

## Council Meeting – 20<sup>th</sup> February 2023

### Questions Received from Members of the Public, answered by the Relevant Policy Committee Chairs

Name of Questioner	Question	Relevant Policy Committee Chair(s)
Paul Wade	<p>When is Sheffield City Council to undertake measures to protect pedestrians in the pedestrian zones on Fargate and The Moor, in relation to vehicular access?</p> <p>Answer - Dear Mr Wade</p> <p>Thank you for getting in touch to raise your concerns about cycling on Fargate and The Moor. I can confirm that there are existing Traffic Regulation Orders that prohibit all vehicles including cyclists from using them at certain times of the day. Currently only South Yorkshire Police have the authority to enforce these restrictions, not Council officers.</p> <p>Our road safety data in the last five years doesn't include any instances of serious injury resulting from cyclists colliding with pedestrians on either the Moor or Fargate.</p> <p>There are plans to introduce new cycling infrastructure into the city centre, which will include safety assessments of the new routes and changes to roads as part of that. We consult with groups such as Disability Sheffield that represent people that can be vulnerable to changes in highway as part of this process to ensure we're considering safety concerns. We will incorporate any required safety changes into our designs and management plans. We will forward your concerns to be considered by the officers designing the infrastructure and management of Fargate.</p>	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste & Streetscene Policy Committee
Carrie Hedderwick <i>(not present at the meeting to ask her question)</i>	<p>We need our Council to be articulating clearly &amp; very publicly what is needed to start to resolve the chronic crisis that our society &amp; the economy are in.</p> <p>Sheffield Council must support and speak out in defence of all those workers fighting, not just for pay, but to prevent the decimation &amp; privatisation of their</p>	Cllr Terry Fox, Leader of the Council and Chair of the Strategy & Resources Policy Committee

	<p>services - rail, mail, the NHS, our universities &amp; schools.</p> <p>We need the Council to tell it like it is - where there is money, where the profits are &amp; how transnational corporations &amp; monopolies &amp; their Tory government representatives are making a killing at our expense.</p> <p>Will the Council, therefore, in response to the socio-economic duty in Section 1 of the Equality Act 2010, which requires public bodies to take no action likely to worsen poverty in their area, agree to publish a parallel no-cuts budget, to demonstrate publicly what investment and funding is needed to provide decent &amp; appropriate services to Sheffield residents and their families?</p> <p>Answer – I am in complete agreement that the Council must do everything we can to challenge government austerity and stand up for local services and the city’s workers.</p> <p>However, a ‘no-cuts’ budget is not an option, as this would be in affect be an illegal budget and result in government appointment commissioners, rather than democratically elected members, in charge of the Council’s finances.</p>	
Abdul Raheem	<p>As you are aware of that Sheffield City Council is going ahead with clean air zone in Sheffield.</p> <p>As my field of workplace is within side Sheffield City centre my vehicle will be charged every day I come out for work</p> <p>I am already financially struggling to keep up with my mortgage payments of my house.</p> <p>Food prices are sky high.</p> <p>Gas and electricity bills keep going up.</p> <p>It's been less than two years since UK came out of the covid pandemic</p> <p>And taxis were heavily effected by UK shut down due covid.</p> <p>Manchester and Leeds have not gone ahead with clean air zones.</p> <p>I just can't understand why Sheffield City Council has failed to take into consideration of self-employed people like me who already financially struggling where am I going to find extra £70 a week to pay to enter Sheffield city centre of my work place.</p>	<p>Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste &amp; Streetscene Policy Committee &amp; Cllr Mazher Iqbal, Co-Chair of the Transport, Regeneration &amp; Climate Policy Committee</p>

