

# **Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee**

---

**Tuesday 19 January 2021 at 4.30 pm**

**To be held as an online video conference**

**The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend**

## **Membership**

---

Councillors Denise Fox (Chair), Ian Auckland (Deputy Chair), Neale Gibson, Dianne Hurst, Alan Hooper, Abdul Khayum, Bryan Lodge, Mohammed Mahroof, Barbara Masters, Ben Miskell, Moya O'Rourke, Sioned-Mair Richards, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Martin Smith and Paul Turpin

## **Substitute Members**

In accordance with the Constitution, Substitute Members may be provided for the above Committee Members as and when required.

---

---

## **PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING**

---

The Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Committee exercises an overview and scrutiny function in respect of the planning, development and monitoring of service performance and other issues in respect of the area of Council activity relating to planning and economic development, wider environmental issues, culture, leisure, skills and training, and the quality of life in the City.

A copy of the agenda and reports is available on the Council's website at [www.sheffield.gov.uk](http://www.sheffield.gov.uk). You can also see the reports to be discussed at the meeting if you call at the First Point Reception, Town Hall, Pinstone Street entrance. The Reception is open between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm, Monday to Thursday and between 9.00 am and 4.45 pm. on Friday. You may not be allowed to see some reports because they contain confidential information. These items are usually marked \* on the agenda.

Members of the public have the right to ask questions or submit petitions to Scrutiny Committee meetings and recording is allowed under the direction of the Chair. Please see the website or contact Democratic Services for further information regarding public questions and petitions and details of the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at council meetings.

Scrutiny Committee meetings are normally open to the public but sometimes the Committee may have to discuss an item in private. If this happens, you will be asked to leave. Any private items are normally left until last. If you would like to attend the meeting please report to the First Point Reception desk where you will be directed to the meeting room.

If you require any further information about this Scrutiny Committee, please contact Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer on 0114 27 35065 or [email deborah.glen@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:deborah.glen@sheffield.gov.uk)

---

## **FACILITIES**

---

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in meeting rooms.

Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

---

**ECONOMIC AND ENVIRONMENTAL WELLBEING SCRUTINY AND POLICY  
DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE AGENDA  
19 JANUARY 2021**

**Order of Business**

---

- 1. Welcome and Housekeeping Arrangements**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Exclusion of Public and Press**  
To identify items where resolutions may be moved to exclude the press and public
- 4. Declarations of Interest** (Pages 5 - 8)  
Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting
- 5. Minutes of Previous Meetings** (Pages 9 - 22)  
To approve the minutes of meetings of the Committee held on 24<sup>th</sup> November and 15<sup>th</sup> December, 2020
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**  
To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public
- 7. Update on the Sheffield Plan** (Pages 23 - 28)  
Report of the Interim Executive Director, Place
- 8. Draft Work Plan 2020/21** (Pages 29 - 34)  
Report of the Policy and Improvement Officer
- 9. Date of Next Meeting**  
The next meeting of the Committee will be held on Tuesday, 23<sup>rd</sup> February, 2021, at 4.30 pm

This page is intentionally left blank

---

## ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

---

If you are present at a meeting of the Council, of its executive or any committee of the executive, or of any committee, sub-committee, joint committee, or joint sub-committee of the authority, and you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest** (DPI) relating to any business that will be considered at the meeting, you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

You **must**:

- leave the room (in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct)
- make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of any DPI at any meeting at which you are present at which an item of business which affects or relates to the subject matter of that interest is under consideration, at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.
- declare it to the meeting and notify the Council's Monitoring Officer within 28 days, if the DPI is not already registered.

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your **disclosable pecuniary interests** under the new national rules. You have a pecuniary interest if you, or your spouse or civil partner, have a pecuniary interest.

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner undertakes.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period\* in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

\*The relevant period is the 12 months ending on the day when you tell the Monitoring Officer about your disclosable pecuniary interests.

- Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority –
  - under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
  - which has not been fully discharged.

- Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.
- Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) –
  - the landlord is your council or authority; and
  - the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -
  - (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
  - (b) either -
    - the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
    - if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

If you attend a meeting at which any item of business is to be considered and you are aware that you have a **personal interest** in the matter which does not amount to a DPI, you must make verbal declaration of the existence and nature of that interest at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. You should leave the room if your continued presence is incompatible with the 7 Principles of Public Life (selflessness; integrity; objectivity; accountability; openness; honesty; and leadership).

You have a personal interest where –

- a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing (including interests in land and easements over land) of you or a member of your family or a person or an organisation with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the Council Tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the Authority's administrative area, or
- it relates to or is likely to affect any of the interests that are defined as DPIs but are in respect of a member of your family (other than a partner) or a person with whom you have a close association.

Guidance on declarations of interest, incorporating regulations published by the Government in relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, has been circulated to you previously.

You should identify any potential interest you may have relating to business to be considered at the meeting. This will help you and anyone that you ask for advice to fully consider all the circumstances before deciding what action you should take.

In certain circumstances the Council may grant a **dispensation** to permit a Member to take part in the business of the Authority even if the member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest relating to that business.

