

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

North Local Area Committee

Meeting held 18 January 2023

PRESENT: Councillors Alan Hooper (Chair), Vickie Priestley (Deputy Chair), Penny Baker, Vic Bowden, Lewis Chinchen, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mike Levery, Ann Whitaker, Richard Williams and Alan Woodcock

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Julie Grocutt and Janet Ridler.

2. EXCLUSIONS 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 5 October, 2022 were approved as a correct record.

5. STANNINGTON GAS INCIDENT

5.1 Tim Myatt, Head of Corporate Affairs at Yorkshire Water, reported on the recent gas incident in Stannington. Also present for this item were Nathan Sunderland (Manager of Asset Planning and Network Engineering, Yorkshire Water) and Vicky Scroggins (Customer Liaison Advisor, Yorkshire Water) who had been leading on communication with residents regarding ongoing works on Bankfield Lane.

5.2 My Myatt offered an apology on behalf of Yorkshire Water to all those who had suffered inconvenience or distress due to the gas incident in Stannington. He added that Yorkshire Water deeply regretted the impact on residents, particularly those who had lost heating during a very cold weather period. Mr Myatt stated that Yorkshire Water was proud of its identity and, with the vast majority of staff living and working in Yorkshire, team members understood the importance of quickly resolving the issues in Stannington and Hillsborough.

5.3 Mr Myatt outlined the incident, which began late on the evening of 2 December,

2022, when treated water began to escape from a significant water supply main on Bankfield Lane, which was a significant water supply main. This was repaired quickly, and there were no issues remaining within the Yorkshire Water network. He noted that the presence, scale and impact of water in the gas network then became clear, and full support from Yorkshire Water teams was offered to Cadent. Throughout the incident, the Bronze and Silver level incident management teams coordinated support to Cadent. Support was coordinated through the Tactical Coordination Group and the Strategic Coordination Group, aiming to assist Cadent and other partners, including the Council.

- 5.4 He noted that there had been a variety of communication methods to keep residents up-to-date, and notify them on how they could access support. This included targeted text messages, the Yorkshire Water website, door-to-door visits, letter drops, press releases and media appearances.
- 5.5 Mr Myatt explained that as the inter-agency response to the incident began to have an effect, a Yorkshire Water payment scheme was put into place for residents to help offset additional costs and expenses residents may have incurred. This was separate to payments that Cadent were making for loss of gas supply. He asked for any residents who had any queries regarding the payment scheme or claims to share their details with Yorkshire Water staff present at the meeting.
- 5.6 Yorkshire Water understood that residents wanted to know how this incident had occurred, and Mr Myatt advised that this was now the subject of an investigation by Burgoynes, an independent forensic expert appointed by Yorkshire Water.
- 5.7 Mr Myatt confirmed that on 9 January, 2023, Yorkshire Water began work to replace and relocate the damaged section of main away from the gas mains. This work was being carried out in accordance with best practice and aimed to reduce the chance of similar incident. The work was expected to continue until around 10 February, 2023. Vicky Scroggins had been informing residents of this work, including door-to-door letter drops.
- 5.8 Taking a wider view of network resilience in Stannington, Yorkshire Water were reviewing performance and how to reduce the chance of further incidents. This included modifying the pumps to reduce the chance of 'shocks' to the network and also installing Variable Speed Drives at the pumping station which reduced the chance of these shocks. They were also looking at reducing pressure in areas of the Stannington network, and in the longer-term conducting mains renewal on assets with a greater risk of bursts. All of these measures were expected to reduce the risk of further incidents in the area.
- 5.9 Mr Myatt was aware that there were lessons to be learnt and confirmed that Yorkshire Water had participated in multi-agency incident de-briefs and were also conducting a thorough internal process. He reiterated that Yorkshire Water deeply regretted the incident and were keen to increase resilience in the area.
- 5.10 David Luck, Local Area Committee Service Manager, shared contact details on screen and advised that paper copies would be available at Stannington Library.

