

## CITY OF SHEFFIELD

### METROPOLITAN DISTRICT

#### MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL – 6<sup>TH</sup> SEPTEMBER, 2017

#### COPIES OF QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS THERETO

##### Questions

##### Answers

#### Questions of Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1. Were you invited to the meeting of Yorkshire Council leaders to discuss the Yorkshire-wide deal?  | Yes   |
| 2. If so, why did you not attend this meeting?   | Because there is no ‘Yorkshire-wide deal’ to discuss. The Government have been clear that the South Yorkshire devolution deal that we have negotiated is the only one on offer - the Northern Powerhouse Minister has said: “There will not be a “full Yorkshire” devolution deal”. |
| 3. During July and August, what communications have you had with Ros Jones and Sir Steve Houghton in relation to progressing the Sheffield City Region devolution deal?                                  | I am in regular contact with all South Yorkshire Leaders. I do not hold a record of every single communication.   |
| 4. Have you and the leader of Rotherham Council, Chris Read, investigated the possibility of continuing the Sheffield City Region deal with Barnsley and Doncaster?                                      | That is exactly what we are doing.  |
| 5. Have any representations been made to the Government about pursuing a Sheffield-Rotherham deal?   | As stated above the Government have made it clear that the South Yorkshire Deal is the only deal on the table at this time, we are committed to this deal.  |
| 6. Since the last City Region Leaders meeting, what communications have you or your officers had with a Minister or Civil Servants about the Sheffield City Region deal? Please list when and with whom? | Both myself and officers have been in contact with the relevant Department for Communities and Local Government Ministers and Civil Servants. We do not hold a record of every single communication.  |

7. If so, what are your thoughts on this proposal?

It is not clear what proposal your question is referring to.

Question of Councillor Gail Smith to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore)

Why were the pre-injunction letters sent out from a Council officer on behalf of Sheffield City Council, rather than Amey?

This question has been asked to and answered by Councillor Bryan Lodge.

Questions of Councillor Penny Baker to Councillor Jayne Dunn (Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety)

1. (a) How many houses owned by the Authority have been vacant for longer than a year?

As at 1<sup>st</sup> September, 11 council houses have been empty for over a year. Five of these are for auction/ awaiting disposal/ decision on disposal, two are fire damaged and the others require major work

I have removed the address number from the table below

- (b) How long have each of these properties been empty?

Property_address	Property type	No._of_ days_void
Glossop Road	House	1232
Mayfield Cottages, Mayfield Road	House	1169
Rivelin Lodge, Manchester Road	House	1050
Meersbrook Park Road	House	994
Whinacre Walk	House	819
Whinacre Walk	House	679
Church Street	House	623
East Bank Place	House	441
Waterthorpe Glade	House	435
Dryden Avenue	House	392
Clipstone Gardens	Bungalow 60+	385

2. Can you provide me with an update on the removal of cladding on the Hanover Tower blocks?

The work to remove the cladding and the insulation material will complete by the second week in September.

Cladding has been removed from all elevations except one.

Work is continuing at roof level to remove the cladding and replace with new material so that residents do not suffer any water penetration.

Questions of Councillor Douglas Johnson to Councillor Jayne Dunn (Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety)

1. What action has the Council taken, since July's full Council meeting, to ensure the fire safety of private sector accommodation in City Ward?

The Director of Housing has contacted all social landlords in the city to seek information about the buildings over 6 storeys.

Contact has also been made with

universities, transport organisations, schools, hospitals and private sector accommodation providers. South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service (SYFRS) have provided Sheffield City Council with a list of buildings and we are compiling a city database.

We have spoken to SYFRS about the buildings for which cladding samples have been submitted to Building Research Establishment (BRE) and they have let us know what action building owners are taking.

The Council has a team that regulates the private rented sector across the city. This is done on a continual basis. The work of the team is nationally recognised and they deliver a range of education and enforcement measures. The officers are experienced and fully qualified in the raft of legislation that applies to the private rented sector.

The team respond to around 2,000 complaints per year.

The private rented sector is the most regulated of all housing in the city. Every private rented property is subject to high and strict standards of health and safety, and this has been regulated since it was introduced in the Housing Act 2004.

Houses in Multiple Occupation (shared houses) have even higher standards to comply with and these are regulated strictly by the team.

The team are satisfied that private rented accommodation across the city is generally safe, and most often very good quality.