To obtain a dispensation, you must write to the Monitoring Officer at least 48 hours before the meeting in question, explaining why a dispensation is sought and desirable, and specifying the period of time for which it is sought. The Monitoring Officer may consult with the Independent Person or the Council's Audit and Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from Gillian Duckworth, Director of Legal and Governance on 0114 2734018 or email [gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk).

This page is intentionally left blank



## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

### Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

**Meeting held 24 November 2020**

(NOTE: This meeting was held as a remote meeting in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.)

**PRESENT:** Councillors Denise Fox (Chair), Ian Auckland (Deputy Chair), Neale Gibson, Dianne Hurst, Alan Hooper, Abdul Khayum, Bryan Lodge, Mohammed Mahroof, Barbara Masters, Ben Miskell, Moya O'Rourke, Sioned-Mair Richards, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Martin Smith and Paul Turpin

.....

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

1.1 No apologies for absence were received.

#### **2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

#### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

3.1 In relation to Item 7 on the agenda (Call-In of the Cabinet Decision on Sheffield Covid Business Recovery Plan), Councillor Ben Miskell declared a personal interest as Cabinet Adviser for Business and Investment.

#### **4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 8th September 2020, were approved as a correct record and, arising therefrom, further to a query raised by Councillor Ian Auckland as to whether there had been any response from Sheffield City Trust (SCT), further to the request of the Committee for them to meet with members of a cross-party Task and Finish Group to review 'the future of leisure facilities past and present', the Chair (Councillor Denise Fox) updated the Committee on the current position. She stated that she had received a response from David Grey (Executive Chairman, SCT), which had been sent to all Members of the Committee, providing an explanation as to why SCT management had not been able to attend the previous meeting, and offering to attend a future meeting to discuss the issues further. Councillor Fox stated that she was to meet with officers in connection with the setting up of the Task and Finish Group, and would invite the Trust to its first meeting.

## **5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

5.1 There were no questions raised or petitions submitted by members of the public.

## **6. CALL-IN OF THE CABINET DECISION ON SHEFFIELD COVID BUSINESS RECOVERY PLAN**

6.1 The Committee considered the following decision of the Cabinet at its meeting held on 21st October 2020:-

- (a) notes the role of the Council in developing the Sheffield Covid Business Recovery Plan as part of a collaboration with the Sheffield Covid Business Response Group;
- (b) endorses the Sheffield Covid Business Recovery Plan as a framework for action to help address the economic impacts of Covid;
- (c) notes and acknowledges the role the Council will play in delivering elements of the Plan as part of the Business Response Group, with the Plan informing the City's bids for Covid relief and recovery funding;
- (d) notes the collaborative approach taken to develop the action plan, creating the basis for a new long-term relationship with the private sector in Sheffield, working together to help to shape the City's long-term economic strategy; and
- (e) notes that a report seeking approval to establish a £2 million Fund to support interventions that address some of the economic impacts of Covid-19 would be considered by the Leader in early November.

### **6.2 Signatories**

The lead signatory to the call-in was Councillor Martin Smith, and the other signatories were Councillors Ian Auckland , Alan Hooper, Mohammed Mahroof and Barbara Masters.

### **6.3 Reasons for the Call-In**

The signatories wanted the Committee to scrutinise the decision, and the actions that the Council intended to take as a result of the Plan.

### **6.4 Attendees**

- Edward Highfield (Director of City Growth)
- Alexis Krachai (Interim Executive Director of Sheffield Chamber of Commerce and Industry)

6.5 Edward Highfield introduced the report, indicating that the Sheffield Covid Business Recovery Plan was not purely a Council document, but had been

developed in partnership with the Business Response Group, which had been established in the early stages of the pandemic in an attempt to pull together the views of both the public and private sectors. The Group comprised representation from the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce and Industry, the Sheffield Universities, the Sheffield Property Association, Sheffield Digital and Unight (a group representing the City's night-time economy), and was co-chaired by Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Business and Investment) and Alexis Krachai. The Group had been a positive and powerful collaboration, which had provided the foundations for the work to be carried out throughout the pandemic, and into the future. Mr Highfield stressed that the Plan related only to business recovery. The Business Response Group had undertaken some positive, early work in aligning all the different sources of support in an effort to ensure that as many businesses as possible would benefit. It was then proposed that a positive plan for the future would be established, hence the Sheffield Covid Business Recovery Plan. He referred to the six priorities set out in the Plan, which had been decided following input from the private sector and from discussions at various Member Working Groups.

