

South Local Area Committee

Tuesday 21 March 2023 at 6.00 pm

**Gresley Road Meeting Rooms,
Gresley Road, Lowedges**

The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend

A logo consisting of a stylized circle made of overlapping colored segments in yellow, green, blue, and pink.

**Local Area
Committees**

Membership Engage · Empower · Enable

Councillor Simon Clement-
Jones
Councillor Richard Shaw
Councillor Ian Auckland
Councillor Sue Auckland
Councillor Steve Ayris
Councillor Nighat Basharat
Councillor Alexi Dimond
Councillor Marieanne Elliot
Councillor Peter Garbutt
Councillor Maroof Raouf
Councillor Sophie Thornton
Councillor Paul Turpin

PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING

Local Area Committees engage, enable, and empower communities across the city with increasing control over decision making, marking a major shift in power to communities. The Committees provide a geographical framework that, over time, will be used to prioritise and direct the local delivery of an increasing number of Council services and oversee the production of a co-produced annual Area Committee Plan which will reflect resident priorities.

A copy of the agenda and reports is available on the Council's website at www.sheffield.gov.uk. 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 Area Committee meetings and recording is allowed under the direction of the Chair.

Please see the [website](#) or contact Democratic Services committee@sheffield.gov.uk for further information regarding public questions and petitions and details of the Council's [protocol on audio/visual recording and photography](#) at council meetings.

Local Area 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.

Local Area Committee executive decisions are effective six working days after the meeting has taken place, unless called-in for scrutiny by the relevant Scrutiny Committee or referred to the City Council meeting, in which case the matter is normally resolved within the monthly cycle of meetings.

In order for us to be able to effectively facilitate attendance at the meeting, we would encourage all attendees to notify us of your attendance in advance by registering [here](#) or emailing committee@sheffield.gov.uk

If you require any further information please contact Jennie Skiba email jennie.skiba@sheffield.gov.uk.

**SOUTH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE AGENDA
21 MARCH 2023**

Order of Business

- 1. Welcome and Housekeeping Arrangements**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Exclusion of the Press and Public**
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 - 16)
To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 12th January, 2023.
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**
To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public.
- 7. Economic Recovery Fund Round 2: funding to help improve local high streets and encourage people to spend their time and shop there**
- 8. South Local Area Committee: Community Plan - Update**
- 9. Close and Date of Next Meeting**

Engage · Empower · Enable

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

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

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

You **must**:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

You have a personal interest where –

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

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

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

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

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

Further advice can be obtained from David Hollis, Interim Director of Legal and Governance by emailing david.hollis@sheffield.gov.uk.

This page is intentionally left blank

South Local Area Committee

Meeting held 12 January 2023

PRESENT: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones (Chair), Richard Shaw (Deputy Chair), Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Nighat Basharat, Alexi Dimond, Marieanne Elliot, Peter Garbutt, Sophie Thornton and Paul Turpin

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sue Auckland and Maroof Raouf.

2. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 Councillor Ian Auckland declared an interest in Item 8 -Community Plan – stating that he was a member of the Sub-Group which determined the funding for community groups “through the South LAC Community Capacity Building Grants” and that he was a member of a club that was one of the beneficiaries of the funding (Norton Country Club) but he said that he had taken no part in the decision to award funding to that group.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 11th October, 2022, were approved as a correct record.

4.2 *Matters Arising*

4.2.1 In Item 5.1, in response to Question 1 from Hazel Daniels, Councillor Paul Turpin said that he had been misquoted and asked that the words “but realise that they cannot prevent the extinction of the planet” be replaced with the words “we are not trying to save the planet for the planets sake, the planet will outlive humanity by a number a of years”. With regard to Question 2 from Hazel Daniels, Councillor Turpin asked that his response should be amended to read that he was not and never had been a member of the Planning Committee and had never done the training so wouldn’t be allowed on the Committee, and that he had neither supported nor objected to the development.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

- 5.1 **Question 1. Two questions were asked from the Secretary of the Banner Cross Neighbourhood Group regarding the Active Travel Scheme in Nether Edge.** She said that when the scheme was first consulted upon and Archer Lane was closed, a large number of residents said that the closure had affected their lives and these comments were collected and it was found that 90% of residents opposed the scheme. She said that with regard to emissions, the volume of traffic had moved from Archer Lane to adjoining streets. She said that a survey had been carried out along Sheldon Road and that 800 cars had queued along the road in a short period of time. She said that she had contacted the Council via a Freedom of Information request asking whether air quality had been taken into consideration and if so, had emission readings been obtained, especially around Nether Edge Primary School, and was awaiting a response.