Only a minority of properties and landlords require our intervention and this is carried out in line with team

resources which are directed at the highest priorities.

Our landlord associations were written to, asking that they forward the letter to their members for information. However, their properties are not high rise and the issues do not apply so we did not expect any replies.

As part of our attendance at their quarterly committee meetings, we are updating them on measures taken by the Council since the Grenfell fire.

2. How many organisations have been written to and how many replies have been received?

Overall, the Director of Housing has contacted over 100 organisations that we understand have properties deemed as high rise. Additional addresses have been provided by SYFRS recently. Approximately 40 organisations have responded to date and follow up letters are being sent.

3. How many high-rise blocks containing residential accommodation have been identified in City Ward?

We will provide this data to the Councillor for City Ward, the database does not currently hold this data but will be updated.

4. How many of these blocks does the Council consider to be safe against fire?

Most private high rise blocks in the city have been built within the past 10-15 years, so they must meet current Planning and Building Regulations and have been inspected by South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service.

5. How many have failed fire safety inspections?

Currently SYFRS have notified us that four private sector blocks have failed the DCLG cladding test undertaken by the BRE. SYFRS have advised that appropriate mitigations are in place and three of these are actively removing cladding as part of the fire safety mitigation activity.

Questions of Councillor Martin Smith to Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Business and Investment)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1. When is the Council likely to get feedback on its initial bid for locating Channel 4 HQ in Sheffield?  | Autumn 2017   |
| 2. How much of the current forecast spend for the first phase of the new retail quarter (Project Cavendish) will be spent with locally based business?      | £15.2m or 22% Sheffield City Region address base for the current construction contract.   |
| 3. When is the forecast completion date for Cavendish building?   | The completion date for the construction works is Quarter 2 2019. However, fit out contracts will complete later than this to suit tenant requirements. |
| 4. How many times have you met with the Sichuan Guodong Construction Group this year?   | None.   |
| 5. In July 2016 the Council announced that the Sichuan Guodong Group would invest £220m in Sheffield within 3 years. How much has been invested since then? | The detail of the schemes are currently being developed   |
| 6. How many small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs) have been supported by the Growth Hub Enhancement Project in the last 12 months?                      | 74  |

Question of Councillor Roger Davison to Councillor Mary Lea (Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure)

Can you please provide a list of all capital investments in Sheffield's parks in the last three years? For each, please provide the project, date, location and cost.

Please see the attached spreadsheet.

## CAPITAL EXPENDITURE ON SHEFFIELD CITY PARKS

Project Number	Scheme Title	Expenditure 31/03/17	Information
93401	GRAVES PARK INCLUSIVE PLAY	8,667.00	
93410	ANGRAM BANK PARK IMPROVEMENTS	43,133.00	
93412	CROOKES VALLEY PARKS	136.50	
93992	RIVELIN VALLEY PLAYBUILDER	7,150.00	
94487	CHARNOCK REC'N GROUND MUGA	4,212.63	
94496	WOODTHORPE RECREATION GROUND	18,679.00	
94501	SYCAMORE ST YOUTH & SPORTS	15,875.00	
94503	GRAVES PARK IMP. PROJECT	10,714.59	
94504	GREENHILL PARK IMPROVEMENTS	30,860.85	
94506	GRAVES AND MILLHOUSE TENNIS COURTS	131,014.86	Graves £79K Millhouses £52K
	HILLSBOROUGH PARK	8,075.00	
94507	BINGHAM COURTS	1,614.00	
94513	ECB PITCHES*	127,934.25	
94516	COLLEY PARK IMPROVEMENTS	1,275.00	
94518	MILLHOUSES PARK BASKETBALL	13,696.20	
		423,037.88	

### ECB Pitches Sites\*

Graves Park x 2  
 Bents Green x 2  
 Ecclesfield Park  
 Mather Road  
 Hollinsend Park  
 Don Valley Bowl  
 Meadowhead School  
 Emmanuel School (Thorpe Green)  
 Mount Pleasant Park