- 6.6 Mr Highfield reported on the three phases of the Plan - Relief, Recovery and Renewal, and indicated that, whilst the Plan related to Sheffield only, it was closely connected to the Sheffield City Region (SCR) Plan, and that there was a possibility that the Council may seek to obtain resources from the SCR towards funding some of the objectives in the Plan. Many of the objectives in the Relief phase were largely focused on the Council, such as making things Covid-secure, work in connection with district centres and administering the Government grants. The Recovery phase would be where the Business Response Group would add most value, and where additional funding, over and above the Council's mainstream funding, could be used to drive projects. Reference was made to the additional £2 million the Council had allocated to a Covid Relief Fund, which would be used to pump-prime projects, using matched funding from the private sector. The Renewal phase was more focused on longer-term plans, and was strongly aligned to the SCR's Economic Recovery Plan. This phase would involve laying down principles that would hopefully go on to inform longer-term discussions about renewal and economic strategy.
- 6.7 Mr Highfield stated that the Plan was a framework which would provide the Council with a structure and a basis to have discussions about mainstream resource, any additional resource, and then to try to influence larger funding sources. The Plan would be constantly reviewed and adapted.
- 6.8 Alexis Krachai stated that the Plan represented a framework that enabled the partnership to use existing resources in the City. The City's response to the pandemic must be City-wide. It was hoped that the Plan would be used to leverage in support and funding from external parties, help to marshal existing resources, and which could adapt on the basis that the current position regarding the pandemic remained very fluid.
- 6.9 Members of the Committee raised questions, and the following responses were provided:-

- This was not a strategy to try and tackle every impact of Covid, but was a Business Recovery Plan, which primarily focused on the impact on businesses. It was accepted that those sectors which employed more people on lower wages, such as the retail, leisure and hospitality sectors, had been the hardest hit. The Plan focused on getting customers back which, in turn, would sustain such employment opportunities. The Plan placed an emphasis on skills, particularly in terms of young people, and also focused on enterprise and start-ups, in an attempt to try and get businesses back on their feet. The Council does not create businesses or provide people with skills or jobs, but the Plan aimed to create an environment where more people were supported or incentivised to create businesses. The Plan would grow and evolve, as well as be inclusive. The views of Unight had been carefully listened to, and the group had been invited to be a member of the Group. The Plan had a clear vision, which needed to be delivered as a City, both from a top-down perspective, as well as a bottom-up perspective, and that all required representatives to play a role in the process.
- There was no detailed data on the number of small local businesses which had folded yet, or the number of business start-ups there had been during the pandemic due to the lag on such data from the Office for National Statistic (ONS). This data needed to be assessed in conjunction with data provided by more intelligence- based sources, such as the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce and Industry.
- As the process was open and inclusive, every effort would be made to ensure that all relevant groups and organisations, such as the Sheffield Sustainability Network, as now suggested, would be listened to and/or included as a member of the Group.
- There were six posts of Information Officer, funded through the Economic Regeneration Development Fund (ERDF), responsible for engaging with the public in terms of providing help and advice in connection with plans to allow high streets to remain open safely. The officers had initially been based in the larger district centres, mainly in terms of prioritising their caseloads. The feedback from the public had been very positive, and the officers had been getting around and engaging with people. The plan was that they would work in all district centres. Members were encouraged to inform the Director of City Growth of any areas they believed the officers should visit, and a list would be compiled to ensure that they visited each district centre.
- There was a question in terms of office requirements in the City going forward, and what this would mean for future development schemes in the City. There were contrasting views on this issue, but it was clear that, post-pandemic, the quality of places, in terms of liveability, flexibility, public realm and links to green space, were going to be even more important. The design of office accommodation going forward was going to evolve in future years, and there would be a need to design such accommodation

which encouraged collaboration. It was still important that people starting their careers could experience the training and learning when at work, that was required for them to progress, specifically to learn from colleagues around them.

- The Director of City Growth received weekly data regarding indicators at both local and national level, which could be sent to Members of the Committee.
- Whilst the Federation of Small Businesses was not represented on the Business Response Group, the body was consulted on a regular basis. There were a number of individual small businesses represented on the Group, such as Unight. It was accepted that consideration needs to be given to how the Council engaged with small businesses, when many owners were currently struggling just to keep their businesses afloat.
- Specific examples of the projects in the Relief phase included the 'Make Yourself at Home' campaign, which aimed to try to get people to support their local independent retailers, both during the pandemic and beyond. The campaign involved a programme of awareness, support and encouragement about residents engaging with local independent traders/businesses. There were also plans to arrange a number of outdoor events, but there was obviously a major risk attached to such plans, particularly on the part of the prospective organisers. The Plan included action aimed at trying to de-risk such events, and possibly look to underwrite any events which were forced to be cancelled due to the pandemic. A further example related to freelancers, who made up a major part of the City's creative economy and, who, unfortunately, had missed out on the Government grants. The Plan could look to offer grants or commission some of their work.
- The situation regarding small businesses struggling to afford their rent and rates, a situation which was likely to result in a number of insolvencies, represented a major concern. The business rates system was in need of reform, and whilst the Council could not subsidise businesses' rents or rates, it could offer help and advice in terms of generating new customers and provide help to increase footfall in areas where they were located.
- The growth of local district centres in the City was critical going forward, and Sheffield had the benefit of the identity of such centres being very strong, and it was hoped that residents could be further encouraged to visit, and spend more, in their local district centres.
- Sheffield was very much a small business economy, and efforts would be made to ensure that all the City's small businesses could survive. The City's core element of growth would involve the growth of the existing businesses.
- Local and regional government could only do so much to influence the

overall performance of the City's economy. In terms of competition with other cities, both nationally and internationally, there were few things which made Sheffield stand out from others in terms of performance. The key to a successful economy was how the public and private sectors worked together. The Business Recovery Plan would only be delivered if parties worked together and were realistic as to what could be achieved. There was therefore the need to focus on the priorities set out in the Plan. Some of the objectives in the Plan could be delivered early on, whereas others could only be delivered with support from Central Government and/or Sheffield City Region. It was believed that the pandemic had provided the opportunity for the Council and the private sector to work more collaboratively, which would hopefully benefit the City going forward.

