

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Thursday 4 November 2021 at 1.00 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), Joe Otten (Deputy Chair), Angela Argenzio, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Dawn Dale, Mark Jones, Mike Levery, Bryan Lodge, Zahira Naz, Martin Phipps and Mick Rooney

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 Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee comprises the Chairs and Deputy Chairs of the four Scrutiny Committees. Councillor Denise Fox Chairs this Committee.

- Remit of the Committee
- Effective use of internal and external resources
- Performance against Corporate Plan Priorities
- Risk management
- Budget monitoring
- Strategic management and development of the scrutiny programme and process
- Identifying and co-ordinating cross scrutiny issues

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. 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 Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer on 0114 27 35065 or [email deborah.glen@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:deborah.glen@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.

**OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA
4 NOVEMBER 2021**

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 5 - 8)
Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting
- 5. Minutes of Previous Meeting** (Pages 9 - 22)
To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 16th September, 2021
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**
To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public
- 7. Clean Air Plan** (Pages 23 - 44)
Report of the Executive Director, Place
- 8. Draft Work Programme 2021/22** (Pages 45 - 50)
Report of the Policy and Improvement Officer
- 9. Date of Next Meeting**
The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Thursday, 2nd December, 2021, at 1.00 pm

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

Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Meeting held 16 September 2021

PRESENT: Councillors Denise Fox (Chair), Joe Otten (Deputy Chair), Angela Argenzio, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Dawn Dale, Mark Jones, Bryan Lodge, Martin Phipps, Mick Rooney, Dianne Hurst (Substitute Member) and Richard Shaw (Substitute Member)

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mike Levery, with Councillor Richard Shaw attending as his substitute, and Councillor Zahira Naz, with Councillor Dianne Hurst attending as her substitute.

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 PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 29th July 2021, were approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

5.1 The Policy and Improvement Officer (Deborah Glen) read out the following questions from members of the public who were not in attendance at the meeting, and which related to the changes on Pinstone Street:-

(a) Liz Allen

“I am very concerned about any plan to restore motor traffic to this route. Whilst the temporary measures, particularly at the Leopold Street end, are visually unappealing and have created access issues, the solution to this is to replace these measures as quickly as possible with the City Centre Transforming Cities Fund (TCF) scheme which will deliver benefits for people walking and cycling, along with public transport users, and delivering much needed public realm improvements. The consultation for this was completed in January and the majority of responses were positive.

I do not believe this scheme can be delivered if motor traffic is restored along this route, and that therefore this significant funding will be lost. If

this is the case, I would be worried about the impact on the viability of other TCF schemes (as well as some of the Active Travel Fund schemes) which all link into the city scheme. It is important to note that the TCF schemes are not just aimed at 'cyclists' but deliver vital improvements for walking and public transport, which are badly needed in Sheffield to give people viable alternatives to making their journeys by car. I would also be concerned about the impact of this decision on future Department for Transport funding for all transport schemes in Sheffield (not just 'active travel' schemes)"

Please could you respond to these comments from Cycle Sheffield?

The Chair requested that a written response be sent to Ms Allen.

(b) Emily Griffiths

In examining best use of the public realm in a city that has declared a climate emergency, and where efficiency can be measured in terms of space taken up, energy expended, or how many people are using it, how efficient is the transport mix of Pinstone Street now, and how efficient was it with two-way motor traffic?

The Chair requested that a written response be sent to Ms Griffiths.

(c) Chris Sterry

With regards to the works being done in Sheffield, especially around the Town Hall, I understand that a number of parking bays are to be lost, including Blue Badge bays, which is a concern as not all persons are able to use public transport, and for some, taxis are not ideal. This is expressly so for wheelchairs, due to the insufficiency of wheelchair bays on some buses, and with regards to taxis for wheelchairs to be securely clamped within the vehicles. For a secure clamping, the wheelchairs need to be either facing forward or rear facing, otherwise they are unstable. So actions need to be taken to provide more secure facilities for wheelchair travel.

This brings me to blue Badge bays, which again, many in Sheffield are not suitable for wheelchair embarking, and as in many bays, there is insufficient space for vehicles to be able to park in a blue badge bay to enable wheelchairs to be loaded or unloaded. Also, in many if not all bays, there are not any safe areas around the bays to enable safe access to load or unload as there are in Blue Badge bays in car parks. So more spaces need to be available around all Blue Badge bays, and certainly more bays for wheelchair accessible access vehicles.

The Chair requested that a written response be sent to Mr Sterry.

(d) Robin Garner

How does the Council reconcile the possible return of motor vehicles to the City Centre in light of their recently declared climate emergency?

The Chair requested that a written response be sent to Mr Garner.

5.2 The Committee received questions relating to the changes on Pinstone Street where members of the public attended in the meeting, as follows:-

(a) Peter Sephton (Chair, Sheffield City Centre Action Group)

Can we be told whether the Council has asked for the views of Dame Sarah Storey over this proposal and if 'Yes', what are these views? In her position as the Active Travel Commissioner for the Sheffield City Region and a person with disability who has won a record 17 Paralympic gold medals, we might presume that she feels the same way as the City Centre residents, who realise that the future of our centre lies in a traffic free environment where people of all abilities and disabilities can move about without fear of dying prematurely from traffic fumes or being flattened by a ten ton bus.

If the Council votes to put traffic back into Pinstone Street it will be killing not just its residents, but the whole future of its expensive and potentially exciting new building project that aims to revitalise our struggling town centre. In 2019 the Council took the brave step to pedestrianise the centre. Let's know whether our Active Travel Commissioner supports a policy that will return us to the polluted 1980's?

Having managed city public transport all my working life I can see what the problem is here. The new route layout needs a massive public information campaign and some decent infrastructure to shelter people from the rain and inform users where the services start and stop. However, if public transport access is an issue, it's a temporary one because you haven't created the facilities or publicity to help its users. All under the Council's and the Passenger Transport Executive's control. Get these sorted and the problem is solved. But please don't ruin the City Centre because you can't fix the present or visualise the future.

In response, Councillor Douglas Johnson (Executive Member for Climate Change Environment and Transport) stated that that Dame Sarah Storey had been involved in advising the Sheffield City Region (SCR) on active travel issues, specifically those issues faced by people with disabilities. The main problem facing the city in terms of active travel was the current lack of infrastructure. In terms of the promotion of public transport, the proposals in the report represented a step-change and 'wrap around' approach to public transport, with the proposed new schemes including new bus stops, real-time information, audio-visual aids, seats and lighting in bus stops and coherence in terms of the sighting of bus stops. In addition to this, the Council was working with the bus operators in

connection with efforts to attract more people to travel on buses.

Matthew Reynolds (Transport Planning and Infrastructure Manager) added that the proposals outlined by Councillor Johnson were all included in the business case, which had been submitted to the SCR, and that the proposals fed into the wider Bus Services Improvement Plan, and how the Council could provide the step-change with regard to public transport priority within the City Centre.

(b) James Martin (Acting Chair, Transport 4 All)

Over the Christmas and New Year period of 2020, several groups of disabled people got together (virtually!) to produce a joint response to the proposed changes in the City Centre for Connecting Sheffield. I believe this response is pertinent to your discussion today, giving some depth to the issues both of permanently losing buses on Pinstone Street and the gains of levelling cambered pavements which excessively tip towards the road, and rectifying the loss of blue badge parking, etc. Gains which are only possible when replacing all pavements on the affected corridor, and hopefully on some side streets as well.

As I understand it, removing the active travel aspect of the City Centre scheme would mean handing millions of pounds back to Central Government because it would not be possible to develop another scheme in time with active travel at its core. I want to make it clear that there are wins and losses for disabled people whether abandoning or keeping the City Centre Connecting Sheffield plans.

The response highlights the essential nature of getting a City Centre circular bus route if closing Pinstone Street. It needs to serve the Barkers Pool/City Hall area and connecting with key transport stops in the Castle Gate, trams and the Moor, and of course the railway station if we are to be attractive to visitors. The City Hall and Town Hall are the most cut off areas of the city due to the Pinstone Street closure and it is a pre-requisite for the success of any City Centre change for disabled people and those with mobility issues that some bus access is provided even if this means changing to another bus.

