

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

Thursday 20 July 2017 at 5.00 pm

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

The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend

Membership

Councillors Denise Fox (Chair), Ian Auckland (Deputy Chair), Mike Chaplin, Neale Gibson, Dianne Hurst, Mark Jones, Abdul Khayum, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ben Miskell, Robert Murphy, Moya O'Rourke, Colin Ross, Gail Smith, Martin Smith 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. 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 Alice Nicholson, Policy and Improvement Officer on 0114 27 35065 or [email alice.nicholson@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:alice.nicholson@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
20 JULY 2017**

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 - 14)
To approve the minutes of the meetings of the Committee held on 26 April and 17 May 2017
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**
To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public
- 7. Call-in of the Cabinet Member Decision on Non-City Centre Parking Developments** (Pages 15 - 38)
Report of the Policy and Improvement Officer
- 8. Draft Work Programme 2017/18** (Pages 39 - 46)
Report of the Policy and Improvement Officer
- 9. Date of Next Meeting**
The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Wednesday, 13 September 2017, at 5.00pm 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 Audit and Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from Gillian Duckworth, Director of Legal and Governance on 0114 2734018 or email gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk.

This page is intentionally left blank

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

Meeting held 26 April 2017

PRESENT: Councillors Steve Wilson (Chair), Ian Auckland (Deputy Chair),
Lisa Banes, Neale Gibson, Dianne Hurst, Talib Hussain, Abdul Khayum,
Ben Miskell, Robert Murphy, Andy Nash, Chris Peace and Martin Smith

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Helen Mirfin-Boukouris.

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 Committee approved, as a correct record, the minutes of its last meeting held on 22nd February 2017.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

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

6. ECONOMIC LANDSCAPE IN SHEFFIELD - EVIDENCE SESSION NO. 2

6.1 The Committee received a report of the Policy and Improvement Officer (Alice Nicholson) on the Economic Landscape in Sheffield - Evidence Session No. 2. The information reported as part of the Session, which comprised input from the City Council's Creative Sheffield and Planning Service, together with the information from Evidence Session No. 1, which had been held at the Committee's meeting held on 15th February 2017, and comprised comments from the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce and Industry, would be considered by the Task Group, established by the Committee, on the Economic Landscape in Sheffield.

6.2 In attendance for this item were Flo Churchill (Interim Chief Planning Officer) and Kevin Bennett (Head of Business Growth, Creative Sheffield), who had been asked to provide information in terms of their responses to the same three questions that Richard Wright (Executive Director, Sheffield Chamber of Commerce and Industry) had responded to at the Committee's last meeting, as follows:-

1. Is Sheffield serving the needs of businesses/developers?
 2. Are there any lessons for the future?
 3. How do we compare with other cities or places?
- 6.3 Details of the responses from the Planning Service were set out in Appendix A to the report now submitted, and information from Creative Sheffield, together with a report produced by the University of Sheffield – ‘State of Sheffield 2017’, had been circulated to Members of the Committee prior to the meeting.
- 6.4 In addition to the information set out in the report, Flo Churchill reported that a new Head of Planning had been appointed, and was due to start on 9th May, 2017, and that the Place Portfolio had recently been restructured. There were likely to be a number of changes in terms of procedures and practices with regard to the Planning Service. As part of the restructuring proposals, a new City Growth Team had been created, which would comprise officers from Planning, Housing and Creative Sheffield, and help to improve the planning process, thereby enabling growth and development of the City. She stated that, whilst it was very difficult to measure whether Sheffield was serving the needs of businesses/developers, she stated that Sheffield was ambitious for growth, and the Planning Service was fundamental to enabling the delivery of such growth and development, as well as the transformation of the City as a place with the necessary infrastructure, community facilities and quality of environment to support it. Reference was made to the commencement of the Sheffield Retail Quarter development, as well as the recent decisions by Boeing and McLaren to open manufacturing plants in the region. The two Universities continued to develop and the Council continued to receive applications in terms of housing developments, with recent applications showing a swing from student accommodation to family housing. The Service offered a Pre-Application Service, where officers advised on matters relating to planning applications and which, in respect of large-scale applications, such as the Sheffield Retail Quarter, attracted significant income in terms of fees. There were plans to increase fees for planning applications in July 2017, by 20%, with any excess income being used to improve the overall service. The Service also offered a further paid for service, known as a Planning Performance Agreement, whereby developers entered into an agreement with the Service, and were guaranteed to receive a specific standard of performance in terms of the determination of their application. The Service would regularly liaise with the Local Enterprise Partnership and the Chamber of Commerce in connection with finding out what developers wanted when dealing with the Council. Ms Churchill stated that the Planning Service was very well respected across the country, having a good record of determining applications, and having very pro-active Enforcement, Development Management and Urban Design Teams, who had won a number of prestigious awards.
- 6.5 In terms of comparisons with other cities or places, Ms Churchill referred to the report, which attached, as an appendix, benchmarking data in respect of the Core Cities. The data included budgetary information, information in terms of planning applications, and statistics regarding appeals, enforcement and building regulations.

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

- The concerns regarding the levels of student accommodation, as opposed to family housing, were appreciated. There was a need to get a correct balance in terms of the different types of housing in the City.
- It was accepted that in those cases where individuals or companies had paid for pre-application advice, and that such advice, or reference to such advice, was not made public when the planning application was made, could be perceived as suspicious by the wider community. It was made clear to those applicants who chose to use this service that such advice was not binding on the Authority, and was provided with this caveat. It was accepted that there may be a need to publicly explain the terms and conditions of the Pre-Application Advice Scheme, and this was one of many issues currently being considered by the Service, particularly if it was found to be having an impact on the quality of decision-making. It was not known whether those local authorities which published details of their Pre-Application Advice Schemes had a more successful planning application process as there were questions as to how this success was measured. Around 90% of the determinations made were made by officers in the Planning Service, acting under delegated powers, with the remainder being determined by elected Members, based on officer advice, at meetings of the Planning and Highways Committee.
- It was very difficult to make comparisons with other local authorities in terms of the length of time it took to determine planning applications, particularly as such details were not published. Some of the more complex planning applications would always take longer to determine, for example, as part of the pre-application advice stage with regard to the Sheffield Retail Quarter, the length of time to determine this planning application was extended with the agreement of the developers. Officers had to make the best, most balanced determination based on the information provided as part of the application, with some applications taking longer than others to determine. The Planning Service also received holding directions from the Highways Agency, which would result in some determinations taking longer than others. The Planning Service aimed to determine all planning applications received within the shortest possible timescale, and comments with regard to Sheffield taking longer than other local authorities to determine applications were strongly refuted. There was also the issue as to precisely when the determination commenced, as some applications were deemed invalid, which, in itself, could take time to determine.
- It was believed that the reports on planning applications, both where determinations were made by officers, under delegated powers, or by elected Members, contained balanced information, including any objections. The reports were also produced in line with planning guidance, legislation and local planning policy. Proper consideration was given to all objections to applications, and it was accepted that in many cases, the information in terms of objections was condensed, rather than make reference to every individual objection. The information would reference the issues raised, rather than set

out information in respect of each individual objection, particularly when they referred to the same issue. Whilst the Service appreciates the importance of the nature of objections to planning applications, in some cases, the issues raised, such as the impact of a development on the price of a property, were not planning matters, and cannot be taken into consideration as part of the determination.