- 5.11 The Chair thanked Mr Myatt for attending and invited questions from those present at the meeting.

(a) Jenny Van Tinteren

We understood that there would be an inquiry into this incident. Is that going to be carried out by an external body or an internal investigation through Yorkshire Water?

Mr Myatt confirmed that Yorkshire Water insurers had appointed an independent body to investigate and Cadent would also be appointing an independent investigator. The regulator was also involved, and would be updated on the outcome of the investigations.

(b) Jayne Hawley, local resident and Labour Party member

This has been a major incident and although residents will get compensation, we need to know who will pay for this ultimately. I am concerned that service users will end up with higher bills. Do shareholders pay in terms of dividends?

In response, Nathan Sunderland confirmed that the regulator set the amount of bill increases that Yorkshire Water could charge its customers, which was usually in line with inflation, and that this capped the amount of capital investment that could be made. Given funding constraints, Yorkshire Water was limited in the level of repair that could take place. There would be mains failures across the region, but the objective of the company was to reduce the number of incidents.

Mr Myatt added that asset maintenance was funded through the five-year price review, which set out expenditure across all wastewater and water networks.

(b) Sean Ebenezer

How was the figure of £60 compensation per household from Yorkshire Water arrived at when the main cause of the problem was the water leak? This doesn't feel fair, especially given the timing of the incident, during a cold spell just before the festive season.

Mr Myatt noted that the cause of the incident was still the subject of an investigation. A standard amount of £60 had been paid to all households that had lost gas supply. A bespoke scheme also allowed residents the option to seek further compensation. He advised that Cadent had a statutory duty to provide a certain level of compensation as their network had been affected.

- 5.11 Councillor Penny Baker, Councillor and resident of Stannington Ward, gave her experiences of the incident. She explained that the seriousness of the incident soon became apparent, but noted that Cadent had quickly attended the scene and were immediately helpful, providing regular updates and involving support organisations such as the British Red Cross. A support 'hub' was set up at Lomas

Hall and had provided Cadent workers with hot food. Local businesses such as Minnie's, Top House (Crown and Glove) and the Peacock Public House had provided support to residents affected by offering hot food and drinks and warm places to sit. She commended the Cadent workers for the efficient, polite and informative way in which they carried out their work.

- 5.12 Councillor Baker also extended her thanks to the local primary schools for opening so quickly following the incident, and Christ Church, Stannington, for opening its doors and welcoming residents in need of a warm space. She noted how the community had come together to support each other, particularly those who were living alone, and she thanked those who had offered their support. The Stannington Facebook group had also provided useful information, with Cadent giving regular updates via this group. Mobile food vans had also been arranged to provide hot food for those without gas, and to ease the demand on local electricity sub-stations. As residents' gas supplies were restored, many offered support to those still without gas. Councillor Baker also expressed her thanks to Mr Barrowclough, Headteacher at Forge Valley School, for opening up the School to provide warm showers for those affected by the incident.
- 5.13 In summary, Councillor Baker wished to extend her thanks to local residents and all the businesses and organisations that had provided support during the incident.
- 5.14 The Chair expressed his thanks to Sheffield City Council for helping and to the North Local Area Committee team who were based in Stannington for two weeks. The Council had organised a pre-Christmas party which had allowed many families to celebrate.
- 5.15 Jenny van Tinteren noted that this had been a historic event, and explained that Stannington Library was asking people to pull together their experiences and photos of the incident, which the Library then hoped to compile and archive. She asked that residents contact the Library with any contributions.
- 5.16 Councillor Richard Williams expressed his thanks to Stannington Community Centre for opening their doors and providing meals for vulnerable people.
- 5.17 Councillor Craig Gamble Pugh acknowledged the work that had been carried out by Olivia Blake MP to support those without gas supply, indicating that the support provided from across Sheffield had been fantastic. He believed that residents and the community would make their own judgment about whether the payment from Yorkshire Water was proportionate to their suffering and whether profits should be invested into the supply network.

