

# South Local Area Committee

---

Thursday 12 January 2023 at 6.00 pm

Terry Wright Community Hall,  
Newfield Green shops, Gleadless  
Valley

The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend

A circular logo composed of several overlapping, semi-transparent shapes in various colors (yellow, green, blue, purple, pink) arranged in a ring.

Local Area  
Committees

**Membership** Engage · Empower · Enable

---

Councillor Simon Clement-  
Jones  
Councillor Richard Shaw  
Councillor Ian Auckland  
Councillor Sue Auckland  
Councillor Steve Ayris  
Councillor Nighat Basharat  
Councillor Alexi Dimond  
Councillor Marieanne Elliot  
Councillor Peter Garbutt  
Councillor Maroof Raouf  
Councillor Sophie Thornton  
Councillor Paul Turpin

---

## PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING

---

Local Area Committees engage, enable, and empower communities across the city with increasing control over decision making, marking a major shift in power to communities. The Committees provide a geographical framework that, over time, will be used to prioritise and direct the local delivery of an increasing number of Council services and oversee the production of a co-produced annual Area Committee Plan which will reflect resident priorities.

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 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 Area Committee meetings and recording is allowed under the direction of the Chair.

Please see the [website](#) or contact Democratic Services [committee@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:committee@sheffield.gov.uk) for further information regarding public questions and petitions and details of the Council's [protocol on audio/visual recording and photography](#) at council meetings.

Local Area 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.

Local Area Committee executive decisions are effective six working days after the meeting has taken place, unless called-in for scrutiny by the relevant Scrutiny Committee or referred to the City Council meeting, in which case the matter is normally resolved within the monthly cycle of meetings.

In order for us to be able to effectively facilitate attendance at the meeting, we would encourage all attendees to notify us of your attendance in advance by registering [here](#) or emailing [committee@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:committee@sheffield.gov.uk)

If you require any further information please contact Jennie Skiba email [jennie.skiba@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:jennie.skiba@sheffield.gov.uk).

---

**SOUTH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE AGENDA  
12 JANUARY 2023**

**Order of Business**

---

- 1. Welcome and Housekeeping Arrangements**
- 2. Apologies for Absence**
- 3. Exclusion of the Press and Public**  
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 Meeting** (Pages 9 - 20)  
To approve the minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 11<sup>th</sup> October, 2022.
- 6. Public Questions and Petitions**
  - (a) To receive any questions or petitions from members of the public.
  - (b) To note the attached document setting out the responses to questions raised at the last meeting, which were not provided at the meeting.
- 7. South Local Area Committee: Community Plan**  
Diane Owens, South Local Area Manager, to give an update on the Community Plan.
- 8. South Local Area Community Plan** (Pages 21 - 28)  
Report of Diane Owens, South Local Area Manager.

**NOTE: The next meeting of South Local Area Committee will be held on Tuesday 28 February 2023 at 6.00 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 Policy Committees, 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 Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from David Hollis, Interim Director of Legal and Governance by emailing [david.hollis@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:david.hollis@sheffield.gov.uk).

This page is intentionally left blank



## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

### South Local Area Committee

#### Meeting held 11 October 2022

**PRESENT:** Councillors Simon Clement-Jones (Chair), Richard Shaw (Deputy Chair), Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Nighat Basharat, Alexi Dimond, Marieanne Elliot, Maroof Raouf, Sophie Thornton and Paul Turpin

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

1.1 No apologies for absence were received.

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

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. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING**

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 6<sup>th</sup> July, 2022, were approved as a correct record.

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

5.1 **Question 1. from Hazel Daniels to Councillors Paul Turpin and Marieanne Elliot (as Green Councillors on the Committee)**

With regard to the green space in the area, to what extent does it drive your actions as local councillors?

In response, Councillor Paul Turpin thanked Hazel for her question and said that as Green Councillors, they are environmentalists and support the environment and green spaces but realise that they cannot prevent the extinction of the planet. What he would really like would be to have a safe, good world for people to thrive and live happy fulfilling lives, through the enjoyment of environmental green spaces, to keep air clean and maintain balance and support life including the biodiversity of animals and plants.

**5.2 Question 2 from Hazel Daniels**

She said the reason she asked the first question was due to the fact that she lives in Meersbrook and referred to a recent planning application to the local authority, where approval had been given for the housing development at the top of Meersbrook Avenue which totally strips the biodiversity of the area. How can you rationalise this decision?

In response, Councillor Paul Turpin stated that he was not and never had been a member of the Planning Committee, so he could neither support nor object to the development, but he did support local residents and would put forward local proposals and suggestions on behalf of residents. Councillor Turpin said the development was for planned zero carbon housing on a former brownfield site that had not been used for a number of years. He said that as far as he was aware, there were planned green spaces amongst the houses and plans to retain public green space and he was happy to mediate between residents and the Council on any matters raised.