<b>Project Number</b>	<b>Scheme Title</b>	<b>Expenditure 31/03/16</b>	<b>Information</b>
93402	LOWFIELD PRO FIT	4,058.99	Lowfield School
93408	ENDCLIFFE PARKOUR	1,900.00	
93412	CROOKES VALLEY PARKS	17,679.15	
93992	RIVELIN VALLEY PLAYBUILDER	1,110.00	
94380	MANOR FIELDS TODDLER PLAY	10,763.35	
94472	CHAPELTOWN TEEN AREA	24,012.00	
94487	CHARNOCK REC'N GROUND MUGA	53,798.24	
94488	HILLSBOROUGH PARK TENNIS COURTS	12,927.91	
94489	HIGH HAZEL TENNIS COURT	60,649.62	
94492	RETHINKING PARSON CROSS PARK	5,387.57	
		192,286.83	

<b>Project Number</b>	<b>Scheme Title</b>	<b>Expenditure 31/03/15</b>	<b>Information</b>
93402	LOWFIELD PRO FIT	119,207.79	Lowfield School
93408	ENDCLIFFE PARKOUR	36,099.98	
93986	BURNGREAVE RECREATION PLAYBUILDER	1,529.00	
93992	RIVELIN VALLEY PLAYBUILDER	14,428.34	
94380	MANOR FIELDS TODDLER PLAY	100,235.62	
94464	HACKENTHORPE SKATE & BMX	961.70	
94468	CHELSEA PARK IMPROVEMENTS	21,908.91	
94487	CHARNOCK REC'N GROUND MUGA	22,477.76	
		316,849.10	

Questions of Councillor Gail Smith to Councillor Bryan Lodge (Cabinet Member for the Environment and Streetscene)

1. Why were the pre-injunction letters sent out from a Council officer on behalf of Sheffield City Council, rather than Amey?

It is the Council that took the action in the High Court.
2. Including the latest High Court injunctions, how much has the Council spent in (a) legal fees and (b) officer time on litigating against tree campaigners?
  - a) The total legal charges to date in the injunction litigation are £150,472 made up of
    - £24,275.41 Legal Internal recharge
    - External costs (as of 14/08/17) for injunction:
    - Counsel's fees: £94,005.70 (£112,780.24 inc VAT)
    - Process server and investigations: £12,634.75
    - Court fee: £783.00
  - b) That information is not available.
3. Which officer advised you that Clause 19.2.1 of the Streets Ahead Contract was superseded by other clauses? What department is that officer based in?

No officer has provided that advice.
4. Do you know which clause(s) supersede Clause 19.2.1. Yes or no? If yes, please inform me of the clause(s).

See answer 3 above.
5. Has the Council drawn up the schedule of works to fell the remaining ear-marked street trees between now and 31<sup>st</sup> December, 2017?

Tree replacement decisions have been published on the Council's web site.

If so, can you please make the information public?

If not, when do you expect this to be drawn up?
6. How do you think you have handled the latest High Court action and the subsequent publicity for Sheffield?

The Council were successful in the High Court action as it was in the 2016 Judicial Review. The High Court HELD (para 92) *"Ultimately, what has been held to be the lawful decision of the democratically elected council as*

*to where the public interest lies must prevail over the views of individual protesters who are not entitled to prevent the council from giving effect to its lawful decisions”.*

Question of Councillor Adam Hanrahan to Councillor Bryan Lodge (Cabinet Member for the Environment and Streetscene)

Since the last Council meeting, what meetings have you had regarding Western Road trees?

A meeting to review the recommendations of the Scrutiny report has taken place. Obviously, further meetings will take place in response to their recommendations.

Questions of Councillor Douglas Johnson to Councillor Bryan Lodge (Cabinet Member for the Environment and Streetscene)

1. Given that the Streets Ahead contract states that Amey is liable for any losses caused through trespass and protest -

(a) why did the Council, and not Amey, take legal proceedings against campaigners?

The Council took legal action as it has a duty to maintain the highway under Section 41 Highways Act 1980.

(b) why did the Council not consider the alternative option of letting Amey decide if it wanted to take legal proceedings against campaigners?

See (a) above.

(c) what steps has the Council taken to ensure it is not in breach of the State Aid rules by taking legal proceedings that benefit Amey?

See (a) above.

(d) how much have the legal proceedings cost the Council?

The total legal charges to date in the injunction litigation are £150,472 made up of

- £24,275.41 Legal Internal recharge
- External costs (as of 14/08/17) for injunction:
- Counsel's fees: £94,005.70 (£112,780.24 inc VAT)
- Process server and investigations:

£12,634.75

- Court fee: £783.00.

(e) do you consider this is good value for Sheffield's residents?

The success in the High Court action will allow the upgrade of the City's roads to progress which is in the interests of the City and the vast majority of its residents. The High Court found comprehensively in favour of the council.