Can the Committee assure the Access Liaison Group and Transport 4 All groups that elected members will take care with this response to understand it and show their engagement with the wins and losses of the different options ahead of us? Aspiration is important for our city, and we need to ensure that the aspirations of disabled people are delivered on irrespective of today's decision to ensure that losses in blue badge parking are reversed and fixing issues with pavement surfaces are resolved whatever the outcome of the Committee's decision today. I hope the Committee is equally supportive of this?

The following is a quote from Disability Sheffield's response to the City Centre proposals:

“There are positives to the scheme, but some significant difficulties remain that could leave people with certain disabilities unable to access parts of the City Centre and these need resolving for the scheme to be positive for all disabled people. It is important to note that positive impacts for one group of disabled people are not a mitigation for people with a different disability and setting the needs of different people against one another is unhelpful. Therefore, this response should not be treated as an endorsement of the scheme by the groups concerned. There are some key problems which need resolving to ensure that equal access for all is maintained.”

Please could you respond to this?

In response, Councillor Douglas Johnson stated that Council officers had been liaising with various groups and organisations on the proposals, including the Access Liaison Group, which had enabled them to get into the detail of the schemes, and find out from people with disabilities exactly how inaccessible the city centre was for them. Councillor Johnson stressed the importance of listening to the views of different people, having a wide range of disabilities. It was accepted that there were a number of barriers in the city centre which created problems of access for people with disabilities, and the current proposals, together with the changing nature of the city centre, would provide the Council with an excellent opportunity to transform the area to make it more accessible for disabled people, and more attractive for everyone. There was a bid for funding for bid for low emission buses, and a free electric bus could form part of that bid.

Tom Finnegan-Smith (Head of Strategic Transport and Infrastructure) reported on the current position regarding Shopmobility, indicating that the Council was currently in discussion with Sheffield Business Improvement District (BID) in terms of the possibility of a new offer, based broadly on the previous scheme. Such discussions had been very positive, and it was hoped that there would be more clarity in terms of a future scheme in the next few weeks.

(c) Martha Foulds (Access Liaison Group and Transport 4 All)

As a blind, white cane user, the changes to Pinstone Street have impacted my ability to travel safely. Tactile paving has not always been updated to reflect the new layout and natural routes for white cane users along the edge of the development lead us into the middle of the cycle path.

Whatever the Committee’s decision, can you assure blind Sheffielders that you will that prioritise our inclusion, access and equality?

In response, Councillor Douglas Johnson referred to his previous comments, indicating that, as part of the proposals, the Council would have to work with all disability groups in order to identify all the different needs. He highlighted the opportunities for the Council if the proposed schemes

were approved, to transform the city centre, and make it more accessible for people with disabilities.

(d) Jenny Carpenter (Sheffield Climate Alliance)

"Given the urgent need to reduce the city's carbon emissions and air pollution, is it not possible to maintain the Pinstone Street priority measures for walking and cycling while at the same time providing a small electric bus service to enable and encourage elderly and less mobile people to access the City Centre more readily by public transport?"

The Chair stated that a response to this issue had been provided already.

(e) Andrew Rodgers (Cycle Sheffield/Streets for People)

"Considering the decision of Central Government to withdraw funding and access to apply for future funding from Councils that have removed active travel infrastructure funded through national schemes, i.e. West Sussex, Liverpool and Brighton & Hove - what risk assessment have Council officers undertaken in relation to how reversion on Pinstone Street will impact the likelihood of funding for schemes that have been consulted on, including those at Tinsley, Crookes, Nether Edge and the Sheaf Valley, and how much liaison has been had with their counterparts in the Department for Transport about this issue?"

In response, Councillor Douglas Johnson reported that the Council had not carried out any risk assessments in connection with the proposed scheme on the basis that there had not been any decisions taken to remove any of the walking and cycling measures undertaken. There had been a number of decisions made over the last two years to proceed with a number of schemes, which all interlocked and overlapped, and would ultimately create a full network across the city. There was therefore no risk of the Council losing its funding.

(f) Stuart Bywater (City Centre Resident and Business Owner)

Have any of the Councillors in favour of reopening Pinstone Street to traffic any evidence that this move would have any advantages either economically, environmentally and indeed socially to the residents of the City of Sheffield?

The Chair requested that a written response be sent to Mr Bywater.

(g) Lee Thompson (Partnership Manager, Sustrans)

What are the benefits of re-introducing buses and cars to a pedestrianised area? Has any modelling been done?

Has any meaningful face to face engagement been conducted with residents, visitors, and local business in the area? pre and post?

In response, Councillor Douglas Johnson referred to the decisions taken over the last two years to use the Transforming Cities Funding and the Future High Streets Fund towards creating a network of accessible walking and cycling routes across the city. This represented the Council's current status and position. The Council declared a climate emergency in 2013, and was now trying to put this into practice.

(h) Thomas Atkin (Sheffield Carer Action Group/Resident)

The closure of Pinstone Street has, in my experience as a disabled person and a carer, become more accessible and is now a better place for people with sensory processing issues, such as ASD? Has the Council factored this into its discussions?

In response, Councillor Douglas Johnson stated that he accepted that the city centre has had poor accessibility for many years, particularly for people with disabilities. The Transforming Cities Fund had granted the Council an opportunity to make the area more accessible. In terms of noise-nuisance, the closure of Pinstone Street to traffic had created a quiet haven in the Peace Gardens, which had been a major benefit for people visiting the city centre. Councillor Johnson made reference to the future proposals for Pounds Park, which was to be developed as part of the Heart of the City scheme, using Transforming Cities Funding on the basis of the city centre scheme.

(i) June Luxon

I oppose the closing of Pinstone Street and Leopold Street because for anyone in a wheelchair, it is all uphill from Arundel Gate or Furnival Gate. I challenge all those who want the streets closed to push my husband in his wheelchair from either of these streets.

Councillor Douglas Johnson stated that there was an opportunity for a major transformation of the city centre, which would improve accessibility for all, and particularly for people with disabilities. He referred to data in the report that showed that one benefit of the scheme was that distances from more bus stops to the theatres were less than they were before.

6. PINSTONE STREET

6.1 The Committee received a report of the Interim Executive Director, Place, on the changes made to Pinstone Street in response to the Coronavirus pandemic, and the future plans for this area of the city centre.

6.2 In attendance for this item were Councillor Douglas Johnson (Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport), Councillor Ruth Mersereau (Executive Adviser, Climate Change, Environment and Transport), Mick Crofts (Interim Executive Director, Place), Tom Finnegan-Smith (Head of Strategic Transport and Infrastructure) and Matt Reynolds (Transport Planning and Infrastructure Manager).

6.3 The report made reference to the changes made to the highway in the core city centre area, in response to the Coronavirus pandemic, in order to create more circulation space, which included the closure of Leopold Street and Pinstone Street to motor traffic, except for emergency vehicles and permitted access. The report contained statistical information in terms of bus stop accessibility and city centre footfall, in comparison with other Core Cities and city centre bus journey times. The report also contained details of proposed Grey to Green landscaping works to be introduced in the city centre, a map showing proposed Connecting Sheffield steps on Pinstone Street and Arundel Gate, bus access and details of how the proposals aligned with the other city centre programmes. Appended to the report was an Equality Impact Assessment.

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

- The main aim of the various schemes was to improve access to, and through, the city centre and to improve the quality of the environment. It was accepted that access to the city centre and its environment had been poor for a number of years, and it was hoped that the proposed schemes would help to significantly improve both these things. One particular aim was to make it attractive for people who are not cycling now.
- In terms of access to specific locations in the city centre, such as the Radisson Blu hotel, drop-off and loading bays were being considered as part of the scheme. Vehicle access for the Radisson Blu Hotel would be on Burgess Street. There were also proposals to address the issue of access and loading for businesses on Pinstone Street, which was likely to be similar to the current arrangements in operation on Fargate. Officers were working closely with colleagues working on the Heart of the City scheme and the Future High Streets Fund scheme to ensure that all the proposed improvements were integrated.
- The main issue with regard to the free electric shuttle bus operating in and around the city centre was one of routing. Officers were working with the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE), in connection with a bid to the Department for Transport for funding for low emission buses, and an electric bus could form part of this bid.
- Considerable work was being undertaken in connection with the future of the John Lewis store and car park but, at the present time, there were no immediate plans for the re-opening of the car park. Any proposals regarding the car park would not fall within the scope of the Connecting Sheffield scheme
- The core change to Pinstone Street would be the same as it is now, as it would be in the Connecting Sheffield project. Wider changes were planned on Arundel Gate and Furnival Gate, and continuing changes on Rockingham Street. On Pinstone Street, the core traffic management arrangements would remain the same. There would be a north-bound bus gate on Arundel

Gate, which would allow access up to the Novotel, and a further bus gate proposed on Furnival Gate, just in advance of Matilda Way.