Councillor Marieanne Elliot said that she too had never been a member of the Planning Committee, but likewise she would be happy to pass on any feedback received from residents to the developer of the site. She said she was aware of issues raised by residents and would continue to mediate between them and the developer.

Councillor Alexi Dimond said that there were issues in the planning application, such as tree retention orders, access onto Derbyshire Lane etc.. These were issues which he had raised with the Planning Officers and to which so far, he had not received a satisfactory response.

**5.3 Question from Ernest Brewin**

Mr Brewin asked whether the Council, when considering the proposed 20mph scheme for Derbyshire Lane, had included Harvey Clough Road and Mount View Road within the scheme? He said the speed that some travel along those roads make it exceedingly difficult to cross and unsafe for children to use.

In response, Councillor Ian Auckland said that the proposals for the scheme were to include most residential roads in the area, but the 20 mph were not engineered speed limits with lumps and bumps in the road, but through lines and signs to reduce speed overall. He hoped the police could enforce these restrictions.

Councillor Auckland advised that the consultation for the 20mph zones in Norton Lees was still live and he encouraged Mr. Brewin to respond to that to feed in his concerns.

**5.4 Question from Martin Lawton**

Martin Lawton asked what the Council's proposals were with regard to installing recharging points outside Council flats and maisonettes within South LAC the area?

In response, the Chair, Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said that he would ask the question of the relevant Council departments and provide Mr. Lawton with a written response.

**5.5 Question from Mrs. Jacklin**

Mrs. Jacklin asked whether there were plans for parts of Derbyshire Lane that could have speed restrictions on them, in particular the blind spot near the Prince of Wales public house and the cemetery? She said since traffic calming works had been carried out along Woodseats, traffic had become a problem, with more cars being driven at speed up Scarsdale Road. She said the new housing area would create much more traffic up and down Derbyshire Lane.

Councillor Ian Auckland responded by stating that the Derbyshire Lane 20mph scheme does not include that part of Derbyshire Lane and Warminster Road. Cllr Auckland felt this was in part, due to a Council policy determined in 2010/11 which set out various hierarchies of speed, the research advised that the speeds on those roads would not be reduced. Councillor Auckland advised that as a local resident, Mrs Jacklin should have received a letter regarding the consultation on this scheme, inviting a response. He felt that there should be police enforcement of 30mph on some roads and that the police had carried out some enforcement work, i.e. speed watch, on Derbyshire Lane. Through these speed watch exercises anyone caught speeding would be written to, but not necessarily prosecuted. He said there were humps and bumps by the school to slow traffic. Councillor Auckland also advised that each ward has been allocated a Speed Indication Device which would be moved to different priority areas during the year.

A local resident responded saying that she did not think that flashing signs would be enough to slow traffic down, she had been a pedestrian physically shaken by the speed of passing traffic.

Councillor Paul Turpin said that three years ago, 20mph zones had been introduced to some parts of Heeley, but it had not been possible to fully roll out the scheme, due to data being received, showing that the average speed along some roads, in particular Heeley Bank Road, was 27mph, under the normal speed limit of 30mph.

**5.6 Question from Mr. Charlie Khan re Pavement Parking**

My question is regarding pavement parking. Mr Khan said that

despite repeated requests, no-one had visited his area to see the worsening effects of pavement parking around Belper Road. Mr Khan said that he was disabled and therefore unable to get out of his home and that the parking problem in the Sharrow/Nether Edge area was getting worse by the day. He said that children can't play, he cannot get of his own home unless he goes and asks someone to move. He said that when he had rung the Council about the matter, his call went to the answering service, asking him to leave a message and someone would get back to him, but no one ever has.

In response, Councillor Clement-Jones said that he would be more than happy to visit the area and discuss the problem with Mr Khan.

Councillor Nighat Basharat said that she shared his concerns and hoped to provide residents with the opportunity to talk to local Councillors at local surgeries. She said she lived in the Nether Edge/Sharrow area and shared the concerns of residents in those areas. She said that she would arrange a visit to the area shortly.

Councillor Maroof Raouf said he has already contacted the Head of Parking Services with regard to better enforcement against illegal pavement parking in the area. He said more enforcement was needed and better education on the effects of illegal parking, including the use of social media.

Councillor Richard Shaw said that pavement parking was an endemic problem throughout the city and that there was a commitment tackle the problem to keep pavements clear and swept and that the issue was included within the Community Plan.

