

East Local Area Committee

Meeting held 30 June 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Mary Lea (Chair), David Barker, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Ben Miskell and Zahira Naz

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ann Murphy, Terry Fox, Mazher Iqbal, Nabeela Mowlana, Sioned-Mair Richards and Sophie Wilson.

2. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 No declarations of interest were made at the meeting.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETINGS

4.1 Comments were received from two members of the public regarding accuracy of the minutes of the meeting held on 23 March, 2022. Their comments were considered by the Committee who subsequently agreed the minutes as an accurate record.

4.2 **RESOLVED:** that the minutes of the previous meetings held on the 23 March, 2022 and 18 May, 2022 were agreed as accurate records.

5. EAST LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE SPEND PROFILE

5.1 The East Community Services Manager, Huda Ahmed, gave an overview of how the Local Area Committee budget was intended to be distributed across the themed priorities, referring to the "Report of East Local Area Committee proposed spending 2022-23".

5.2 Each Local Area Committee had a £100,000 budget to address local priorities, identified within their respective Community Plans. This report set out details of the proposed spending in respect of this £100,000 during the 2022/23 financial year. The report gave an overview of the general categories of proposed expenditure and sought authorisation from the East Local Area Committee to permit the Community Services Manager, in consultation with the Local Area Committee Chair, to spend monies to address identified priorities within the Community Plan.

5.3 The East Local Area Committee Community Plan had been formally agreed at the meeting of 23 March, 2022, and page 4 of the spending report showed a

breakdown of showed an overview of anticipated spend during 2022/23 against the 3 main priorities: children and young people, environment and communities and neighbourhoods.

- 5.4 A questioner asked about the proposed expenditure of £2,500 per ward on projects for children and young people, and whether, if necessary, this could be redistributed across wards with more children.

In response, Huda Ahmed advised that each ward had access to 'ward pot' based on the Index of Multiple Deprivation. The Local Area Committee budget was in addition to this and could help put extra support in place around children and young people. The spending proposal aimed to improve the livelihoods of the whole area and to identify key projects needed to help make those improvements.

- 5.5 A questioner felt that £100,000 did not feel like a lot of money in the current cost of living and climate crises and asked why insulation advice had not been included in the spending plan. A suggestion had been made at a recent climate change meeting that part of the Council's wider budget be allocated towards insulation advice.

In response, the Chair advised that local spending priorities had been identified via the Local Area Committee survey.

Councillor Hurst added that a 10 Point Plan for Climate Change Action had been agreed which aimed to put climate at the centre of decision making via routes such as the planning process and housing schemes. This would include support for cladding schemes and roof insulation on the worst affected buildings.

- 5.6 A volunteer with Sheffield Litter Pickers was concerned about litter and flytipping and noted that the spending plan had no mention of taking stronger enforcement action on litter dropping. He understood that there had been more prosecutions taken in relation to this but wanted to know why enforcement was not given more priority and what happened to money received from fines.

Another questioner was concerned that reporting of flytipping incidents did not always result in enforcement action being taken.

In response, the Chair advised that each Local Area Committee had been allocated a proportion of city-wide funding to tackle flytipping and graffiti, some of which had been allocated to tackle hotspots. This was a city-wide issue, and Local Area Committees would be working closely with the environmental enforcement team. She also explained that funds received via fines were put back into the service and noted that 'days of action' had been held in Tinsley and Castlebeck.

Councillor Miskell agreed about the importance of enforcement and noted that this was one of the areas that had suffered due to budget cuts. He advised the questioner to follow up his query and continue to seek answers.

Councillor Drabble noted that it was important to ensure fairness in the way money was distributed. He was concerned that there might be a bias towards larger organisations that had more capacity and hoped that this could be addressed to ensure that smaller organisations also had opportunities.

Lorraine Wood, Head of Communities, confirmed that procedures were in place to ensure there was fairness and opportunity, and that the Local Area Committee team were able to provide support to those smaller organisations when submitting bids for funding.

