

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

North Local Area Committee

Meeting held 7 July 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Alan Hooper (Chair), Vickie Priestley (Deputy Chair), Vic Bowden, Lewis Chinchin, Julie Grocutt, Mike Levery, Ann Whitaker, Richard Williams, Alan Woodcock, Craig Gamble Pugh and Janet Ridler

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Penny Baker.

2. EXCLUSIONS OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 There were no items that excluded the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 Councillor Julie Grocutt declared a personal interest in item 8 of the agenda 'Stocksbridge Towns Fund update' by virtue of her being a member of the Stocksbridge Towns Fund Board.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

4.1 RESOLVED: that the minutes of the previous meetings held on 3 March, 2022 and 18 May, 2022 were agreed as accurate records.

5. NORTH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE ACTION PLAN

5.1 David Luck, the North Community Services Manager, gave an overview of proposed actions for the North East Local Area Committee.

In September and October 2021, initial consultations were held both online and in person to gain residents views on the priorities for their areas. Three main priorities were noted: highways and transport, clean and attractive environment, and the wider issue of a vibrant community life.

In addition to Local Area Committee funding, 'ward pots' funding was also available for local projects, and applications were welcome from groups with projects that might benefit from this funding.

Around £6,000 of funding had been made available to support celebrations of the Queen's Platinum Jubilee.

5.2 The Committee noted the information now reported as part of the presentation.

6. NORTH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE BUDGET REPORT

6.1 The North Community Services Manager, David Luck, gave an overview of how the Local Area Committee budget was intended to be distributed across the themed priorities, referring to the “Report of North Local Area Committee proposed spending 2022-23”.

6.2 Each Local Area Committee had a £100,000 budget to address local priorities, identified within their respective Community Plans. This report set out initial details of the proposed spending within this £100,000 budget during the 2022/23 financial year.

6.3 Funding of up to £5,000 would be available for smaller projects upon agreement and approval by the North Local Area Committee.

6.4 Councillor Julie Grocutt queried whether members needed to declare an interest in items on the agenda relating to their ward. She wished to ensure that residents were aware of the work of councillors within their area.

The Chair responded by saying that he felt that there was an expectation that ward councillors would have knowledge on work within their ward.

6.5 Councillor Levery noted his thanks to the High Green Development Trust for providing the space for the proposed project and felt that it would provide a focus for young people.

6.6 Councillor Chinchon noted that the document referenced digital inclusion and advised that there were plans to hold a ‘pop up’ event in Stocksbridge Library in September, which would offer expertise to support both basic learning and digital schemes.

6.7 Mark Whittaker, a representative of Stocksbridge Town Council (for Deepcar) and Deputy Mayor of Stocksbridge explained that activity was ongoing for pulling together a ‘friends’ groups of Fox Glen park. A public meeting was due to be held in Stocksbridge Town Hall.

6.8 Laura Walker, a resident of Grenoside, advised that a Friends of Grenoside Park group had been set up aiming to seek views from residents around the renovation needs of the park.

6.9 RESOLVED: that the North Local Area Committee:

(i) notes the proposed anticipated expenditure against the £100,000 budget to address local priorities in the North Local Area Committee Community Plan in 2022/23, as detailed in the report, and in particular:-

- agrees that a grant of £11,302 be awarded to High Green Development Trust for the development of a youth base; and
- approves a budget of £25,000 for parks improvements.

(ii) to the extent that it is not covered by existing authority, authorises the

Community Services Manager to make decisions on expenditure relating to the priorities set out in the report provided that:

- the decision is taken in consultation with the Local Area Committee Chair;
- the decision may not approve expenditure on any element in excess of the anticipated limit for that element set out in the report; and
- a report detailing the delegated spending decisions taken by the Community Services Manager is presented to the next Local Area Committee meeting.

(iii) agrees the attached action plan as a basis to develop future projects/activity.

6.10 Reasons for Decision

The North Local Area Committee is asked to note the proposed allocation of funding to the projects identified to enable detailed planning to commence and delivery to begin in the coming months.

6.11 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

6.11.1 Decisions on any expenditure above the existing authority to the Community Services Manager could be reserved to the Local Area Committee but this would delay delivery of priority actions to address specific issues identified in the Community Plan.

6.11.2 All decisions on expenditure to support Community Plan priorities could be delegated to officers. However, this would restrict the Local Area Committee's ability to monitor its delegated budget and delivery of the Community Plan.

7. STOCKSBRIDGE TOWNS FUND UPDATE

7.1 Amanda Holmes, Communication Officer, updated the Local Area Committee on the Stocksbridge Towns Fund. In 2019, the Government announced a £3.6 billion fund investing in towns as part of plans to level up many regions. Sheffield City Council was the responsible authority and set up Stocksbridge Towns Fund. A board was formed in early 2020 and an engagement process began about what should be included in the Towns Fund bid. This coincided with the first national Covid19 lockdown, and engagement was carried out online and via local newspapers.

7.2 Regeneration of Stocksbridge town centre, in particular the High Street, was considered a main priority due to concern about being left behind since the opening of Fox Valley in 2016.