Secondly, she asked whether Members were aware of the diversity in the area and the potential impacts in terms of community cohesion. As at the top of the hill, the residents were mainly white, middle-class people, whereas at the bottom of the hill, which was affected the most by the scheme, the residents were largely Asian and levels of deprivation were higher. She said that she had met with officers and had been told that the scheme was to be extended by a further six months, due to end Summer, 2023. Her questions to Members were:

(a) Can residents be given a definite date that the scheme will end and also a date for when the decision will go to Elected Members?

(b) Can we have an assurance that before any recommendation goes to Elected Members, that the public will have the chance to see all the data; along with details of the data gathering approaches used, before the data goes to the committee to inform a decision?

Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said that he would make sure that written answers would be provided. Councillor Peter Garbutt said he had received a briefing on the possible outcome of the scheme and would ensure that members of the public were given an update. He said that there would be an opportunity for members of the public to be involved in the consultation, and that there were three possible outcomes to the scheme namely, leave it as it is, take it away or change it. In terms of change, options could include alternations so that the traffic lights had definitive timings or had one way traffic travelling uphill but not down. Councillor Garbutt said that he had received positive feedback on the scheme and that Nether Edge Primary School were happy with the scheme. With regard to Sheldon Road, residents had asked whether a crossing could be installed. Councillor Nighat Basharat said that she had held meetings with officers and had asked whether there could be a crossing installed on Sheldon Road for easier access to the swimming baths, the park and the school. She said that

initially the scheme was to have run from April to October, 2022 and she would make enquiries as to the end date for the study. She said the focus was on Archer Lane and questions were asked regarding the first six months. Statutory consultation runs out in 18 months. Councillor Basharat said that she would ensure that any future communication was spread widely not just on social media. Councillor Richard Shaw said that the Council had 12 months to decide on the scheme and that a report would be submitted to a meeting of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee and that that meeting was open to all members of the public. Councillor Alexi Dimond said that the trial had been hampered due to vandalism and that schemes such as this one took time to test out, and if approved, embed, and that it was normal for the displacement of traffic to occur, especially in the early stages, but that Active Travel was designed to reduce overall traffic and congestion. He said that the main focus had to be on road safety as many of the roads were dangerous.

A local resident who lives on Sheldon Road, said that traffic and emissions had been like this for seven to eight months now and pollution from 2-6pm was particularly awful. Active travel related local road closures (Archer Lane) were causing the issues and felt that it was a factor between the better off and the poorer. The resident asked when are we going to have the end of this terrible road closure?

- 5.2 **Question 2 from a resident of Folds Lane.** He said that he had lived on Folds Lane for 30 years and it had become a “rat run. He asked if Folds Lane/Dalewood Road could be designated a 20mph zone. He said that large lorries and cars travelling at speed were using these roads.

In response, Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said that the locality of 20mph schemes were due to be considered and he would give his support to Folds Lane being included. Councillor Richard Shaw said that Folds Lane was not in the current programme of schemes, but City Council policy was for 20 mph schemes to be implemented along as many roads as possible. The next scheme would commence at the end of 2024. Councillor Paul Turpin said that when 20mph schemes were first introduced in Sheffield, the Green Party had wanted to implement them on every residential road, but the Labour Party had introduced them piecemeal. He urged residents to contact their local Ward Councillors about specific roads, if they had concerns. Councillor Clement-Jones said he would support Folds Lane/Dalewood Road being included in the current programme. The service would be asked to provide a written response in relation to this question.

- 5.3 **Question 3 regarding the Gleadless Valley Masterplan.** The questioner said that she had looked at the Masterplan and the quality of housing on the Gleadless Valley estate and said that it would cost £90m to refurbish the houses to provide low carbon housing. She said that not all residents wanted their homes to be retrofitted as they did not want

the disruption caused while works were being carried out on their homes. She asked the following five questions:

1. Is there a programme of dates yet for the refurbishment of houses on Gleadless Valley estate?
2. Will residents be consulted on what materials, technologies and standards will be used, and if so, how will they be consulted?
3. What provisions were being made alongside the masterplan programme, for local skills training to involve, educate and train young people for jobs in low carbon construction, design and engineering?
4. What provisions were being made in the masterplan programme to train local people and construction workers to provide support and information for people facing major building works in their homes?
5. Was the Local Authority intending to decant residents whilst the works were taking place?

In response, Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said that when the Council carried out the decent homes programme in other areas of the city, lessons had been learned from it. He said that he would get back to the questioner with written answers. Councillor Paul Turpin said that he had been involved with the development of the Masterplan and had fought to improve it. He said that five Green Party Members and one Labour Party member had pledged to employ and retrain local people, however trainers were few and far between.