- There were always going to be some people who benefited from the proposed changes, in terms of access to and through the city centre, and those who would find access more difficult.
- Sheffield had performed better than most Core Cities in terms of the recovery in footfall in the city centre following the Coronavirus pandemic.
- Consultation on the proposed schemes had been undertaken in December 2020 and, as part of the development of the Connecting Sheffield programme, officers were very conscious of the effect of the pandemic on people's lives. A number of shops and businesses in the city centre were re-opening at the time of the consultation, and a large part of the consultation was held online. Information leaflets had been distributed to residents and businesses in the city centre area. A series of online engagement events had also been held with interested groups and organisations. The response to the consultation had been fairly significant, with comments having been received from a wide range of individuals, groups and organisations. There may be further consultation on the details of the proposed schemes.
- Whilst the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) attached to the report now submitted related mainly to the plans on Pinstone Street and the wider social distancing measures, there was a specific EIA for the project, which had been updated and developed as the project had progressed.
- Sheffield had led the way in a number of exemplar projects, such as Grey to Green, and the plan was to use the ethos of such projects, and link it to the city centre proposals. Active Travel was clearly a key element of the process, and providing high quality, clear, coherent and consistent routes was vital to the project's success. The aim was to provide a clear, coherent route through the city centre, together with high levels of public transport priority, and closing Pinstone Street had helped to improve some bus journey times.
- The proposed schemes included green planting and sustainable urban drainage for flood management measures based on Grey to Green designs.
- With regard to Hostile Vehicle Mitigation, the need to protect space that high levels of people would be in was very important. The emergency measures were implemented to ensure there was sufficient external space for people, such as to allow for queuing outside banks. Other such measures included Tudor Square, where it was considered vital to have sufficient, outdoor space for people visiting the theatres, and which included permanent counter-terrorism measures.
- Details of the different levels and gradients in the city centre could be provided. As part of the accessibility work undertaken, officers had followed the inclusive mobility standards.

- Details of the number of Sheffield residents having a disability would be forwarded to Members.
- As part of the consultation process, whilst no-one had specifically been on those buses included as part of the 36 bus routes that had been changed, to seek the views of customers, people were asked whether they were public transport users or not. The consultation was shared with Transport User Groups, via the SYPTE and bus operators.
- Service requirements had been identified in the design of the projects. Service requirements regarding the Radisson Blu Hotel had been included in both the emergency works, and there was a servicing route for all businesses on Pinstone Street, shown on the plans included in the report now submitted.
- The Council had undertaken considerable work, which had included working with the bus operators, to improve bus emissions. The Council had also secured funding from the Government's Clean Bus Technology Fund to upgrade more of the city's bus fleet to Euro 6 standard, which represented a significant improvement.
- It was accepted that improvement in footfall in the city centre following the relaxation of Government restrictions was not solely due to the closure of Pinstone Street, but simply due to a trend which had been mirrored in other cities. However, the increase in footfall was not as high in those cities having higher levels of office accommodation due to staff not returning to their offices on a regular basis. This had also affected patronage levels on buses in such cities. Reference was made to a letter from Councillor Paul Turpin (Executive Member for Inclusive Economy, Jobs and Skills) to the Committee, highlighting the benefits of keeping Pinstone Street and Leopold Street closed to traffic.
- The South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service were statutory consultees regarding any proposed Traffic Regulation Order, and the Service had been consulted on the proposed plans. The Service would also be consulted on the more permanent plans.
- The creation of a coherent City Centre Plan was work in progress, and would involve a number of different elements, including the Heart of the City scheme, Transforming Cities Fund, Connecting Sheffield and Future High Streets Fund, as well as the Bus Service Improvement Plan. There were also a number of other related issues to consider, such as anti-social behaviour, green spaces and Grey to Green works.
- It was accepted that given all the different elements, and complexities involved in the various schemes, it was difficult to keep the public up to date, and involve them in the overall process. There was a draft plan which explained all the various different elements of change in the city centre, which would lead into a broader consultation with all interested parties,

including the public, on the longer-term plans and wider central area.

- All local authorities had received a letter from the Minister of State for Transport, in July 2021, regarding the active travel measures funded through the Government's Emergency Active Travel Fund, and also referring to broader transport funding issues. It made specific reference to the premature withdrawal of those schemes funded through the Active Travel Fund, warning that any premature withdrawal of schemes could affect future funding. There was an element of risk in terms of the current proposed schemes, in that there were time limits set for the completion of such works. The withdrawal of the scheme at Shalesmoor would not result in any financial risk to the Council as this decision had been made prior to the current Government guidance being announced in February 2022, which would not be retrospective.
- There were no demographic details relating to the footfall figures, although there was a link in the report now submitted to the Centre for Studies data, who were responsible for modelling across urban cities, and which may hold some data regarding demographics.
- Any potential impact of the current proposals across the city would be discussed with the Sheffield City Region, and possibly with the Department for Transport. This would include the Connecting Sheffield Programme, The Sheaf Valley Cycle Route and the Active Travel Fund 2 submission (Attercliffe to Darnall, East Bank Road and Abbey Lane/Crookesmoor crossings).
- There had been considerable improvements in terms of bus times and reliability due to the bus re-routing measures in the city centre. There was still a requirement for further discussion, at a regional level, regarding further improvements to the bus network.
- In terms of the service routes, it did not refer to all the areas highlighted on the orange routes on the plan in the report now submitted, but would also include Cross Burgess Street and Surrey Street, and this is where the servicing would be provided from. The loading bays would be used much in the same way as Fargate, with loading allowed between certain times. Should emergency access be required, this would be managed by the City Centre Management Team, by use of rising bollards and/or barriers. The zero emission bus funding that could support a free electric bus had gone through an expression of interest stage, and a full business case would be submitted to the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive.
- At the present time, there was no certainty as to the bus route to Pounds Park.
- As Pinstone Street was the most popular walking route through the city centre, this was the reason why it had been targeted for the social distancing measures.

- There could be more public promotion of the benefits of the schemes, including through visuals and artwork on hoardings and barriers.
- Pedestrianisation allowing cyclists was not deemed to be pure pedestrianisation, and allowing vehicles into a pedestrian space would have to be designed appropriately. The Government have been clear that local authorities should not be promoting schemes which allowed vehicles onto pedestrianised areas.
- It had been clear from discussions with the SYPTTE and bus operators that the operators had wanted to continue using Pinstone Street, but they also valued the potential economic benefits which could be derived from having a strong, thriving city centre. They supported the proposed bus gates, which they considered would help to provide improved journey times and reliability.
- The scheme developed does not accommodate buses travelling past the Town Hall, on Pinstone Street. However, if the scheme does not progress, and buses are reintroduced onto Pinstone Street, there would be a need to redesign the scheme, and consider all the implications of bus use, including the risks around funding.
- The Committee would be informed as to whether or not Public Health had been consulted on the proposals.
- Cycles had been formally recognised as mobility aids by the Council in 2019.

6.5 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, the information now reported and the responses to the questions raised;
- (b) thanks Councillor Douglas Johnson, Mick Crofts, Tom Finnegan-Smith and Matt Reynolds for attending the meeting and responding to the questions raised; and
- (c) requests that (i) the report be referred back to the Co-operative Executive, together with the issues now raised and highlighted by this Committee, specifically with regard to accessibility, inclusivity and travel routes through the city centre, and (ii) Councillor Douglas Johnson (Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport) and Councillor Cate McDonald (Executive Member for Finance and Resources) give consideration, as part of the budget process, to funding a free, electric bus, to run on a route to be agreed, through the city centre.