- The Chamber of Commerce and Industry had six different levels of membership in terms of businesses, from the largest businesses/organisations, such as the Universities, to small, independent retailers.
- £2 million had been identified in the Council's budget for developing district centres. A shadow Steering Group had been established to look at how this funding could be utilised. It was hoped that the Council could use this funding to lever in further funding from other public or private sources, and that it could be used for pilot projects.
- The Council had received some funding from 'Visit Britain' to look to develop the City as a visitor destination. Some work had been undertaken on the Outdoor City, which had included talking to the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive in connection with the provision of an overnight coach park in the City, which the City has never had, and which was believed to have had an adverse effect on the City's tourism ambitions in the past.
- Every effort would be made to try to encourage more people to use public transport although, given the current position, and the questions of the economic viability of some companies, this may prove very difficult. There were concerns that the potential withdrawal of services may result in a smaller network in the future. The Council had ambitious plans for making it easier and more attractive for people to walk or cycle more, but it was likely that such progress would have to be made in incremental steps over a long period of time.
- Several projects that would be funded through the Business Response Plan were in the Recovery phase, and in which the Business Response Group considered it could add the most value, with the second lockdown providing more time to get plans in place.
- It was acknowledged that there were issues with regard to the City Centre, in that footfall had already decreased prior to the pandemic, and which had decreased further due to the pandemic, mainly due to the absence of commuters and students, the closure of shops, pubs, restaurants and other

leisure facilities. The plan was to look at Fargate, not just as a retail destination, but for other uses, and to develop a better and wider mix of uses in an attempt to attract more people into the City Centre. There was a need for the Council to lobby the Government in connection with the Future High Streets Fund, particularly with regard to developing Fargate. The City Centre was constantly evolving, with footfall on The Moor having increased following the refurbishment works and the new shopping offer. It was important that there was enough in the City Centre, including shops, officers, bars, restaurants and cultural venues, to attract people to visit.

- There had been plans for an event to take place in the City Centre, but it had to be cancelled due to the lockdown. Every effort would be made to look at organising events and releasing public outdoor spaces for use by performers, and it was hoped that a pilot could be undertaken using some of the £2 million funding. Any such events needed to be risk- assessed in terms of Covid-secure measures, and the Council would welcome any ideas for future events from groups or organisations.

6.10 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the information now reported and the responses to the questions raised; and
- (b) agrees to take no action in relation to the called-in decision, but requests that the Director of City Growth and the Interim Director of Sheffield Chamber of Commerce and Industry be invited to a future meeting in March/April 2021, to provide an update on the progress of the Sheffield Covid Business Response Group, including information on how resources from the Covid Relief Fund had been allocated to date.

**7. DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME 2020/21**

7.1 The Committee received a report of the Policy and Improvement Officer (Deborah Glenn) containing the draft Work Programme for 2020/21.

7.2 Members made a number of suggestions in terms of possible issues it could scrutinise, which included small businesses and public transport.

7.3 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the contents of the report now submitted, together with the information now reported; and
- (b) requests the Policy and Improvement Officer to contact First and Stagecoach bus operators and the Sheffield City Region, with the aim of inviting representatives from those organisations to the next meeting of the Committee, to be held 15th December 2020 to report on their future plans for a public transport network in the City.

**8. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

- 8.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Tuesday, 15th December 2020, at 4 30 pm.



# **SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL**

## **Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee**

### **Meeting held 15 December 2020**

(NOTE: This meeting was held as a remote meeting in accordance with the provisions of The Local Authorities and Police and Crime Panels (Coronavirus) (Flexibility of Local Authority and Police and Crime Panel Meetings) (England and Wales) Regulations 2020.)

**PRESENT:** Councillors Denise Fox (Chair), Ian Auckland (Deputy Chair), Dianne Hurst, Alan Hooper, Abdul Khayum, Bryan Lodge, Mohammed Mahroof, Barbara Masters, Ben Miskell, Sioned-Mair Richards, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Martin Smith, Paul Turpin and Alan Law (Substitute Member)

.....

#### **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Neale Gibson, with Councillor Alan Law attending as his substitute, and Moya O'Rourke.

#### **2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS**

- 2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

#### **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

#### **4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS**

- 4.1 There were no questions raised or petitions submitted by members of the public.

#### **5. IMPACT OF THE COVID-19 PANDEMIC ON BUS SERVICES IN SHEFFIELD**

- 5.1 The Committee received presentations from representatives of the bus operators in the city on the impact of the Covid-19 pandemic on their respective services and on the city.

- 5.2 In attendance for this item were Phil Medlicott (Managing Director, Stagecoach), Nigel Eggleton (Managing Director, First South Yorkshire), John Young (Commercial Director, Stagecoach) and Matthew Reynolds (Transport Planning and Infrastructure Manager, Sheffield City Council).