6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

- 6.1 The Committee received the following questions from a member of the public who had submitted the questions prior to the meeting, and who attended the meeting to raise them:-

(a) Jenny van Tinteren, OBE, Co-Chair of Stannington Pavilion Renewal Committee (SPARC)

- SPARC is a consortium of local groups set up in March 2022 to save Stannington Park Pavilion, with a view to raising funds to replace it with a new purpose-built band rehearsal room and community space.

SPARC submitted an Expression of Interest to the Council on 14 June 2022, copy attached. We received an acknowledgement, followed by 2 emails from Jo Pearce 30 June and 14 September, saying that no response could be provided due to capacity issues and many other higher priority projects across the city.

It is now 4 months later, and we still have no proper reply nor any indication of when someone might be willing to even start talking to us. This is unacceptable, especially when our EOI was specifically directed at relieving the Council a burden of costs through a transfer of the building to the community.

Question 1: Would the Council please agree to meet us soon to discuss the Expression of Interest and agree a way forward?

Question 2: What proposals does the Council have for consulting with the community in Stannington about the future of the pavilion?

Question 3: What proposals does the Council have to meet the need for more community space to house Stannington Brass Band, the after-school club, park sports activities etc?

Question 4 – What are the timescales for the review of community buildings authorised at the meeting of the Finance Sub-Committee on 7 November 2022 agenda item 6?

Question 5: How does the Council propose to involve local communities and consult publicly on that review?

Jenny also asked the following question on behalf of Action for Stannington:-

Question 1: Action for Stannington has offered repeatedly to partner with the council and raise money for a repair project, to safeguard Stannington Park Pavilion in the short term. The last time we did this was in 2012 and it is now needed again. Who is currently responsible for agreeing such projects and when will they talk to Action for Stannington please?

In response, Councillor Richard Williams confirmed that he had met with Ajman Ali, Executive Director, Operational Services. He shared Jenny's frustrations with the situation and advised that he would share the questions raised with Mr Ali.

Councillor Penny Baker expressed her thanks to the members of SPARC for showing an interest and for working to maintain the pavilion.

The Chair advised that the Council was currently undertaking a review of

community buildings and the results of this would help to identify those in need of repair or disposal.

The Committee received the following question from Pete Hurrell who was not in attendance at the meeting and had submitted a question prior to the meeting, which the Chair read out:

(b) Pete Hurrell

Can I ask if it's possible for our local planning officer to work with mobile phone companies to establish a location in Stannington for a phone mast so that we can have a good quality signal, this needs to be addressed as the move to full fibre broadband in our area will in most cases mean the landline will cease to work should the internet connection fail, it will require some co-operation as at least three phone mast planning applications have been rejected.

The Chair advised that a full, written response would be sent to Mr Hurrell.

Councillor Richard Williams added that it was a difficult balance between protecting the environment, whilst also accepting that people like to use their mobile phones. He stated that a conversation between planning and communities would be useful, in order to consider appropriate locations.

(c) Jim Conibear

Personally I find that the Draft Sheffield Plan is a long document and doesn't seem to be in a format which can be read and understood by Sheffield residents in the time span they are able to spare to read it.

Question 1: Is it possible to break it down to area commentaries of changes to the current position and other development proposals for the future of eg the Stannington area which can be circulated to residents.

Question 2: Am I right in thinking that the local plan areas do not correspond with the division used for LAC purposes.

The North West Sub area in the Local Plan seems to concentrate on the Don Valley and parts of the central LAC area rather than the likes of Stannington and Loxley (page 36/37).

Question 3: What are the key proposals for Stannington and the Loxley valley particularly development plans and areas and what changes arise from those existing.

Question 4: The plan highlights the congestion in the area but only seems to mention doing something on the A61. What steps are proposed to improve traffic flows particularly around eg Malin Bridge/Holme Lane before any further development takes place.

Question 5: Will the planning gain money already accrued and future developments be spent on schemes to alleviating the transport issues and community infrastructure in eg Stannington and Loxley rather than diverted elsewhere in the city (eg improving or widening Malin Bridge/Holme Lane/Bradfield road and traffic lights reflecting more the effects of Tram/bus gates on vehicle usage flows).