7. WORK PROGRAMME 2021/22

- 7.1 RESOLVED: That approval be given to the draft Work Programme for 2021/22, as contained in the Policy and Improvement Officer now submitted.

8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 8.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Thursday, 4th November 2021, at 1.00 pm, in the Town Hall.

This page is intentionally left blank

Report of: Michael Crofts, Executive Director of Place

Subject: Clean Air Plan

Author of Report: Tom Finnegan-Smith, Head of Strategic Transport,
Sustainability and Infrastructure

This attached report regarding the Clean Air Plan was submitted to the Co-operative Executive on the 26th October. It is being presented to Scrutiny Members for information.

The report provides updates on the development of the Sheffield and Rotherham Clean Air Plan (CAP) to tackle Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) exceedances and sets out the actions required to achieve compliance with our Direction by Government to reach legally compliant annual average levels of NO₂,

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

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	X
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	

The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:

- Consider and comment on the Clean Air Plan

Background Papers: Listed in attached report

Category of Report: OPEN

This page is intentionally left blank



Author/Lead Officer of Report: Tom Finnegan-Smith,
Head of Strategic Transport, Sustainability and
Infrastructure

Version: Final - V6.00

Email: Tom.Finnegan-smith@sheffield.gov.uk

Report of: *Michael Crofts, Executive Director of Place*

Report to: *Cooperative Executive*

Date of Decision: *26th October 2021*

Subject: *Clean Air Plan*

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 type="checkbox"/>	
Which Executive Member Portfolio does this relate to? <i>Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport</i>		
Which Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee does this relate to? <i>Overview and Scrutiny Committee</i>		
Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken?	Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No <input type="checkbox"/>
If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? (<i>REF: 803</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 updates on the development of the Sheffield and Rotherham Clean Air Plan (CAP) to tackle Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) exceedances and sets out the actions required to achieve compliance with our Direction by Government to reach legally compliant annual average levels of NO₂. In summary these are:

- Proceeding with the recommended CAP proposals which includes establishing a Category C charging Clean Air Zone (CAZ) within Sheffield City Centre with wider traffic management measures.
- Accepting the grant funding received from Government in March 2020
- Commencing public consultation in November 2021.
- Submission of the Full Business Case to Government early in 2022 including any revisions arising from the consultation
- Completing the procurement, and thereafter contract awards, for any necessary infrastructure, goods and services required, together with any other such steps, to implement and meet the aims and objectives of the Clean Air Plan.
- To report to the Executive on the consultation findings early in 2022.

Background

In common with other cities, air pollution is a major public health challenge that is damaging the health and life chances of people in Sheffield, contributing to the deaths of around 500 people a year in the city. Multiple places across our road network are in breach of legal limits for air quality with road vehicles (and particularly diesel vehicles), exposing communities to invisible but harmful concentrations of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂).

In 2017 Government placed Sheffield and Rotherham under a legal duty to improve the city's air quality by reducing NO₂ emissions below the legal limits in the shortest possible time.

In response, SCC and RMBC developed and submitted an Outline Business Case (OBC) to Government in December 2018, which identified the option to deliver compliance was a Category C+ Charging Clean Air Zone on and within the Inner Ring Road, along with a number of additional traffic management measures.

In February 2020 Government issued a further Ministerial Direction under which SCC are legally obliged to implement a CAZ C charging Clean Air Zone.

Having announced a review of our Clean Air Plan in September 2020, to consider the implications of Covid-19 and the lengthy period between the submission and Government's approval of the OBC, this is now complete.

The outcome of the review of the Clean Air Plan has confirmed that in order to achieve legally compliant levels of air quality in Sheffield we need to deliver a Class C Clean Air Zone along with wider traffic management measures. The review has also confirmed that the original proposals around the compliance standards for taxis can be amended to incorporate the current standards without major additional burdens on the majority of the existing taxi fleet .

The primary goal of the proposed Clean Air Zone is to encourage and support the removal of the most polluting vehicles from the city's roads in order to make our air cleaner and safer to breathe. It is not the intention to penalise drivers or companies and the report sets out the proposed financial support measures that will be offered to certain drivers to upgrade and replace non-compliant vehicles. In addition, the report includes details of specific fleet where circumstances determine that an exemption to charges is appropriate.

The CAP proposals are significant and form part of Sheffield's ambitions to deliver clean air for everyone and support the development of safe, reliable and clean transport options in the city.

Given the proposals to see the continued regeneration of the City Centre and the delivery of approximately 21,000 new homes in the central area, the importance of making our air cleaner and safer to breathe must be a pre-requisite to continued development. The proposals for the City Centre Vision will highlight this aspect further.

Whilst a major consultation on our CAP proposals was undertaken in Summer 2019, given the time that has elapsed and the development of the scheme, it is now proposed that consultation on the final Clean Air Plan proposals is undertaken. This will provide an opportunity for people to give feedback on the full details of the scheme, including financial support measures and exemptions, the detail of which was not previously available.

Alongside this, the Full Business Case will be developed in liaison with Government's Joint Air Quality Unit (JAQU), but only finalised once the outcome of the consultation is known and any final amendments to the scheme are made where necessary. In addition, arrangements to distribute funds to support those businesses, individuals and organisations who need to upgrade their vehicle to become compliant will be finalised and in line with existing delegated authority the delivery of the Clean Air Zone infrastructure will continue to be progressed.

Recommendations.

That the Cooperative Executive:

1. To approve acceptance of the grant funding of £23,967,436 awarded in March 2020 from the Department for Environment Food & Rural Affairs (DEFRA) and the Department for Transport to enable the Council to comply with its statutory duty through the measures described in this report.
2. Approves the launch of further consultation on the Clean Air Plan in November 2021 as detailed in this report.
3. Delegates authority to the Executive Director Place to enter into the contract for the successfully tendered infrastructure work required for the charging zone including supply, installation and maintenance of Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras
4. Delegates authority to the Executive Director Place in consultation with the Leader of the Council and the Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport to submit to Government a Full Business Case to deliver a Category C Charging Zone as outlined in this report.
5. Where no existing authority exists under the LSOD, delegate authority to the Executive Director, Place, in consultation with the Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport, and with the Director of Financial and Commercial Services to approve such procurements and thereafter contract awards for any necessary infrastructure, goods and services required together with any other such steps to implement and meet the aims and objectives of the Clean Air Plan.

Background Papers:

WHO global air quality guidelines, September 2021

<https://www.who.int/publications/i/item/9789240034228>

The invisible threat: how we can protect people from air pollution and create a fairer, healthier society; British Lung Foundation and Asthma UK, February 2021

https://cdn.shopify.com/s/files/1/0221/4446/files/Invisible_Threat_FINAL_compressed.pdf?v=1612948799&_ga=2.175216866.1719479710.1633475143-418606468.1624021878

Clean Air Zone Outline Business Case – Acceptance of Further Grant Funding: Leaders Decision, 29 March 2019

<https://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/mglIssueHistoryHome.aspx?lId=27888>

Air that is safe to breathe for all: Sheffield's Clean Air Zone Proposal, Cabinet report 21 November 2018,

<https://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/documents/s33102/Clean%20Air%20for%20Sheffield%20-%20Final.pdf>

Sheffield City Council (2017) Clean Air Strategy,

<https://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/documents/s29124/Clean%20Air%20Strategy%20Dec%20Cabinet%202.pdf>

Sheffield City Council (2018) Transport Strategy

<https://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/documents/s31437/Transport%20Strategy%202.pdf>

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 completed / EIA completed, where required.
	Finance: Ryan Keyworth
	Legal: Steve Eccleston and Henry Watmough-Cownie
	Equalities: Adele Robinson
<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: Kate Josephs, Chief Executive
3	Executive Member consulted: Cllr Douglas Johnson, Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport
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: (Insert name)
	Job Title: (Insert job title)
	Date: (Insert date)

1.0 PROPOSAL

- 1.1 Air quality in Sheffield has exceeded required legal levels since 2010. In Sheffield air pollution contributes to the early deaths of around 500 people every year and particularly affects the long-term health of young people and those with existing health conditions. The Sheffield Clean Air Strategy 2017 stated that addressing the effects air pollution is a public health emergency.
- 1.2 In September 2021 the World Health Organisation released new Global Air Quality Guidelines that provide clear evidence of the damage air pollution inflicts on human health, at even lower concentrations than previously understood. The guidelines recommend new air quality levels to protect the health of populations, by reducing level of key air pollutants, some of which contribute to climate change.