- 5.3 Phil Medlicott, Stagecoach

- 5.3.1 Mr Medlicott stated that, although there had been a number of lessons learnt

along the way due to the unexpected circumstances of the lockdown, the Company had adhered reasonably effectively to the Government guidance relating to reductions in service, social distancing and additional cleaning. The Company had worked closely with the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTe) to ensure that appropriate levels of service remained in all areas of the city. The levels of service had fluctuated throughout the changes in Government advice, with passenger numbers reflecting such changes. Full service had been maintained following Lockdown 2. Mr Medlicott stated that social distancing rules had been adhered to throughout, with a distance of 1.8 metres being allowed on buses due to their design. This had enabled the buses to carry only a maximum of 20% of their capacity. A distance of one metre had later been agreed, which resulted in an increase in capacity. The financial support provided by the Government had been both required and welcome. He reported that approximately 50% of Stagecoach staff had been off work under the shielding or furlough schemes in March and that all but 2% of staff, who had been deemed medically vulnerable under Government guidelines, had returned to work in September. The Company had not been forced to lay off any frontline staff to date. Mr Medlicott concluded by stating that the pandemic had represented a very challenging time for Stagecoach, and every effort had been made to ensure that the Company continued to provide the best service possible for Sheffield residents.

#### 5.4 Nigel Eggleton, First South Yorkshire

5.4.1 Mr Eggleton stated that the Government funding, whilst being welcome, had only allowed First to breakeven, as bus companies were not able to increase or reduce their bus fares. The operators had also received funding from the Department for Education in connection with the provision of school bus services. Whilst there had been some concern regarding the operation of services for school children following their return to school, the Company had experienced few problems in this regard. In the light of the capacities, specifically regarding social distancing measures, First had only been forced to deny passengers access on to buses on a few occasions. Mr Eggleton stated that, surprisingly, First had experienced an increase in vandalism on its buses. In terms of funding going forward, the operators had been guaranteed financial assistance from the Government up to Spring 2021, and would receive eight weeks' notice of the withdrawal of such funding. This remained a concern for the operators on the basis that forecasts had indicated that passenger numbers were likely to return to only 80% capacity after the pandemic.

5.5 Members of the Committee raised questions, and the following responses were provided:-

- In terms of school pupils travelling to schools on buses, there were two applicable rules. The first related to pupils travelling on normal public service routes, where they would be counted on to the bus by the driver, and required to adhere to social distancing rules and wear a face mask. The second related to school bus contracts, where social distancing rules did not apply, but the pupils would still have to wear face masks.

- It was acknowledged that if the operators were to attract passengers back after the pandemic, the quality of service would be more important than ever. In terms of future modelling, there may be a requirement to make small reductions to frequencies on some of the main bus corridors. Any major changes going forward would require additional Government funding, and discussions had commenced between the operators and the Department for Transport in this regard.
- Whilst major improvements had been made in technology in recent times, such as improved ticketing options, contactless payments, the use of apps, websites and real time information, there was always the opportunity for further advancement in this area.
- The operators did not have any major concerns going forward, and it was hoped that some of the ideas highlighted as part of the South Yorkshire Bus Review, which included a number of positive suggestions from members of the public, could be implemented as a means of further service improvements. It was envisaged that a large proportion of services in the Sheffield City Region would remain in place after the pandemic, albeit with the help of additional funding, particularly regarding those marginal services which had been struggling prior to the pandemic.
- The Council fully understood the adverse impact of Covid-19 on the city's public transport network, acknowledging the fact that passenger numbers were down, due mainly to the reduced need and ability to travel. The Council acknowledged the huge efforts made by the bus operators in terms of the action taken to adhere to Government guidelines regarding Covid-19, including the implementation and management of social distancing measures and additional cleaning. This position was reflected both nationally and internationally, and the Council was actively looking for examples of best practice across the world. There would obviously be a need for the operators, working closely with the Council and the SYPTE, to build in a number of contingencies going forward. The benefits of an effective public transport system were still viewed as being vital, for both environmental reasons, particularly with regard to the aims to reach net zero carbon by 2030, and for the social benefits. Connecting Sheffield comprised a £150 million funding package from the Government, and the Council was currently working with the bus operators and the SYPTE to look at initiatives which could be funded through this initiative.
- It was difficult to predict the level of cuts which may be required to be made to bus services following the pandemic. It was not envisaged that there would be any major changes or reductions, just minor timetable changes. It was expected that all areas of the city would still be covered.
- The Council would continue the implementation of projects under its capital programme, although this would not include any major transformation of projects. Improvements would continue to be made to

the city's cycle and walking network, with projects being funded from the Active Travel Fund. The Council would continue to respond, where possible, in connection with the implementation of highway projects, subject to resources being available.