Councillor Alexi Dimond said that there was a pavement parking ban in the city centre, but not yet rolled out across the city. He encouraged residents to report pavement parking to Councillors and the police. He said that in the northwest of the city, there was a police enforcement scheme in place whereby should someone have to step into the road due to the pavement being blocked, the police had the power to act. However, illegal pavement parking had not been identified as a priority for the South West Police area. He said consultation was also being carried out to ban grass verge parking, as this too blocked people being able to go out walking and it churned up the grass and had a negative impact on biodiversity. Cllr Dimond encouraged people to respond to the consultation.

#### **5.7 Question from Joy Arnott, on behalf of the Terminus Project**

Does the LAC have any flexibility within the Community Plan and budget, to put in place some support to address the cost-of-living crisis?

In response, Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said that the Council

was looking into this matter and the role of the LACs, specifically in terms of whether grants can be given and also ward pots. He would look to see what else could be done through the LACS. He said following the pandemic, a structure had been put in place to assist those in need and it was hoped that the structure could be brought to the fore again.

**5.8 Question from Dave Dolan**

Dave Dolan asked whether there was anything that could be done to stop people parking outside the Mount Pleasant public house on Wednesday evenings? He said it was impossible to get out of Mount View Road.

Councillor Sue Auckland said that she was not aware of the problem, but if Mr. Dolan left his details, she would visit the area on a Wednesday to see the problem for herself and see if there was anything that could be done.

**5.9 Question/Comment from Nicki Rivers**

Ms. Rivers said she was a local resident who worked for Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust. With regard to the council's current consultation about parking on grass verges, she was disappointed in the consultation as she felt the questions were very narrow and that there wasn't any free space / free text questions so people can provide more information. She said she was more than happy to give people the necessary information / contact details at the end of meeting.

The South LAC Team will also share this feedback with the team leading on the consultation.

**5.10 Question from Brian Hurst**

Brian Hurst said that since the closure of Hackthorn Road, the traffic, particularly at weekends, had been absolute chaos. He said the "Queues Likely" signs had done nothing to alleviate the problem. He said that the traffic lights were abysmal in terms of timing, and he asked if anyone would be willing to visit the area to witness what the effect had caused.

In response, Councillor Ian Auckland stated that the scheme was still under consultation which did not close until the 15<sup>th</sup> November through the "Connecting Sheffield" website should Mr Hurst which to send in this feedback, he said that he would also feedback the comments that had been made. He said that the Lead Officer acting on this, was checking the timings of the traffic lights on Scarsdale Road, to improve the flow of traffic along the A61 and any changes to the Woodseats Road/Scarsdale Road traffic lights could significantly affect the traffic flow along Woodseats, so opinions on the matter

were mixed, some residents thought that the traffic flow worked reasonably well, others not so well. Unfortunately, it was an age-old problem that goes back many years, regarding traffic cutting through Hackthorn Road and other roads in the area.

5.11 The following questions / comments all related to the closure of Rose Café in Graves Park. In attendance were Ruth Bell, Head of Parks and Countryside, Nathan Rodgers, Head of Facilities Management and Catherine McDougall, Graves Park Manager.

5.11.1 **Andy Kershaw** said that it had been 76 days since the Council closed the Rose Garden Café with 15 minutes notice. During that time, there had been anger, frustration and upset amongst the local community and many users of Graves Park. He said Graves Park was the largest park in the city and was rated number 10 throughout the United Kingdom as a visitor attraction on TripAdvisor; and that the café had brought a great deal of pleasure, joy and a meeting place to families, residents, walkers, dog walkers etc. over many years. Andy Kershaw said that Graves Park was run as a Charitable Trust by the Council and asked how the Council fulfilled these duties if it did not meet on a regular basis. He said many people were now demanding that a new survey of the building be carried out to assess the roof. He said that not one single engineer had been to the café and inspected the roof space and he asked the Council to carry out a new survey, outline what the issues were in order to repair the roof and reinstate the 12 members of staff that were affected by the closure.

Andy Kershaw said that if the Council were able to place container units in Fargate, why could it not put temporary measures in place to re-open the café. He said there had been offers to raise funds to get the café reopened. The café was not only a place to buy warm food, but it served as a social meeting place for many. He asked for a donation of £10,000 from the South LAC budget to kickstart the refurbishment of the building and asked if residents could be included within the Charitable Trust, so that they could have a say on how the park was run. Finally, Andy Kershaw paid tribute to the officers involved saying that they had apologised for how the closure had been handled and he was looking forward to meeting with them again tomorrow to find a way forward and ensure demolition of the café was off the table.

5.11.2 Ruth Bell said she and her team were now working closely with the community; and advised that any donations towards the campaign would be greatly received. She said she was committed to supporting the reopening of the café in whatever form and was working with the “Friends of Graves Park” and “Save the Rose Garden” Groups and would be meeting with them the following day to go through some of the detail.