- There were a number of high quality public realm buildings in the City and, as part of its efforts to attract more buildings with a high quality design, the Service was planning to refresh the Urban Design Compendium. Officers were currently working on a number of projects involving buildings of high quality design, but as part of the process, consideration had to be given to the effects of such buildings on existing Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas in the City. As more developers expressed an interest in developing in the City, there would hopefully be an increase in the number of quality buildings. One of the outcomes of the recent restructuring of the Place Portfolio was to bring together those Services responsible for planning and the future growth of the City, and for taking the City forward, to establish a City Growth Team. The restructure was viewed as more of a cultural change, and one which would hopefully result in improved co-ordination and interaction.
- There had not been a meeting of the Development Forum for six months, on the basis of a reduction in the attendance at the last few meetings. Officers would look into why this had been the case, and whether organising such meetings would be productive in the future.
- The Service would always demand good quality developments on the basis that the City both deserved and needed this, and officers would instruct developers along those lines.
- Whether there would be a separate Planning Division as part of the Sheffield City Region would be dependent on the elected Mayor's powers. There was already a legal duty on the Authority to take a strategic lead in terms of dealing with applications for planning permission over the City boundary. Determining such applications invariably raised a number of issues.
- The reason behind the recent swing from student accommodation to family housing had been due to a rebalance in the housing market, mainly due to the student accommodation market reaching saturation and, to a lesser extent, the efforts made by the Council in terms of redressing the balance.
- An explanation of what the figures in the "Other" column in terms of the income with regard to the Core Cities' budgets for 2016/17 referred to would be circulated to Members of the Committee.
- Although there was no precise figure in terms of the number of housing developments that had been granted planning permission, but had not yet commenced, the Service held figures in terms of the number of housing developments completed and those cases where developments had received permission, but had not yet commenced. The Government was currently

looking at amending the time limit granted in respect of the completion of developments. The Authority had the powers to enforce planning conditions, but did not have the power to force developers to do everything that they had been given permission to do, as part of their applications. Officers tried everything possible to ensure that developers completed all the works as detailed in their original planning applications. An example where developers had not completed all the works as detailed in their applications involved failure to construct stipulated levels of affordable housing, as part of major housing developments. Figures on the levels of housing approved, and completed, would be provided to Members.

- 175 of the 250 jobs created as part of the McLaren relocation comprised semi-skilled jobs, including apprenticeships and other semi-skilled manufacturing/operative jobs. It was believed that a similar pattern would be followed in connection with the relocation of other major companies, including Boeing. There was a need for the City Growth Team to talk to the City's schools and colleges in an effort to ensure that pupils had the necessary knowledge and skills, thereby creating a semi-skilled employee base in the light of further, large manufacturing companies locating to the region.
- There was a view that the Council did not shout about some of the excellent work it undertook in terms of city growth. The Council had received a number of national and international awards in terms of planning and development, including Planning Excellence Awards and the Regional Urban Design Award.

6.7 Kevin Bennett stated that he had spent 18 months working with McLaren prior to their relocation to South Yorkshire, and indicated how impressed the Company was in terms of how the Council had dealt with them. In terms of future investment and City growth, Mr Bennett stated that the investment pipeline was currently the strongest it had been for a number of years, with around 78 projects currently being developed. The location of Boeing and McLaren to the region had been a major boost for the region's economy, and the Council was already dealing with a number of enquiries from other companies wanting to be located near the two companies, in terms of providing a supply chain. He stated that this, along with the increased number of planning applications, would help to generate substantial investment in the local economy in the next few years.

6.8 In response to a question from a member of the Committee, Mr Bennett stated that the Council worked closely with existing businesses and start-up businesses in the City, through its Business Sheffield branded service. This now encompassed a very strong start up service and support for businesses in their early years of development. It also included a very experienced team of Business Growth Advisers, who worked with existing companies in the City to help them achieve their growth ambitions.

6.9 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the additional information circulated prior to the meeting, and the responses provided to

the questions raised;

- (b) requests that the explanation as to what the figures in the “Other” column in terms of the income regarding the Core Cities budgets for 2016/17 referred to, be circulated to Members as soon as possible; and
- (c) thanks Flo Churchill and Kevin Bennett for attending the meeting, and responding to the questions raised.

7. WORK PROGRAMME REVIEW AND SCRUTINY ANNUAL REPORT 2016/17

7.1 The Policy and Improvement Officer (Alice Nicholson) submitted a report containing a review of the Committee’s Work Programme 2016/17 and attaching, as an appendix, a draft of the Scrutiny Annual Report 2016/17, containing details of highlights of the work of the Committee during this period.

7.2 Ms Nicholson made specific reference to the requirement for the Committee to consider the report and recommendations of the Western Road First World War Memorial Trees Task and Finish Cross Party Working Group at a meeting during the Municipal Year 2016/17. Councillor Lisa Banes, a member of the Working Group, indicated that whilst the majority of the Working Group’s work had been completed, it had still not seen the report of the Independent Tree Panel or the Council’s response to this report, therefore a special meeting would have to be arranged on a date when this information was available, thus leaving a very short timescale. Ms Nicholson stated that the most suitable date for the special meeting of the Committee was Tuesday, 16th May 2017, at 12.30 pm.

7.3 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the comments now made; and
- (b) agrees:-
 - (i) the date and time of the special meeting to consider the report and recommendations of the Western Road First World War Memorial Trees Task and Finish Cross Party Working Group as Tuesday, 16th May 2017, at 12.30 pm in the Town Hall; and
 - (ii) that the following topics be added to its Work Programme 2017/18:-
 - De-culverting of Rivers
 - Small Businesses
 - City Library Building/Sheffield Retail Quarter.