	<p>There is only one Hackney carriage vehicle manufacturing company in UK which is the London taxi TX.</p> <p>And these new electric Hackney taxis Are going up in price again to nearly £70000. After 5 years payment plan it nearly comes up £92000 Due to Sheffield economic situation it's almost impossible to keep up with payment plan And not to forget all the other bills still going up gas electricity bills home grocery shopping bills it all adds up.</p> <p>The least Sheffield City Council could do is delay the clean air zone pollution levels are already going down.</p> <p>I would appreciate if you could allow me the opportunity to ask a question to Sheffield city council full meeting that because of shortages of Hackney carriage vehicles available in the market are limited .</p> <p>And clean air fundings process is already facing technical issues which i have filled in online application form but I have not received a email of confirmation yet .</p> <p><b><i>An answer was provided at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></b></p> <p><u><a href="#">Sheffield City Council - Agenda for Council on Monday 20 February 2023, 2.00 pm</a></u></p>	
Julie Pearn	<p>Sheffield Labour Friends of Palestine welcome the twinning agreement signed between Sheffield City Council and the Ukrainian city of Khmelnytskyi. We welcome the return to public demonstration, on behalf of the city, of international solidarity and the upholding of international law. We appreciate the empathy shown by the representatives of our humane city as Ukrainian citizens fight against military aggression, occupation and for the right to life.</p> <p>We hope that empathy extends to victims of military aggression and occupation regardless of culture and ethnicity.</p> <p>We note the very swift action taken in response to the invitation to twinning by the Mayor of Khmelnytskyi.</p> <p>We wish to remind the Council that an invitation to twin was made by the Mayor of Nablus in April 2019 and that until now the Council has not even acknowledged</p>	Cllr Terry Fox, Leader of the Council and Chair of the Strategy & Resources Policy Committee

	<p>that invitation. The West Bank and Gaza have been under occupation and East Jerusalem illegally annexed since 1967. Palestinians have been subjected to ethnic cleansing since 1948, creating millions of refugees. An extreme right ethno-nationalist Israeli government claims all the land of historic Palestine from the Jordan river to the Mediterranean sea. Its state representatives and colonial settlers publicly express genocidal intentions and escalate violence against Palestinians on a daily basis.</p> <p>Can we please have advice from the Council as to how we may get a reciprocal response from the City to the Mayor of Nablus' invitation and achieve a twinning relationship, an aim which is supported by individuals and organisations all over Sheffield?</p> <p><b><i>An answer was provided at the meeting and the webcast and minutes (when published) can be found here (copy and paste the link into your browser):</i></b></p> <p><u><a href="#">Sheffield City Council - Agenda for Council on Monday 20 February 2023, 2.00 pm</a></u></p>	
<p>Michael Mullin (not present at the meeting to ask his questions)</p>	<p><b>Question 1</b> Regarding concerns raised by the public on the potential health risk from electromagnetic fields, Sheffield City Council will rightly cite the UK Health Security Agency, Ofcom, the World Health Organization and the local Director of Public Health for advice. All these organizations will formally recognise the International Commission for Non-ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP) as a primary reference point to use when deciding if the public are currently safe or not. It is important to emphasize that the document Sheffield City Council are choosing to determine that "there should be no consequences for public health" is merely based on a "general guideline" for the public. A "general guideline" is certainly not by definition a safe standard for all. The ICNIRP certificate your following has informed you of this on page 546:</p> <p><b><i>“Different groups in a population may have differences in their ability to tolerate a particular Non-ionizing radiation exposure. For example, children, the elderly, and some chronically ill people might have a lower tolerance for one or more forms of Non-ionizing radiation exposure</i></b></p>	<p>Cllr Julie Grocutt, Co-Chair of the Transport, Regeneration &amp; Climate Policy Committee</p>

***than the rest of the population. Under such circumstances, it may be useful or necessary to develop separate guideline levels for different groups within the general population, but it may be more effective to adjust the guidelines for the general population to include such groups."***

<http://www.icnirp.org/cms/upload/publications/ICNIRPphilosophy.pdf>

Based on the ICNIRP statement above, does Sheffield City Council accept, that when you are choosing to install a mobile phone tower close to a school, hospital, GP surgery, care home or deprived community, the "general guidelines" you are wishing to follow have advised you that unless you "adjust" or consider using other international guidelines, (which have always been available to use), you are at risk of causing a significant minority of people in our society to get ill, attributed by the increase in non-ionizing radiation to the environment?

**Q1 response**

Sheffield City Council do not install telecommunications equipment, but the local planning authority do receive and must determine, within a specified time period, applications for telecommunications equipment.

Planning law requires that applications for planning permission be determined in accordance with the development plan, unless material considerations indicate otherwise. The development plan in Sheffield comprises of the Sheffield Core Strategy (2009) and the saved policies of the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (UDP) (1998).