5.11.3 Nathan Rodgers said that he would share the programme of surveys

and the propping works with the LAC Committee, he said the propping works would commence on 24<sup>th</sup> October and he would continue to work with the commercial operator of the café to see what, if anything, was possible over the period of time with the propping works in place.

- 5.11.4 The following were comments made from those in support of the campaign to save the café and responses thereto.
- 5.11.5 **Sue Lee** stated that she was the co-ordinator of the Wellbeing Walks in Sheffield which regularly held health walks through Graves Park every Monday morning. She said she had sent a formal complaint to the Council about the way the staff had been treated and stated the café was a much-needed facility for the health walkers. She said it was not just about walking around the park, but it was very much about socialising and connecting and reducing social isolation. She said she had asked whether a temporary facility could have been put in place and had received a response from the Council stating that they were waiting for a cart to be placed on site and for someone to run it, but this would not be possible until after the half term break. Ms. Lee said she was fearful of what might happen in the near future, if people were not able to socialise in a warm space after walking through the park, as she felt it would take quite some time for the consultation process to be completed.
- 5.11.6 **Nathan Rodgers** said it was difficult to understand if the café could operate with the propping installed due to the amount of scaffolding required. A design of the propping had been received today , he said he had left a message to meet a representative of brewkitchen's to review the designs to see what was possible . He said there was no "propping" of the roof in the food preparation area but there was significant propping in the seating area of the café and also propping and scaffolding to the external area of the premises. Nathan Rodgers said there needed to be a number of surveys carried out to fully understand the situation and available options.
- 5.11.7 **Julie Collins** introduced herself as the Café Manager, she thanked everyone for their support. She said that in August she received a phone call, giving 15 minutes for herself and her staff to vacate the premises. Since that time, nothing further had transpired. The community was totally behind the campaign and now the petition had over 10,500 signatures. These had been very easy to gather, with people approaching her and her staff to sign their name and offer their support. She said managing the café was more than a job to her, it had a social connection, was a great space for communities to meet, it had disabled accessibility and wide access for people with prams. However, something needed to happen quickly as the weather was changing and people need an inside area within the park.
- 5.11.7 **Nick Williams** said he had looked through the accounts of the park

and that the major income streams to the Council was rent from the café and car parking fees. He said that many people used the car park just so that they could use the café and also a share of the profits from the café were also paid to the Council. He asked why the Council had not used some of that revenue from the cafe to maintain the building.

Councillor Simon Clement-Jones said there had been a trend for the Council not to maintain its buildings over the years and it was time to buck that trend, as something like this was an alarm call not to get into situations similar to this.

- 5.11.9 **Ruth Goddard** said that not only was revenue received by the Council from the café and parking, but also from the fairs and events that were held within the park. She asked whether it would be possible for some of the equipment used for such events, to be used as temporary accommodation for a café of some sort, so that it could be reopened. She said that over the years, she had raised money for local schools and nurseries only for the Council to go their own way, knock things down, and disregard the views of local people. .
- 5.11.10 **Councillor Simon Clement-Jones** raised his concerns about where revenue from the café had been spent and agreed there was a need to find out why it had not been used to maintain the building.
- 5.11.11 **Caroline Drewer** Chair of the Friends of Graves Park said she had been on the Friends Group for the past 22 years and for 22 years had raised concerns about where revenue from the park had been spent. She said there had been campaigns to stop the Council selling off parts of the park over the years. She said the café was closed during the first week of the school holidays and she felt that the Council had a duty to maintain the park as it does for its other parks. Also, she asked why the Council had given green flag status to 16 parks and open spaces around the city and had put money into them, but Graves Park had not been given such status and revenue. Ms. Drewer said that Graves Park was becoming run down, the gates not repaired when needed, the walls at the pond were crumbling into the water, the waterfall no longer worked etc., and the closure of the café was the last straw. She said there was a constant battle to keep the park as parkland. She said the Friends Group had managed to keep hold of two areas of the park that were to be redesignated for housing development, but there was a third area that was to be used as depot land. Why wont the Council restore the land to parkland? She said she spends her free time trying to protect Graves Park, which was her choice as long as the park was protected and she asked the Council to spend some money on Graves Park.
- 5.11.12 **Councillor Simon Clement-Jones** said that he had been involved with the park over a number of years and wanted to see the best of it. He said he would be happy to be more involved in how the park was run and felt that the Trustees should be more involved than they were



at present. He said he was grateful to everyone coming to the meeting and making their point.

5.11.13 **Marian Parkinson** said that the Council had a duty of care. She said that although the Council says it has no money, the staff should be compensated for unfair dismissal.

5.11.14 **Councillor Ian Auckland** said he had been a Councillor for the Graves Park Ward for many years, the “Hands Off Campaign” was probably the campaign which got him elected to the Council and that he was sorry to say that some of the decisions taken by the Trustees he had totally opposed. Councillor Auckland said that the café was the beating heart of the park and he hoped to protect the parks’ legacy left by the benefactor, J. G. Graves in the 1920s. He said that he wanted to protect it, renew it and make it one of the best park cafes in the country.