8. SHEFFIELD RETAIL QUARTER

8.1 The Director, Major Projects, submitted a report containing an update in terms of the Sheffield Retail Quarter following key decisions taken by the Leader of the Council and the Cabinet in 2014 and 2016.

8.2 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, particularly the significant progress that has been made in achieving a start in delivering the Retail Quarter, with the first phase now underway; and
- (b) requests the Retail Quarter Project Team to attend future meetings to present the final plans and provide an update to Members on progress, financial outcomes and risk management with regard to the project.

9. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

9.1 It was noted that, subject to any further changes in arrangements, a special meeting of the Committee would be held on Tuesday, 16th May 2017, at 12.30 pm, in the Town Hall.

This page is intentionally left blank

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

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

Meeting held 17 May 2017

PRESENT: Councillors Ian Auckland, Lisa Banes, Denise Fox, Neale Gibson, Dianne Hurst, Mark Jones, Abdul Khayum, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ben Miskell, Robert Murphy, Moya O'Rourke, Colin Ross, Gail Smith and Martin Smith

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 No apologies for absence were received.

2. APPOINTMENT OF CHAIR AND DEPUTY CHAIR

2.1 RESOLVED: That Councillor Denise Fox be appointed Chair of the Committee and Councillor Ian Auckland be appointed Deputy Chair for the Municipal Year 2017/18.

3. DATES AND TIMES OF MEETINGS

3.1 RESOLVED: That meetings of the Committee be held on a bi-monthly basis, on dates and times to be determined by the Chair, and as and when required for called-in items.

This page is intentionally left blank



Report to Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee Thursday 20th July 2017

Subject: Call-In of Independent Cabinet Member decision on 'Non-City Centre Parking Developments'

Author of Report: Alice Nicholson, Policy & Improvement Officer
0114 2735065, alice.nicholson@sheffield.gov.uk

Type of item: The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Independent Cabinet Member decision	X
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	
Other	

1.0 Background

1.1 On the 30th May 2017 the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport took the following decision:

Proposed tariff changes set out in the report will help to better manage parking demand in areas and times when demand is demonstrably and dramatically outstripping supply.

The Cabinet Member therefore resolves that:-

- The hourly tariff within the Non-City Centre Parking Zone be increased to 70p per hour, with a maximum daily charge of £4.50 where time limits allow;*
- in the Highfield Controlled Parking Zone only, tariffs be reduced to a maximum of £2.80 for the full charging period of 8am to 6.30pm in the current 10 hour maximum stay bays and that the 10 hour maximum stay restriction be removed in these bays;*

- *the free parking period available to motorists in the Non-City Centre Parking Zone be extended to 20 minutes;*
 - *these tariff changes above, which are detailed in Appendix B of the report, be implemented as soon as practicable and these revised pay and display tariffs be kept in place until any future amendment be agreed*
 - *any increased surplus parking income which may arise from the tariff changes proposed in this report are to be used in developing proposed parking initiatives which will be the subject of further reports; and*
 - *no changes to the city centre tariffs or parks car parks tariffs are made.*
- 1.2 Appendices to this report include PDFs of Call-In Notice; the Individual Cabinet Member Decision Record; and the original report of Executive Director, Place, which itself has two appendices (A and B) – five documents in total.
- 1.3 As per Part 4, section 16 of Sheffield City Council’s Constitution, this decision has been called in, preventing implementation of the decision until it has been considered by this Scrutiny Committee.
- 1.4 The Call-In notice states that the reason for the Call-in is ‘*Examination of the Financial Implications and the underpinning research*’
- 2.0 The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:**

As per the Scrutiny Procedure rules, scrutinise the decision and take one of the following courses of action:

- (a) refer the decision back to the decision making body or individual for reconsideration in the light of recommendations from the Committee;
- (b) request that the decision be deferred until the Scrutiny Committee has considered relevant issues and made recommendations to the Executive;
- (c) take no action in relation to the called-in decision but consider whether issues arising from the call-in need to be fed back to the decision maker or added to the work programme of an existing Scrutiny Committee;
- (d) if, but only if (having taken the advice of the Monitoring Officer and/or the Chief Finance Officer), the Committee determines that the decision is wholly or partly outside the Budget and Policy Framework, refer the matter, with any recommendations, to the Council after following the procedures in the Budget and Policy Framework Procedure Rules

(If a Scrutiny Committee decides on (a), (b) or (d) as its course of action, there is a continuing bar on implementing the decision).

2.2 The Scrutiny Procedure rules state that if a decision is referred back, it is referred back to the individual or body that made the decision. In this case the decision maker is Cabinet Member Infrastructure and Transport.

Background Papers

- Call-In notice - dated 31.05.2017
- Individual Cabinet Member Decision Record – dated 30.05.2017
- Report of Executive Director, Place – dated 18.05.2017

Category of Report: OPEN

This page is intentionally left blank

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

CALL-IN PROCESS FOR EXECUTIVE DECISIONS

MAZ AUCKLAND (Name of Member in Block Capitals)

under the provision of Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16, wish to call-in Item No.
relating to NON-CITY Co-the Britain's Developments
of the meeting of Cabinet Make Decision (meeting title)
on 30-05-17 (date) for consideration by the
Economic & Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee.

The relevant Scrutiny Committee will be indicated on the Checklist within the report relating to this matter.

Reason for Call-In

Extensive in the Financial Implications
and the underpinning research.

Signed [Signature] Date 31-5-2017

I have obtained the following signatures of the other Members who wish to call-in this item:-

- | Name (in Block Capitals) | Signature |
|-----------------------------|--------------------|
| 1. <u>SUSAN E. AUCKLAND</u> | <u>[Signature]</u> |
| 2. <u>ADAM HANNAHAW</u> | <u>[Signature]</u> |
| 3. <u>SHAFIQ MOHAMMED</u> | <u>[Signature]</u> |
| 4. <u>MARTIN SMITH</u> | <u>[Signature]</u> |

(NOTE: Scrutiny Procedure Rule 16 requires five Members, including two from the appropriate Scrutiny Committee to 'call-in' an Executive decision for scrutiny. This can be done **up to 4 working days after the decision publication.**

The five signatures required for the call-in process must be submitted by the deadline date, but need not all be on one form.

Completed forms to be returned to the
Head of Democratic Services (Room G13/14, Town Hall),
by the deadline referred to above.

The request will be logged and forwarded to Policy and Improvement Team
for action.