2. Staff purporting to act on behalf of the Council told demonstrators outside Olive Grove depot on Wednesday 23<sup>rd</sup> August "We're not obliged to show you any ID; we're working on behalf of the Council" -

(a) Is this the Council's position or are staff instructed to show their identity badges?

There were no Council staff present.

(b) Who is the data controller for the recently-hired "evidence collectors"?

Evidence is provided to the Councils legal department.

(c) Are they all SIA registered and DBS checked and does the Council hold verification of this?

SIA registration is irrelevant and the roles do not carry a requirement for DBS checks.

(d) Are they permitted to take pictures of children?

Those taking photographs have been instructed to avoid taking photographs of children if at all possible. However, if protesters choose to include their children in protests then they are creating a risk that their images might be recorded.

3. Given that the only two expert reports commissioned by the Council on the Chelsea Elm advise the problems with the tree are "minor but rectifiable" by crown reduction to leave a "reasonably balanced and aesthetically pleasing specimen," is it not wrong and disingenuous for the Council to make completely unsubstantiated claims that decay is "significant and extensive" and work would "*dramatically alter the look of*

The reasons for the planned replacement of the trees are detailed on the Council's web site. The report from the independent tree inspector carried out aerially on 25<sup>th</sup> October 2016, states "All the topping points have decay ranging from 100 millimetres to 150 millimetres in depth. The topping points have a profusion of new growth between three and five metres in length. It was noted that a number of the topping points had died.

*the tree.”*

Of particular note is a large scaffold limb 340 millimetres in diameter with a significant cavity on the south eastern canopy. The cavity was examined with a probe and found to extend beyond 600 millimetres into the limb. The limb’s residual wall is found to be particularly thin and within current scientific observations for potential failure, though there were no features in the bark to indicate the beginnings of such.” Both Council and Amey tree specialists categorise such a situation as substantial decay and they expect to have to carry out significant pruning to deal with the decay and that will in their opinion have a dramatic effect on the form of the tree. It should be noted that in order to end up with a balanced (safe) tree (as the independent inspector noted) further pruning of healthy material will be required in addition to that of the decayed material. The categorisation made by the inspector is from British Standards and it should be noted that on other trees with similar categorisation the same inspector actually recommended felling.

4. What is the latest estimate of the number of Sheffield residents – typically, those in blocks of flats – who do not yet have facilities for recycling (a) glass, (b) plastics, (c) paper and card, (d) metal cans, to a level broadly commensurate with blue bins for kerbside recycling?

There are approximately 15,000 flat and maisonette properties that do not receive a recycling service broadly commensurate with blue bins for kerbside recycling. As per the policy agreed by Cabinet in November 2009, where a recycling container is shared by more than one property then residents are restricted to recycling cans and glass bottles, along with paper and card. In January, 2017 Cabinet approved changing the kerbside recycling service, exchanging the blue box for a 240 litre brown bin. When this change is implemented those flats and maisonettes that don’t currently receive a recycling service commensurate with the kerbside recycling service will be provided with

one that is, including the opportunity to recycle plastics.

Questions of Councillor Alison Teal to Councillor Bryan Lodge (Cabinet Member for the Environment and Streetscene)

1. After you told the media that the Council faces “catastrophic financial consequences” caused by delays to the Streets Ahead highways programme, the Yorkshire Post journalist, Chris Burn, followed up with an article which challenged your claim. Your reply was evasive and imprecise. Can you please clearly explain in practical terms exactly how the Council will be financially liable for delays caused by protesters?

Contractual matters are complex and allocating responsibility for issues depends on the circumstances. The Council is clear that there is a significant risk of huge costs falling to the Council that it cannot afford without cutting other services.
2. Why did the Council choose to take campaigners to the High Court rather than attempting Alternative Dispute Resolution first?

We have met several times with campaigners and have put forward proposals which were rejected by STAG.

The High Court agreed with the Council and held in unambiguous terms that the Council’s programme was lawful and required. We hope that the campaigners will comply with the law now the Court has set out what it is.

The Council has won twice now in the High Court and as suggested in the motion which you have seconded on today’s Council agenda ‘the UK has a long and proud tradition of organising society on the rules of law and not on arbitrary decree’.
3. Will the Council quantify the overall cost of delays to the Streets Ahead works caused by the ITP process, in addition to the operating costs of the ITP? Will the costs be made available to the public?