The Chair noted that ward councillors had the advantage of being aware of the smaller organisations within their areas and could also offer them support.

- 5.7 A questioner who was involved with a volunteer litter picking group was concerned that some bins in the Norfolk Park area had been removed. This had been reported but not actioned, and the questioner had experienced problems in reporting this issue via the Council's website and was redirected to the FixMyStreet website.

The Chair confirmed that issues reported via FixMyStreet were passed onto to the relevant Council team. She also noted that the bulk of the cost was around the bin emptying scheduling rather than replacement of bins.

Councillor Miskell thanked those who worked as volunteers for litter picking groups for the excellent work that they carried out. He noted that parts of Norfolk Park had recently undergone a transformation and that now would be a good time to be creative about encouraging residents to use litter bins. He agreed that enforcement action was needed, and felt it was important to encourage residents and park users to make the right choices.

- 5.8 **RESOLVED:** that the East Local Area Committee:-

- i. notes the proposed anticipated expenditure against the £100,000 budget to address local priorities in the East Local Area Committee Community Plan in 2022/23, as detailed in the report; and
- 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.

- 5.9 **Reasons for Decision**

The East LAC was asked to note the broad allocation of funding under the priority headings identified to assist its ability to monitor its budget, and to authorise the Community Services Manager to approve expenditure above the current delegated authority in certain circumstances so that delivery of the Community Plan is not delayed.

5.10 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

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

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

6. **ECONOMIC RECOVERY FUND**

6.1 Sarah Lowi Jones, Economic Policy Officer based in the Council's Economic Strategy Team, presented an overview of the Economic Recovery Fund (ERF) project that has been live since March 2019. This covered:-

What ERF is:-

- A unique grant fund of £2.38m - £2m from the Council and £382,000 from a Government fund called ARG. The Fund aimed to support local economic recovery, especially in district and local centres, by safeguarding jobs and businesses, bringing back footfall, increasing consumer confidence, and building awareness of the great offer across our local high streets.
- It opened to applications in March 2021 and interested parties could bid for a small grant of up to £50k or a large grant of up to £200k.

How it has worked:-

- ERF purposefully had broad eligibility criteria and was open to all that can meet them. These were:
- The applications had to come from a collaboration, not just an individual business or organisation
- The application had to be for the broader benefit of an area
- It had to have additionality – i.e. would it have happened anyway, or would funding enable it to happen bigger, better and faster?
- Covid security implications taken into account (for example in event proposals).
- All eligible applications were scored using a standard, transparent set of scoring criteria and there was a minimum pass mark that applications had to meet.
- To score these applications and oversee the ERF as a project a Steering Group was established that included Councillors, Senior Officers and

- private sector representatives.
- The Council also took a collaborative approach by working with applicants wherever possible, to help them develop the best possible application.
- 104 applications were received of which 26 received funding that represented a range of areas and type of project.
- Two clear 'groups' of applications emerged, the first were a group of events based largely in the city centre that fit well with the Council's planned Summer in the Outdoor City marketing campaign. The second group were from groups of businesses and others from district centres and high streets.
- The district centre projects all reflect what local businesses, community groups and others think is important and will have an impact.

Delivery so far:-

- Since July 2021 over 80 events had been delivered that received ERF funding. In this period, Sheffield was also shown to have the most improved footfall across UK cities.
- At the end of 2021 ERF funded the enabling works and installation of Christmas lights, large Christmas trees and events in some areas.
- Place-making activity had started, including new street furniture and lamppost banners in some parts of the city. Improvements had been made to Firth Park, including improvements to the park itself and to the roundabout.
- Since the new year events have been delivered in Woodhouse and the city centre. At least 30 events were planned over the coming months using ERF funds, alongside new public art, shop front improvement schemes, a green wall, planters and new trees and lots of other activity.
- A summary of all district centre projects was available on the <https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/business/covid-19-economic-recovery-fund> and a roundup of the Summer in the Outdoor City events was also available <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=uzN-WI7neEg>

6.2 Dawn Dale, Community Development Coordinator for Manor Castle Development Trust, provided an update on the Heart of Manor Park project, which was a joint consultation exercise between the Trust and the Council, working with shopkeepers to identify key local issues relating to the physical environment.