- There had been continuous debate regarding the issue of driver and passenger safety during the pandemic. Drivers did not have the power to enforce the Government guidelines regarding social distancing and the wearing of face masks, which was welcomed by management due to a potential for conflict in those circumstances where passengers did not adhere to the guidelines. The bus operators worked very closely with the police, who would provide assistance subject to resources being available. Around 95% of bus passengers had adhered to the Government guidelines.
- There had been plans for the bus operators to upgrade their fleets, but a number of orders for new vehicles had been cancelled at the start of the pandemic. There was a possibility that the operators would place small capital orders this year for 2022. The operators would also be looking to use funds made available under the Clean Air Zone proposals for undertaking improvements to their fleets. Sheffield had been successful in obtaining funding from the Clean Bus Technology Fund, and the Council was working with the operators to look at possible upgrading options.
- The bus operators had not been adversely affected by staff having to shield due to being classed as medically vulnerable. 40 Stagecoach staff (4% of its workforce) had been forced to shield at home. This number had then reduced to 20 following the change in the Government advice. All these members of staff had now returned to work. Six First drivers and two engineers had been forced to shield at home, and 13 members of staff had been forced to self-isolate. The recent rise in Covid-19 cases in the city had not resulted in any reduction in service for First, with staffing cover being drafted in from other areas. First had closed all its work canteens in order to stop the spread of the infection.
- The operators would always try and ensure that there was adequate service in all areas of the City. As Stagecoach and First were commercial operators, they were able to reinvest any profits into improving services. Every effort would be made to use the additional Government funding to make necessary improvements to the network. Whilst comments suggesting that the first cuts to services should be on those higher frequency routes were noted, it was stressed that such services operated due to the demand for them, so this would be counter-intuitive. It was accepted that the operators needed to strike a balance in terms of potential service cuts/reductions and the provision of a fair and efficient bus service for use by all Sheffield residents.
- The city centre was changing, and the bus operators needed to keep in regular dialogue with the Council and the SYPTE in terms of how the bus

network could adapt to such change. The operators had raised concerns regarding the proposed pedestrianisation of the lower end of Pinstone Street, being one of the main central bus routes through the city centre, but they would look to ensure that their passengers did not have to walk too far to reach a bus stop. It was hoped that the level and frequency of discussions between the bus operators and councillors could increase, particularly given the changes to the City Centre. The changes to the lower end of Pinstone Street had been undertaken due to social distancing requirement. Whilst a number of positive comments had been received regarding such changes, it was not yet known whether these changes would become permanent after the pandemic. The changes made at Shalesmoor had been funded through the Emergency Active Travel Fund and, again, a number of comments had been received from the public, some positive, regarding these changes.

- In terms of action to deal with anti-social behaviour on, and vandalism to, its buses, First had run a Trojan bus in those areas affected, with police on board. This had proved successful, with the perpetrators being apprehended, and no further problems being experienced in these areas. Stagecoach had also experienced similar problems, and had worked with First, South Yorkshire Police and the SYPTE, with regard to taking any necessary action.
- Whilst there was no specific data available regarding customer satisfaction during the pandemic, comments on social media had been mostly positive, and had indicated that punctuality had improved as a result of there being less other traffic on the roads.
- It was believed that the majority of services would continue after the pandemic, and every effort would be made to ensure that the level of service provided in each area of the city was based on usage and demand.
- Evening and late night services would potentially be more challenging to maintain existing provision due to declining usage. It was important that the operators provided services to enable people to access venues and facilities in order to support the night-time economy.
- Efforts would continue to look at providing new and improved ticketing options, particularly for those families on low incomes, who struggle to afford to travel to leisure and other facilities. Both First and Stagecoach offered a group ticket option where up to five people could travel for £5, for use after 5:00 pm on Fridays, and throughout the weekend.

5.6 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes the information reported by Phil Medlicott, Nigel Eggleton, John Young and Matthew Reynolds, together with the responses to the questions raised;

- (b) thanks the representatives of the bus operators and Matthew Reynolds for attending the meeting, and for responding to the questions raised; and
- (c) requests the Chair, on its behalf, to write to the representatives of the bus operators, expressing its sincere thanks and appreciation for the excellent work undertaken by all staff in order to maintain an efficient level of service in very difficult and challenging circumstances, during the Covid-19 pandemic.

## **6. DRAFT WORK PROGRAMME 2020/21**

- 6.1 The Committee received a report of the Policy and Improvement Officer (Deborah Glen) containing the draft Work Programme for 2020/21.
- 6.2 Members made a number of suggestions in terms of possible issues it could scrutinise, together with a number of possible amendments to the Work Programme.
- 6.3 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-
  - (a) notes the report now submitted, together with the information now reported; and
  - (b) arising from the issues now raised, (i) requests the Policy and Improvement Officer to make arrangements for reports on updates on Business Recovery and City Centre Development/Growth to be submitted to its meeting to be held on 23rd March 2020, and (ii) agrees that (A) the Active Sheffield Strategy Working Group concludes its work and (B) the Sheffield City Trust be invited to attend a meeting of this Committee early in the 2021/22 Municipal Year.

## **7. DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

- 7.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Tuesday, 19<sup>th</sup> January 2021, at 4.30 pm.