1.3 Current Legal Requirement and relevant background information

- 1.3.1 In 2017 Sheffield City Council (SCC) and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council (RMBC) were jointly Directed by Government to reach legally compliant annual average Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) levels by 2021. Specifically, this required us to take action to address Nitrogen Dioxide emissions from road transport.
- 1.3.2 In November 2018 Sheffield City Council (SCC) Cabinet approved the submission of an Outline Business Case (OBC) to Government, for a Clean Air Plan (CAP) which included a category C + charging Clean Air Zone (CAZ) in central Sheffield. The CAZ C + zone would charge non-complaint (older than Euro 6 Diesel and Euro 4 Petrol) HGVs, LGVs, buses, coaches, with the added '+' requirement that taxis needed to be Ultra Low Emission standard, along with wider traffic management measures, the majority of which were to be delivered at key air quality hotspots in Rotherham. It is now feasible to align the taxi fleet standard with that within the Governments [national CAZ Framework](#). Therefore, it is no longer necessary for taxis to be of Ultra Low Emission standard to achieve the aims of the CAP. Consequently, the proposals have been amended, with more detail on the reasoning contained further in this report.
- 1.3.3 Government finally approved the OBC in February 2020 and issued a Ministerial Direction¹ under which SCC are legally obliged to implement a CAZ C charging Clean Air Zone with additional measures, to achieve compliance in 2021 and to submit a Full Business Case (FBC).
- 1.3.4 The Direction and grant award decision (see below) pre-dated the 16th March (national lockdown) and were before the enactment of the Coronavirus Act 2020, meaning that the implications of pandemic management policies had not been considered in setting the submission dates.
- 1.3.5 In April 2020 Government's Joint Air Quality Unit announced that the introduction of Clean Air Zones would be delayed as a result of the pandemic and at that time it was expected that the introduction of Clean Air Zones would be no earlier than January 2021. We have continued to liaise closely with Government and the Joint Air Quality Unit.

1.4 Grant funding awarded in 2020

- 1.4.1 Alongside the Legal Direction received in February 2020, Government awarded grant funding for implementation of the CAP proposals, funding of this type would

¹ Environment Act 1995 (Sheffield City Council and Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council) Air Quality Direction 2020

usually be released after the approval of a Full Business Case so this was unexpected.

- 1.4.2 JAQU awarded £23,967,436 to deliver Sheffield and Rotherham’s Clean Air plans. £3.5m has been allocated from the **Implementation Fund** and £20.4m from the **Clean Air Fund**. The **Implementation Fund** is ring-fenced to measures required to reach annual compliance i.e. charging zone and road schemes. The **Clean Air Fund** is a competitive fund that provides funding to mitigate the economic impact for people that are most disproportionately affected by the introduction of the charging clean air zone, see award values in Table 1. Clean Air Fund – Financial Support Measures below.

1.5 Clean Air Fund grant funding:

- 1.5.1 Sheffield and Rotherham have been in discussions with JAQU to retain the full funding allocation awarded March 2020 and have provided evidence to support and justify the requirement for financial support for fleet in the city to upgrade.
- 1.5.2 Further detailed work including market research and stakeholder engagement has been undertaken to develop the proposals since the grant award. We have also been able to review updated fleet profiles to understand how different vehicles have upgraded since the CAP work commenced in 2017 and have some insight into the success of comparative measures where Clean Air Zones have already been launched.
- 1.5.3 Our financial support packages have been updated and it is considered that the measures will provide a significant benefit to those drivers that are most impacted by the proposed Category C Clean Air Zone. These measures, outlined in the table below, will be included in the proposed consultation.
- 1.5.4 We are seeking JAQUs approval to vary the funding allocations to provide the required flexibility of the financial support measures to best meet our local needs. Final assessment of the CAF funding allocations for the different support packages will be informed by the consultation. Allocations will be further reviewed dependant on uptake when the schemes go live from early 2022.
- 1.5.5 Grants and loans to support upgrades are proposed to be set at the following levels and will be administered from mid-2022 onwards:

Table 1. Clean Air Fund – Financial Support Measures

Vehicle Type	Potential Support	Potential total expenditure
Wheelchair Accessible Hackney Carriage Taxis	Up to £10k grant Or Interest free loan	£3.3m
Private Hire Vehicles	Up to £3k grant Or Interest free loan	£2.5m
Vans	Up to £3.5k grant Or Interest free loan	£5.1m

Lorries	Up to £16k grant	£3.5m
Buses & Coaches	Up to £16k grant	£2.6m

1.5.6 The support will be allocated according to eligibility criteria to help those drivers most affected by the introduction of the charging zone.

1.6 Implementation Fund award:

1.6.1 Funding of £3.5m was also awarded from the Implementation Fund for the delivery of the ‘compliance measures’, which includes all of the infrastructure costs of installing and implementing the Clean Air Zone and traffic management schemes in Rotherham.

1.6.2 JAQU have confirmed that further Implementation Fund monies can be accessed at FBC stage. Final detailed design and delivery costs are currently being compiled as part of the FBC.

1.7 CAP review work

1.7.1 A review of the Sheffield & Rotherham Clean Air Plan was publicly announced by SCC in September 2020. The review considered both the potential implications of the time that had elapsed since the OBC had been submitted and the implications of Covid-19.

1.7.2 *Covid-19 implications:*

In February 2020 the implications of the national pandemic were emerging and national lockdown in the UK was announced on the 16th March 2020. Different periods of lockdown restrictions continued at a national and local level through 2020 and at the start of 2021. The implications on travel were significant and this brought about associated improvements in air quality.

In close liaison with JAQU the potential medium- and long-term implications of Covid-19 on travel and transport were reviewed. However, towards completion of our analytical review, we were advised in a letter from Ministers in February 2021 that due to the significant uncertainties associated in forecasting these impacts that no Covid-19 related impacts should be considered as part of our review.

From our monitoring of road traffic, it is clear that a number of key routes across the city are now back, or close to, pre-pandemic volumes and along with this are aligned increases in air pollution.

1.7.3 *Wider information accounted for within the review:*

Given the time that had passed since the submission of the OBC in December 2018 more recent roadside air quality monitoring data was available. This included data from a number of new monitoring locations introduced at the start of 2019 at areas of interest identified in the OBC where previously no monitored information was available. Whilst air quality monitoring in 2020 was clearly impacted as a result of the pandemic, in liaison with JAQU it was agreed that the evidence base would be updated using new pre-pandemic data where previously the OBC had relied solely on modelled data.

In addition, where changes to the road network had occurred the transport model was updated to reflect these changes. These include the junction improvements at Bridgehouses and the changes across the City Centre including proposals that form part of the broader Connecting Sheffield Transforming Cities scheme.

1.7.4 *Other considerations relating to the pandemic:*

The pandemic is unprecedented in modern times and the impacts are still being observed and cannot be fully understood at this time.

Whilst the Government has made a number of financial packages available to businesses and the self-employed, the Local Authority is very aware that the pandemic has and continues to impact on people's lives in different ways.

As far as was possible during the pandemic, stakeholder engagement took place with key stakeholders who would be most economically impacted by the CAZ charges. Feedback has been incorporated into the detailed CAF funding mitigation packages put to JAQU to strengthen the case for financial support for Taxi, HGV, LGV, buses and coaches to upgrade to compliant vehicles.