Challenges to local businesses varied from environmental issues to vandalism, and the project hoped to support businesses by delivering a programme of events aimed at encouraging footfall. A bid was prepared based on the issues identified.

A monthly steering group would be set up with two sub-groups: one focussing on events and engagement, the other on community artwork. These would involve the whole team together with local shopkeepers, local residents, ward councillors, Together Housing, Temple Park, Park Academy and Manor After School Club, amongst others.

Other physical improvements noted included regular emptying of litter bins and repairs to a damaged noticeboard.

The panel were now looking at options for community artwork and a meeting was due to take place next week to decide upon an artist that best fits the local area. It was hoped that local people could be engaged in this process.

An event had been planned to launch the installation of new planters on 12 August, with assistance from local community groups. The Manor Park Keep Tidy campaign had been working with local children on designs, and Park Academy planned to hold events around litter picking.

A Facebook Page called “Heart of Manor Park” and a newsletter had been set up and would be utilised to help promote the launch of the artwork and the planters. Discussions were also taking place with local shopkeepers to consider options around fund raising for Christmas events, including Christmas lights and market stalls.

- 6.3 A questioner asked how much the artist was being paid, and whether this would be a local artist.

Dawn Dale confirmed that the cost would be £10,000 including materials, and that expressions of interest had been received from three artists. This project would involve schools and colleges and aimed to seek out and encourage young talent.

7. HOLIDAY ACTIVITY FUND

- 7.1 Fidelma Guinan, Commissioning Officer, gave a presentation on the Holiday Activities and Food (HAF), a national Department for Education programme.

The first share of funding was made available to support school age children in 2020 and it had been a challenge to distribute activity packs and food hampers during the first year of the pandemic.

2022 was the third year of this funding, and the challenge was to spread the £2.7million funding across the city to address the gap in provision for children over the holiday periods. This funding was based on the numbers of children eligible for free school meals in Sheffield.

Minimum standards were set by the Department for Education and aimed to support high quality provision coordinated across a local area. This included provision of healthy food, enriching activities, physical activities, nutritional education, and a core set of policies and procedures.

Consultation had taken place with over 800 children to understand what they would like to do and eat. During the summer of 2022 there would be seven Holiday Activities and Food locality coordinators working across the city to deliver activities.

Fidelma Guinan outlined the branding for the scheme and noted the website which had full details of the diverse range of activities on offer for children of different age groups across Sheffield: <https://sheffieldhealthyholidays.org>

7.2 Debbie Mathews, Chief Executive Officer of Manor Castle Development Trust, gave some background on the Holiday Activities and Food programme in her area, which included:-

- Holiday Hunger was delivered in 2017/18. Voluntary Action Sheffield was the accountable body and had applied for funding and was successful. This covered the east of Sheffield (Darnall, Manor Castle, Park, Arbourthorne and Richmond)
- In 2019 the programme was devolved to Local Authorities and Sheffield used a subcontracting model allowing local anchor organisations to deliver in Sheffield. Lockdowns during the pandemic had required a focus on getting food parcels out to families reliant on Free School Meals.
- In 2020 there had been a mix of food parcels and some limited face to face activity.
- In 2021 there had mainly been face to face activities. The Department for Education have announced a 3-year programme from Easter 2022.

7.3 Debbie Mathews explained that there had been challenges around delivering the programme and that it was important to consider the legacy and activities that could continue beyond the programme. The east of Sheffield had a large number of children eligible for free school meals, and there was a particular challenge of reaching teenagers. An evaluation process was in place when allocating funding to providers, aiming to share resources fairly.

The IPAL booking system was useful but challenging for families that were digitally excluded or where English was not their first language.

