplaces**

While sub-regionally the city is the leading commercial centre and is home to some significant public sector and commercial businesses, Sheffield has considerably less (in employment terms) than in cities of a comparative size across the UK. Sheffield Executive Board identified that there needs to be some consideration as to how the city positions itself to attract new businesses as well as supporting the growth of high performing indigenous companies.



The city needs greater diversification and more core business district offices, yet enquiries for areas of more than 1000 sq metres are far lower than in previous decades. With the way people work also changing, Sheffield needs to develop a strategy that is sufficiently focused to differentiate itself from Nottingham, Leeds and Manchester, but sufficiently flexible to adjust to an economic context which has a far higher proportion of small businesses.

**Key questions and challenges**

What are the specialist sectors that Sheffield can develop and attract which offer a niche or distinctive specialism in comparison to other UK cities? What are the factors that will make the city more attractive to a wider range of small businesses? How can we do more to help attract businesses that employ 50 people or more in the city centre? What do current occupiers think of Sheffield’s offer and how could it be strengthened?

**6. A city centre for all**

A vibrant city centre is one which is attractive to all, a place which is accessible for young people, older people, families and friends. This means continuing to offer a wide range of experiences that are affordable and of interest to all those communities. It is also about ensuring that the city centre remains friendly, safe and welcoming to everyone. The city centre needs to be easily accessible from all parts of the city region with high quality and affordable public transport, safe and attractive routes to encourage more walking and cycling and affordable and good quality car parking.

The city centre should also be a place where there are sufficiently diverse leisure and cultural functions for all ages, generations and across all the religious and cultural communities of the city region.

### Key questions and challenges

To what extent are visitors to the city centre able to find out about the diversity of cultural, sporting and leisure resources that are easily accessible from their hotel or apartment? What is the experience of international and UK students who are new to Sheffield? What would local communities and residents like to see improved? What are the big successes in the city centre and how we can build on these?



## 7. A city for learning

We want Sheffield to further develop its reputation as a leading UK city for education. With one of the most successful and largest colleges in the UK and outstanding higher and further education traditions, the city is an international location for learning. With significant new investment by all the city centre educational institutions, there ought to be scope to attract more employers and to leverage this multi-million investment to attract new businesses and opportunities for employment.

Equally with one of the largest providers of e-learning in Europe based in the city, Learn Direct provides services all over the UK and there is a cluster of related distance learning businesses also located in the city region. In the foreseeable future, investment in higher level skills, personal and professional development will continue to be important sectors in their own right and Sheffield has the potential to provide a distinctive and high level offer in this important sector.

Sheffield is also developing the idea of 'Learning Companies', where students learn their trade and professional skills whilst running a real business (under supervision), such as a pop-up restaurant. Other ideas include pop-up retail showcasing and selling jewellery and other artifacts from silver smithing students. To demonstrate Sheffield's commitment to Health and well-being and international reputation for Food research, the city centre could include demonstration pop-up workshops to do daily cookery and diet demonstrations from the experts in our colleges and universities.

### Key questions and challenges

What more can be done to leverage further private sector investment on the back of the significant growth of learning institutions in the city centre? How can we strengthen links across the learning institutions? How can we more directly link learning to economic growth in Sheffield?

## 8. Culturally vibrant

Sheffield has strong cultural organisations and institutions with a long track record of innovation and wide public engagement. But the city has for many hundreds of years also been a place where people



have used their ingenuity and creativity to make things. This was reflected in the 20th century with leading silversmiths, designer makers, fine artists, musicians and performers and is still central to the cultural distinctiveness of Sheffield.

The city centre reflects these distinctive qualities in public art, award winning public realm, a cluster of cultural facilities within easy walking distance and a growing community of alternative contemporary art and alternative galleries reflecting a large community of practicing artists and designer makers.



Sport is also part of Sheffield's broader cultural offer; the city has world class athletes and facilities as well as a growing advanced research and manufacturing sector linked to medical, psychological and engineering companies that specialise in sport equipment and services.

#### Key questions and challenges

How can we extend and further develop the benefits arising from these organisations and individuals without new public sector investment? How can we collaborate to lever more private sector partnerships or investment in these important sectors? Does the city centre fully reflect Sheffield's cultural offer? Key buildings such as the Graves (as a central library and gallery) require investment, what should be the city's priorities?

### 9. City living

Sheffield city centre is now home to more than 16,000 people and with a new school (apprenticeship college) currently under construction, the city is becoming progressively more adapted for city living. In addition, with many residential communities located within easy walking distance of the city centre, and some emerging housing schemes (private and public sector) underway, there is further potential to increase the number of families living within 15 minutes walk of the city centre.

Unlike Manchester and Leeds where there is a large number of one and two bedroom high rise homes (built during the last boom), Sheffield has the potential (and the land) to attract more family and low-rise housing types as well having innovative projects including Park Hill and Kelham Island already underway. With high quality transport infrastructure and a broad range of centrally located health and wellbeing facilities, the city has great potential for increasing a more rounded approach to city living.

#### Key questions and challenges

Can Sheffield position itself as a more family friendly city centre than other UK cities? How can we encourage small and medium scale investment in other city centre locations to attract new residents into the city centre? Are there new opportunities such as Castlegate (with the market being moved to the Moor)?

## 10. Sustainable City

Sheffield already has some outstanding resources including its District Heat and Power Network and green roof initiative. With extensive grass roots interest in sustainable initiatives; urban gardening, cultivation, estate management, cycling and a vigorous network of social enterprises and not-for-profit organisations, there is great potential for further enhancing Sheffield's environmental credentials. However with specific challenges on air quality and flooding there is also much work still to do.



### Key questions and challenges

What new initiatives can be taken to further progress Sheffield's sustainability? How can we convert important challenges around air quality and flooding into economic opportunities? How important is sustainability to residents of Sheffield?

### What do you think?

We want to hear what the people of Sheffield think the city centre of the future might look like, and what we need to do now make sure Sheffield's is one of the best.

You can contact us on email at [sheffield.first@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:sheffield.first@sheffield.gov.uk), find us on Twitter as [@SheffieldFirst](https://twitter.com/SheffieldFirst), or visit our website at [www.sheffieldfirst.com](http://www.sheffieldfirst.com).

### Find out more

Sheffield City Council are consulting on a refresh of the City Centre Masterplan at the moment and are due to finish this process later in 2013. Look out for a planned public exhibition in May and further conversations throughout June.

Two recent reports on the future of retail may be of interest. Firstly, an Arup Foresight & Innovation report published in November 2012 looking particularly at the impact of technology on traditional retail (downloadable here: [http://www.arup.com/Home/Publications/Future\\_of\\_retail.aspx](http://www.arup.com/Home/Publications/Future_of_retail.aspx)); secondly, a recent report in *The Economist* looking at how online retailers are starting to look at traditional stores to enhance their business models (downloadable here: <http://econ.st/YtahY6>).

Finally the Portas Review, which looked at the future of high streets and was published in December 2011 contains much that is of interest (downloadable here: <http://bit.ly/14vll2U>).