1.8 Taxi Standards:

- 1.8.1 A key implication arising from the February 2020 funding award and the economic implications of the pandemic has been in relation to the higher ULEV standards that we proposed as the minimum compliance standards for Hackney Carriages and Private Hire Vehicles (PHV). This proposed that Hackneys would be required to be either Electric Vehicles or retrofitted to Liquid Petroleum Gas (LPG), and PHVs would have to be Euro 4 Petrol Hybrid or better. The national CAZ compliance standards are Euro 6 Diesel or Euro 4 Petrol.
- 1.8.2 Our local licensing standards have successfully achieved a fully wheelchair accessible Hackney Carriage fleet in Sheffield. However, the availability of appropriate electric wheelchair accessible Hackney Carriage vehicles is limited. At the time of our consultation in Summer 2019 there were only two models of vehicle suitable, and this remains the case. The cost of these vehicles is significant, particularly given the limited second-hand market, and production was adversely impacted because of the pandemic.
- 1.8.3 As such, it is considered that the implications of moving to an ULEV minimum compliance standard for taxis at this time would be too onerous and within our review we have tested the implications of moving to the national CAZ compliance standards. Our assessment has confirmed that a Category C Charging Clean Air Zone with Euro 6 Diesel and Euro 4 Petrol standards for Hackney Carriages and PHVs achieves compliance.
- 1.8.4 Whilst it is recommended moving to the national compliance standards for taxis, the aspiration remains to help those who can, to move to an electric vehicle. As part of our package of financial support measures we will be offering a higher level of funding for taxi drivers to upgrade to an electric vehicle (up to £10k for a Hackney Carriage and £3k for a PHV).
- 1.8.5 Wider supply chains continue to be disrupted in variable ways leading to limited availability of compliant vehicles and some other materials such as highway infrastructure required for the charging zones. The project team continue to engage with suppliers to understand these impacts and how they might ultimately affect the deliverability of the CAP. Exemptions to daily clean air charges will be offered to drivers who are in the process of upgrading but are suffering from supply chain constraints.

1.9 CAZ Exemptions:

- 1.9.1 The National Clean Air Zone Framework² sets out a number of exemptions to charging that apply at a national level and therefore need to be included in every Clean Air Zone.
- 1.9.2 The national framework also outlines the ability for Local Authorities to consider local exemptions and the circumstances in which these may be considered appropriate. In providing exemptions it must be shown that these do not affect the ability for an area to achieve compliance in the shortest possible time. A breakdown of the exemptions currently proposed is presented in Appendix 1.

1.10 Current Position:

- 1.10.1 Following the February 2020 Ministerial Direction Sheffield City Council (SCC) are legally obliged to implement a Category C charging Clean Air Zone along with wider traffic management measures, to achieve compliant levels of annual average NO₂ in 2021, and to submit a full business case to Government.
- 1.10.2 Although air quality across the city improved in 2020 as a result of the lower traffic levels during periods of lockdown, there are still locations where compliant levels of air quality are not met. Without intervention Sheffield has locations that are currently predicted to remain in exceedance until 2025.

1.11 The recommended proposal:

- 1.11.1 The Clean Air Plan proposal is to progress a CAZ C charging zone in Sheffield in conjunction with traffic management measures and the delivery of the financial support measures for people to upgrade to compliant vehicles.
- 1.11.2 Updated evidence has shown that the CAZ C zone is the option most likely to achieve compliance within the shortest time. The predicted year for achieving compliance is currently 2022 based on an anticipated implementation of the scheme by September 2022³.
- 1.11.3 Fleet upgrades observed since 2017 (OBC evidence base) mean that the ultra-low emission ‘+’ standard for taxis previously proposed is no longer required to reach compliance. It is now proposed that the CAZ compliance standard for Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Vehicles (PHV) in all CAZ options is Euro 6 Diesel or Euro 4 Petrol.
- 1.11.4 Note that the CAZ C charging zone remains as that consulted on in 2019 with the exemption that the taxi vehicle standards have changed and are now in line with the National Government CAZ Framework.

Clean Air Zone Boundary	The area bounded by, and including, the Inner Ring Road and all roads within it. This is the same CAZ boundary as proposed within the consultation undertaken in Summer 2019.
Times of Operation	24 hours a day, 7 days a week.

²

https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/863730/clean-air-zone-framework-feb2020.pdf

³ Subject to approval of FBC and joint SCC and JAQU agreement on the overall ‘readiness’, including that the Central Charging Portal and national Vehicle Checker is fully available.

	Anticipated implementation September 2022.
Vehicles affected	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Licensed Hackney Carriage • Licensed Private Hire Vehicles • Bus • Coach • Minibus • LGV • HGV
Proposed daily charge (single charge even if making multiple trips) for non-compliant vehicles (i.e. those vehicles older than Euro 6 Diesel and Euro 4 Petrol)	<p>£50 - HGV, Coaches and Buses</p> <p>£10 – LGV, Minibus, Licensed PHV, and Licensed Hackney Carriage</p>
Wider traffic management measures required ⁴	<p>Northbound only Bus Gate on Arundel Gate from a point north of Novotel access.</p> <p>Anti-idling enforcement at Bus Stops on Arundel Gate.</p>

1.12 **Consultation:**

1.12.1 Consultation on the detailed CAP proposals is planned to commence at the start of November 2021. The method and form of consultation will broadly follow the consultation undertaken in Summer 2019 with the primary consultation questions hosted on citizen space with updated information on the scheme proposals available on the Clean Air Sheffield section of the Council's website.

1.12.2 The additional information provided will include:

- Information about the charging zone
- The different support packages to mitigate the impact on those most affected by providing financial support to upgrade to a compliant vehicle.
- National and local exemptions

1.12.3 Meetings will be held with key stakeholder groups. Specific questions will be included for businesses, taxi drivers and the general public.

The consultation will be used to inform the final position on proposed exemptions and where possible in refining aspects of the final financial support packages.

⁴ It should be noted that as part of the joint Sheffield and Rotherham CAP that Rotherham MBC will be taking forward a range of traffic measures.

1.13 Full Business Case and Implementation:

- 1.13.1 A Full Business Case (FBC) needs submitting to JAQU as soon as is practicably possible, therefore it is recommended that the authority to submit the FBC to Government is delegated to the Executive Director of Place, in consultation with the Executive Director of Resources and Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport. The FBC will only be finalised following full consideration of the consultation findings.
- 1.13.2 Implementation of the zone and delivery of the financial mitigation packages will continue to be progressed (as per the February 2020 Direction) alongside the consultation and finalisation of the FBC utilising the grant funding previously received from Government.
- 1.13.3 Siemens successfully tendered for the infrastructure work required for the charging zone including supply, installation and maintenance of Automatic Number Plate Recognition cameras. This contract must be entered into by the 31st October 2021 as the framework under which it was tendered expires on that date. Failure to do so would mean a new tender process carrying risks of increased costs, potential supply issues and delay to the timescales set out in this report. Following a short preparation period, the installation process is planned to commence in November 2021.
- 1.13.4 It should be noted that following a Cabinet decision in March 2021⁵ Rotherham MBC are progressing the statutory consultations and procurement required for the delivery of their compliance measures which comprise of a number of traffic management schemes in Rotherham. RMBC will also need to approve the joint Sheffield and Rotherham CAP FBC prior to submission to Government.

1.14 Broader action on Air Pollution and Carbon emissions from Transport

- 1.14.1 In line with our legal direction, our Clean Air Plan focuses on tackling Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) from road traffic in the shortest time possible. Approximately 50% of NO₂ comes from tailpipes of the city's vehicles. In addition, 27% of the city's overall Carbon emissions (CO₂e) comes from transport, which is the biggest overall contributor in Sheffield.
- 1.14.2 Whilst the Clean Air Plan measures are essential to achieve current legal limits, addressing air pollution more fully and tackling transport's role in responding to the Climate Emergency is fundamentally an issue of how we live and how we choose to move around the city. In June 2018, Sheffield City Council agreed a new [Transport Strategy](#) which created a long-term vision for transforming the city's infrastructure to make it easier to travel around Sheffield by the most sustainable modes, prioritising the delivery of improved infrastructure for walking and cycling and ensuring that public transport is integrated, faster and more reliable.
- 1.14.3 Through the development of the recent [Pathways to Zero report](#) we know that the action required will need to result in an overall reduction in vehicle trips; with a significant switch to active and public transport away from private cars; and that all remaining motorised vehicles will need to be upgraded to electric or other zero emission fleet to deliver our Net Zero ambitions. This will be reflected in the upcoming 10 Point Plan for Climate Action
- 1.14.4 There are a number of significant projects that we have delivered to contribute towards these outcomes, and further improvements are planned through our Connecting Sheffield programme, which will be expanded should a number of

⁵ <https://modern.gov.rotherham.gov.uk/documents/s130236/Report%20-%20CAZ%20Scheme%20Approval.pdf>

current funding bids to Government be successful. These infrastructure projects sit alongside the continued delivery of wider initiatives including, but not limited to: training, support, and bike loans to enable active travel; EV van and taxi trial schemes; the roll out of public EV Charging; work to develop the Bus Service Improvement Plan (BSIP) and Enhanced Bus Partnership with SYMCA partners.

