Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee – 27 September 2023

Name	Question	Member(s)
Mohammed Faysal Ansar	Petition (received 13 signatures) Title: Amey to clean street properly or give back control to Sheffield Council	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste
	Statement: We the undersigned, petition the council to give back control with regard to the cleaning of Sheffield's streets to the City Council. Do you love going out for a walk in your local area, if the answer is yes you would expect to go out for a walk and enjoy the scenery around you? You would also expect it to be nice and clean, nice and tidy, but today around the streets of Sheffield you see streets full of litter and people going for a walk and walking in their local area which is a total mess. I could give one example of this, Page Hall. It was a nice and tidy and beautiful place to live, still is ,but what do we see instead on the streets of Page Hall and around, Sheffield residents cleaning the streets themselves because Amey, the company that is employed to clean the streets, on behalf of Sheffield Council, take too long to respond to the mess people of Sheffield are concerned about in their local area?	and Street Scene Policy Committee
	Details: Not forgetting back in 2012 Sheffield Council employed a company to refurbish Sheffield roads, the same roads that today you see full of litter, where ever you go.	
	Answer: Page Hall is a particularly challenging area of the city from a street cleansing perspective.	
	Our street cleansing contractor, Amey, go well over and above their contractual obligations at their own expense with the aim of making their best endeavours to keep this area tidy.	
	This involves checking litter bins and fly tipping daily and attending to deep clean the streets 26 times per year (rather than the 3 times that they would typically attend a suburban street).	

Petitions and Questions Received from Members of the Public

	Amey always provide detailed photographs of before and after their work in this area and the quality of litter picking is consistently exceptional – sadly litter is a human generated phenomenon and this hard work is not respected, so the standard of the area very quickly degrades. As such, the problem does not sit with Amey as a contractor, but with wider societal attitudes towards litter and managing waste appropriately. To this end, a number of Council projects are underway and forthcoming for the area - including issuing of replacement bins for households which did not have their full provision or proper bins, education about recycling and appropriate use of household bins, as well as a forthcoming waste trial for managing household waste and excess waste in a different manner in October. We are also working closely with colleagues in Enforcement as well as engaging directly in local schools to underpin a message of respect for the environment and our city. For other areas across the city we know that there are areas for improvement on cleansing and officers have worked closely with Amey to develop new ways of working to improve this. Indeed some examples are discussed in the committee report later. Again though if people didn't drop litter then this wouldn't be a problem so tied to the work we are doing on	
	picking up litter we are also running educational programmes and enforcement.	
Greg Hewitt (Sheffield Action on Plastic)	Q: A Sheffield City Councillor informed me that "The Plastic Free Resolution is something that all Councils should support and I am keen to help Sheffield achieve the Plastic Free Communities status and to develop a Plastic Free Action Plan."	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste and Street Scene Policy
	The Councillor promised that if elected they would commit to the following points:	Committee

 For Sheffield City Council to lead by example and remove single use plastic items from its premises and operations. To encourage plastic free initiatives, promote the Sheffield Action on Plastic campaign and support events. Name a representative of the council to sit on the Core Group of Sheffield Action on Plastic. Can the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee please add this as part of its workplan?
Answer: The Council does not currently have a specific policy on single use plastics, however we will be developing a new waste strategy which will set out how Sheffield's waste will be managed over the coming years. Whilst the scope and detail of this strategy will need to be agreed through the Committee system, it is expected that the new Waste Strategy will include consideration of Council waste as well as household waste, and potential measures to increase sustainability, through waste reduction and recycling.
The development of the waste strategy will begin once Government has provided its long awaited confirmation of a number of key waste policies. This will ensure that Sheffield's future strategy meets legislative requirements.
A Climate Impact Assessment tool was introduced in 2022 to identify the potential climate impacts of Council projects, policies and programmes, and includes (among other things) consideration of resource use, use of products, and waste. The use of this tool will help to highlight opportunities to reduce or eliminate single-use plastics. Where opportunities to do this are identified, this can be carried through service delivery, or as a contract requirement in procurement.
This year, we established a working group to provide advice and support to businesses on the