This page is intentionally left blank

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

INDIVIDUAL CABINET MEMBER DECISION RECORD

The following decision was taken on 30 May 2017 by the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport.

Date notified to all members: Wednesday 31 May 2017

The end of the call-in period is 4:00 pm on Tuesday 6 June 2017

Unless called-in, the decision can be implemented from Wednesday 7 June 2017

1. **TITLE**

Non-City Centre Parking Developments

2. **DECISION TAKEN**

Proposed tariff changes set out in the report will help to better manage parking demand in areas and times when demand is demonstrably and dramatically outstripping supply.

The Cabinet Member therefore resolves that:-

- The hourly tariff within the Non-City Centre Parking Zone be increased to 70p per hour, with a maximum daily charge of £4.50 where time limits allow;
- in the Highfield Controlled Parking Zone only, tariffs be reduced to a maximum of £2.80 for the full charging period of 8am to 6.30pm in the current 10 hour maximum stay bays and that the 10 hour maximum stay restriction be removed in these bays;
- the free parking period available to motorists in the Non-City Centre Parking Zone be extended to 20 minutes;
- these tariff changes above, which are detailed in Appendix B of the report, be implemented as soon as practicable and these revised pay and display tariffs be kept in place until any future amendment be agreed
- any increased surplus parking income which may arise from the tariff changes proposed in this report are to be used in developing proposed parking initiatives which will be the subject of further reports; and
- no changes to the city centre tariffs or parks car parks tariffs are made.

3. **Reasons For Decision**

It is anticipated that the proposed tariff changes set out in the report will help by better managing parking demand in areas and at times when demand is regularly and demonstrably outstripping supply.

4. **Alternatives Considered And Rejected**

The Council could maintain its current tariffs. This would not address the excess demand parking issues outlined in the report.

The Council could make higher and more widespread increases in tariffs, but, with the information available, these are not thought to be appropriate.

5. **Any Interest Declared or Dispensation Granted**

None

6. **Respective Director Responsible for Implementation**

Executive Director, Place

7. **Relevant Scrutiny Committee If Decision Called In**

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee



Author/Lead Officer of Report: Paul Fell,
Transport Traffic & Parking services Business
Manager

Tel: 0114 2057413

Report of: Executive Director, Place
Report to: Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for
Transport & Sustainability
Date of Decision: 30 May 2017
Subject: Non-City Centre Parking Developments

Is this a Key Decision? If Yes, reason Key Decision:-	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
- Expenditure and/or savings over £500,000	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
- Affects 2 or more Wards	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Which Cabinet Member Portfolio does this relate to? <i>Infrastructure & Transport</i>		
Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? Culture, Economy and Sustainability		
Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? <i>(Insert reference number)</i>		
Does the report contain confidential or exempt information?	Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-		
<i>"The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)."</i>		

Purpose of Report:

This report formalises changes previously announced in August 2016, changing Non-City Centre parking tariffs.

It also recommends further development work being carried out on a range of parking initiatives in order to address parking demand issues.

Recommendations:

Proposed tariff changes set out in this report will help to better manage parking demand in areas and times when demand is demonstrably and dramatically outstripping supply.

It is therefore recommended that:

- The hourly tariff within the Non-City Centre Parking Zone be increased to 70p per hour, with a maximum daily charge of £4.50 where time limits allow;
- In the Highfield Controlled Parking Zone only, tariffs be reduced to a maximum of £2.80 for the full charging period of 8am to 6.30pm in the current 10 hour maximum stay bays and that the 10 hour maximum stay restriction be removed in these bays;
- The free parking period available to motorists in the Non-City Centre Parking Zone be extended to 20 minutes;
- These tariff changes above, which are detailed in Appendix B of this report, be implemented as soon as practicable and these revised pay and display tariffs be kept in place until any future amendment be agreed
- Any increased surplus parking income which may arise from the tariff changes proposed in this report are to be used in developing proposed parking initiatives which will be the subject of further reports; and
- No changes to the city centre tariffs or parks car parks tariffs are made

Background Papers:

(Insert details of any background papers used in the compilation of the report.)

Appendix A - Parking Research**Appendix B – Proposed Parking Tariff Schedule**

Lead Officer to complete:-		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms	Finance: Catherine Murray
		Legal: Paul Bellingham

	completed / EIA completed, where required.	Equalities: Annemarie Johnston
	<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>	
2	EMT member who approved submission:	Laraine Manley
3	Cabinet Member consulted:	Councillor Jack Scott
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Decision Maker by the EMT member indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	Lead Officer Name: <i>Paul Fell</i>	Job Title: <i>Transport Traffic & Parking Services Business Manager</i>
	Date: 18 May 2017	

NON-CITY CENTRE PARKING DEVELOPMENTS

1 **Background**

- 1.1 It is clear from analysis of parking demand that there are areas within the city where demand is very high. In significant parts of the Non-City Centre Parking Zone (NCCPZ) in Broomhall, Broomhill, and Crookesmoor zones and in the Ecclesall Road corridor where demand currently outstrips supply.
- 1.2 Managing the supply of parking and charging for parking are well-established methods of managing demand for parking and are utilised by most local authorities who control on or off street parking. Research on the effectiveness of these measures is cited in Appendix A. This contributes to managing traffic congestion by encouraging more frequent turnover of spaces, which prevents vehicles circulating to look for available spaces, adding to traffic congestion and pollution. It also helps in discouraging over-reliance on car based trips and encourage drivers to consider more sustainable modes of travel, such as walking, cycling and public transport, for at least some of their trips.

2 **Non-City Centre Parking Zone**

- 2.1 The Non-City Centre Parking Zone (NCCPZ) is an area surrounding the city centre which consists of several permit parking zones, some of which have pay and display parking.
- 2.2 The NCCPZ began to be incrementally introduced from 2003, in order to mitigate the detrimental effects of unrestricted commuter / visitor parking in residential areas and district shopping centres. In each area widespread consultation was undertaken in advance.
- 2.3 The Council has several zones within the NCCPZ which have pay and display parking, such as Broomhall, Broomhill, Sharrow, Highfield, Crookesmoor. There is also pay and display parking in Hillsborough and in the Fir Vale area.
- 2.4 There is also pay and display parking in a number of the Council's parks car parks. The tariffs in these car parks are set separately to the NCCPZ parking and are not covered by this report.

3 **Proposal**

- 3.1 This report sets out proposed amendments to pay and display tariffs in the Non-City Centre Peripheral Parking Zones aimed at improving turnover of parking spaces and managing congestion.