- 1.14.5 Delivery of projects to improve conditions within local communities will also be essential and measures we are progressing include: Low Traffic Neighbourhoods, to reduce rat running and create safe and accessible streets; School Streets, to reduce traffic and emissions outside schools and encourage people to walk, scoot or cycle; continued delivery of the citywide commitment to 20mph speed limits in residential areas.

1.15 Next Steps

- 1.15.1 Subject to the recommendations of this report being endorsed, officers will:

- Finalise consultation information so that this can commence at the start of November 2021.
- Continue to develop the implementation and contract arrangements required to deliver the CAZ and other CAP measures.
- Prepare FBC documentation for submission to Government.
- Make arrangements to distribute funds to support those businesses, individuals and organisations who need to upgrade their vehicle to become compliant.

2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?

- 2.1
- Contributes towards meeting the legal obligation
 - Contributes towards protecting public health and making a positive impact on those who are vulnerable to roadside pollution including working drivers.
 - Contributes positively towards net-zero targets
 - Contributes towards achieving the corporate objectives within the One Year Plan

3.0 HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?

- 3.1 Public consultation the CAP including a category C '+' (higher ultra-low emission standard for taxis) was undertaken between the 1st July and 26th August 2019 covering both Sheffield and Rotherham. The [consultation reports](#) can be viewed on the SCC website.
- 3.2 Additional stakeholder engagement with business and other impacted groups / individuals was undertaken during 2020 and into early 2021, this provided some essential insights to inform the development of the mitigation measures.
- 3.3 As covered in Section 1, further consultation on the detailed proposals is scheduled to commence in November 2021.

4.0 RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION

4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications

- 4.1.1 **Health Impact Assessment summary:** The Clean Air Zone, if successful in reducing NO₂ will improve Sheffield's air quality which should directly impact on cardiovascular and respiratory health of residents. The CAZ is only for nitrogen

dioxide reductions and other air pollutants are not covered – these pollutants such as fine dust (PM₁₀ and PM_{2.5}) will continue to be produced by less polluting vehicles as they are a result of wear and tear on the vehicle and road surface. Therefore, a modal shift to active travel and mass transit would be needed to deliver overall air quality improvements. Those switching from car use to active travel (particularly walking, cycling, running, scooting, skateboarding) are likely to be healthier as they will be more likely opportunistically to achieve physical activity targets of 30 minutes, 5 times a week as part of their commute⁶

4.1.2 **Equality Impact Assessment summary:** Air pollution can be harmful to everyone, some people are more vulnerable than others because they are exposed to higher levels of air pollution in their day to day lives, live in a polluted area, or are more susceptible to health problems caused by air pollution. The most vulnerable people face all of these disadvantages. Overall, the introduction of a charging Class C CAZ, which brings about compliance with legal levels for nitrogen dioxide, will have positive health benefits for all and in particular for those people in the following protected characteristic groups:

- Age: Children and the elderly are most at risk
- Disability: Those with respiratory or cardio-vascular conditions are specially at risk
- Pregnancy and Maternity: Unborn babies are at risk and there is increased risk of miscarriage.

Addressing Sheffield's air pollution challenge should bring benefits to communities across the whole city, particularly as some of the most significant polluters (buses, taxis, LGVs) drive around and through neighbourhoods in every part of Sheffield.

As vehicle fleets are upgraded and replaced in response to the CAZ, the NO₂ concentrations around the whole road network should improve at a faster rate than without action. Changes in the automotive industry and shift toward hybrid and electric vehicles and away from diesel should continue to bring reductions in air pollution to communities and neighbourhoods in Sheffield.

The CAP proposals involve significant change but are intended to bring positive health and wellbeing outcomes for all communities and particularly those most exposed to the harmful levels of NO₂. There are economic impacts resulting from the CAZ charges which have been considered, and the financial support measures have been developed to mitigate these as much as possible. Consideration is needed to protect people with limited mobility to mitigate potential impacts on essential services such as accessible taxis or buses.

The EIA will continue to be updated and will be published again after the consultation analysis work is completed.

4.2 **Financial and Commercial Implications**

DEFRA and DfT have awarded grant funding of which the key features (not exclusive) are summarised below. The Grant Manager will need to read, understand and comply with all of the grant terms and conditions and ensure that there are no ongoing, unfunded costs when the grant funding ends.

⁶ <https://travelwest.info/essential-evidence/no-186-active-travel-physical-activity-evidence-review>
<https://travelwest.info/essential-evidence/119-walking-to-work-does-it-contribute-to-increasing-total-physical-activity-time>

4.2.1 **Revenue CAZ Grants**

1. NO2 PLAN - Implementation of Measures Grant (No 31/4039): £1.302m

- Detailed budget headings for grant expenditure are identified in the grant offer letter
- Implement local plan to reach legal NO2 compliance in the shortest possible time.

2. NO2 Plan - Clean Air Fund Grant (No 31/4038): £12.628m

- Support individuals/businesses affected by the local plan to reach legal NO2 compliance in the shortest possible time (projects to be supported are identified in the grant offer letter).

For both CAZ revenue grants the following conditions also apply:

- Any unused funding is to be used for delivering air quality improvements and/or supporting individuals and businesses affected by local air quality plans.
- Any project changes must be discussed with JAQU asap and substantial changes may require a variation

4.2.2 **Capital CAZ Grants.**

3. NO2 Plan - Clean Air Fund (No 31/4051): £7.785m

- Support individuals/businesses affected by local plan to reach legal NO2 compliance in the shortest possible time (projects to be supported are identified in the grant offer letter).
- JAQU will provide 5% of EV charge points funding to RMBC at the time payment is made.

4. NO2 Plan – Implementation Fund Grant 2020 (No 31/4052): £2.209m

- The grant will fund Rotherham Road Schemes.
- Implement local plan to reach legal NO2 compliance in the shortest possible time.
(As per OBC September 2019 - CAZ Class C).

For both CAZ capital grants the following conditions also apply:

- Unused funding to be used for delivering air quality improvements and/or supporting individuals/ businesses affected by local air quality plans.
- Changes to any element of the project must be discussed with JAQU as soon as possible and any substantial change may require a variation
- The grant may be used only for the purposes that a capital receipt may be used for in accordance with regulations made under section 11 of the Local Government Act 2003.
- Failure to comply with any of the conditions will lead to grant clawback

For note:

If any risks to the ability to meeting compliance as set out in the legal direction are identified JAQU must be notified as soon as possible and in advance of the reporting periods. Actions taken to mitigate will need agreed with JAQU.

Grants are made on the basis of information in the OBC and require delivery in line with the information provided (Implementation of a class C charging CAZ and additional measures as soon as possible to achieve compliance in 2021).

4.2.3 **Other**

The resource implications of the introduction of the clean air plans will be set out in the Full Business Case. The introduction of the zone, other compliance measures and payment of support will be funded via the grant allocations. The on-going costs associated with the operation of the zone will be funded through the surplus charging income generated.

Any surplus income generated after covering the costs of the operation of the zone can only be used for re-investment in sustainable transport schemes in the city and cannot be used for any other purpose.

All procurement activity identified in the Final Business Case will comply with Public Contract Regulations 2015.