	requirements of the Single Use Plastic ban. This new legislation requires that from from 1 October 2023 businesses must no longer supply, sell or offer certain single-use plastic items including plastic cutlery, plates and polystyrene coffee cups. Messages to encourage the reduction and recycling of plastic items are included in our waste and recycling communications, and we would welcome a conversation with the Sheffield Action on Plastic group to explore the potential to include details of events and initiatives in future communications.	
David Cron <i>s</i> haw	 Q. I've sent in a questionnaire regarding having a bigger blue bin but not heard anything. I would like to know the outcome as I was in favour of a bigger blue bin. Also, I've seen something regarding a Soft Plastic recycling trial but not heard anything, please can you provide an update on this? Answer: The current recycling service provided to households 	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee
	includes a 140 litre blue bin for paper and card and a 240 litre brown bin for glass bottles and jars, cans and plastic bottles, both collected every four weeks. Whilst residents can place extra paper and card next to their blue bin for collection (neatly bundled and no bigger than the blue bin), we do understand from carrying out customer satisfaction surveys, that residents would like to see additional capacity provided for the collection of paper and card.	
	Options for increasing paper and card recycling capacity will be considered as part of the development of a new waste strategy that will set out how Sheffield's waste and recycling will be managed over the coming years. The development of this strategy will begin after Government has provided its long awaited confirmation on a number of key waste policies, that are expected to place additional	

	requirements on Councils in respect to waste and	
	recycling collections.	
	The Government has stated its intention to require local authorities to provide a recycling collection service for soft plastics including plastic bags, crisp packets, films and wrapping from homes by 2027. However, there are a number of obstacles that need to be overcome in order to meet this timescale due to limited recycling outlets for this material and difficulties in being able to separate, and clean the soft plastics once collected.	
	Recognising these barriers, 9 councils in England are currently operating a soft plastics collection trial to inform government and industry on how plastic bags and wrapping should be added to existing household collection services.	
	Soft plastics can currently be recycled at a number of supermarkets. Locations can be found at <u>www.recyclenow.com</u>	
Graham Marsden (Greener Greenhill)	Q. As a community based climate and nature group, we have experimented with collecting certain products that need specialist recycling if their materials are to be re-used. This has necessitated finding routes to return these products to appropriate re-processing facilities. Dental products (toothpaste tubes and toothbrushes) were original recycled via Terracycle but now via Boots Pharmacy, Heeley, and medicine blister packs were recycled via Superdrug (in Rotherham).	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee
	If we are to create a circular economy, and prepare our city options for a time when less waste will be incinerated, we need to pilot and test different mechanisms for collection, holding and dispatch. It was significant, for instance, that Superdrug in Rotherham needed to restrict its recycling offer to just the shop's immediate customers when increased use from people like ourselves overwhelmed it. Capacity building, and proper resourcing, at these different stages is essential if a circular economy is to work in practice.	

	1
We recognise that city-wide solutions are needed, but feel that voluntary and community groups like ourselves have much to offer in terms of piloting approaches in different neighbourhoods and gathering close-to-the-ground feedback.	
Will the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee agree to setting up a 'Recycling and Re-use Pilots' working group which includes councillors, officers and representatives from the business, community and voluntary sectors to identify, scope and commission such pilots? Will Sheffield Council appropriately fund these pilots? Recognising the urgency of addressing these issues will Sheffield Council agree to start a programme of such pilots within three months with an agreed and appropriate timescale to make an initial report on their findings?'	
Answer: We acknowledge and appreciate the input of community groups in providing local solutions for some recycling schemes. It is important that when providing recycling collections across the whole city we ensure that there are reliable and secure recycling outlets available for the materials we collect. Our existing services, which provide collections of paper, cardboard, glass, cans and plastic bottles have long established recycling markets, which means that the materials we collect for recycling are then sent for recycling. There are a number of other materials that could theoretically be collected through our recycling services but many have limited or unreliable outlets or have long-distance disposal options, which means we have to carefully consider the environmental, and financial viability of collecting such materials.	
With numerous upcoming changes expected through the Environment Act we do expect to be taking more recyclable materials in the next few years, including plastic pots, tubs and trays, and potentially cartons and soft plastics. The exact detail and timing for these new requirements has been long awaited from Government, and once confirmed this will inform the development of a new waste strategy that will set out	