- 3.2 The current general hourly tariff in the NCCPZ for on and off street parking is 50p per hour. This tariff has remained unchanged since April 2013.
- It is recommended that the hourly tariff within the NCCPZ be increased to 70p per hour.
- 3.3 There are a limited number of locations within the NCCPZ where long stay parking is permitted. These are in parking bays which have a 10 hour limit. The tariff for these bays is currently a maximum of £4 for up to 10 hours.
- It is recommended that approval be given to lower the 10 hour tariff on bays in the Highfield zone which are affected by low parking occupancy, in order to encourage more drivers to park in the area outside the Inner Ring Road and walk to their eventual destination in the city centre.
 - It is recommended that tariffs be reduced to a maximum of £2.80 for the full charging period of 8am to 6.30pm in the current 10 hour maximum stay bays in Highfield only. It is proposed that the 10 hour restriction be removed in these bays as the length of charging period is only 10.5 hours and the time limit is difficult to enforce.
 - It is recommended that in all other areas of the NCCPZ, the up to 10 hour tariff be increased from its current £4.00 to £4.50
 - All proposed tariff changes are detailed in the tariff schedule in Appendix B of this report.
- 3.4 Drivers parking in the NCCPZ can currently access a free 15 minutes of parking by obtaining a ticket from the machine.
- Representations have been received from local businesses requesting that the free parking period be extended in order to improve passing trade.
 - It is therefore recommended that the free parking period be extended to 20 minutes.
- 3.5 It should be noted that parking legislation requires that an observation period of 10 minutes must be carried out by a Civil Enforcement Officer before a penalty charge notice (PCN) can be issued for overstaying on a paid-for parking session. The free 20 minute period is considered to be a paid-for parking session, so at least 30 minutes would have to elapse after the driver obtained the ticket from the machine, before they would be at risk of receiving a penalty. The proposal to extend the free parking period therefore means that drivers can always access up to 30 minutes of free parking throughout the NCCPZ.

- 3.6 It is proposed that these tariff changes above be implemented as soon as practicable.
- 3.7 No changes to city centre tariffs are proposed.
- 3.8 No changes to tariffs in parks are proposed
- 3.9 Any additional surplus parking income which arises from these proposals is to be spent on developing parking initiatives, which will be the subject of further reports.

4 **How does this decision contribute?**

- 4.1 The operation of on and off street parking spaces, the management of parking through the introduction of parking restrictions and use of parking permits contribute to the management of traffic in the city. Traffic management through parking restrictions and their enforcement also enables the Council to help deliver its “Vision for Excellent Transport in Sheffield”, by investing in facilities to enable people to make informed choices about the way they travel and helping transport contribute to the social, economic and environmental improvements we want to happen in the City.
- 4.2 The priority in spending any surplus parking income is the provision and maintenance of off street parking spaces. Income may also be used to fund public transport improvements, new highway schemes, highway maintenance, reducing environmental pollution and maintaining and improving public open spaces.

5 **Has there been any consultation?**

- 5.1 The Council is not required to consult on straightforward tariff changes, but a legal notice will be published in the local newspaper giving at least 21 days’ notice of the changes being implemented. Copies of the legal notice will also be posted in the car parks covered by the new tariffs.
- 5.2 The change to the 10 hour tariffs in Highfield will necessitate a change to the prevailing Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) as it will mean a change to the tariff structure. The proposed change to the order will be published in the local newspaper in accordance with legal requirements and copies of the notice will also be posted on-street in the vicinity of the parking bays affected. Any objections to the proposed change which are received will

be reported to the Cabinet Member for a decision.

6 **Equality of opportunity implications**

- 6.1 Overall there are no significant differential equality impacts, positive or negative, from implementing the tariff increases
- 6.2 It should be noted that blue disabled parking badge holders can use council pay and display parking spaces free of charge and these proposals have no impact on the number of disabled parking spaces available to drivers.

7 **Financial and commercial implications**

- 7.1 Any costs of making the necessary changes to tariffs will be met from the parking services budget and it is anticipated that increased income from the tariff changes will cover any associated costs.
- 7.2 Any increased surplus parking income arising from the tariff changes proposed in this report are to be used in developing parking initiatives, which will be the subject of further reports.

8 **Legal implications**

- 8.1 Section 122 of the Road Traffic Regulation Act 1984 (“the Act”) imposes a general duty on the Council to exercise its function under the act to “secure the expeditious, convenient and safe movement of vehicular and other traffic (including pedestrians) and the provision of suitable and adequate parking facilities on and off the highway”. Collectively, these criteria may be referred to as “traffic management purposes”.
- 8.2 Section 45 of the Act gives the Local Authority a power (a discretion) to designate parking places on a highway; to charge for the use of them and to issue parking permits for a charge.
- 8.3 Section 55 of the Act requires that the Local Authority keep an account of their income and expenditure in respect of designated parking places. This includes ‘pay and display’ income. The ring-fenced account is referred to as the Specialist Parking Account. Section 55(4) of the Act sets out the purposes for which any surplus income in respect of designated parking places can be used. These purposes include:
- Provision and maintenance of off street parking
 - Meeting costs incurred in the provision or operation of public transport

- Highway and road improvements and maintenance
- Reducing environmental pollution
- Improvement and maintenance of public open space
- Provision of outdoor recreational facilities open to the public without charge

8.4

All of these functions are carried out by the Council's Place Portfolio, which includes Transport, Traffic and Parking Services and the Highways Maintenance Divisions. Any surplus in income in respect of designated parking places is currently utilised in accordance with Section 55(4) of the Act to underpin the activities of these two service areas

9 **Alternative options considered**

9.1 The Council could maintain its current tariffs. This would not address the excess demand parking issues outlined in this report.

9.2 The Council could make higher and more widespread increases in tariffs, but, with the information available, these are not thought to be appropriate.

10 **Reasons for recommendations**

10.1 It is anticipated that the proposed tariff changes set out in this report will help by better managing parking demand in areas and at times when demand is regularly and demonstrably outstripping supply.