He was heartened by the comments of the chief officer to get the café reopened. Councillor Auckland said that money was available in the Community Infrastructure Levy known as CIL, which was a planning charge to developers and could be used to support development in an area by funding the provision, improvement, replacement, operation or maintenance of infrastructure and so he felt that this could be used to support the restoration and improvement of Rose Café. Councillor Auckland advised that Graves Park Ward members would be looking to allocate £10,000 from the Graves Park CIL Pot and suggested that other Wards in the area might wish to do the same as a matter of solidarity, but this was something that might need to be discussed at Members’ briefing sessions. Councillor Auckland said that it was going to take a big effort to get the ball rolling to make the building good for the future and was hopeful for partnership working between officers and the Friends Groups. Since the matter of trusteeship had been raised, he was totally in favour of local Councillors, especially LAC Councillors being involved in the management of the park and being appointed Trustees of the park, alongside community involvement.

Councillor Auckland referred to the Council’s Constitution under Part 4G of the Area Committee procedure rules which states that “it is possible for a local area committee to refer to a Committee of the Council any item of business that is discussed at a meeting and suggested that this be referred to the appropriate Committee, either the Governance Committee or Strategy and Resources Committee, or both. He said that there was to be a Charities Sub-Committee meeting due to be held sometime during October so that may also be the appropriate route.

This was put to South LAC Committee, who agreed that this suggestion should be referred to the appropriate Committee.

- 5.11.15 **Councillor Marieanne Elliot** stated that the café was very well used by many people around the city as well as locally, and she would fully support the campaign. She said that she would like to better understand how people feel the Charitable Trust had mismanaged their duty.
- 5.11.16 **Councillor Richard Shaw** said that it was noticeably clear that the park meant a great deal to many people and he would be happy to support the proposals set out by Councillor Auckland. Councillor Shaw said that Graves Park was gifted land and as such, should not be sold off or developed on. He felt that Councillors and residents should be part of the Charity Trust. He said that he would support the principle of a £10,000 contribution from the Beauchief and Greenhill CIL pot and also felt that the Council should be asked to allocate some of the city-wide CIL fund to this very worthy cause.
- 5.11.17 **Councillor Steve Ayris** felt that the South LAC as a whole could contribute towards the renovation of the café and supported the principle of devolving the powers of the Graves Park Trust, which in recent years had been served by 10 members of the Council, none of whom were Graves Park Ward Councillors. He said the structural disrepair of buildings like the café was endemic throughout the city and the real solution was to ensure that the Council had a duty of care to its buildings. He said the park was in the top ten of the most used parks in the city. Councillor Ayris suggested that CIL funding could be allocated from across the four Wards in the South LAC area.
- 5.11.18 **Councillor Nighat Basharat** said that she had visited and enjoyed the park on many occasions and was familiar with the impact the closure of the cafe had had on the local community. She said that it was sad that this had happened, and it was important that any community space be maintained, whilst realising that money was a big issue everywhere and discussions should be held city-wide to support the park.
- 5.11.19 **Councillor Sue Auckland** said that she lived local to the park and walked through it almost every day and had held conversations with many people and listened to their concerns about the way the staff were treated. She said that it was an awful situation to lose their jobs in such a way, many of the staff worked part-time which fitted in with their home lives and other responsibilities. She believed that negotiations with the developer were ongoing and asked that those negotiations and the outcome be communicated to the public so that they were kept fully informed of the latest position.
- 5.11.20 **Councillor Maroof Raouf** said that he was sad to see the closure of the café, but he held some concerns about allocating CIL funding from his Ward to the Graves Park Ward and so further discussions should be held between members.

- 5.11.21 **Councillor Simon Clement-Jones** said that in principle he also agreed that £10,000 could be ring fenced from the Beauchief and Greenhill CIL allocation towards the restoration and improvement of Rose Cafe. He advised that this would be subject to CIL funding going through the proper approval channels.

Councillor Clement-Jones said there would be plenty of opportunities to raise further questions/discussion points when the item was brought to Full Council on 2<sup>nd</sup> November.

He thanked everyone for their attendance for this item.

## **6. SHEFFIELD TRADING STANDARDS - NOT BORN YESTERDAY CAMPAIGN**

- 6.1 Tina Weston, Trading Standards Enforcement Officer gave background information in the “Not Born Yesterday” campaign, which was run by Sheffield Trading Standards, who were a small team that investigate incidents of financial abuse, primarily through incidents of doorstep crime, rogue trading and scams. The Not Born Yesterday brand, was launched in 2018 to raise awareness and tackle the problems faced by the residents of Sheffield. She said the aim was to keep people in the city safe and improve their health and quality of life and ensure a fair-trading environment for consumers and businesses. She said Local Authorities have a duty to identify, report, investigate and safeguard victims who had been or are at risk of being a victim of financial abuse. Tina Weston said the pandemic, which obviously saw already lonely people become even more isolated from their family, friends and community, gave rise to an increase in scams.