	how Sheffield will manage its waste and recycling over the coming years. Government is also expected to provide clarity on what funding will be made available to Local Authorities to help pay for these new requirements and as we continue through periods of restricted funding and pressured budgets. The Environment Act will have a major impact on the waste industry, not just in terms of new recycling collections, but because product manufacturers will be required to pay fees on the products they place on the market, based on how recyclable their products are. This is important because they will be incentivised to reduce packaging, and where packaging is needed the fees will make sure it is reusable or recyclable. This should mean that manufacturers using hard to recycle materials for their packaging will move to using materials that are recyclable, and this will help to provide more secure and sustainable recycling markets in the future.	
Simon Geller	 Q. I am a volunteer ranger for Sustrans, the Sustainable Transport Charity and we try to look after the National Cycle Network and Trans Pennine Trail routes in the city. In general the maintenance standards for the network are quite good. However, we do have some hot spots where the problems of litter, fly-tipping and antisocial behaviour seem intractable. One such is the "stub" of Tinsley Park Road leading to the subway under Broughton Lane and continuing up to Europa Way. This is part of a key Active Travel route not only used by long-distance tourists and local cyclists but also part of the route between Meadowhall and the Advanced Manufacturing Park and the employment opportunities provided there. For at least 10 years this has been a hotspot for us. We have reported it countless times and have conducted numerous cleanups there only to return a few weeks later to find it is just as bad as it was beforehand. This is a major deterrent to using the route. We have surveyed people using the route and they have confirmed that this is a major concern, with 	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee

some people preferring to use the busy major roads nearby rather than use the route at night.
We suggested that the road should be blocked off to prevent issues of antisocial behaviour which have been witnessed and reported. There are no premises on the road so there is no need to retain vehicle access. The legitimate users who would be inconvenienced are the fishermen but there are options for them to park just a short way away. With the street blocked off it would be possible to start turning the area into a small community park.
The response was to block off the turning area where people would park up but this has not solved the problem.
On our last visit the Canal and Rivers Trust were conducting a fishing promotion, something they do across the country, and they said this was the worst site they had seen. It really is a disgrace to the city of Sheffield. By contrast, the CRT along with the Blue Loop maintain the adjacent canal up very well.
We also have problems along the whole stretch from Attercliffe Common to Europa Way but this is by far the worst section.
My question is, why have the Council and its contractors so singularly failed in their obligation to keep this street tidy and well maintained and what can be done to improve the situation?
Answer: The underpass which goes underneath Broughton Lane and connects the two sides of Tinsley Park Road has sadly become somewhat of a littering hotspot.
During 2022, our Street Cleansing contractor Amey undertook over 35 additional visits to the site to carry out additional street cleansing on demand, so this is not an issue of poor service, as every single time they attended and resolved these environmental issues within their contractual timescale.

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
	This issue instead sadly points to a lack of respect for the environment from those who throw their litter and dump waste here.	
	There is a legal right on the highway to pass and repass and fly tipping and littering is not deemed in law to be an appropriate reason for permanently closing a road. The DBL depot on the East side of the bridge have an access gate very close to the bridge itself and on the Western side, the adjacent car park to the bridge is private land who may decide to either develop or bring the site into daily use – and as such would have legitimate grounds for objection to their site access being closed off from Tinsley Park Road.	
	As the existing closure cannot be moved further out, we are instead trialling a new approach to street cleansing in the area, utilising an area based team (which will also cover the area of Attercliffe Common referred to), giving the team more ability to respond dynamically to litter demand in the area rather than a one-size-fits-all approach of treating all streets equally. We will track litter levels in the area in partnership with Keep Britain Tidy and establish whether this delivers an uplift to the area in terms of litter levels.	
Geoff Palmer	 Q. Who at Sheffield Council supervises/monitors the work AMEY Contractors do? Why are the management team at Amey continually allowed to" BLOCK" and refuse to do the necessary Road Repairs, they are totally out of control and should be made to face the Committee in person to face their failures. 	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee
	I do have numerous letters from AMEY management which I would be prepared to show you as evidence of their continuing refusal to do works, if this is permitted.	
	Answer: The Streets Ahead Highways Maintenance contract is based on the principle of self-monitoring. Sheffield City Council carries out sample checks to validate	