Contractual matters are complex and allocating responsibility for issues depends on the circumstances. As we have stated the costs of delays to Streets Ahead works are difficult to quantify at this stage because we are still in the Core Investment Period.

4. The publication of the Five Year Tree Management Strategy 2012-17 by Streets Ahead states that detailed information is recorded on each street tree and provides an inventory. What is not listed are the methodological practices employed for assessment. Can you please answer the following questions making reference to objective measures:

(a) How is the degree of damage caused to a kerb quantified?

Site inspection.

(b) What is the actual measureable criteria?

That depends on the circumstances found during the inspection. There are national guidelines on highway defects.

(c) How much disruption to a kerb caused by a tree root results in the decision to either fell the tree or to lay a narrower kerb stone?

The ability to use a thin kerb is determined by the position of the roots and whether they are such that a full concrete bed can be provided to properly locate the kerb.

(d) When a root becomes visible beyond the kerb and lifts or splits the carriageway, what is the objective decision making process?

The process involves a site inspection to evaluate impact of the position and size of the roots on the necessary carriageway works.

(e) Which of the 'D' categories applies when the reason to fell a tree is given as "overhanging a carriageway"?

A tree is not replaced due to "overhanging a carriageway".

5. On 1st February this year, you determined to set the record straight about street trees <http://www.sheffieldnewsroom.co.uk/street-trees-myth/> The so called Myth #2 is "It's cheaper to remove a tree than it is to retain it." However, you go on to explain the truth of the matter is that, "The costs associated with removing an existing tree followed by sourcing, planting and maintaining a replacement are greater than those associated with maintenance of a mature tree," and you go on to explain a number of variables to consider. Given the huge

Your proposal would mean the Council would not comply with its legal duties.

expense of tree replacement, would it not be more prudent to retain all healthy street trees that are marked for felling due to minimal kerb and/or carriageway damage?

Questions of Councillor Steve Ayris to Councillor Cate McDonald (Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care)

1. Are you aware of the Lancet report “Is late-life dependency increasing or not? A comparison of the Cognitive Function and Ageing Studies (CFAS)”?

Yes, we have noted the publication of the study. It was a helpful report and will serve as part of our evidence base for planning future needs for health and social care.
2. Are you aware of the report’s findings in relation to care places?

Yes. This is set out in the abstract of the paper.
3. How does this need equate to Sheffield’s needs for extra care places?

The Kingston paper in the Lancet is a complex paper published a few weeks ago. Given the complexity, officers have not yet fully digested the detail, the extent to which the estimates can be applied in a straightforward way to Sheffield. This approach will only be one part of our process.

When thinking about the future demand for care home placements in Sheffield, it is important to compare our recent performance with other Local Authorities. Most comparable Local Authorities have made fewer care home placements than Sheffield has in recent years, allowing for local population. Other areas have developed alternatives (for example supported housing), have targeted homecare resources more effectively and have worked with NHS colleagues to ensure that more people are discharged from hospital to their home address with the right support, rather than into care homes. We are making progress in all these areas but have further to go. The more effective we are, the greater the number of people who will be able to stay in their own homes in line with their wishes and the fewer care home placements the city will need.
4. In light of this, do you regret the decision earlier this year to close Hurlfield View?

Sheffield City Council did not ‘close Hurlfield View’. I believe that our decision to commission replacement

services was the right one under the circumstances.

5. Has the Council followed up with former residents and service users of Hurlfield View since the closure?

Yes. We have just completed a follow up of all the former users of Hurlfield View to ensure that their care needs are being met by the replacement services.

6. If not, when will this take place?

See above

Questions of Councillor Martin Smith to Councillor Jack Scott (Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability)

1. How many public electric vehicle charging points are there in Sheffield?  
Zap-Map.com states that there are 30 chargers, with space for 48 vehicles.
2. How many charging points is the Council planning to install in the city centre over the next 3-5 years?  
There are a number of chargers proposed as part of applications presently being considered.  
  
For example, IKEA is due to provide five rapid chargers over 10 years, two now with usage to be reviewed in three years.  
  
The number and type of vehicle charging points will be considered as part of our work to define our Clean Air Strategy and delivery plan, along with the Clean Air Zone Feasibility study that we will be undertaking over the next 18 months, which will be seeking funding from the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs.  
  
In addition to electric vehicle charging, the role of other alternative fuels such as hydrogen will also be considered.