4.3 **Legal Implications**

4.3.1 Under Part IV of the Environment Act 1995, Local Authorities are required to have regard to any national strategy on clean air which is published by the Secretary of State; and to review and assess air quality in their areas and to report against objectives for specified pollutants of concern, to the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (DEFRA). The Secretary of State, in exercise of the power conferred by section 85(5) of the Environment Act 1995, Directed that SCC and Rotherham on 24 February 2020:

1. Must take steps to implement the local plan for NO₂ compliance for the areas for which they are responsible.
2. Must ensure that the local plan for NO₂ compliance is implemented so that;
 - (a) compliance with the legal limit value for nitrogen dioxide is achieved in the shortest possible time, and by 2021 at the latest;
 - (b) exposure to levels above the legal limit for nitrogen dioxide are reduced as quickly as possible.
3. Must prepare a full business case for the areas for which they are responsible.
 - (a) The full business case must be submitted to the Secretary of State as soon as possible and by 24 March 2020 at the latest and must describe (Schedule 1) the implementation of a Charging Clean Air Zone class C with complementary measures.

Under section 85(7) of the Environment Act it is the duty of a local authority to comply with a Direction given to it.

4.3.2 In November 2018 this Authority approved the submission of the Outline Business Case to Government and it was anticipated that the Full Business Case would be submitted thereafter. The submission of a FBC has not proved possible as set out in this report.

4.3.3 Action to manage and improve air quality is a legal requirement. SCC has received a Ministerial Direction during the development of the proposed CAZ scheme. The effect of which is that the Council must fulfil its statutory duty to achieve compliance with air quality standards by 2021, at the latest and in any case, in the shortest time

possible, by the implementation of the CAZ C charging scheme as mandated. Compliance with that deadline has not so far proved possible as set out within the report. The Authority's failure to submit the FBC and implement the mandated CAZ C charging scheme within the prescribed deadlines imposes a serious risk to the Council and gives rise to potential legal challenges by way of judicial review. There is also the risk that any grant funding already provided to SCC such funds could be recovered by Government, by way of clawback.

4.4 Other Implications

4.4.1 *Impact on individuals*

Poor air quality is responsible for about 3% of all illness and just less than 5% of deaths in Sheffield. There is no bodily process that isn't accelerated by one form of pollution or other. In assessing impact, it is also important to consider the role of pollutants both causing and accelerating the progress of a disease. The estimates are probably underestimates as the science is continually developing and we are continually learning more about the negative health impact of air quality.

There are a significant number of children who are having their life course influenced by something which isn't in their control, and we know the impact of air pollution is regressive - people of low income exposed to greatest pollutants. Pre-existing conditions (for example asthma or cardiovascular disease) make people more prone to the impacts of pollution, those conditions are more common in more deprived communities, combined with pollution per se being higher in more deprived communities.

Increasingly we are seeing that particulates (PM – particulate matters) and black carbon can get into the placenta and into unborn babies, and we know children are also more sensitive to the negative impacts in terms of the impact on developing brains, lungs, immune system (moving it to a more allergic / inflammatory prone phenotype). We are beginning to see a different type of asthma with more, late onset non allergic asthma. We are also beginning to see more very early onset wheezing in very young babies.

The [coroner report](#) on the death of Ella Kissi-Debrah where air pollution was directly attributed to the death of this girl notes that this is will not be the last time such a case is heard.

4.4.2 *Public health policy*

Whilst it is perhaps inevitable that national policy is driven by compromise There are no circumstances in which air pollution could be seen as a good thing. The distinction between legal limit and safe can't be underscored enough. There isn't a "safe" limit from a public health perspective. The World Health Organisation (WHO) set out a dramatically reduced limit for emissions linked to fossil fuels, the recommended NO₂ limit is lowered from 40 µg/m³ to 10µg/m³. It has also lowered the recommended limits for average annual PMs.

The WHO stated that on PM2.5 Almost 80% of deaths related to PM2.5 could be avoided if the current air pollution levels were reduced to those proposed in the updated guideline. Some of the new guideline values look feasible for the UK to meet, within this decade, if clean technologies work as hoped and implementing net zero progresses at pace.

Nitrogen dioxide (NO₂) for example is already starting to fall as older vehicles retire and battery electric vehicles increase in number; there is the prospect of largely eliminating this as a cause of harm in the medium to long-term.

Of note WHO devoted significant space to the most vulnerable in society; underscoring that the risks of air pollution are not evenly distributed. Meeting the public health challenge will need both population shift and effort to protect the most vulnerable. A 1 ug change across a population will have a significant impact. The implications are the need to shift social norms, make an environment that supports non car modes of travel and set out changes that we can all make supported by the right environment.

5. ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED

- 5.1 In assessing options, the primary success factor required by Government is ensuring 'compliant levels of Nitrogen Dioxide (NO₂) emissions within the shortest time'. The Full Business Case (FBC) appraisal process will follow HM Treasury guidance and be consistent with the approach taken at OBC.

Post Covid 19, remodelling work was undertaken to establish whether any alternative CAZ approaches would be sufficient to meet the legal obligations. A CAZ C continues to be the model most suited to achieving compliance within the shortest time and this remains the requirement mandated by Government. No other form of CAZ is permissible without Ministerial consent.

A set of technical documents detailing the analytical modelling work will be submitted to Government, forming part of the Full Business Case. These documents are currently being drafted and will be submitted to the JAQU for review by their technical assurance panel prior to FBC submission. Further detail will be published on the SCC Clean Air website after JAQU technical review process is completed.

6.0 REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 The recommended proposal is predicted to reach legal compliance within the shortest time to achieve the outcome of protecting public health by minimise exposure to harmful NO₂ pollution.
- 6.2 Other recommendations within this report are included to ensure that in the CAP actions can be progressed as quickly as possible to achieve the outcome above.

Appendix 1: Clean Air Plan Proposed Exemptions - V1.00

This page is intentionally left blank



Report to Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee Thursday 4th November 2021

Report of: Policy and Improvement Officer

Subject: Work Programme 2021/22: Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee

Author of Report: Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer
deborah.glen@sheffield.gov.uk
 0114 273 5065

The Work Programme is attached at Appendix 1 for the Committee's consideration and discussion. It aims to focus on a small number of issues which fit in with Scrutiny's role in this transitional year in terms of governance.

The Work Programme will remain a live document and will be brought to each Committee meeting.

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 comment on the committee's work programme
- Identify, prioritise and agree topics for inclusion in the work programme

Background Papers: [Sheffield Council Constitution](#)

Category of Report: OPEN

OSMC 2021-22		Thursday 1 – 3pm	
Topic	Reasons for selecting topic	Lead Officer/s	Agenda Item/ Briefing paper
Thursday 29th July 21			
Repairs and Maintenance Service	Requested as follow up to previous work programme of the Safer and Sustainable communities committee	Nathan Rodgers	Agenda Item
Work Programme		Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer	Agenda Item
Thursday 16th September 21			
Pinstone Street	Requested by Members	Tom Finnegan Smith Matthew Reynolds Cllr Douglas Johnson	Agenda Item
Work Programme		Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer	Agenda Item

Thursday 4th November 21			
Clean Air Plan	Requested for information following exemption from call in	Tom Finnegan-Smith, Head of Strategic Transport, Sustainability and Infrastructure	Agenda Item
Work Programme		Deborah Glen, Policy & Improvement Officer	Agenda Item
Thursday 2nd December 21			
Equalities Annual Report	Annual item	Adele Robinson, Equalities and Engagement Manager	Agenda Item
Work Programme		Deborah Glen, Policy & Improvement Officer	Agenda Item
Thursday 17th February 22			

Revenue Budget 2022/23 and Capital Programme 2022/23 Date tbc subject to budget timetable	To consider the Council's budget proposal in advance of Cabinet.		Agenda Item
Housing Repairs and Maintenance Service	Follow up from July meeting	Nathan Rodgers	Agenda Item
Work Programme		Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer	Agenda Item
Thursday 17th March 22			

2022
2023
2024
2025
2026
2027
2028
2029
2030
2031
2032
2033
2034
2035
2036
2037
2038
2039
2040
2041
2042
2043
2044
2045
2046
2047
2048
2049
2050
2051
2052
2053
2054
2055
2056
2057
2058
2059
2060
2061
2062
2063
2064
2065
2066
2067
2068
2069
2070
2071
2072
2073
2074
2075
2076
2077
2078
2079
2080
2081
2082
2083
2084
2085
2086
2087
2088
2089
2090
2091
2092
2093
2094
2095
2096
2097
2098
2099
2100

This page is intentionally left blank