	The overall road condition in Sheffield continues to benchmark well against national figures. Each carriageway and footway is assessed on a two-year cycle. Carriageways and footways that fail to meet the required standards are rectified in the following year cycle. As part of Streets Ahead there is a team of highway safety inspectors who conduct inspections of each area of Sheffield. The frequency of inspections depends on the hierarchy of the road, with principal roads being routinely inspected on a monthly basis, and local estate roads routinely inspected on an annual basis. Should there be any potholes that require attention then they will be noted on these inspections and repaired accordingly. Any road or footway that is deemed dangerous or unsafe as part of a risk-based inspection will be addressed. We also encourage members of the public to report any issues which give cause for concern. Repairs to hazardous potholes have shown good performance throughout the year. These are potholes which are greater than 40mm in depth. It is notable that during quarter 4 of 2022/23 which is the winter seasonal peak Amey achieved 98.7% quarter average. However we know performance around lower	
	However we know performance around lower category defects (potholes less than 40mm deep in carriageways) isn't as good as it should be and further detail is set out in closed Appendix 3 of the Amey Performance Report (Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee, 27 September 2023) for Cllrs to debate.	
Andy Buck	Q. 1. Will the Council:	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste and Street

a) hold further discussions with Amey with a view to expediting the preparation and then implementation of plans to resurface Chippinghouse Road and neighbouring streets;	Scene Policy Committee
Answer: Yes, discussions are ongoing, and Amey are also committed to discussing these adjacent streets to achieve a joined-up solution to these areas that have waited a significant amount of time for resurfacing.	
 b) guarantee that at the very latest these streets will be resurfaced by March 2025; 	
Answer : The target date is March 2025 and Amey are committed to using all reasonable efforts to undertake the work by then.	
c) confirm that the necessary work on each street will be undertaken in a single period, rather than split over two or more periods?	
Answer: Amey have confirmed that they will target their programmes to maximise programme efficiency. Any mitigations related to the trees will tend to be delivered prior to resurfacing and there will be a natural short break between the differing workstreams.	
2. Will the Council guarantee that Amey will repair all the sections of Chippinghouse Road marked up for repair on 15 September 2023 before the yellow markings fade and disappear?	
Answer: Yes, Amey have confirmed that they will repair all sections marked up for repair.	
3. What is the Council doing to improve the handling of complaints about Streets Ahead? Will the Council ensure that my complaint of 24 March 2023 is responded to?	
Answer:	

	Amey are preparing-an action plan to deal with the long timescales associated with customer enquiries. With regard the complaint of 24 March 2023 many of the points have been addressed in the Streets Ahead response dated 7 th August. With regard the ongoing remaining issues these will be responded to by October 2023, however the ponding issue will have to be addressed as result of the delivery of the surfacing programme when implemented.	
Chloe Cheeseman	Q. I live on Ulverston Road, part of the Sheaf Valley Cycle route. When I cycle to town, there are often vehicles parked illegally on double yellow lines on the corner, at the junction with Woodseats Road. Woodseats Road is busy and these illegally parked vehicles obscure my view before I turn into the road, making turning more dangerous. I feel frustrated that this illegal parking happens so regularly and apparently without consequence. What can be done to make enforcement action against this kind of illegal parking more effective?	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee
	Answer:	
	Parking on a double yellow line can only be enforced by a Civil Enforcement Officer attending in person to observe the infringement and issue a PCN. Photographic evidence of previous infringements cannot be used to issue PCNs. We would encourage infringements are reported to the parking services enforcement team with details of where and when it takes place. The team can attend as soon as resources are available, or schedule future enforcement activity in the locality. Currently contact can be made by emailling parkingenforcement@sheffield.gov.uk or calling 0114 273 6255. We will also shortly be launching an online reporting tool which will be hosted on the council's website.	
Extinction Rebellion	Q. A group from Extinction Rebellion have worked together on some questions for the meeting this Wednesday concerning the motion on Glyphosate.	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste and Street
	1.This motion is weak because it has no timeline. Please amend the motion to set a date by which	Scene Policy Committee