Question of Councillor Cliff Woodcraft to Councillor Jack Scott (Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability)

- Have the priorities for the 2017/18 Highways Programme been determined, and is a crossing on Hangingwater Road included in the Projects for this year?
- The priorities for 2017/18 have been defined.
- Hangingwater Road is not included in the Projects for this year, as you are well aware.

Questions of Councillor Ian Auckland to Councillor Jack Scott (Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability)

1. Please provide the budget, source of funds, and completion target dates for the City Centre Area Wide 20mph speed restriction (20's Plenty)?  
The construction of City Centre 20mph zone is currently estimated to cost £320,000.  
  
The proposed City Centre 'Sign only' 20mph limit would be delivered in phases along with the City Centre Sheffield City Region Investment

Fund (SCRIF) programme (Grey to Green, Knowledge Gateway, Sheffield Retail Quarter). This is anticipated to be in three phases; phase 1 commencing in 2017/18 and phases 2 and 3 in 2018/19.

The city centre scheme will be implemented using SCRIF funds with a contribution from the University, but designed using local funding sources (Local Transport Plan 20mph allocation).

2. How many local transport request for schemes are outstanding? Have you any proposals for changes to the management of the list of outstanding requests?

There are 172 footpaths, 291 pedestrian crossing (zebras, pedestrian islands, road narrowings), 325 light controlled crossings and 573 traffic calming requests on the city wide request list.

Given that we are currently in the final year of the Core Investment Period we are considering how the management and prioritisation of requests will work beyond 17/18.

Once final recommendations on changes are made these will be formally considered.

3. Will strengthened local arrangements be put in place in respect of Member involvement in the oversight of South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive?

The Sheffield City Region Combined Authority is responsible for oversight of South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive. A review of these arrangements will be considered in due course.

4. Thinking about your previous Cabinet Responsibilities, will you be encouraging your Officers to have greater involvement with Local Area Partnerships?

Of course. Officers have previously committed to attend each of the LAP meetings and the LAP Chairs meetings at least once a year to provide a full update on issues affecting their areas and respond to issues raised.

Naturally, all Councillors can either contact Officers or myself at any time should they require further information or action.

Questions of Councillor Adam Hanrahan to Councillor Olivia Blake (Cabinet Member for Finance)

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. How much has the change in location of the Leader's office cost?  | £251.69.   |
| 2. Since being appointed Cabinet Member for Finance, have you examined:<br>1. Veolia Contract<br>2. Amey StreetsAhead Contract<br>3. Guodong investment deal | I receive regular briefings on each when material decisions are to be taken. |

Please provide an answer to each.

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 3. (a) How many external bookings (from people or organisations not part of Sheffield City Council) has the Council had for the main Council Chamber in each of the last five years? | Nine events generating £23,986.75 from July 2016 to date.<br><br>Prior to July, 2016 Kier Asset Partnership managed these events as part of a wider commercial contract and the data isn't available. However we estimate the usage for previous years based on officer knowledge of: 5 to 10 events per annum costing between £1,000 to £5,000 per event. |
|--|--|

- |  |            |
|--|------------|
| (b) How much has been raised through this? Please provide information for each year. | See above. |
|--|------------|

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 4. Have any of the following people asked to see:-<br><br>1. Amey StreetsAhead contract<br>2. Veolia contract<br>3. Chinese investment deal with Guodong Construction | The Council do not keep a record of requests from MPs to see our contracts so are unable to provide a response. Please contact the respective MPs directly should you require any further details. |
|---|--|

- Angela Smith MP
- Paul Blomfield MP
- Gill Furniss MP
- Jared O'Mara MP
- Louise Haigh MP
- Clive Betts MP

Please list by name with which contract, if any, they have asked to see.

Questions of Councillor Martin Smith to Councillor Olivia Blake (Cabinet Member for Finance)

1. Approximately what percentage of the City's business rates income is derived from/paid by small and medium sized enterprises (SMEs)?

Assuming an SME is defined as a business that would qualify for all or some Small Business Rate Relief (SBRR), SBRR is awarded to businesses that have a Rateable Value (RV) between £0.00 and £15,000.

For Businesses with a RV of £0.00 to £12,000, full SBRR is awarded which means they have a nil rates liability and so will contribute nothing to the income the Council derives from Business Rates. (Although the level of relief granted to these businesses is reimbursed in full by Government, so there is nil impact on the Council in this regard). There are 12,158 businesses in the City who will receive full SBRR in 2017/18.