10.2 It is therefore recommended that:

- The hourly tariff within the Non-City Centre Parking Zone be increased to 70p per hour, with a maximum daily charge of £4.50 where time limits allow;
- In the Highfield Controlled Parking Zone only, tariffs be reduced to a maximum of £2.80 for the full charging period of 8am to 6.30pm in the current 10 hour maximum stay bays and that the 10 hour maximum stay restriction be removed in these bays;
- The free parking period available to motorists in the Non-City Centre Parking Zone be extended to 20 minutes;
- These tariff changes above be implemented as soon as practicable and these revised pay and display tariffs be kept in place until any future amendment be agreed;
- Any increased surplus parking income which may arise from the tariff changes proposed in this report are to be used in developing

proposed parking initiatives which will be the subject of further reports; and

- No changes to the city centre tariffs or parks car parks tariffs are made

This page is intentionally left blank

Parking Developments Report – Appendix A

1. Parking Research

There have been numerous pieces of parking research carried out over the years. The most relevant research to the issues raised in this report are described below.

1.1 Management of Parking Occupancy / Demand

It is generally accepted that a parking occupancy rate of between 60 and 80% is optimal. This means that although the area is busy, a driver seeking a space will not need to look far before finding one.

An International Parking Institute Study estimated that 30% of drivers in congested urban centres were in fact looking for parking::

It is estimated that about 30 percent of the cars circling a city at any given time are doing so as drivers look for parking. Aside from the frustration factor, those cars are creating traffic congestion, viewed by survey respondents as being the single most significant societal change affecting the parking industry. From an environmental standpoint, that translates to incalculable amounts of wasted fuel and carbon emissions.”(International Parking Institute (IPI) 2012 Emerging Trends in Parking Study).

Other studies have estimated the figure as being somewhat lower, but it is clear that drivers seeking parking spaces are a significant factor in traffic congestion in cities.

Managing the supply of parking (via the number of spaces available or placing time limits on stay lengths) and charging for parking are well-established methods of managing demand for parking. These methods are used by most local authorities who charge for parking.

The availability of parking appears to be an increasing concern for motorists. The RAC produce an annual report on Motoring and the latest 2016 report notes:

There has been a sharp increase in concern about the availability of parking this year: 14% of motorists say this is a top-four concern as opposed to just 8% in 2015.

1.2 Effects of Price of Parking on Travel Behaviour

The Department for Transport commissioned Transport Research Laboratory (TRL) to carry out a review of all available parking research, which concluded:

“Much research has demonstrated the importance of parking costs to travel choices although the extent of the impact may vary. A combination of parking charges and reducing or restricting parking availability is likely to be most effective in encouraging behavioural change.” (Parking Measures and Research Review, TRL, 2010)

1.3 Parking and Placemaking

Effects on Business

A parking research review, commissioned by the London Councils and carried out by The Means, a placemaking consultancy, which studied all relevant research carried out on parking, concluded that a well-structured and managed parking system with appropriate charges could be beneficial to businesses:

“The limited research into the impacts of parking on the local economy suggest that there are no adverse impacts of a well-managed parking scheme on the local economy (COST Action 342 2005). Research carried out in The Netherlands even suggests that a well-structured parking system, could even be beneficial to town centres. If set appropriately, parking charges results in a higher turnover of visitors and therefore potentially higher retail turnover.”

The Means concluded that Parking was not the most influential factor for motorists in deciding whether to visit a shopping destination:

Parking is often perceived as important to town centre business in attracting customers. The Means own survey data demonstrates this as does the RAC Foundation and British Retail Consortium Report from 2006. However, the evidence from studies focusing on shopper surveys suggests that other factors may be much more influential in the choice of shopping location. Some of the most frequently quoted are the mix of retail and environmental improvements or creating a pleasant atmosphere in which to shop.

Here there is also an irony: congestion is one of the factors that are often cited as making a urban centre location unattractive, yet retailers still perceive parking as being one of the main reasons for lack of footfall. Well managed parking that reduces the need for searching could be one way to improve the attractiveness of town centre. At the same time, reducing congestion makes it easier for those on foot to access town centres. (The Relevance of Parking in the Success of Urban Centres, The Means, 2012)

This supports that keeping parking occupancy to a level of 60-80% is beneficial, as it reduces congestion by ensuring drivers do not need to circulate seeking a parking space, reducing levels of congestion.

1.4 Effects of Travel Mode on Business

The available evidence from studies carried out is that drivers are not the highest spending visitors. The review of parking research by The Means concluded:

The evidence from all the available studies into how people travel to town centres is that the share of those that come by public transport, walking or cycling is greater than that of those that come by car. There are some variations in this. Town centres with poorer public transport links will see higher levels of car use. Smaller urban centres within cities are likely to see higher levels of walking and cycling.

However in all the studies that looked at shoppers' mode of travel, shopkeepers have consistently overestimated the proportion of their customers who come by car. In some cases this overestimation approaches 100 per cent compared to the actual figure. In the case of Camberwell, in 2008, shopkeepers overestimated the share of shoppers coming by car by a factor of over 400 per cent

The analysis from the Camberwell study, from the Transport for London Town Centre Survey and of the shopping centre data by the ROI Team shows that those who don't come by car are responsible for a larger average spend. Whereas car drivers may spend more in a single trip, those that come by bus spend more per week and per month. The biggest spenders in London are those that walk. (The Relevance of Parking in the Success of Urban Centres, The Means, 2012)

One of the published studies on how people travel to town centres was carried out in Bristol by Sustrans. This study was replicated in Barnsley by Barnsley Council around five years ago and their findings mirrored the ones from Bristol, that business owners vastly overestimated the number of customers who travel to them by car. The Barnsley study was not published but was carried out by a Sheffield Hallam University postgraduate student.

2. Travel Cost and Vehicle Usage Trends

2.1 Costs of Travel

The Office for National Statistics concluded that in the period from 1980 to 2014, the general cost of motoring fell by 14%, whilst the cost of bus travel rose by 58% and rail travel costs increased by 63%. Reduced overall motoring costs, combined with an improving national economy, tends to result in car traffic levels increasing.

2.2 Vehicle Usage Trends

Department for Transport figures show that motor vehicle usage in Sheffield increased from 2,169 million vehicle kilometres in 2013 to 2,224 million in 2015 (last available figures). At the same time, although some public transport fares in Sheffield have risen (mainly single trip and day tickets), the Council has worked in partnership with bus operators via the Sheffield Bus Agreement, which has resulted in significant decreases in multi-operator ticket costs, for example a weekly multi-operator ticket was £22.70 and is now £14.

The net result of motoring costs reducing over time is that car trips become relatively cheaper and drivers are therefore less likely to choose more sustainable modes of travel for at least some of their trips.

3. Parking Demand in The Peripheral Parking Zone

3.1 Occupancy Survey Results

Results of survey of Western Sector of PPZ carried out in 2016 shown in the table below. Results show many streets with occupancies higher than 80%, with some reaching 100%.