## Report to Economic and Environmental Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee

19 January 2021

---

**Report of:** Interim Executive Director, Place

---

**Subject:** Update on the Sheffield Plan

---

**Author of Report:** Simon Vincent, Local Plan Service Manager (Tel: 0114 2734157)

**Summary:**

This report provides an update on progress in preparing the Sheffield Plan (the city's new statutory Local Plan). The update has been requested by the Committee.

---

**Type of item:** The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	X
Other	

**The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:**

The Committee is asked to note progress in preparing the Sheffield Plan and provides views on the next steps.

**Background Papers:**

Sheffield Plan Citywide Options for Growth to 2034 (November 2015)

Sheffield Plan Local Development Scheme (November 2019)

Sheffield Plan Issues and Options document (September 2020)

**Category of Report:** OPEN



# **Report of the Director of City Growth**

## **Update on the Sheffield Plan**

### **1. Purpose of the Report**

- 1.1 To update the Scrutiny Committee on progress on the city's statutory Local Plan ('The Sheffield Plan').

### **2. Background**

- 2.1 Members will recall that consultation on 'issues and options' (Regulation 18 consultation<sup>1</sup>) originally took place in 2015.
- 2.2 Following concerns from Members and the public about the scale of Green Belt release envisaged, a new timetable and process was agreed in November 2019 (through publication of a revised 'Local Development Scheme').
- 2.3 The Sheffield Plan will guide development in the city to 2038 and set out a new ambitious vision for how the city grows and develops.
- 2.4 The new Plan will be informed by a new **Central Area Residential Strategy** that provides a framework for accelerated delivery of sustainable residential growth across the City Centre and immediately adjoining areas. The work demonstrates that there is spatial capacity to deliver 20,000 homes within that area.
- 2.5 When eventually adopted, the new Sheffield Plan will replace the Sheffield Core Strategy (2009) and 'saved' policies in the Sheffield Unitary Development Plan (1998). Those documents, together with policies in the National Planning Policy Framework, will continue to be used for development management purposes until the new plan is adopted.

### **3. Timetable and Process**

- 3.1 The timetable agreed in November 2019 is as follows:
- Consult on Issues and Options (Reg 18): July-Sept 2020
  - Consult on Publication Draft Local Plan (Reg 19): July-Sept 2021
  - Draft Plan Submitted to the Government: January 2022
  - Public hearings: April – July 2022
  - Preliminary Inspector's Report: Nov 2022
  - Consult on Main Modifications: Jan – Feb 2023
  - Final Inspector's Report: June 2023
  - Adoption: Sept 2023
- 3.2 Delays caused by the Covid-19 meant that the consultation on the Issues and Options took place 2 months later than planned (1st September – 13th October 2020). This slippage is likely to be reflected in subsequent stages.
- 3.3 Government expects all local planning authorities to have a local plan in place by 2023.

### **4. Issues and Options Consultation (Reg 18) (Sept-Oct 2020)**

- 4.1 The main purpose of the Issues and Options document was to ask what the Plan should contain. It set out a draft vision for the city and 8 interrelated aims. The main

challenges and opportunities under each of those aims were outlined. Consultees were asked to answer a series of questions on the key issues.

- 4.2 Importantly, the document also set out the main options for meeting the city's future housing needs. These are summarised in Appendix 1 below.
- 4.3 Several supporting documents were published alongside the Issues and Options document, including a Green Belt Review and a Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment (HELAA). The HELAA identifies all the land that is potentially available for development.
- 4.4 Due to Covid-19 the consultation was held entirely online. It included a series of meetings and briefings with a wide range of organisations, as well as 3 online question and answer sessions open to members of the public.
- 4.5 We intend to publish an Interim Consultation Report in February 2020 that will summarise the comments that were made, as well as details of the consultation that was undertaken. A final Consultation Report, setting out the Council's responses to the comments will be published alongside the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan (in Autumn 2021).
- 4.6 There were 575 responses to the Issues and Options consultation – an overview of who responded set out in Appendix 2.

## **5. What does this mean for the people of Sheffield?**

- 5.1 The Sheffield Plan will be the city's new local plan and will guide development in the city until 2038. As a statutory document, it will be a powerful tool to deliver the positive change we have described above; it will have a big impact on the city's economy, affecting the number, type and location of businesses and jobs. It will affect what it's like to live in our neighbourhoods, shop on our high streets, use local services, travel around, and visit our parks, countryside and attractions.

## **6. Next Steps**

- 6.1 The responses to the Issues and Options consultation will inform the content of the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan. We will also be gathering further evidence and will need to take account of any changes to planning legislation and national policies.
- 6.2 We expect the Publication Draft Plan to be presented to Cabinet in September 2021 followed by full Council in October 2021.

## **7. Recommendation**

- 7.1 The Committee is asked to note the progress being made on producing the Sheffield Plan and to provide views on the next steps and content of the Publication Draft.