5.4 Question 4 regarding the “Connecting Nether Edge to the City Centre Scheme.

Concerns were raised about plans to close the underpass at the bottom of Cemetery Road and to fill it in (a stream runs underneath it) and put a crossing over the road. This was part of the Connecting Sheffield: Nether Edge – City scheme. Post covid, it was felt that more people were using their cars and public transport was not great. It was also felt that most people wanted to use the underpass to keep away from the traffic. It was appreciated it was ugly at the moment and for people who use mobility scooters or prams the access wasn't brilliant, but it was wide enough to make improvements and do something really creative. Can the South LAC Committee help the community find out why the Council was sticking to this proposal when it didn't make sense and why the community was hitting such a stumbling block?

In response, Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said that he would look into the matter and would request a written response from the service. Councillor Peter Garbutt said that he would obtain information regarding the Connecting Sheffield scheme, but he felt that the underpass was not within the remit of the South LAC, more likely to be part of the Central LAC.

5.5 Question 5 regarding Boston Street.

The questioner said that the size of the local community around the bottom of Cemetery Road, Boston Street, London Road (heading towards Aldi) had grown substantially over the past few years, but the junction traffic light settings at this junction had not been adjusted accordingly, and there was no proper crossing, so it was very dangerous for pedestrians trying to cross the road. The timings made it slow, and many people cross when the traffic was moving. Connecting Sheffield have said they can't do anything about this issue as its outside of the scheme. Can the Council look into this issue?

In response, Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said that the matter of traffic lights was not within the remit of the Local Area Committee; but that he would request a written response from the relevant service.

5.6 Question 6 regarding The Independent Caribbean Kollektive (TICK) The questioner (Beverley Bennett) said that she had applied to the South LAC for funding to support TICK who ran activities in the Nether Edge and Sharrow areas and had been told that applications had been oversubscribed and that funding for this group had been refused. She said that she had grown up in Nether Edge and wanted to bring joy back into the area and make it more diverse. She said that she felt that the Caribbean community was always left out, and she had funded many events out of her own pocket over the years. She asked why she was always refused grant funding?

In response, Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said that regarding the allocation of funding from South LAC Community Capacity Building Grants, the LAC had consulted with groups to design the funding; and that the grant schemes were designed to make it as fair as possible when considering applications for support, including from Ward Pots. He apologised but said that the funding had been heavily oversubscribed and that the Committee was entirely fair across the process. Councillor Peter Garbutt said that he would contact Ms. Bennett direct on this matter. Councillor Nighat Basharat said that with regard to granting funds from the Ward Pot, every effort was made to make sure that everything fair and that diversity and inclusion were considered. She said that she had taken everything on board in terms of what had been said, adding that there was a limited pot of money and there were many organisations needing assistance, especially with the current cost of living crisis. Councillor Basharat also offered to speak to Ms. Bennett directly outside of the meeting.

5.7 Question 7 regarding the Mosque on Wolseley Road. The questioner said that there was a take-away across the road from the Mosque, but there wasn't a litter bin. He said that some people took their litter home with them, but many dropped empty cups on the street. He asked if a litter bin could be provided? It was also stated that there was a litter bin outside the gates of Sharrow School, but the bin was not emptied on

a regular basis and so the questioner asked who was responsible for emptying litter bins?

In response, Councillor Peter Garbutt said that he would follow up the question regarding the supply of a litter bin on Wolseley Road and enquire who was responsible for emptying litter bins and the frequency of collections and would get back to the questioner.

5.8 Question 8 regarding the Community Plan.

Would local young people be involved in the street art project e.g. Double Six Youth Club at Woodseats

In response. Diane Owens confirmed that there was an intention to involve local young people in the street art projects. Ms. Owens confirmed that the likely approach would be to establish one project per ward; and that it was intended to use some of the funding (or possibly explore additional funding) to support the engagement of young people directly in the street art projects.

6. SOUTH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE: COMMUNITY PLAN

6.1 Diane Owens, South LAC Area Manager, gave a presentation which provided an update on the South LAC Community Plan. She highlighted the six key themes of the Plan which were based on community engagement and data received and the work that had been carried out so far. She advised that each LAC had been allocated £100,000 to support projects identified in its Community Plan; and that so far the South LAC had allocated £60,000 of this budget. She said that each LAC had also been allocated £57,000 to focus on preventative projects around fly tipping and graffiti hotspots. Ms. Owens said that the initial focus had been on fly tipping hot spots and that a short list of key sites had been submitted and that the LAC was now awaiting quotes for the projects. Each LAC had also been allocated £10,000 for youth activities.

