

Council – 2nd December 2020

Petitions Received from Members of the Public

Name	Petition	Cabinet Member
Kate Monaghan	<p>The Council has received a petition requesting the installation of double-yellow lines and traffic-calming measures at Rundle Road/Kenbourne Road.</p> <p><i>Response from Councillor Robert Johnson</i></p> <p><i>Thank you for your petition requesting the installation of double-yellow lines and traffic-calming measures at Rundle Road/Kenbourne Road.</i></p> <p><i>The collision data for both roads has been investigated and there have been two injury collisions in the past 5 years.</i></p> <p><i>The first was in October 2015 on Rundle Road towards the junction with Montgomery Road. The collision involved a cyclist and an elderly driver, the driver was overtaking the cyclist then pulled across into him whilst attempting to park his car. Slight injuries to the cyclist.</i></p> <p><i>The second was in October 2019 at the junction between Rundle Road and Kenbourne Road. A driver pulled out from Kenbourne Road into a car travelling on Rundle Road. The contributory factor was that the driver emerging “failed to look properly”. So essentially it was driver error rather than anything wrong with the physical layout of the carriageway, the driver was young, so inexperience may have come into play but it was not mentioned as a causation factor. It resulted in a serious injury to the driver of the car on Rundle Road.</i></p> <p><i>I understand that these roads have recently been resurfaced through the Streets Ahead project and</i></p>	Robert Johnson

	<p><i>there is a perception that driver speeds have increased, mainly because the road surface was so poor beforehand that drivers took care to avoid the worst pot-holes.</i></p> <p><i>On the basis of the collision data there would be no grounds for the introduction of either traffic calming nor double yellow lines. The requests have been added to the master list of requests but are likely to receive a low score and not be prioritised for action the foreseeable future.</i></p>	
Matt Smith	<p>The Council has received an electronic petition requesting the listing and reopening of Tinsley Carnegie Library.</p> <p><i>Response from Councillor Mary Lea:</i></p> <p><i>Anyone can apply to have a building considered for listing see http://historicengland.org.uk/listing/apply-for-listing/</i></p> <p><i>Applications are made via Historic England who consider whether the building should be listed against set national criteria.</i></p> <p><i>The decision then on whether a building is then actually listed is made by DCMS based on the recommendations of Historic England. Sheffield City Council is not involved in deciding whether a building should be listed.</i></p>	Mary Lea
Kurtis Crossland	<p>The Council has received a petition requesting Sheffield City Council to implement a 20 mph zone in Westfield and to work with South Yorkshire Police to tackle speeding in the area.</p> <p><i>Response from Councillor Robert Johnson</i></p> <p><i>Thank you for your petition requesting Sheffield City Council to implement a 20mph zone in Westfield and to work with South Yorkshire Police to tackle speeding in the area.</i></p> <p><i>The Westfield 20mph area wide zone has been assessed and currently sits at number 11 within the Council's delivery schedule. This typically means that it is not on a list for implementation this year, or next year in accordance with regional</i></p>	Robert Johnson

	<i>funding allocations. However, through the Council's own Road Safety Fund, there is a possibility that this could be delivered via that funding stream. I will update once this has been looked into.</i>	
--	---	--

Questions Received from Members of the Public

Name	Question	Cabinet Member
Kurtis Crossland	<p>1. Is there an update on the crossing on Station Road (Halfway) yet?</p> <p>2. Have you secured the funding for the crossing on Station Road (Halfway) yet?</p> <p>3. There is a big gap in the trees on Moss Way leading to Westfield Open Space. This has lead to vehicles being driven onto Westfield Open Space. Will the Council look at putting a fence in place to stop this?</p> <p><i>These questions were answered at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p>http://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=154&MId=7675&Ver=4</p>	Robert Johnson
Matt Smith	<p>Q1. Is Tinsley Carnegie library currently listed by the council for disposal?</p> <p><i>A1. The library building is being considered for disposal but there are a number of complex legal considerations that need to be fully understood before the site can be disposed.</i></p> <p>Q2. What options have been explored by the council and local community groups for community use of the building?</p> <p><i>A2. The building needs considerable investment in order to bring it back into use. The Council does not have any budget available to undertake this work however we would be supportive of any group that was able to</i></p>	Mary Lea