Glyphosate will no longer be sprayed on our streets and pavements? 2025 would seem reasonable.	
Answer: The Committee report opens with a clear recommendation that officers are to return to Committee as soon as central government guidance and/or legislation on the use of pesticides in the public realm has been published, with an update promised before the end of 2025.	
At this time, given the Council's financial situation, the indicative £150 million cost of a complete cessation of Glyphosate to the Authority and a lack of licensing for alternative products for use on hard surfaces mean that this is realistically out of the Council's control and is a matter for Central Government and regulatory bodies to drive forward.	
As soon as we get specific guidance we will be coming back to Committee for a decision on the best way forward.	
2. The background in this motion gives very little detail about the harmful effects of Glyphosate to nature or to human health. Do you realise we are currently experiencing the 6th mass extinction of species, and insects are taking the biggest hit. UK's flying insects have declined by 60% in the last 20 years. In 2019, Biological Conservation reported that 40% of all insects species are declining globally and that a third of them are endangered. The first thing to do to reverse this trend is to stop poisoning them with herbicides, insecticides and pesticides. As well as destroying their food sources Glyphosate has a direct health impact on bees. It alters the beneficial gut flora of bees making them more susceptible to disease and it harms the bees navigation abilities which endangers the hives' survival.	
Answer: The Committee report is clear that Glyphosate will not be used on soft surfaces, flowerbeds, shrub beds etc where bees and other insects would acquire their food source. As per the Health and Safety Executive publication, Glyphosate is not a neonicotinoid; these	

 types of pesticides are insecticides and are used to treat crops against the actions of certain insects such as pollen beetles, this is not how we operate weed control in the public realm. The report also cites at 1.5 Academic Studies such as Tarazona et al (2017) around concerns of the potential effect upon insects and bees so does recognise this school of thought. Glyphosate will only be used on weeds which have already emerged in pavements on a "spot treatment" basis. The trials so far using this methodology have yielded reductions in usage down to around one-third of what it previously was. The Committee report is clear that residents can help us further reduce usage by removing weeds from hard surfaces from pavements in their neighbourhoods. Put simply - when teams arrive at a 	
street, if there are no weeds, no Glyphosate will be used. 3. In 1.4 in the motion it is noted that Glyphosate is deemed to be safe and efficacious for use as a herbicide. This ignores the conclusions from the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) which labelled glyphosate as "probably carcinogenic". Independent scientific studies have revealed numerous acute and chronic effects of glyphosate-based herbicides. In addition, the ingredients added to glyphosate products may be toxic. Many of these chemicals are trade secrets and we rely on the manufacturers to ensure the products have been tested to be safe. Studies have found that glyphosate-based herbicides can interfere with various organs and biochemical pathways in mammals. It causes imbalances in gut bacteria and some studies have found that glyphosate appears to accumulate in human cells. At low concentrations it damages liver, kidney and skin cells and long term effects include cancer, infertility, pregnancy problems, birth defects and respiratory diseases. Please amend 1.4 accordingly. Answer:	