Question 6: Will the plan as formulated allow future developments in park facilities in eg Stannington Park of the Volunteer Library, Action for Stannington block and café without further red tape planning issues to be overcome to achieve them?

Richard Holmes (Principal Planning Officer) explained that although Part 1 of the Draft Sheffield Plan had several 'sub-areas' within the north of Sheffield, it had not been possible to align boundaries due to its wide-ranging area and strategic characteristics.

Mr Holmes advised that there was very little change proposed for Stannington because the green belt boundary was so tightly drawn, and he confirmed that there were no proposals to alter the green belt boundary.

In terms of traffic flow, Mr Holmes advised that the Transport team would be the appropriate team to answer this question, and he added that there was a supporting report about the Transport Strategy that fed into the Draft Sheffield Plan.

In response to the question regarding planning gain money, Mr Holmes advised that Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) monies were collected city-wide and decisions on spending was strategic and made separately to planning decisions. This was something that the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee would make decisions on. He noted that 15% of CIL was allocated locally to individual wards and parishes, and could be used for local issues such as congestion in a local area.

With reference to developments in Stannington Park, Mr Holmes advised that this was a development management issue, although there was a policy in the Draft Sheffield Plan for green spaces that generally sought to ensure no building on green spaces, with some exceptions.

7. UPDATE ON REFERRALS TO POLICY COMMITTEES

- 7.1 The Chair provided an update on a public question regarding the issue around funding for bus services in the north of Sheffield that was raised at the North Local Area Committee on 7 July, 2022.
- 7.2 The issue was initially referred to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, however as the responsibility for public transport sat with South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA), the issue was subsequently referred to the SYMCA for a response.

- 7.3 The Chair referred to the response from SYMCA, that had also been included within the agenda pack.
- 7.4 David Luck, North Local Area Committee Manager, advised that Stannington Councillors had been contacted by residents, requesting a reduction of the speed limit on Rails Road. Residents believed it raised wider questions about policy and approaches to speed on rural roads.
- 7.5 Mr Luck also advised that East Ecclesfield Councillors had been contacted by residents of Smith Street, Chapelton, requesting a residents parking scheme. A survey had shown a very high level of support, however Members had been advised no residents schemes were possible outside of the city centre.
- 7.6 Councillor Craig Gamble Pugh noted that he was a member of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, and he hoped to raise these issues at its next meeting, due to take place the next day.
- 7.7 **RESOLVED:** That the Committee agrees:-
- (a) that the issue around policy on speed on rural roads be referred to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee; and
 - (b) that the issue around policy on residents parking schemes outside of the city centre be referred to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.

8. PARISH COUNCIL UPDATES

- 8.1 Councillor Vickie Priestley provided an update from Bradfield Parish Council, who provided support to groups and organisations within the parish. This support, together with Local Area Committee funding, included the provision of a new football pitch at Wadsley Park Village. Councillor Priestley advised that the Parish Council continued to supply parks with new equipment, and that the Parish Council also had some CIL funding and was continuously looking for organisations and projects that would benefit from CIL money. Councillor Priestley asked for anyone who knew of any such organisations to contact Bradfield Parish Council.
- 8.2 Tim Whitaker (Councillor, Ecclesfield Parish Council) provided an update from Ecclesfield Parish Council. He stated that a coffee morning had been held in support of Ukrainian refugees, there had been no increase on the pre-set spending limit, tree planting had taken place in Chapelton Park for the Queen's Platinum Jubilee and that the Parish Community Hall had been refurbished, and was due to open on 30 January, 2023. Mr Whitaker confirmed that over £10,000 in grants had been given by the Parish Council over the last quarter, which had included support for Ecclesfield Priory Players, Scouts, Sheffield Rainbows, Thorncliffe Football Club, and Friends of Grenoside Green.