Saved policy BE14 of the UDP states that 'Telecommunications development should be sited and designed so as to minimise its visual impact, subject to technical and operational considerations, and will be permitted only if the scheme includes satisfactory proposals to ensure that the site would be restored to its original condition should the development no longer be needed for telecommunications. New equipment should share masts or be sited on existing structures where this is technically and economically possible.'

There are no relevant policies in the Core Strategy.

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) is a material consideration in planning decisions. Planning decisions must also reflect relevant international obligations and statutory requirements.

Chapter 10 of the NPPF (Supporting high quality communications) states that:

114. Advanced, high quality and reliable communications infrastructure is essential for economic growth and social well-being. Planning policies and decisions should support the expansion of electronic communications networks, including next generation mobile technology (such as 5G) and full fibre broadband connections. Policies should set out how high quality digital infrastructure, providing access to services from a range of providers, is expected to be delivered and upgraded over time; and should prioritise full fibre connections to existing and new developments (as these connections will, in almost all cases, provide the optimum solution).

115. The number of radio and electronic communications masts, and the sites for such installations, should be kept to a minimum consistent with the needs of consumers, the efficient operation of the network and providing reasonable capacity for future expansion. Use of existing masts, buildings and other structures for new electronic communications capability (including wireless) should be encouraged. Where new sites are required (such as for new 5G networks, or for connected transport and smart city applications), equipment should be sympathetically designed and camouflaged where appropriate.

116. Local planning authorities should not impose a ban on new electronic communications development in certain areas, impose blanket Article 4 directions over a wide area or a wide range of electronic communications development, or insist on minimum distances between new electronic communications development and existing development. They should ensure that:

a) they have evidence to demonstrate that electronic communications infrastructure is not expected to cause significant and irremediable interference with other electrical equipment, air traffic services or instrumentation operated in the national interest; and

b) they have considered the possibility of the construction of new buildings or other structures interfering with broadcast and electronic communications services.

117. Applications for electronic communications development (including applications for prior approval under the General Permitted Development Order) should be supported by the necessary evidence to justify the proposed development. This should include:

a) the outcome of consultations with organisations with an interest in the proposed development, in particular with the relevant body where a mast is to be installed near a school or college, or within a statutory safeguarding zone surrounding an aerodrome, technical site or military explosives storage area; and

b) for an addition to an existing mast or base station, a statement that self-certifies that the cumulative exposure, when operational, will not exceed International Commission guidelines on non-ionising radiation protection; or

c) for a new mast or base station, evidence that the applicant has explored the possibility of erecting antennas on an existing building, mast or other structure and a statement that self-certifies that, when operational, International Commission guidelines will be met.

118. Local planning authorities must determine applications on planning grounds only. They should not seek to prevent competition between different operators, question the need for an electronic communications system, or set health safeguards different from the International Commission guidelines for public exposure.

Therefore, where an applicant certifies that proposals have been designed to comply with the guidelines published by ICNIRP, health impacts cannot be considered as part of the decision-making process.

### **Question 3**

Most people who work in law including Sheffield City Council's legal department will be well aware of Michael Mansfield. He is a Queen/King Councillor and qualified judge. In the UK he is widely regarded by many of his respected colleagues to be the "king of human rights". His previous works have included