As per Tarazona et al (2017), since Glyphosate was introduced in 1974, all regulatory assessments have established that glyphosate has low hazard potential to mammals.	
We acknowledge that the IARC reported in 2015 that Glyphosate was "probably carcinogenic". The carcinogenic status from the IARC places Glyphosate in the same tier as red meat and night shift working.	
The IARC conclusion was however <u>not</u> confirmed by the EU assessment nor by joint World Health Organisation (WHO) Food and Agriculture Organisation / FAO evaluation, both of which used additional information beyond that reviewed by the IARC in coming to their decision.	
1.4 of the report paraphrases the Health and Safety Executive national regulatory stance, so this section is not the Opinion of the Authority, but that of the relevant regulatory body.	
4. Also in 1.4 the motion mentions current legislation but not that the EU may well be about to ban Glyphosate.	
Answer: Britain is no longer a member of the EU so this would be out of scope of the report.	
On 19 September 2023, the Commission put forward to the Member States a revised Renewal Report and a draft Regulation which actually proposes the renewal of approval of Glyphosate's license, not the removal of it.	
5. Do you realise Glyphosate is found as a residue in many of the food products we eat. It has also been found in water, wine and beer. Testing has revealed that glyphosate is present in people's urine in Europe, and in urine and breast milk in the USA.	
Answer: Yes, this is reflected in section 6.3.2 where the report recognises that Glyphosate is used in food	

production in the UK – it is routinely used in cereal crops such as wheat and barley hence why it appears in end-user food and drink products such as wine, beer and bread.

6. GMB represents around 630,000 workers including those most at risk from exposure to the chemical such as parks staff, gardeners and agricultural and forestry workers. Dan Shears, GMB National Officer, said: "GMB is clear the guidance from the World Health Organisation should be heeded and glyphosate must be treated as a severe health risk to the general public. In situations like this, surely it is better to be safe not sorry? Employers should stop using glyphosate immediately and replace it with safer alternatives – many of which have been trialled by councils in the UK."

Answer:

The IARC conclusion was <u>**not**</u> confirmed by the EU assessment or the recent joint World Health Organisation (WHO) Food and Agriculture Organisation / FAO evaluation, both of which used additional information beyond that reviewed by the IARC.

1.4 of the report paraphrases the Health and Safety Executive national regulatory stance, this is not the Opinion of the Authority but that of the relevant regulatory body.

7. In 2.2 the motion mentions the report that was commissioned by Cardiff City Council. It is important that you realise that this report was written by Dr Daniel Jones. He is Managing Director of Advanced Invasives. Customers of Advanced Invasives include international herbicide producers like Bayer, the manufacturer of Glyphosate! Bayer have a long history of misleading the public and legislators about the safety of their products, notably Neonicotinoids which are now recognised as extremely harmful to bees and other insects.

Answer:

The Health and Safety Executive as the regulatory body are clear that Glyphosate is not a neonicotinoid;

these types of pesticides are insecticides and are used to treat crops against the actions of certain insects such as pollen beetles, this is not how we operate weed control in the public realm.	
8. In 2.5 it is stated "Annual usage figures of Glyphosate decreased from 140,000 litres of diluted product being used across this city in 2020 (pre-trial) to currently less than 50,000 litres of diluted product being used in 2023, representing a huge overall reduction in use of Glyphosate based products in the public realm." But 2023 is not yet at an end. Is 50000 litres an estimate for the whole year, or is it the figure for just part of the year? If so what fraction of the year does it include?	
Answer: Figures reported were to just before the report was prepared, it is acknowledged a small further increase may be encountered, but given the incredibly rainy summer weather, spraying had substantively stopped by the time of writing as this product is not used in adverse weather conditions where the rainfastness time is unlikely to be achieved (i.e. if rain is forecasted).	
9. In 3.1 it is stated that it is important to continue spraying Glyphosate on soft surfaces. Presumably this includes tree pits and areas surrounding trees. Are you aware that this damages the fungi on the tree roots that help the tree collect nutrients and water. It is very important for tree health not to spray Glyphosate near them.	
Answer: This may be a mis-reading or misinterpretation - the report states at 3.1 that alternatives to Glyphosate will be used on soft surfaces.	
10. In 3.3 you admit that the Glyphosate free trial was unsuccessful at evaluating the impact on the highway of not applying any chemical weed killers. This is a great shame. You have not identified what went wrong with the trial or how it could have been done better. Obviously you should not repeat the same mistakes, but surely further trials should be	