Nuisance calls increased from 21% to 40% in the last two years and fraud was the most commonly experienced crime, accounting for approximately 42% of crime against individuals. She said that statistics showed someone was three times more likely to be a victim of a scam than be burgled, 19 times more likely to be a victim of a scam than be mugged and a third of scam victims fell for a second scam within 12 months. She stated that the impact of falling for a scam could see a decline in mental health, cause social isolation, loss of confidence to live independently and a deterioration in physical health. She said half of scams start with a phone call and Trading Standards have 13 call blockers which can easily be installed and loaned for three months.

- 6.2 Tina Weston responded to a question stating that should anyone fall foul of a bank card scam, the person should contact the bank immediately who had the power to block cards straight away to prevent them being abused. She said that use of the mobile bank app was absolutely safe and secure, adding that the encryption used by banks was very secure and advised that people should either go into their bank regularly or check their accounts online.

6.3 Councillor Simon Clement-Jones thanked Tina Weston for attending the meeting.

**7. SOUTH LOCAL AREA COMMITTEE: COMMUNITY PLAN - UPDATE**

7.1 It was agreed that an update on the Community Plan would be brought to the next meeting of the Committee to be held in January.



**Author/Lead Officer of Report:** Diane Owens,  
South LAC Community Services Manager  
**Tel:** 0114 474 3635

**Report of:** Community Services Manager  
**Report to:** South Local Area Committee  
**Date of Decision:** 12<sup>th</sup> January 2022  
**Subject:** South LAC Community Plan Report

Has appropriate consultation been undertaken? Yes  No

Has an Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) been undertaken? Yes  No

If YES, what EIA reference number has it been given? *(Insert reference number)*

Does the report contain confidential or exempt information? Yes  No

If YES, give details as to whether the exemption applies to the full report / part of the report and/or appendices and complete below:-

*"The (report/appendix) is not for publication because it contains exempt information under Paragraph (insert relevant paragraph number) of Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 (as amended)."*

### Purpose of Report:

Each Local Area Committee has a £100,000 budget to address local priorities, identified within their respective Community Plans. To date the South LAC has allocated £70,000 of this budget. This report sets out details of spend to date and proposed spending regarding the remaining balance of £30,000, during the 2022/23 financial year.

This report gives an overview of remaining priorities for proposed expenditure and seeks authorisation from the South Local Area Committee to permit the South LAC Community Services Manager, in consultation with the LAC Chair, to spend monies to address identified priorities within the Community Plan.

### Recommendations:

That the South Local Area Committee:

(i) Notes the proposed allocations of £30,000 from the £100,000 budget to address local priorities in the South LAC Community Plan in 2022/23, as detailed in the report, and in particular

- Approves a budget of £11,000 to purchase 2 portable CCTV cameras
- Approves a budget of £3,000 for community capacity building
- Approves a budget of up to £16,000 for street art projects

(ii) To the extent that it is not covered by existing authority, authorises the Community Services Manager to make decisions on expenditure relating to the priorities set out in the report provided that:

- The decision is taken in consultation with the Local Area Committee Chair
- The decision may not approve expenditure in excess of the allocated budget for each priority set out in the report, and
- A report detailing the delegated spending decisions taken by the Community Services Manager is presented to the next Local Area Committee meeting.

(iii) Notes the expenditure to date of £70,000 as agreed by the South LAC Committee (and as outlined in section 1.2)

**Background Papers:**

The South Community Plan is published at:

[South Local Area Committee Community Plan \(sheffield.gov.uk\)](https://www.sheffield.gov.uk/council-and-politics/local-area-committees/south-local-area-committee-community-plan)

Lead Officer to complete:-		
1	I have consulted the relevant departments in respect of any relevant implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist, and comments have been incorporated / additional forms completed / EIA completed, where required.	Finance: Ann Hardy
		Legal: Andrea Simpson
		Equalities: Adele Robinson
<i>Legal, financial/commercial and equalities implications must be included within the report and the name of the officer consulted must be included above.</i>		
2	<b>Head of Service who approved submission:</b>	Carl Mullooly
3	<b>LAC Chair consulted:</b>	Cllr Simon Clement-Jones
4	I confirm that all necessary approval has been obtained in respect of the implications indicated on the Statutory and Council Policy Checklist and that the report has been approved for submission to the Decision Maker by the Head of Service indicated at 2. In addition, any additional forms have been completed and signed off as required at 1.	
	<b>Lead Officer Name:</b> Diane Owens	<b>Job Title:</b> South LAC Community Services Manager
	<b>Date:</b> 20/12/22	

**1. PROPOSAL**

1.1 Local Area Committees (LACs) were established by Full Council in May 2021. Their Terms of Reference are set out in Part 3 of the Council's Constitution and include:

- To agree a Community Plan setting priorities for the area of the committee, monitor delivery of that plan and keep it under review; and
- To make decisions relating to funding as delegated from time to time by the Council to fit with the priorities set out in the Community Plan and following engagement with the community.