For Businesses with a RV between £12,001 and £15,000, SBRR is awarded on a tapered basis. There are 1,051 businesses within this RV banding who will receive some level of SBRR. The net liability for these businesses is £4.5m and this is the amount that these businesses will contribute to the Council's income from Business Rates in 2017/18, if they all pay in full. This equates to around 2% of the amount of business rates billed for 2017/18.

2. With regards to the Business Rates Living Wage Relief scheme:

(a) How many businesses in Sheffield have applied?

One business has applied for Living Wage relief.

(b) How many businesses in Sheffield currently get this relief?

One business currently gets Living Wage relief.

(c) What is the total annual value of the rates relief for those

£5,000.

businesses?

- (d) What is the total value of the rates relief since the scheme was announced in the 2016 budget? £5,000.
- (e) How much has the Council spent on administering the scheme to date (including cash outlay and officer time)? The administration of this relief is part of normal business rates administration as with any relief scheme implemented.
3. What has been the maximum operational debt so far this municipal year? Regarding the maximum operational debt, the Council set the operational borrowing limit for 2017/18 at £1,600,000,000.
- However the current level of external borrowing is significantly below this.
4. Do you agree with the 2017/18 budget report that Sheffield City Council is “under borrowed”?
- The phrase “under borrowed” is a technical treasury management term that relates to the fact that borrowing for expenditure on capital activities has not, to date, been fully matched by external borrowing. It is not a term that implies any criticism or improper practice.
- It should of course be noted that the Council can only borrow for certain purposes, and in particular cannot borrow simply to fund day-to-day revenue expenditure. We also have to operate within the Financial Regulations and standards and account prudently.

Questions of Councillor Colin Ross to Councillor Ben Curran (Cabinet Member for Planning and Development)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1. When do you expect the long awaited Sheffield Development Plan to be published?  | There is no publication date for the Sheffield Development Plan.   |
| 2. Will this incorporate the results of the Green Belt review?  | Yes  |
| 3. On how many occasions in the last 12 months has formal enforcement action been taken against developers where they have breached the planning conditions or have been conducting the development in an inappropriate or unsafe manner? | The Council deals with several hundred planning enforcement enquiries every year. The vast majority of cases are remedied without the need for formal enforcement notices to be served and instead are remedied through negotiation. In the last 12 months the Planning Service of the Council has served 16 Enforcement Notices and 13 Breach of Condition Notices. |

Question of Councillor Douglas Johnson to Councillor Ben Curran (Cabinet Member for Planning and Development)

What is the Council's current assessment of the supply and demand of purpose-built student housing in Sheffield and do you plan to bring this assessment up to date?

Including spaces under construction, the Council estimates a potential supply of around 25,900 student bed spaces in the city.

The Student Accommodation Strategy (2014-19) acknowledges that 'there is a risk that the provision of more purpose-built student accommodation will lead to over supply'. I believe that assessment to be accurate and not in need of updating.

Questions of Councillor Vickie Priestley to Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families)

1. How many appeals have been made relating to school places for the academic year beginning September 2017?

To put all 3 replies in context, 98.12% of primary were offered one of their 3 preferences, and 95.93% of secondary. There were 163 appeals for Reception out of a total cohort of 6194 (2.63%) and 252 appeals out of a Y7 cohort of 6101 (4.13%)

Also, Appeals are heard by an Independent Panel, who should be thanked for putting a lot of time and effort into hearing them as soon as possible. To answer the questions:

As at 30<sup>th</sup> August, 2017, we have received a total of 415 appeals for a September 2017 start. 163 appeals for Reception places and 252 appeals for Year 7.

2. How many of these appeals have been successful so far?

So far 18 Primary School appeals and 46 Secondary School appeals have been upheld by the appeal panels.

3. How many children are awaiting the outcome of admission appeals?

All appeals for September starters that were made on time were heard before the summer break.

There are a total of 22 appeals for Reception and Y7, made after the deadline, which could not be heard before or during the summer in order to comply with statutory timescales around giving sufficient notice. These will be heard within the statutory timescale from September.

Finally, it is important to note that all children for whom a late appeal has been submitted have been allocated a school place for September. This may be a 2<sup>nd</sup> or 3<sup>rd</sup> preference or nearest school available. No child should be out of school waiting for an appeal hearing.

This page is intentionally left blank