Diane Owens said that from the £100,000 budget, £10,000 had been allocated towards clearing up of The Lumb in Gleadless Valley and she gave an update on work carried out so far with the aim of improving community use of the site. With regard to crime and community safety, £40,000 had been allocated to support community capacity building projects, including responding to the cost-of-living crisis. This funding was heavily oversubscribed and had now been fully allocated.

Diane Owens said that a speed indication device had been installed in each of the four Wards (and would be rotated around priority locations) and that work with local Police Teams and partners, including the community and voluntary sector, was continuing to support the work of three Neighbourhood Action Groups (NAGs) for priority areas, to reduced levels of crime and anti-social behaviour and increase feelings

of safety.

With regard to Children, Young People and Families, Diane Owens said that a group of Councillors from the South LAC had met with young people from the South LAC Youth Cabinet to hear about priorities for young people and to increase engagement with young people. She referred to grants that were available to help fund youth activities, with a total of £30,000 being allocated through the South LAC.

Finally, she gave a progress update on the Ward Pots and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL). She said that 39 small grants had been given out so far this year through Ward Pot funding which was allocated by local Ward Councillors and had funded a wide range of activities, including community events, equipment for local sports groups, walking clubs, social clubs for older people and family activities and trips. 23 projects had been supported to date through CIL funding, which was also allocated by local Ward Councillors, the projects had included new equipment for playgrounds and highways improvements.

6.2 A number of questions were asked, and responses given as follows:-. A resident asked whether to which.

Question What was the cost of fly tipping in Sheffield per annum?

Response Councillor Alexi Dimond said that under the contract the Council had with Amey, if fly tipping was on the highways, Amey had a responsibility to clear it up, so there was no cost to the Council. Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said he would request a written response to this question.

Question Would CCTV would be effective in catching fly tippers?

Response Diane Owens said that each LAC did have some budget to focus on preventing fly tipping at key hot spot locations. The LAC had been working with Environment Protection Officers, who go to sites and assess how fly tipping could be prevented. In some cases, CCTV could be effective at capturing vehicular fly tipping, but that it was less effective at catching individuals – in part due to the burden of proof required for a conviction. Diane Owens advised that other less costly measures could also be effective, such as concrete boulders to stop vehicles entering sites.

Questions With regard to CIL monies, how much Section 106 money was raised by the Council per annum? How much was allocated to LACs? How much had been spent and on what? Does the money have to be spent on highways infrastructure?

Response Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said that the issue of funding through CIL and Section 106 money was complex, including politically. In terms of CIL funding, two weeks ago a meeting had been

held with all LAC Chairs and the Leader of the City Council, Councillor Terry Fox and one of the issues raised was fairness in the distribution of the CIL money, as only 15% was under the control of LACs, whilst the bulk of the money was spent on priorities decided upon centrally. Councillor Clement-Jones said he felt there were also issues in terms of the inflexibility of the Council and the bureaucratic process. Councillor Clement-Jones said that something needed to be done to change the current approach. Councillor Peter Garbutt said the amount of CIL allocated changed year on year. He said the amount of the money depended on what had been generated by developments carried out within the city and the income received from them. He said the amount of money spent was fluid and varied by wards as it was also in part linked to deprivation levels. Councillor Clement-Jones said he would request a written response to these questions.

Question Mobile speed cameras, has it been decided where they will be sited. An example would be around Greenhill School, where there was a rat-run.

Response Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said that in his ward (Beauchief and Greenhill) there were three SIDs already in the area, so the LAC one had made it four. Part of the deal with the SIDs, was that the LAC would inform the locations that would be prioritised; and that each Ward had identified six locations, based on feedback from communities and local intelligence. After 12 months, an assessment would be carried out to see if there were any other sites that could be used. Councillor Clement-Jones gave details of the six rotation sites currently being used in the Beauchief and Greenhill area.

7. SOUTH LOCAL AREA COMMUNITY PLAN

- 7.1 Diane Owens referred to the report and said the presentation had focused on the spends to date. She said that the report also outlined the spend to date and also gave an outline of proposed spending regarding the remaining balance of £30,000, during the 2022/23 financial year. She outlined a proposal to spend £11,000 on two portable CCTV cameras; £3,000 for community capacity building and up to £16,000 for street art projects.
- 7.2 Councillor Simon Clement-Jones thanked everyone for their commitment and involvement in the delivery of the Community Plan and it was **agreed** to approve the recommendations set out in the report.