Each LAC was allocated an initial budget of £100,000 under an executive decision by the Leader of the Council on 17th August 2021. This money is to be spent in line with the Community Plan. As the Community Plan was not finalised until late in the 2021/22 financial year very little of this budget has been spent across the LACs and it has been carried forward to the current financial year.

To enable decisions to be taken quickly and to respond to emerging issues between Committee meetings, in September 2021 the LAC authorised the Community Services Manager to make decisions on expenditure provided that:

- The decision is taken in consultation with the Local Area Committee Chair;
- Spending is in line with any specific purposes of the allocated budget;
- The decision may not approve expenditure of more than £5,000, and
- A report detailing the delegated spending decisions taken by the Community Services Manager is presented to the next Local Area Committee meeting.

1.2 The South Local Area Committee (LAC) developed a Community Plan through consultation with residents, community groups and other stakeholders in South Sheffield.

These conversations have helped identify key priorities within the South area, which will inform actions to address issues that matter most to local people.

The key priorities highlighted in the Plan are:

- environment and green spaces
- transport and highways
- community safety and crime
- communities
- employment and skills
- children, young people and families

At a meeting of the South LAC held on 16 March 2022, the LAC approved the Community Plan.

At a meeting in of the South LAC held on 6<sup>th</sup> July 2022 the South LAC approved the following expenditure against priorities in the Community Plan.

£20,000 – youth activities

£40,000 – community capacity building  
£10,000 – to clean up “The Lumb” area in Gleadless Valley

The £20,000 for youth activities and the £40,000 for capacity building have now been allocated and activities are being delivered. The capacity building funding has also been used to support groups to respond to the cost-of-living crisis.

The Lumb project is underway, and the clear up work is expected to be complete by January 2023. The focus will then be on the public realm element of the project.

A detailed update on these priorities will be presented at the South LAC meeting on 12<sup>th</sup> January 2023 by the South LAC Manager.

To enable the South LAC to continue to address key issues identified in the Community Plan, this report presents an overview of spend in relation to the remaining budget of £30,000 during 2022/23.

### **Priority 1: Environment & Green Spaces**

**Action:** Street Art Project

**Issue:** Graffiti

**Overview:** We will develop a street art project to target a number of key graffiti hot spot sites in the South LAC area. We will look to engage local young people in the project, including working with youth services and VCFS (voluntary, community and faith sector) youth providers.

#### **Outcome / impact**

- Reduced levels of graffiti in key targeted areas
- Cleaner / more attractive environment
- Potential reduction in ASB (anti-social behaviour)
- Improved feelings of community safety

**Budget allocation:** up to £16,000

Funding will cover the costs of hiring skilled street artists, engaging and supporting the involvement of young people (e.g. youth worker time); and also paint and other materials.

### **Priority 3: Crime & Community Safety**

**Action:** Purchase 2 Portable CCTV cameras

**Issue:** Crime and ASB (anti-social behaviour)

**Overview:** This priority focuses on working together with the Police and other partner agencies to respond to issues of crime and ASB in local communities. The 2 portable CCTV cameras will offer wireless remote coverage in selected locations. The cameras can help to reduce incidences of crime and ASB and provide reassurance to local communities. The location of the cameras will be informed by the South LAC and also the 3 established NAG's (Neighbourhood Action Groups) in the South LAC area. The funding will also provide up to 4 initial location moves for the cameras.



**Outcome / impact**

- Reduced levels of crime / ASB
- Increased feelings of safety

**Budget allocation:** £11,000

The budget will cover the purchase of 2 Portable CCTV cameras (£4500 each, £9,000 in total) and a number of location moves for the cameras (£250 per installation, up to a total of £2,000).

**Priority 4: Communities**

**Action:** To deliver a range of capacity building sessions for the VCFS (voluntary, community and faith sector) in the South LAC

**Issue:** Sustainability of VCFS organisations

**Overview**

This priority focuses on building community capacity and infrastructure within the South LAC. The capacity building sessions offered will be based on the needs of the area (gathered from our recent survey and some further engagement with groups) likely topics include, strategic planning, developing a funding strategy, investing in community leaders and volunteers, developing community assets, and improving community engagement, including using online platforms and social media.