	<p><i>lever in external financial assistance to bring the property back into use and has a sustainable business plan to run activities and provide ongoing investment into the building and its long term maintenance.</i></p> <p>Q3. What are the current issues with the Tinsley Carnegie library which have prevented the council from using it for community purposes and / or as a base for the area's Associate Library, please give specific details of each issue and the estimated cost to rectify it.</p> <p>A3. <i>The building is in a poor state of repair. We do not have up to date figures of the cost of bringing the building back into use but the cost is significant.</i></p>													
James Newman Gray	<p>Just to let you know I am the great great grandson of Thomas Gray who built the library and would like to see the building saved and put to use. Following on from Matthew Smiths petition to save the library, I'd like to add:</p> <p>Q1. I'd like to ask on a personal level, to what extent do you feel responsibility to saving a piece of Sheffield's cultural and architectural history given that so much has been lost over the years.</p> <p>A1. <i>Community heritage buildings and cultural heritage generally plays an important part in community cohesion, and in shaping health and societal wellbeing. Historic England states that heritage 'helps us understand our past, our individual and community identity and helps us connect with the places where we live. Please also see my answer to question 2 and 3.</i></p> <p>Q2. Given Tinsley's educational standards and achievements on literacy etc, it would seem that it needs some sort of educational centre for reading and writing, particularly for the Asian community.</p> <p>A2. <i>Firstly, the results of Tinsley Meadows School and key stage 2 are:</i></p> <p><i>% of pupils reaching or exceeding the expected standards in: key stage 2</i></p> <table data-bbox="395 1912 1134 2020"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th><i>National</i></th> <th><i>Sheffield</i></th> <th><i>Tinsley Meadows</i></th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td><i>Reading</i></td> <td>76%</td> <td>71%</td> <td>80%</td> </tr> <tr> <td><i>Writing</i></td> <td>81%</td> <td>77%</td> <td>81%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table>		<i>National</i>	<i>Sheffield</i>	<i>Tinsley Meadows</i>	<i>Reading</i>	76%	71%	80%	<i>Writing</i>	81%	77%	81%	Mary Lea
	<i>National</i>	<i>Sheffield</i>	<i>Tinsley Meadows</i>											
<i>Reading</i>	76%	71%	80%											
<i>Writing</i>	81%	77%	81%											

	<p>Maths 82% 77% 84%</p> <p>SPAG 81% 75% 84%</p> <p><i>Tinsley Meadows School was opened just a few years ago, the facilities are excellent as are the teaching staff, and are supported by Tinsley parents.</i></p> <p>Q3. The land was gifted to Tinsley for the benefit of the community and the money for it to be given to Tinsley on the grounds that it is always used for the benefit of the community. It standing there empty is not acceptable.</p> <p>A3. <i>Please see my answers to Matt Smith questions 1,2 and 3.</i></p> <p>Q4. This question was not permitted as it was not a fully formed question.</p>	
Nigel Slack	<p>1. The fate of the row of Georgian shops on Devonshire Street (that used to house Rare & Racy) are again in the news. In 2015 the plans to redevelop this site met opposition from the public as great as the support given to the Governance review petition. Some 22,000 Sheffields objected to plans to demolish the Georgian row and replace it with a like for like replacement with added residential space to the rear. https://nowthenmagazine.com/articles/new-threat-to-rare-racy-site?fbclid=IwAR063QI7mNLJA2APRdjlc0UaonfEhLyRvXIIwCt3-9DU58d5SrXdSYWAcWs</p> <p>The permission for the redevelopment was eventually granted for that scheme and Rare & Racy were put out of business as a result. The developers then left the site empty for 5 years and this gem of Sheffield's heritage is a blight, instead of a vibrant independent retail link to Division Street.</p> <p>A new permission is now being sought and any pretence of retaining the Georgian facade has been dropped as the new plan is to demolish the block of 1827 shops and replace with a 4 storey office building. The application appears to suggest that the case for demolition has been made and should therefore be a matter of course for the new plan. With the developer's planning agents suggesting that, through the previous permission, the demolition of the existing building has already been established. The agents have also entered the fray with the usual</p>	Robert Johnson

	<p>levels of dissembling, indicating in May that the previous agent CODA had no further interest in the site and yet the new agent Urbana Town Planning is founded by the same person that founded CODA. Perhaps the CODA name has become too toxic after the number of heritage planning issues in which they have been involved. The timing is also interesting, making application when both SCC and the public are mired in the distraction of Covid19.</p> <p>Can Council confirm; That the first application's permission to demolish was within very limited and specific lines and not a general permission to demolish? That the planning history and the public & heritage groups responses in particular, will be part of the consideration? That the Council will not consider as they did in 2015 that their hands are tied due to strict planning laws, and that if the Council tried to block the application they could end up facing huge legal bills? After all if it is worth that risk to block the destruction of Green heritage, is it not also worth that risk for our built heritage?</p> <p>2. It has been drawn to my attention that the city has not adopted any space standards for new housing developments, which reduces the ability to refuse “shoebox” developments. The position on conversions is far worse, because converting an office building into apartments is Permitted Development, so does not even go through the usual planning process. (this may hopefully change with new national standards being adopted in April)</p> <p>It is ironic that a city that pioneered decent Council housing nearly a hundred years ago now permits developments that do not meet National space standards for housing.</p> <p>How will the local plan, when finally adopted, impact on minimum space standards? Will Council adopt a policy on minimum space standards in advance of the local plan and any changes to National policy? Will Council instruct that officers be more willing to challenge minuscule apartments, sending the clear message that such apartments raise amenity issues for residents?</p>	
--	---	--