Full or Over-Occupied Streets in Western Sector of Peripheral Parking Zone (≥ 80%) (pay & display / shared bays only – June 2016)

Street	Observed occupancy rate of P&D bays Average of four samples Weekdays 10am – Noon 1 – 3 pm	
Gloucester Street	213%	OVER-OCCUPIED
Northumberland Road	139%	OVER-OCCUPIED
Hanover Square	130%	OVER-OCCUPIED
Mushroom Lane	106%	OVER-OCCUPIED
Wellesley Road	103%	OVER-OCCUPIED
Broomfield Road	100%	OVER-OCCUPIED
Severn Road	96%	OVER-OCCUPIED
Shearwood Road	95%	OVER-OCCUPIED
Beech Hill Road	89%	FULL
Damer Street	89%	FULL
Peel Street	85%	FULL
Broomhall Road	85%	FULL
Park Lane	85%	FULL
Wharnccliffe Road	80%	FULL

Notes

Totals in excess of 100% arise due to a) vehicles being parked outside of parking places and b) some vehicles being parked closer together than nominal 6m length of parking space.

≥ 80% is considered full, ≥ 90% is considered over-occupied, as at these occupancies, as lack of spare kerbside, and loss of kerbside due to inefficient parking behaviour (which might mean free kerbside is not distributed so as to be usable), means drivers are considered likely to have to circulate to find a space. Such circulating is inconvenient for drivers (due to time lost), and it not in the interest of the city (representing unnecessary additional vehicle mileage with attendant increases in danger of collision, vehicle emissions, nuisance to other road users etc.)

APPENDIX B

SCHEDULE OF PROPOSED TARIFF CHANGES

PROPOSED CHANGES TO OFF-STREET PARKING TARIFF IN NON-CITY CENTRE PARKING ZONE

Car Park	Duration of Stay	Existing (p)	Proposed (p)	Car Parks
Broomspring Lane	UP TO 1 hour	50	70	Parkers Lane Spooner Road Alderson Road Stewart Road
	UP TO 2 hours	100	140	
	UP TO 3 hours	150	210	-
	UP TO 4 hours	200	280	-

PROPOSED CHANGES TO ON-STREET PARKING TARIFF IN NON-CITY CENTRE PARKING ZONE

Duration of Stay	Existing (p)	Proposed (p)
Up to 1 hour	50	70
Up to 2 hours	100	140
Up to 3 hours	150	210
Up to 4 hours	200	280
Up to 10 hours	400	450

PROPOSED CHANGES TO ON-STREET PARKING TARIFF - HIGHFIELDS AREA ONLY

Duration of Stay	Existing (p)	Proposed (p)
Up to 1 hour	50	70
Up to 2 hours	100	140
Up to 3 hours	150	210
Over 3 hours	-	280

This page is intentionally left blank



Report to Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee Wednesday 12th July 2017

Report of: Policy and Improvement Officer

Subject: Draft Work Programme 2017/18: Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee

Author of Report: Alice Nicholson, Policy and Improvement Officer
alice.nicholson@sheffield.gov.uk
 0114 273 5065

At the start of the municipal year each scrutiny and policy development committee determine and agree a work programme.

A draft work programme 2017/18 for this Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee is attached at appendix 1 for the Committee's consideration and discussion. Appendix 2 provides a log of the issues looked at in 2014/16, 2015/16 and 2017/18. Appendix 3 is Sheffield selecting scrutiny topic tool.

Type of item: The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	
Other	X

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

- Consider and discuss the committee's work programme for 2017/18
- Identify, prioritise and agree topics for inclusion in the work programme

Background Papers:

[Sheffield Council Constitution](#)

Category of Report: OPEN

Draft Work Programme 2017/18: Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee Wednesday 12th July

1.0 Determining the work programme

- 1.1 A draft work programme 2017/18 at Appendix 1 includes provisionally scheduled agenda items against meeting dates as well as a list of possible policy items to be agreed, added to, prioritised and scheduled.
- 1.2 The work programme remains a live document throughout the year to be shared and discussed at each meeting of the Committee.
- 1.3 For information a log of topics considered by the Committee in previous years is attached at Appendix 2.
- 1.4 The Committee should prioritise which issues will be included on formal meeting agendas, whether as a single agenda item, in depth approach, or for information/briefing only.
- 1.5 The Committee may wish to reflect on the principles attached at Appendix 3 and referred to in section 3 below to ensure that scrutiny activity is focussed where it can add most value. Section 2 below gives a legislative context to Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee.

2.0 Resources for scrutiny

- 2.1 We have set up a [scrutiny intranet page](#) which contains some useful documents and links, including the following documents:
 - **Selecting topics** - PAPER criteria - **P**ublic Interest, **A**bility to Change, **P**erformance, **E**xtent, **R**eplication - our tool for selecting the most appropriate topics for scrutiny (Appendix 3)
 - **Approaches to scrutiny** – an overview of the four broad ways in which a committee can choose to scrutinise topics
 - **Developing KLOEs** –questions to ask when developing Key Lines of Enquiry (KLOEs)
 - **Questioning styles** - a Centre for Public Scrutiny (CfPS) guidance document

3.0 Recommendations

- 3.1 The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:
 - Consider and discuss the committee's work programme for 2017/18
 - Identify, prioritise and agree topics for inclusion in the work programme

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

Draft Work Programme 2017/18

Last updated: 03 July 2017

Please note: the work programme is a live document and so is subject to change.

Topic	Reasons for selecting topic	Key Contact	Scrutiny Style
Wednesday 12th July 2-5 pm			
Non-City Centre Parking Developments (Call-In)	Call-In of Individual Cabinet Member Decision on 30.05.2017 - Call-In Lead Signatory: Cllr Ian Auckland	Jack Scott, Cabinet Member Transport and Infrastructure; Paul Fell, Transport, Traffic & Parking Services Manager, Place (Report Author)	Single agenda item
Draft Work Programme 2017/18	Committee to agree work programme 2017/18 – within framework of selecting scrutiny topics & remit	Policy & Improvement Officer	Standard Agenda Item