**Outcome / impact**

- Increase in community engagement and capacity
- Increase in community events and activities
- Increase in community assets

**Budget allocation:** £3,000

The funding will be used to bring in experts from the field to run training and development sessions for local VCFS organisations. Sessions will be open to all groups in the South LAC area.

This gives a total allocation of £30,000 which is the South LAC's remaining budget for the 2022-23 financial year.

- 1.3 Some of the proposed expenditure may fall within the Community Service Manager's current authorised spending limit. There will however be occasions when expenditure will exceed £5,000 and so would require a decision by the LAC to proceed, but to wait until the next meeting of the LAC would cause undue delay to the project.

To enable decisions to be taken quickly and to deliver priority actions to address specific issues identified in the Plan, it is therefore proposed that, to the extent that it is not already covered by existing authority, the Community Services Manager is authorised to make decisions on expenditure relating to the priorities set out in paragraph 1.2 above provided that a decision may not approve expenditure in excess of the allocated budget for each priority set out in the section above.

This authorisation would be subject to the conditions on consultation with the LAC Chair and expenditure being reported to the next meeting of the LAC set out in paragraph 1.1 above.

Reports detailing the activities funded and the exact amounts of expenditure under each priority heading will be brought to each Local Area Committee meeting during 2022/23, as spending is incurred.

## **2. HOW DOES THIS DECISION CONTRIBUTE?**

- 2.1 Local Area Committees directly support the Communities and Neighbourhoods and Our Council commitments in the 'Our Sheffield: One Year Plan' but to be effective they need to have the capability to respond quickly to emerging local issues.

## **3. HAS THERE BEEN ANY CONSULTATION?**

- 3.1 The Community Plan has been developed through community consultation that has comprised of an online survey through the Council's Citizenspace platform; a paper-based survey for those less digitally enabled; engagement activity with partner organisations including the voluntary, community and faith sector and in-person meetings.

Partner organisations and Council departments that have been identified as offering potential solutions to some of the issues identified have also been consulted, to establish whether suggestions can be realistically implemented.

## **4. RISK ANALYSIS AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE DECISION**

### **4.1 Equality of Opportunity Implications**

- 4.1.1 Decisions need to consider the requirements of the Public Sector Equality Duty contained in Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010.

This is the duty to have due regard to the need to:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation and any other conduct that is prohibited by or under the Act;
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it;
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it.

The Equality Act 2010 identifies the following groups as a protected characteristic: age; disability; gender reassignment; marriage and civil partnership; pregnancy and maternity; race; religion or belief; sex and sexual orientation.

The overall impact of this decision is likely to be positive and not disproportionate from an equality, diversity and inclusion perspective. In developing a Community Plan, local communities have been given the

opportunity for a greater say in local decision making for services which impact their daily lives.

The devolution of responsibilities will improve inclusion for local people and the work of the Sheffield Equality Partnership will support and enhance the approach from a citywide and underserved communities' perspective.

However, in order to ensure this approach takes into account people who share protected characteristics under the Public Sector Duties the Local Area Committee Community Plan will be supported by appropriate equality monitoring of budget.

An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA 916) was previously carried out in respect of the establishment of Local Area Committees.

## 4.2 Financial and Commercial Implications

- 4.2.1 This report concerns expenditure from the LAC's approved budget of £100,000. This budget must not be exceeded.

The priorities outlined in this report equate to a budget allocation of £30,000 which is the South LAC's remaining budget for this financial year.

Procurement of supplies and/or services and any award of grant aid will be carried out in line with the Council's Contracts, Standing Orders and Financial Regulations.

## 4.3 Legal Implications

- 4.3.1 The LAC must operate in accordance with its Terms of Reference, approved as part of the Council's updated Constitution, reflecting the committee system of governance, by Full Council at its Annual Meeting on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2022. In accordance with the provisions of section 101 of the Local Government Act 1972 the Constitution provides that a Committee may delegate to a Council Officer.

## 5. **ALTERNATIVE OPTIONS CONSIDERED**

- 5.1 Decisions on any expenditure above the existing authority to the Community Services Manager could be reserved to the LAC but this would delay delivery of priority actions to address specific issues identified in the Community Plan.
- 5.2 All decisions on expenditure to support Community Plan priorities could be delegated to officers. However, this would restrict the LAC's ability to monitor its delegated budget and delivery of the Community Plan.

## 6. **REASONS FOR RECOMMENDATIONS**

- 6.1 The South LAC is asked to note the allocation of funding under the priority headings identified to assist its ability to monitor its budget, and to authorise the Community Services Manager to approve expenditure above the current delegated authority in certain circumstances so that delivery of the Community Plan is not delayed.