9. NORTH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE BUDGET REPORT

9.1 David Luck provided an update on the North Local Area Committee budget. He advised that the Leader made a decision on 17 August, 2021 to allocate a budget of £100,000 to each Local Area Committee and the Leader's Scheme of Delegation of Executive Functions has been amended to give Local Area Committees the power to approve expenditure from the budgets allocated to them.

9.2 The report presented highlighted current spend and also requested approval to provide replacement swings at The Rookery, Deepcar and Cross Lane Stocksbridge at a cost of £11,000. This would upgrade equipment that was coming to the end of its useful life and was based on conversations with the Parks and Countryside Department about sites in need of investment.

9.3 This proposal was recommended to address local priorities of developing a clean and attractive environment and vibrant community life.

9.4 The Chair thanked Mr Luck for the progress made on spending so far.

9.4 **RESOLVED:** That the North Local Area Committee:-

(i) notes the expenditure against the £100,000 budget to address local priorities in the North LAC in 2022/3, as detailed in the report, be noted.

(ii) approves £11,000 further expenditure for replacement swings at The Rookery, Deepcar and Cross Lane, Stocksbridge.

9.5 Reasons for Decision

The North Local Area Committee was asked to note the use of funding as per the previous decision of 30 September, 2021, and agree further expenditure to address the identified local priorities.

9.6 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

None. This was in line with the previous decision of 30 September, 2021, regarding expenditure below £5,000 and the North Community Plan agreed on 9 March, 2022.

10. DRAFT SHEFFIELD LOCAL PLAN

10.1 The Committee received a presentation from Richard Holmes, Principal Planning Officer, on the Draft Sheffield Plan.

10.2 Mr Holmes outlined the aims and objectives of the Plan and how it affected North Sheffield. He explained that this was the statutory Local Plan for the city, and that all local authorities were required to produce one. The Plan set out a vision and framework for the future development of the city and would guide decisions on planning applications.

- 10.3 Mr Holmes explained that the Draft Sheffield Plan covered the whole city except for the part that fell within the Peak District National Park boundary, and covered the period up to 2039 but would be reviewed at least every five years. The Plan would replace the Sheffield Core Strategy (2009) and the Unitary Development Plan (1998), and for the North of Sheffield, the Plan was divided into two Sub-Areas:- Stocksbridge/Deepcar and Chapeltown/High Green Sub-Area.
- 10.4 In terms of the timeline, Mr Holmes advised that the public consultation period ran from 9 January to 20 February, 2023. Details were available on the Council's website: [Emerging Draft Sheffield Plan | Sheffield City Council](#), and a paper copy was also available to view at Howden House. He advised that after the public consultation, the Council may propose amendments to the Plan and that such proposed amendments would be submitted to the Government and considered by an independent planning inspector.
- 10.5 The Chair thanked Mr Holmes and his team for attending and invited questions from those present.

David Holmes, Friends of Loxley Valley

We met last week and discussed preliminary views on the Draft Sheffield Plan. We are broadly supportive of the plan and welcome the protection of the green belt. However, the process is complicated and long and potential developers might be less supportive and have very different views to ours. If others argue strongly against the protection of certain sites, at what point in the process can we counter those objections?

In response, Richard Holmes advised that all comments would be processed by the Council and grouped into particular topics/areas before being submitted to the independent planning inspector, who would then decide how the examination would run. Those submitting comments would be asked if they would like to appear at the examination and would then be invited to those sessions along with the developer.

- 10.6 Councillor Mike Levery noted that a public consultation was held two years ago, and over 80% of those who participated believed that no development should take place on land designated as green belt. Members backed this and it was later agreed that green belt boundaries would be maintained whilst still achieving housing criteria.
- 10.7 Councillor Penny Baker added that the Peak District had its own planning authority. She explained that over one third of the land mass in Stannington fell within the Peak District boundary and as such Sheffield City Council had no authority over planning matters in this area.
- 10.8 The Chair advised that representatives from South Yorkshire Police, the Library Service, Yorkshire Water and Planning Officers were present and would be available for questions/comments at the close of the meeting.