possible, on different terms, having learnt from previous mistakes.	
The areas of the trial were subject to a large number of residents and 3 rd parties spraying the highway. We have worked with Edinburgh Council (more detail in the report) and listened to our consultation outcomes and will work with residents and volunteering groups to embrace this willingness to help remove weeds on the highway and reduce the amount of chemical we have to use.	
11. In 3.7 it is stated "the Council are working with Amey to put in place a Contract Change Notice pursuant to the Contract which will enable a relaxation to some of Amey's contractual obligations to manage weeds across the Council's land". Exactly what changes to the contract are being proposed?	
Answer: A temporary 2 year relaxation of Performance Requirements relating to weed growth in grass verges, under hedgerows and in shrub beds to ensure that they are not penalised for alternative products being less efficacious.	
12. In 7.2 it is noted that "the total potential cost implication of complete cessation in a worst-case scenario could be as high as £150 million of additional expenditure." Has anyone costed the worst case scenario of continued use of Glyphosate? A court in the US which ruled that Roundup – which contains glyphosate as its key ingredient – was liable for a terminally ill man's cancer and ordered the company to pay \$289 million in damages. This was the first case of its kind but there are another 8,000 similar cases pending in the US alone. Amey workers are regularly observed spraying Glyphosate without masks. When Graham Wroe asked one why he was doing this he said that masks are scary for the public. There is a big concern that in the future Sheffield Council could face massive compensation bills if workers ill from Glyphosate use take them to court. Apart from the possible legal costs, the worst case scenario for continued use of Glyphosate is the continued decline and possible extinction of many	

species of bees and other insects. Has anyone costed the implications of that?	
Answer: Employees transferred under TUPE regulations from the Council into the private sector in 2012. Amey's manage any risks to their employees, which includes detailed risk assessments, COSHH assessments and appropriate controls and Personal Protective Equipment Policies as well as health surveillance for their staff.	
13. In 8.1 the motion concludes that approval of the recommendations will allow "A continuous reduction in the use of glyphosate in highway areas across all of Sheffield." You really need to set a timescale for this reduction.	
Answer: With reference to earlier sections - timescales are outlined in the report which are aligned to likely forthcoming clarification from central government on the usage of Glyphosate prior to 2025.	
Q. Secondly the motion says it will allow "The opportunity to work with residents in various areas of the city to promote awareness and encourage action in line with the Nature Emergency outcomes. This will achieve an important step in the city's response to the declared Nature Emergency. Working with residents on this is to be welcomed, but it is vital for the Council to take the lead. You have declared a Nature Emergency, so you must act on this now.	
Answer: Agree, we hope the volunteer sector and those who are actively engaged in wanting to help us reduce the use of Glyphosate will spread the word that if there are no weeds in the pavement, then no Glyphosate will be sprayed and encourage people to become more involved at community level as has been so successful for Edinburgh Council in their Pesticide Free Balerno campaign.	
Q. Thirdly it says it will allow "Alignment with the timescales for further central government guidance	

	 and/or legislation and future licensing of information on the future licensing of Glyphosate." This Government is best friends with the Chemical and Oil industries. Sheffield can't wait for them to take action. Sheffield needs to take the lead. Answer: The Health and Safety Executive are the relevant licensing body for pesticides in England and once we get clarification we will be able to return to committee to seek a decision on the way forward. 	
Joel Gilbert	 Q. There is a feeling SCC has given up when it comes to supporting residents who have to walk in the city. Primarily, for me, this about pavement parking to such an extent the pavement becomes impassable, including having vehicles having all 4 wheels on the pavement sometimes for weeks at a time! As an example when walking my nephew to the park along Shirecliffe Lane last week I had to push the buggy (uphill) along the middle of the road to face oncoming traffic as both pavements were unpassable. This is not something that should need a consultation to remedy, walking a 15 month-old on a pavement s is not a nice to have, so what steps are the committee planning on introducing to make sure pavements are more accessible for humans? Answer: There is no general legislation outside of London for an offence of pavement parking. A specific Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) must be written to prevent parking on pavements in any locations that the council would want to prohibit pavement parking. The TRO must be consulted on. Signs and lines also have to be installed to show where pavement parking begins or ends. The policy to introduce pavement parking restrictions has designated the city centre as the only location pavement parking enforcement will currently be introduced. The responsibility for transport policy and any amendments to this approach sit with the Transport, regeneration, and Climate Policy Committee. However, locations where double yellow lines are installed may also allow the enforcement of parking on the pavement. The double yellow line applies from the centre of the road up to 	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee

the nearest barrier or wall, so may encompass a pavement in some circumstances. Double yellow lines also need TRO's which must be consulted on. Requests for new parking restrictions are dealt with by the council's Strategic Transport and Infrastructure Service. They have a limited budget which is used to prioritise new measures in the areas of greatest risk. I would encourage any evidence of the risks posed in areas of the city be sent to transport@sheffield.gov.uk In addition to raising concerns with the council's transport team to collate evidence, I would also encourage any instances of obstructive parking on the pavement as described in this incident to be reported to the police via the none emergency number of 101 or online at	
 smartcontact.southyorkshire.police.uk The police can enforce obstruction of the highway without there being a traffic regulation order present. Q. I hope to attend in person and ask these questions related to item 11. 1. Noting 4.4.2, Disability Sheffield would welcome constructive and proactive engagement with SCC officers as the design of the reporting and feedback mechanism will be vital to help ensure this is accessible for the full breadth of the disabled community who are affected by issues such as parking across dropped kerbs and pavement parking. Will the committee require this? 	Cllr Joe Otten, Chair of the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee
 2. Additionally, can the committee consider requiring that regular publication/reporting of the number of reports, final outcome/action taken, general geographic area should be built into reporting and enforcement systems to give suitable oversight (hopefully to seeing an improvement over the coming years)? 3. Finally, we would like to flag that the consultation period was run for a very short period, and we are concerned that all those negatively affected by 	
	 pavement in some circumstances. Double yellow lines also need TRO's which must be consulted on. Requests for new parking restrictions are dealt with by the council's Strategic Transport and Infrastructure Service. They have a limited budget which is used to prioritise new measures in the areas of greatest risk. I would encourage any evidence of the risks posed in areas of the city be sent to transport@sheffield.gov.uk In addition to raising concerns with the council's transport team to collate evidence, I would also encourage any instances of obstructive parking on the pavement as described in this incident to be reported to the police via the none emergency number of 101 or online at smartcontact.southyorkshire.police.uk The police can enforce obstruction of the highway without there being a traffic regulation order present. Q. I hope to attend in person and ask these questions related to item 11. 1. Noting 4.4.2, Disability Sheffield would welcome constructive and proactive engagement with SCC officers as the design of the reporting and feedback mechanism will be vital to help ensure this is accessible for the full breadth of the disabled community who are affected by issues such as parking across dropped kerbs and pavement parking. Will the committee require this? 2. Additionally, can the committee consider requiring that regular publication/reporting of the number of reports, final outcome/action taken, general geographic area should be built into reporting and enforcement systems to give suitable oversight (hopefully to seeing an improvement over the coming years)? 3. Finally, we would like to flag that the consultation

spots. Choosing which areas to prioritise or tackle first will be important to start unblocking access (some locations will have a longer distance to the next crossing point) and some areas of contravention will also create safety issues for pedestrians who can work around the obstruction. It would be helpful if officers were to take some time with the disabled community to understand what offences cause the most problems in order to give confidence on the approach being taken. Will the committee be interested in Officers using Access Liaison Group time to assist in this manner?	
To note, there may be issues for disabled drivers which we have not had time to analyse.	
Answer: The committee would welcome Disability Sheffield's input into the designing of the reporting and feedback function.	
The committee would like to see inclusion of the statistics requested in the annual parking report.	
The committee would welcome the input of the access liaison group in helping shape the priority areas.	