	<p>We do not want the city to become known as a haven for slum landlords, with apartments no bigger than Boris's Limo, or as a city that loses residents to authorities with better housing standards.</p> <p>3. We are now 2 ½ years on from the decision about the disposal of Mount Pleasant. Local residents and activists were hoping to see a vibrant new neighbourhood amenity by now. Instead we have a dilapidated empty building, undoubtedly suffering as a result.</p> <p>What is the current state of play on the sale of the site and the fate of the tenant in the stable block?</p> <p><i>These questions were answered at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p>http://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=154&MId=7675&Ver=4</p>	
<p>Marcus Combie</p>	<p>In relation to The Public Archive proposal in relation to street trees between the period of January 2015 - January 2018. The FOI/Information Management team has stated information they held related to trees prior to April 2017 is NO LONGER HELD according to corporate retention schedules.</p> <p>Q1. Has the corporate retention schedules been amended in relation to street trees been amended? If not how will the archive capture records prior to 2017 April.</p> <p>A1. <i>I have discussed with officer (Monday 30th November) on how the Council will be setting this archive up and how the Council can develop the archive going forward.</i></p> <p><i>Initially we will seek to establish the archive, set in place some simple frameworks to ensure that materials can go onto the archive and that the archive is populated with information as quickly as possible. Once established, and due to the significant public interest and historical nature that this whole process has drawn we will then look to extend the archive both froward and back in time.</i></p>	<p>Mark Jones</p>

	<p><i>The reference dates stated in the response to the Ombudsman’s report were in response to the report, and covering the period of the report. These dates are merely a starting point.</i></p> <p><i>We have already discussed with other stakeholders about further information that could be included. I understand that others, like South Yorkshire Police have already published some materials. It would feel like a logical progression for other stakeholders to include such information in the Councils repository/archive.</i></p> <p><i>I feel we have an opportunity to establish a significant repository of both contemporary and historical information. I am really excited at how this could develop and evolve.</i></p> <p>Q2. Can the council confirm, with either an affirmative or a negative, HAS ANY record, under FOI/EIR related to street trees, been disclosed to the public prior to January 2019, that had the subject or derivative of 'not subject to FOI' .</p> <p>A2. <i>Thank you for your question, to better understand what information you are requesting, I would like to offer the opportunity to meet and discuss this further. I am happy to arrange a meeting in a Covid appropriate manner, in a format comfortable for yourself. If Officers check your contact details and we will arrange this with you.</i></p> <p>Q3. Rather than stating the process that should have been followed. Can the council state on record that prior to January 2019, the FOI team had actively received records label 'not subject to FOI' in relation to trees from record custodians.</p> <p>A3. <i>Please see the response to question 2.</i></p>	
Rebecca Atkinson	<p>In December 2019 the Council resolved to move towards a Circular Economy</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The council resolved to define a metric for progress made in the transition to a circular economy. Has this been achieved and if not what steps have been taken to achieve it? 2. In a proposed amendment to the original motion it was suggested that the council should 'develop 	Mazher Iqbal / Mark Jones

	<p>proposals to introduce a pilot scheme for the collection of food waste from households'. This proposal was voted down. Given strong evidence that food waste collections have the positive impact of reducing household food waste, would the council reconsider a pilot food waste collection in the city? What are the main barriers to trialling such a service?</p> <p>3. The council resolved to support local businesses to transition to closed loop systems. How has the council fulfilled this pledge to local businesses over the past year?</p> <p>4. In 2018/19 Sheffield had a household recycling rate of 31.0%. Does the council have any formal target for increasing the rate of a) household and b) plastics recycling?</p> <p><i>These questions were answered at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></p> <p>http://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ieListDocuments.aspx?CId=154&MId=7675&Ver=4</p>	
Justin Buxton	<p>Q1. This question was not permitted as it was not a fully formed question.</p> <p>Q2. This question was not permitted as it named an officer or Member</p> <p>Q3. This question was not permitted as it was not a fully formed question.</p> <p>Q4. Is there any financial effect of the new excusing cause to service standard 6.38 of the Streets Ahead contract and did the council have to negotiate the change with the DoT or have it approved by the DoT?</p> <p>A4. <i>The answer to these questions are No and No.</i></p> <p>Q5. This question was not permitted as it was not a fully formed question.</p>	Mark Jones

This page is intentionally left blank