	<p>the Hillsborough disaster and the Grenfell fire disaster. If any human and environmental crime was taking place today, it will struggle to go unnoticed by him. Is Sheffield City Council aware that Michael Mansfield along with thousands of world leading professors and eminent international scientists are currently leading legal proceedings against the deployment of wireless 5G networks?</p> <p><b>Q3 response</b> The Council is not aware of Mr Mansfield's actions.</p> <p><i>(NB. Another question from Mr. Mullin (his Question 2), which related directly to a named officer of the Council, was not accepted by the Lord Mayor as she deemed it to be disrespectful to that named officer.)</i></p>	
<p>Ruth Hubbard <i>(not present at the meeting to ask her questions)</i></p>	<p><b>1. The Leader's comments on local governance</b></p> <p>There is a very recently published (31<sup>st</sup> Jan) Public Interest Report written by Grant Thornton about Cheshire East Council governance. The report notes that the biggest critical factor in re-setting their governance has been the shift to a committee system. This has enabled Cheshire East to address an historical abuse of strong leader power. Cheshire East Council has done huge amounts of sustained work over many years on securing governance change, and its new committee system appears to be working well, as endorsed in the detailed Public Interest Report.</p> <p>Here, at members questions in last full Council, the Leader was asked whether he thought the new committee system was working well. He provided a one word answer, "No".</p> <p><i>(I also saw him quoted in the press implying that the delays, difficulties and failures of Fargate Container Park were to do with the new committee system - rather than his 'strong leader' decision on the container park last February.)</i></p> <p>I recognise that Cllr Fox and many of those around him in the Labour Group, though by no means all, were opposed to the change of governance. And that this change, in combination with the inevitable 'no overall control' is a big challenge to those who were accustomed to, and believe in, what went before, and</p>	<p>Cllr Terry Fox, Leader of the Council and Chair of the Strategy &amp; Resources Policy Committee</p>

that citizens and communities saw - the top-down imposition of political authority on the city by the few, operating a form of extreme strong leader governance.

I am not entirely in disagreement with Cllr Fox, however, that the new arrangements could be better, though I suspect my concerns may be quite different from his. I have made mine pretty repeatedly known to Governance Committee and officers (as have others), though sadly to no effect. There has been no influence exercised by stakeholders or citizens in the new constitution nor any meaningful engagement for the Governance Review - despite a Chief Executive who wants to talk about 'co-design'.

However, a committee system was always a far more democratic starting point. The core principal of committee governance that full council is sovereign and that all elected councillors should play a role in decision-making, is a far, far better fit for Sheffield.

But it *is* only a starting point, and change is hard. The Leader's one word answer "No" is not at all suggestive of the commitment to change that he expressed after the resounding referendum vote. Despite the other challenges the Council and city faces, making governance change real will require sustained effort over time, and will probably be error-strewn and slow. It requires vision, understanding, commitment and leadership. Can I ask that he reiterates his commitment to changing and improving the way the council works for citizens, rather than him give the impression that he may be just a bit annoyed and resistant, and potentially seeking to undermine what will be a long-term change project? If he cannot offer a bit of vision, understanding, leadership and commitment to the significant governance change project, should he be considering whether someone else might be better placed to be Council Leader?

**Q1 response**

I can absolutely reinstate my commitment to leading this organisation to be the best it can be for the citizens it serves.

The committee system provides an opportunity to make the Council more transparent and open, and we will continue to strive to make the new system of governance deliver for the city and its people.

	<p>There have, however, been several issues which have meant the new governance arrangements have not worked as well as it could do. This is not unexpected given the significance of the change, and the council's ongoing governance review, being delivered cross-party, will report back soon and I am confident this will lead to the required changes to deliver a fit-for-purpose governance system within the Council.</p> <p><b>2. Tramlines and the Hillsborough local community and businesses</b></p> <p>My question is about the significant Hillsborough community concerns raised in advance of last year's Tramlines Festival. These concerns were particularly, but not exclusively, about the detrimental impact of Tramlines new "no re-entry" policy - on local businesses and the local community (and in a post-covid and cost of living crisis). The importance of addressing and/or mitigating detrimental impacts to areas immediately local and disrupted due to large festivals has often been noted e.g. Glastonbury Festival – everyone avoids Glastonbury for two weeks.</p> <p>A whole range of people and groups in the community took action to raise these issues as there were lots of impacts. However, the concerns were not addressed or resolved satisfactorily prior to the Festival despite councillors trying to take them up. Separately, an officer statement was simply issued that did not appear to understand the concerns raised. The Safety Advisory Group was also cited as tacitly giving consent to Tramlines to change the way they ran the festival, even though Tramlines local community and business relationships would appear to be outside their remit.</p> <p>The specific community concerns were also discussed at some length in last July's Central LAC and were all to be referred to the "relevant committee". On a quick look, however, I cannot see these referred to in any committee minutes or workplan.</p> <p>Tramlines is owned by London-based Superstruct Entertainment Ltd backed up by a global private equity firm Providence Equity.</p> <p>Superstruct's business strategy involves tight control of festival costs to maximise profits and the acquisition of music festivals with strong brand names and a high level of customer loyalty. Historically rooted in a strong</p>	<p>Cllr Martin Smith, Chair of the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee</p>
--	---	---

Sheffield communities identity and vibe, Tramlines is obviously perfect for this exploitation. The benefit to Sheffield is often cited as city-wide economic benefits.