Half term holidays were covered by Sheffield City Council and were not comparable in terms of activities on offer. It was now hoped to plan further ahead, ie for the year ahead rather than to the next school holiday.

7.4 Debbie Mathews outlined the positive aspects of the programme. A large percentage of children had been reached, providing a good offer of activity and food, and this offer was improving all the time. The programme had also built on local knowledge and relationships, particularly with providers and schools.

7.5 Debbie Mathews outlined the next steps:-

- Work with ward-based allocations using the free school meal data to focus the resources where they are needed.
- Work out how to support schools to target the eligible children.
- Look at ways of assessing value for money and reach with the new monitoring
- More tailoring of the commission to ensure it provides what children and young people want.
- Support providers to meet the due diligence requirements.

- The summer programme was ready to go and plans were underway for October half term.

7.6 The Chair noted that it was important not to stigmatise children.

In response, Debbie Mathews explained that some providers had been able to match fund and offer some paid places for peers that were not eligible. This aimed to help destigmatise the offer and to increase reach but was work in progress.

7.7 Councillor Drabble felt there was an imbalance regarding inclusion of organisations in Richmond and wished to understand the efforts being made to address this and to ensure that children in Richmond were supported.

Debbie Mathews advised that Richmond had a budget allocation proportional to free school meals and a Richmond budget. Some providers were already working in this area. During the pandemic work was carried out with smaller organisations to help with delivery of the programme. The relationships with provider were now in place and conversations/sharing of information could continue to take place. Due diligence requirements had increased as the programme had developed and for some providers this had been a challenge and sometimes excluded them.

The Chair noted that it was important to continue these conversations to ensure that all the organisations involved were able to develop and to continue to have a voice.

8. LOCAL AREA COMMUNITY PLAN - ACTIVITIES PROGRESS UPDATE

8.1 The East Community Services Manager, Huda Ahmed, gave an update on activities progress on the themed priorities, which included:-

- Public meetings involving South Yorkshire Police in Arbourthorne
- Activities around the Queen's Platinum Jubilee
- Developing the Voluntary Sector Forum
- 'Day of Action' on flytipping and litter in Tinsley and Castlebeck
- Approving locations of Vehicle Activated Speed Signs
- Tree of Hope – St Catherine's of Siena
- Information guide for the Voluntary/Community/Faith sector
- Working groups around the cost of living crisis
- Applications for ward pot spending
- Approval of the £100,000 anticipated spend

9. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

9.1 The Committee received the following questions from members of the public who had submitted questions prior to the meeting, and who were in attendance

to raise them:-

9.1.1 **Question 1**

A questioner who was in attendance at the meeting asked the following question:

At the last LAC meeting, and as other Councillors have said, we were told the Park Hill Parking Scheme would not go ahead if the majority of residents did not want it.

Out of the 1066 responses only 46 were in favour of the scheme (4.3%). So 95.7% were against it.

Will this parking scheme now be abandoned as this clearly shows the scheme does not have community support and the majority of residents do not want it? Plus a councillor has said the Parking Hill scheme has overwhelmingly been rejected.

In response, the Chair explained that there was a due process to follow. Where circumstances had changed since the proposal was first made, an updated report would be presented to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee who would make appropriate recommendations. Ward Councillors were unable to make such decisions.

9.1.2 **Question 2 – Stephen Burgin**

Stephen Burgin, who was in attendance at the meeting, asked the following question:

Given the initial business case is written predominantly to give equal support to businesses and residents and that the population of Norfolk Park/Park Hill is >90% residential and the research that underpins the vast majority of the rationale is from 2005-2015 and is from overseas research is there really any point in continuing with this costly scheme?

In response, the Chair advised that individual Councillors were unable to make decisions on such schemes, and the decision would be made in due course by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.