7.3 The engagement process also highlighted that skills and education were felt to be a priority. It was noted that there were no post-16 opportunities within

the area, and extra provision was now being investigated.

- 7.4 Health and wellbeing was the third priority noted. A number of projects were being looked at, including major investment in Stocksbridge Leisure Centre to provide a hydrotherapy pool as a potential regional facility. Further investment was planned to regenerate Oxley Park, including a new skate park and a 3G sports pitch to support teams that otherwise had to travel out of the area. There were also plans to develop new trails and a cycle network to link up with footpaths in the area.
- 7.5 The next steps involved putting a business case together for sign-off by the Towns Fund Board on 22 July, which would then be submitted to the Department for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities. The total funding available was around £24.1 million and, if secured, projects would begin to be tendered around December 2022 and work was hoped to commence in spring 2023. A regular newsletter and social media sites would keep residents updated.
- 7.6 Amanda Holmes confirmed that priority discussions were ongoing with the Council's library team to seek a temporary location for Stocksbridge Library. Parking options were also being considered, and a full survey was being carried out on the options that were available.
- 7.7 The Chair thanked Amanda for her contribution to the meeting.
- 7.8 David Luck advised that there would be a short break in the formal meeting of around 20 minutes to give the opportunity for attendees to meet in small informal groups to discuss the Stocksbridge Towns Fund proposals, and for residents of other wards to discuss issues of concern with their local councillors.
- 7.9 The meeting resumed, and the following feedback was provided:
- 7.9.1 **Stocksbridge**
- Suggestion of charging facilities for bikes.
 - Hub for cycling and secure storage.
 - Possible provision of a cinema in the new hub
 - Parking provision at proposed 3G pitch.
 - Concerns about housing developments and the need for street cleaning.
 - Possibilities for a multi-storey car park.
 - Speeding was of concern at the Hole House Lane junction.
- 7.9.2 **Stannington**
- Buses needed to be more on time and more reliable. Instances of buses leaving early had been noted.
 - Stocksbridge plans could be shared with residents in other wards in the north of Sheffield to attract people to the venues.
- 7.9.3 **Grenoside**

- Grenoside park was discussed, and developing a plan to progress regeneration via LAC and ward pot funding

7.10 Emma Mainwaring of Ecclesfield Parish Council provided an update on work carried out in their area, which included:

- A community skip day had been carried out at Angram Park to allow collection of larger rubbish items, and over 2 tonnes of waste had been collected.
- Jubilee events had taken place at Grenoside and Chapeltown, with over 2,000 people attending
- School uniform 'swap shops' had taken place at schools across the parish
- Four information posts were being installed to give residents information about activities over the summer holidays.
- Outcomes from the 'Transport Issues on Jeffcock Road Residents Survey' had been published and plans were underway to install boulders around Angram park to help prevent anti-social behaviour. Parking issues in this area were due to be discussed at the next parish council meeting.

7.11 The Chair noted that an agenda item would be added to future meetings of the North Local Area Committee for Parish and Town Councils to provide updates.

8. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

8.1 Question 1 – Emma Mainwaring

Lound Side school Academy PTA, recently approached the Road Safety team at Sheffield City Council, to ask them if they could put out no waiting cones.

This would be at school opening and closing times, in the hope that it would make a safer environment around the school, trying to alleviate antisocial parking at school times.

The answer received was negative in that this would not be allowed.

1. Does the officer and department who made this decision have any alternative proposal to make?
2. How many complaints have been made that relate to the placing of cones outside of schools?
3. Which school have these complaints been made against

In response, the Chair noted that safer roads were an objective within the Community Plan and was an issue throughout Sheffield. Many parents were still using cars for transporting their children to school, despite activity

and education from schools. He advised that Parking Services had limited resources to enforce parking restrictions outside schools and that Councillor Woodcock had met with officers to discuss these concerns.

Councillor Woodcock advised that the use of cones would be to emphasise no parking and had no legal standing. The cost of providing these for both the infant and junior buildings would be around £900. Loundside Infant and Junior School informed parents about safe parking. He had met with senior technicians in Highways earlier that day to look at options. A factor to consider when looking at options was maintaining access at all times to a nearby bus stop. Costings had been given to install 14 bollards at approximately £650 per bollard. Other strategies had been tried, including police officer attendance, but there were issues in finding a safe position to park as the site was on the brow of a hill. The possibility of further educating parents on safer parking was mentioned.

Councillor Grocutt, as Co-Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee, was aware that there were currently vacancies for school crossing wardens that were struggling to be filled.

Councillor Gamble Pugh agreed that the provision of bollards was an expensive option and believed that the limited hours on offer to school crossing wardens was a barrier to recruitment, and that ways of attracting interest in these posts should be pursued.

The Chair advised that a full answer would be provided to the question raised, and the issue would be escalated to the relevant Policy Committee if necessary.