Superstruct's latest published accounts show a 555% increase in profits (admittedly on the covid-affected previous year's activities). It is good to know that significant profits are being generated for London directors and New York based private equity investors, despite the local businesses close to Hillsborough Park losing out.

Perhaps the best comparator to Sheffield's Tramlines Festival is the Victorious Festival, Portsmouth. Like Tramlines, Victorious is an urban, 3-day summer festival but is a bit bigger than Tramlines (approx.. 25% in visitor capacity). The Victorious Festival is also owned by Superstruct Entertainment Ltd (backed up by Providence Equity), and the performer line-ups for both Tramlines and Victorious are very similar indeed.

The economic benefit of Tramlines to Sheffield has recently been reported and celebrated as being **£3.8 million** in 2022. However, the economic benefit to Portsmouth of their Victorious Festival is reported as **over £15.5 million** (in the previous year, 2021). This is more than four times the economic benefit we apparently see in Sheffield. (The same independent company calculated the economic benefits for both cities.)

And, at the same time, the Victorious Festival in Portsmouth permits full re-entry on each of the three days of the Festival, up to 8pm. This means festival goers can come and go as they please. In the Portsmouth local press this is reported as being because the Council recognises the importance of support to local businesses and local residents that re-entry brings. And clearly the Victorious Festival has been open to permitting re-entry.

a) Can I ask what action has been taken in follow up since last July's Tramlines, by any of the following: Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee, Community Parks and Leisure Committee, Licensing Committee, Charity Trustee Sub-Committee, the Safety Advisory Group, or by officers? (The Council has, so far, created the most unwieldy and bloated committee system in the country so it is not easy to discern who might at least be taking the lead.) Can the

Hillsborough local community and businesses be reassured that action has been taken so that the same issues do not arise again, to the detriment of Hillsborough? Or will residents see nothing happen and/or be told this is (yet another) commercially sensitive contract with provisions and conditions that cannot be changed or influenced, and where private profit is the priority?

b) Given the Portsmouth figures, is Sheffield punching significantly below its weight in terms of city-wide economic benefits that might be generated by Tramlines? If so, why? At the same time, is our Council also failing to ensure that Tramlines is much more responsive to ensuring benefits and mitigations for local Hillsborough businesses and residents?

### **Q2 response**

#### **Actions taken since the Tramlines event in 2022 (particularly with respect to the re-entry policy)**

Following a meeting of the Central LAC last year three questions were referred to me as Chair of the committee and written questions on similar topics were submitted to a subsequent committee meeting. One question was also referred to the Chair of the Communities, Parks & Leisure Committee. According to my notes all of these received written answers. Since the event itself I understand that Council Officers and the festival organisers have met with Ward Councillors to discuss a number of points that were raised and review ways to improve its operation for residents, local business and spectators alike. At this time I understand there are no plans to change the re-entry policy that was introduced in 2021. It is worth noting that several hundred festival goers took advantage of this policy last year. There is no blanket ban on re-entry.

#### **Economic Benefits of Tramlines to the local economy**

As a city we use a UK Sport & DCMS event impacts modelling tool across our events programme. This allows us to compare events throughout the city in a consistent manner.

We do not know which methodology was used to assess the economic impact of the other event you mentioned, however we do know that it is approximately 50% larger than Tramlines, with significantly more unique/day visitors to their

	<p>festival. Well over 80% of Tramlines guests are weekend ticket holders which will also reduce the economic impact. Our economic assessment also excludes voluntary donations by the organisers, for example free/discounted tickets for local residents and charitable donations.</p> <p>The Council works with all the event organisers and promoters to ensure their events are safe and benefit the city and its economy. Events like Tramlines and others bring much enjoyment, profile and economic benefit to the city that few others could bring.</p>	
--	--	--

This page is intentionally left blank