## Appendix 1: Sheffield Plan Issues and Options Consultation 2020 – Housing Growth Options

	Description of Option	New Central Area homes	New Urban Area homes (outside Central Area)	New Green Belt homes	Total new homes
<b>Option A</b>	High density, vibrant walkable neighbourhoods with a wide choice of homes.  Where: The Central Area – in and around the City Centre and at Attercliffe.	20,000 (50%)	20,000 (50%)	0*	40,000
<b>Option B</b>	Mid-rise and vibrant central area and some new houses with private gardens in the suburbs.  Where: The Central Area and some limited areas on the edge of the City	15,000 (37.5%)	20,000 (50%)	5,000 (12.5%)	40,000
<b>Option C</b>	Less dense central area, more new houses with private gardens in the suburbs  Where: the edges of the city including some Green Belt.	10,000 (25%)	20,000 (50%)	10,000 (25%)	40,000

## Appendix 2: Respondents to the Sheffield Plan Issues and Options Consultation 2020

Category of Respondent	Number of responses	Overall %
Councillor/Political Party Representative	6	1.04%
Developer/Agent/Landowner	61	10.61%
Individuals	433	75.30%
Member of Parliament	1	0.17%
Neighbourhood Planning Group	3	0.52%
Other Local Authority	9	1.57%
Private Company	8	1.39%
Private Organisation	5	0.87%
Public Body	9	1.57%
Voluntary Organisation	38	6.61%
Partnership Board/Panel	2	0.35%
<b>Total</b>	<b>575</b>	<b>100%</b>



## Report to Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee

---

**Report of:** Policy and Improvement Officer

---

**Subject:** Work Programme 2020/21: Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny & Policy Development Committee

---

**Author of Report:** Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer  
[deborah.glen@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:deborah.glen@sheffield.gov.uk)

---

The Work Programme is attached at Appendix 1 for the Committee's consideration and discussion. It aims to focus on a small number of issues, in depth. This means the Committee will need to prioritise issues to be included on formal meeting agendas. Where an issue is not appropriate for inclusion on a meeting agenda, but there is significant interest from Members, the Committee can choose to request a written briefing paper.

The Work Programme will remain a live document and will be brought to each Committee meeting. The work programme for this year is specifically focusing on Covid 19 and the implications of this for relevant services.

---

**Type of item:** The report author should tick the appropriate box

Reviewing of existing policy	
Informing the development of new policy	
Statutory consultation	
Performance / budget monitoring report	
Cabinet request for scrutiny	
Full Council request for scrutiny	
Community Assembly request for scrutiny	
Call-in of Cabinet decision	
Briefing paper for the Scrutiny Committee	
Other	X

**The Scrutiny Committee is being asked to:**

- Consider and comment on the committee's draft work programme
- Identify, prioritise and agree topics for inclusion in the work programme

**Background Papers:** [Sheffield Council Constitution](#)

**Category of Report:** OPEN



## Appendix 1:

<b>Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee</b>			
<b>WORK PROGRAMME 2020/21</b>			

**Last updated:** 11/01/21

**Please note:** the work programme is a live document and so is subject to change.

<b>Economic and Environmental Wellbeing</b>		<b>Tuesday 4.30 – 6.30 pm</b>	
<b>Topic</b>	<b>Reasons for selecting topic</b>	<b>Lead Officer/s</b>	<b>Style of scrutiny</b>
<b>Tuesday 8<sup>th</sup> September</b>			
Sheffield City Trust – Leisure facilities during lock down and since	Issue carried forward from last year, Committee requested further information on Sheffield City Trust following the call in from last year. They also requested the report in response to community and residential concerns about the re-opening of facilities following lock down, particularly Ponds Forge.	Eugene Walker, Executive Director Resources  Lisa Firth, Director of Culture, Parks and Leisure	Agenda Item

<b>Tuesday 24<sup>th</sup> November 20</b>			
Sheffield Covid Business Recovery Plan	Brought to the Committee as a call in	Edward Highfield, Director  Alexis Krachai Interim Executive Director, SCCI	Call in
Work Programme 2020/21		Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer	Standing Item
<b>Tuesday 15<sup>th</sup> December 20</b>			
Update on bus services in light of Covid 19	Verbal item to include SYPTE, Sheffield City Region, First Bus and Stagecoach		Agenda Item
Work programme 2020/21		Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer	Standing Item
<b>Tuesday 19<sup>th</sup> January 21</b>			
Sheffield Local Plan	An ongoing issue of interest for the committee. To be confirmed		Agenda Item
Work programme 2020/21		Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer	Standing Item



<b>Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> February 21</b>			
Waste, fly tipping and littering	An item of ongoing interest to the Committee. To be confirmed		Agenda Item
Work programme 2020/21		Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer	Standing Item
<b>Tuesday 23<sup>rd</sup> March 21</b>			
Update on Business Recovery	Recommended as a result of Call in November 2020.		Agenda Item
Update on City Centre Development	Prioritised at the Committee on 15/12/20		
Work Programme		Deborah Glen, Policy and Improvement Officer	Agenda Item
<b>Potential Items:</b>			
Transport Strategy – Role of cycling	Progress report requested by Committee in 2018/19		
Climate Change			

Employability/Inclusive and Sustainable Economy			
<b>Scrutiny Review Group:</b>			
Leisure Services – Active Sheffield	A review of the new Leisure Strategy at drafting stages and the potential impact on City Council services. Requested at the meeting held on the 8/9/20.		Task and Finish Group