TBC July - Special			
Western Road First World War Memorial Cross Party Scrutiny Task and Finish Working Group	Western Road First World War Memorial Cross Party Task and Finish Working Group draft report of recommendations to be agreed by the full Scrutiny Committee	Chair task and finish working group	Single agenda item
Wednesday 13th September 2-5pm			
Retaining World Snooker Championships in Sheffield	To receive an update on the retention of the World Snooker Championships	Mick Crofts - Director of Business Strategy and Regulation, Place	Agenda Item
Sheffield Retail Quarter – key decisions and announcements – update	Update on key decisions and announcements	Lead Cabinet member, Lead officer - Nalin Seneviratne	Agenda Item
China Economic and Civic Programme Update	To receive an update on this following Call-in of Cabinet Decision - December 2016	Lead Cabinet Member; Lead Officer - Edward Highfield	Agenda Item
Work Programme 2017/18	To consider and discuss the committees work programme for 2017/18	Alice Nicholson - Policy & Improvement Officer	Standard Agenda Item
Wednesday 29th November - time TBC			
Work Programme 2017/18	To consider and discuss the committees work programme for 2017/18	Report of Alice Nicholson - Policy & Improvement Officer	Standard Agenda Item

Wednesday 31st January – time TBC			
Work Programme 2017/18	To consider and discuss the committees work programme for 2017/18	Report of Alice Nicholson - Policy & Improvement Officer	Standard Agenda Item
Wednesday 14th March - time TBC			
Scrutiny Annual Report 2017-18 Draft Content & Work Programme 2018-19	This report provides the Committee with a summary of its activities over the municipal year for inclusion in the Scrutiny Annual Report 2017-18. It also includes a list of topics which it is recommended be put forward for consideration as part of the 2018-19 Work Programme for this committee.	Report of Alice Nicholson - Policy & Improvement Officer	Annual Agenda Item
Task Group			
<i>Western Road First World War Memorial task and finish cross party working group (committee group) - to complete this task group</i>	<i>In response to Council on 4th January referring a petition to a cross party working group of Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee – Report of working group to full Committee</i>		
Dependent on resources and need			

Future items to be agreed, added to, prioritised and scheduled - scope to be determined			
Growing Sustainably: A bold plan for a Sustainable Sheffield	Making it happen, a look at Programme/action plan for this Sheffield sustainability strategy - response to report of Sheffield Green Commission - <i>November</i>	Mark Whitworth - Head of Strategic Housing and Regeneration	
Economic Landscape - continuing the investigation	Continuing the task group topic item 2016/17 - Multi approach of business needs, city's economic role in SCR - <i>November/January</i>	External calls for evidence, potential development companies; Sheffield City Region	
Bus Services Act 2017	An in depth follow up o the Bus Services Bill item 2016/17, and how Combined Authority can make best use of the powers	SYPTe, SCR CA, Sheffield Bus Partnership	
Planning Applications - ward members	Possible briefing picking up this and other matters from 26.04.2017 - Economic Landscape item	Chief Planning Officer, Sheffield City Council	
De culverting work in the city as flooding prevention e.g. Porter Brook and Sheaf	Identified by member of the Committee – a look at what has been done, success of work and forward look as a future model for preventing flooding elsewhere in the city.	TBC	
Small business	Identified by member of the Committee - What is the offer in Sheffield? For example for business, small & medium, in the Maclaren supply chain	TBC – to include Federation of Small Businesses; Sheffield City Council; Sheffield City Region	

Economic & Environmental Wellbeing		
Log of Topics	Year	Month
Streets Ahead Action Plan on Street Lighting	2014/15	July
Cabinet Member Response to the Committee's Cycling Inquiry	2014/15	July
Draft Work Programme 2014/15	2014/15	July
Call-in of Highway Cabinet Member Decision Session on Parking Permit Prices	2014/15	August
Call-in of Individual Cabinet Member Decision on the Statement of Community Involvement	2014/15	August
Waste Strategy 2009-2020 - Update	2014/15	September
The Future Role of the City Centre	2014/15	October
Sheffield's Library Services - Update	2014/15	December
Waste Strategy - Update	2014/15	December
Air Quality in Sheffield	2014/15	February
How Sheffield Presents Itself	2014/15	April
Task Group Report on Private Sector House Building	2014/15	April
Call-in of the Cabinet Decision on The Graves Park Charitable Trust - Cobnar Cottage	2014/15	June
Leader's Decision on the Proposed Disposal of Walkley Library	2015/16	July
Waste Management - Assisted Collection Policy Review	2015/16	September
Streets Ahead Project - Winter Review	2015/16	September
Private Sector Housebuilding - report back from Cabinet Member & officers	2015/16	November
Broadband and Economic Development	2015/16	December
Sheffield Money - written briefing	2015/16	December
Future Role of City Centre - follow up	2015/16	February
Bus Services in Sheffield - petitions	2015/16	March
Sheffield Bus Partnership (SBP) review	2016/17	July
Bus Services Bill – briefing	2016/17	October
Business Rates	2016/17	October
Inclusive Growth	2016/17	October
Protecting Sheffield from flooding	2016/17	November
Economic Landscape Task Group draft scope	2016/17	November
Call In of Cabinet Decision: China Economic and Civic Programme Update - special	2016/17	December
Implications for Sheffield of the vote to leave the European Union (commonly referred to as Brexit)	2016/17	January
Western Road First World War Memorial Trees - task and finish cross party working group (committee group)	2016/17	January
Waste Services Review: Consideration of Delivery Solutions for Waste Services - Call In of Cabinet Decision 18th January 2017	2016/17	February
Economic Landscape - evidence session 1	2016/17	February
Economic Landscape - evidence session 2	2016/17	April
Sheffield Retail Quarter – update briefing for information	2016/17	April
Western Road First World War Memorial Trees - task and finish cross party working group report and recommendations - special	2016/17	May

Sheffield Council Scrutiny Selecting Scrutiny topics

This tool is designed to assist the Scrutiny Committees focus on the topics most appropriate for their scrutiny.

- **P**ublic Interest
The concerns of local people should influence the issues chosen for scrutiny;
- **A**bility to Change / Impact
Priority should be given to issues that the Committee can realistically have an impact on, and that will influence decision makers;
- **P**erformance
Priority should be given to the areas in which the Council, and other organisations (public or private) are not performing well;
- **E**xtent
Priority should be given to issues that are relevant to all or large parts of the city (geographical or communities of interest);
- **R**eplication / other approaches
Work programmes must take account of what else is happening (or has happened) in the areas being considered to avoid duplication or wasted effort. Alternatively, could another body, agency, or approach (e.g. briefing paper) more appropriately deal with the topic

Other influencing factors

- **Cross-party** - There is the potential to reach cross-party agreement on a report and recommendations.
- **Resources**. Members with the Policy & Improvement Officer can complete the work needed in a reasonable time to achieve the required outcome