8.2 **Question 2 – Adam Hurst**

The Chair read out a question from Adam Hurst, who was in attendance to participate in the discussion:

1. Could the Committee inform me of when and how the decision for the Staindrop Lodge Hotel to be allocated for use for Asylum Seekers was made
 - a. The extent to which the council was informed and whether the change of use was subject to Planning Regulations
 - b. Any consultation with local residents
 - c. What support is being offered to people currently resident at Staindrop Lodge.

Councillor Levery gave some background and confirmed that Staindrop Lodge was privately owned and at the height of the Covid19 pandemic in 2020 had been put forward to house rough sleepers on a short-term basis. By mid-May the Council was informed by the Home Office that the building was to be used to home asylum seekers. The Council objected on the

basis that the needs of the people concerned would be better met in the city centre, but the plans went ahead. The Home Office had responsibility for the site and the Council's remit was limited to statutory functions only. Mears Group were the housing management service operating the site.

It was hoped that further meetings could take place with the Home Office to discuss concerns such as the site location, providing school places for children, conditions within the building and site accessibility for safeguarding purposes.

As ward councillor, Councillor Whitaker had been made aware of difficulties at the site. She was concerned about reports that security staff had denied officials access to residents and to the site, and reports of overcrowded rooms.

The Chair noted that Sheffield was a City of Sanctuary and advised that Councillor Whitaker would continue to meet with Council officers on a regular basis.

8.3 **Question 3 – Adam Hurst**

The Chair read out further questions submitted by Adam Hurst:

- Following a number of comments made by residents of Mortomley Close Matt Wilson who bought the subject up at Full Council in March the following comment was received from the Council;
- **“While Mortomley Lane is and will remain an unadopted public highway, we do accept that our construction traffic will increase its wear and tear more than usual so we will resurface the carriageway once the construction work is completed.”**
 - At the Corporate Executive meeting on April 20th the following question was raised; “In the light of this new information, could the council give me an update on how they propose to progress this matter”. Cllr Paul Wood responded by saying that the relevant Paperwork had now been located and a meeting would be arranged with the relevant Officers and “yourselves” in due course. Can anyone inform me of what progress has been made on this issue since April 20th.

Adam Hurst advised that an additional question had been raised by residents who believed that a promise had been made that the road would be surfaced.

The Chair noted that there had been some confusion over this issue and confirmed the Mortomley Close was not used by construction traffic. The case was still under investigation and once this was concluded a full response would be provided.

8.4 **Question 4 – Jim Wynne**

The Chair read out a question from Jim Wynne, who was not in attendance at the meeting:

Last September, I attended a meeting at Stocksbridge, and I pointed out that one of the entrances from Mortomley Park goes straight onto Jeffcock Road.

Because there is no footpath people step from the park and straight onto the road. It was agreed that this is a serious safety issue.

A safety gate was commissioned but as yet nothing is in place. This seems to be an over long process. Could you look into this please and let me know of any progress.

The Chair advised that this land belonged to Sheffield Homes and that he had met with them earlier in the year. This was an ongoing issue, and he would seek a full response and escalate as necessary.

8.5 **Question 5 – Maureen Barnett**

The Chair read out a question from Maureen Barnett, who was not in attendance at the meeting:

Unfortunately I cannot make the meeting as I do not drive but please could a suggestion be put on my behalf. I live at Grenoside where the bus service is deteriorating at a rapid rate to the point where many older people are not going out and becoming semi-housebound. The 135 is so infrequent and unreliable so people avoid it. The 86 is more reliable and regular but has a long tortuous route and does not connect with the tram or other bus services. The M92 is reliable and goes directly to the interchange, making connections possible. However, there are only 4 a day with timing gaps of 2hrs 10 minutes and only in the middle of the day. Yet in spite of its lack of frequency it is the busiest bus.

What is needed is a shuttle service directly to Hillsborough Interchange, possibly hourly. A smaller bus like the M92 would be adequate.

I feel very strongly that should be seriously considered. Thank you.

In response, the Chair advised that the latest information suggested that the 135 bus service was to be drastically reduced in two weeks' time, by ceasing early morning and evening buses from Monday to Friday. The 32 bus service was to cease, and further cuts were expected to be announced in October 2022. As a large geographical area, he noted that the north of Sheffield would suffer connectivity issues as a result of the bus service cuts.

Councillor Grocutt added that South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority had put together a bid for Government funding for their Bus

Service Improvement plan which was turned down. Public transport was a Local Area Committee priority particularly in order to help people attend medical appointments. She confirmed that meetings had taken place with the South Yorkshire Mayor and further funding would be applied for, which although would not help with immediate issues, might assist in the longer term.

Councillor Gamble Pugh was welcoming of the potential for improvements to the north of Sheffield via the Stocksbridge Towns Fund process but noted the need for significant and longer-term funding for bus services in the area.

Councillor Chinchin felt that the bid put forward by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority was not as ambitious as some neighbouring authorities who had been successful in their bids and hoped that the new South Yorkshire Mayor would bring forward some positive changes.

The Chair advised that the Local Area Committee would seek a full response to the concerns raised.

- 8.6 RESOLVED: that the issue around funding for bus services in the north of Sheffield, as mentioned above, be referred to the South Yorkshire Mayor and the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.