9.1.3 **Question 3 – Rosalie Hill, Chair, Park Community Action**

Rosalie Hill, who was in attendance at the meeting, asked the following questions:

1. Regarding the proposed Park Hill parking scheme, were there any alternatives to parking permits and meters considered as a means of addressing extraneous parking in the area: for example, no parking before 9.30am as currently prevails on parts of Duke Street/City Road? Were such alternatives costed and compared in terms of ease of

enforcement?

2. Were the parking needs for access to community buildings such as the Park Centre/library considered before drawing up the scheme? Was the Council aware of the importance of activities in Park Centre to community cohesion, the improvement of health and the reduction of social isolation?

The Chair noted that the work carried out at the Park Centre was appreciated, and advised that a full response to the questions raised would be provided.

9.1.4 **Question 4 – Graham Wroe**

Graham Wroe, who was in attendance at the meeting, asked the following question:

Could the parking scheme consider:

- (a) provision of secure parking for bicycles; and
- (b) provision of electric vehicle charging points.

The Chair noted Mr Wroe's suggestions.

9.1.5 **Question 5 – Steve Cooper**

Steve Cooper, who was in attendance at the meeting, asked the following question:

Crossing points for pedestrians at Parkway/Handsworth Road junction for Athelstan School pupils as the bus is invariably late and parking provision at school is difficult especially when the recreation department car park is not allowed to be used?

In response, the Chair advised that this issue cut across various services within the Council, and that a full response would be provided to the questioner.

Councillor Miskell echoed concerns around the quality of bus services and noted that one-third of bus services were expected to be cut in October 2022. He believed that public investment was needed and explained that the newly elected South Yorkshire Mayor, Oliver Coppard, had taken the decision to start a formal assessment into bus franchising with a view to planning and determining bus routes.

9.1.6 **Question 6 – David Cobley**

David Cobley, who was in attendance at the meeting, asked the following questions:

We have been trying for three years to get traffic calming measures on

Donnington Road, Essex Road and Holdings Road. We were advised that a draft scheme was in force and that the Council had indicated it would use CIL money to fund such a scheme and that the money was available.

Following on from a meeting of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, written confirmation had been received that officers had developed options which had then been submitted to the Local Area Committee for their consideration.

Can you confirm that you have had these options and are positively considering them?

A Freedom of Information request put to South Yorkshire Police regarding the number of fixed penalty notices issued for non-compliance with no left/right turns has not yet been answered. We have been advised that the Council has devolved powers to apply for enforcement powers to use enforcement cameras for such driving offences. Has the Council applied for those powers and, if so, when do they plan to commence?

Nether Edge and other wards have set out a programme of signage on roads. Is there a similar programme for the East Local Area Committee area?

In response, the Chair confirmed that there was a scheme to install vehicle activated signs, and that each LAC had been asked to identify 6 hotspots which the VAS would be rotated around throughout the year. A schedule would be provided to the questioner. She also advised that CIL money was owned by the ward and that ward councillors made decisions on this spending.

The Chair noted that Active Neighbourhood schemes were being trialled in Nether Edge and Crookes, and that there was limited funding available.

NG Hill noted that a question regarding speed restrictions on Donnington Road had been raised at the March meeting of the East Local Area Committee and that a full response was yet to be provided.

The Chair advised that a full written response would be provided to all of the questions raised.

9.1.7 **Question 7 – Irene Day**

Irene Day, who was in attendance at the meeting, asked the following question:

Park Hill parking discussions have dominated the meeting and there are other people in this area that have other questions.

At the East LAC online event in February, I asked a question about an empty house in Richmond park that had been vandalised and other

houses in the area which are known to be empty, and if anything was being done to repair these properties. I would like to know what is happening to those properties under the estates review.

Councillor Hurst confirmed that there had been an undertaking to keep the house in a decent state of repair until a review could be carried out. She agreed, along with Councillor Drabble, to make renewed efforts to seek clarification on this issue.

10. NEXT PUBLIC MEETING

- 10.1 The next East Local Area Committee was due to take place on Tuesday 18 October, 2022, at a venue to be confirmed.