

# SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

## Waste & Street Scene Policy Committee

### Meeting held 27 September 2023

**PRESENT:** Councillors Joe Otten (Chair), Mark Jones (Deputy Chair), Alexi Dimond (Group Spokesperson), Sue Alston, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Tim Huggan, Sioned-Mair Richards, Mike Chaplin (Substitute Member) and Tony Downing (Substitute Member)

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

1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Dianne Hurst and Garry Weatherall, Councillors Mike Chaplin and Tony Downing attended as substitute members.

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

2.1 It was noted that Appendix 3 to the report at item 9 on the agenda was not available to the public or press because it contained exempt information under Section 100A of the Local Government Act 1972 [as amended]. If Members wished to discuss the exempt information, the Committee would ask the members of the public and press to kindly leave for that part of the meeting and the webcast would be paused.

#### **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 21 June 2023 were approved as a correct record.

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

5.1 A petition had been received from Mohammed Faysal Ansar which had received 13 signatures:

“Amey to clean street properly or give back control to Sheffield Council

We the undersigned, petition the council to give back control with regard to the cleaning of Sheffield's streets to the City Council. Do you love going out for a walk in your local area, if the answer is yes you would expect to go out for a walk and enjoy the scenery around you? You would also expect it to be nice and clean, nice and tidy, but today around the streets of Sheffield you see streets full of litter and people going for a walk and walking in their local area which is a total mess. I could give one example of this, Page Hall. It was a nice and tidy and beautiful place to live, still is ,but what do we see instead on the streets of Page Hall and around, Sheffield residents cleaning the streets themselves because Amey, the

company that is employed to clean the streets, on behalf of Sheffield Council, take too long to respond to the mess people of Sheffield are concerned about in their local area?

Not forgetting back in 2012 Sheffield Council employed a company to refurbish Sheffield roads, the same roads that today you see full of litter, where ever you go.”

There was no speaker to this petition therefore the petition was noted and the petitioner would be provided with a written response in respect of the issue.

5.2 Andy Buck attended the meeting and asked the following questions:

“1. Will the Council:

- a) hold further discussions with Amey with a view to expediting the preparation and then implementation of plans to resurface Chippinghouse Road and neighbouring streets;
- b) guarantee that at the very latest these streets will be resurfaced by March 2025;
- c) confirm that the necessary work on each street will be undertaken in a single period, rather than split over two or more periods?

2. Will the Council guarantee that Amey will repair all the sections of Chippinghouse Road marked up for repair on 15 September 2023 before the yellow markings fade and disappear?

3. What is the Council doing to improve the handling of complaints about Streets Ahead? Will the Council ensure that my complaint of 24 March 2023 is responded to?”

The Chair responded with the following answers:

1. a) Yes, discussions are ongoing, and Amey are also committed to discussing these adjacent streets to achieve a joined-up solution to these areas that have waited a significant amount of time for resurfacing.

b) The target date is March 2025 and Amey are committed to using all reasonable efforts to undertake the work by then.

c) Amey have confirmed that they will target their programmes to maximise programme efficiency. Any mitigations related to the trees will tend to be delivered prior to resurfacing and there will be a natural short break between the differing workstreams.

2. Yes, Amey have confirmed that they will repair all sections marked up for repair.

3. Amey are preparing an action plan to deal with the long timescales associated with customer enquiries. With regard to the complaint of 24 March 2023 many of the points have been addressed in the Streets Ahead response dated 7<sup>th</sup> August. With regard to the ongoing remaining issues these will be responded to by October 2023, however the pending issue will have to be addressed as result of the delivery of the surfacing programme when implemented.

5.3 Greg Hewitt, on behalf of Sheffield Action on Plastic, attended the meeting and asked the following question:

"A Sheffield City Councillor informed me that "The Plastic Free Resolution is something that all Councils should support and I am keen to help Sheffield achieve the Plastic Free Communities status and to develop a Plastic Free Action Plan."

The Councillor promised that if elected they would commit to the following points:

1. For Sheffield City Council to lead by example and remove single use plastic items from its premises and operations.
2. To encourage plastic free initiatives, promote the Sheffield Action on Plastic campaign and support events.
3. Name a representative of the council to sit on the Core Group of Sheffield Action on Plastic.

Can the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee please add this as part of its workplan?"

The Chair responded with the following answer:

The Council does not currently have a specific policy on single use plastics, however we will be developing a new waste strategy which will set out how Sheffield's waste will be managed over the coming years. Whilst the scope and detail of this strategy will need to be agreed through the Committee system, it is expected that the new Waste Strategy will include consideration of Council waste as well as household waste, and potential measures to increase sustainability, through waste reduction and recycling.

The development of the waste strategy will begin once Government has provided its long-awaited confirmation of a number of key waste policies. This will ensure that Sheffield's future strategy meets legislative requirements.

A Climate Impact Assessment tool was introduced in 2022 to identify the potential climate impacts of Council projects, policies and programmes, and includes (among other things) consideration of resource use, use of products, and waste. The use of this tool will help to highlight opportunities to reduce or eliminate single-use plastics. Where opportunities to do this are identified, this can be carried through service delivery, or as a contract requirement in procurement.

This year, we established a working group to provide advice and support to businesses on the requirements of the Single Use Plastic ban. This new

legislation requires that from 1 October 2023 businesses must no longer supply, sell or offer certain single-use plastic items including plastic cutlery, plates and polystyrene coffee cups.

Messages to encourage the reduction and recycling of plastic items are included in our waste and recycling communications, and we would welcome a conversation with the Sheffield Action on Plastic group to explore the potential to include details of events and initiatives in future communications.

The Chair added that he would be attending a meeting of the Sheffield Action on Plastic Core Group in October.

- 5.4 Two questions had been received from David Cronshaw. David Cronshaw did not attend the meeting to ask their questions therefore a written response would be provided.
- 5.5 Geoff Cox attended the meeting to ask the following questions on behalf of Greener Greenhill:

“As a community based climate and nature group, we have experimented with collecting certain products that need specialist recycling if their materials are to be re-used. This has necessitated finding routes to return these products to appropriate re-processing facilities. Dental products (toothpaste tubes and toothbrushes) were original recycled via Terracycle but now via Boots Pharmacy, Heeley, and medicine blister packs were recycled via Superdrug (in Rotherham).

If we are to create a circular economy, and prepare our city options for a time when less waste will be incinerated, we need to pilot and test different mechanisms for collection, holding and dispatch. It was significant, for instance, that Superdrug in Rotherham needed to restrict its recycling offer to just the shop’s immediate customers when increased use from people like ourselves overwhelmed it. Capacity building, and proper resourcing, at these different stages is essential if a circular economy is to work in practice.

We recognise that city-wide solutions are needed, but feel that voluntary and community groups like ourselves have much to offer in terms of piloting approaches in different neighbourhoods and gathering close-to-the-ground feedback.

Will the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee agree to setting up a ‘Recycling and Re-use Pilots’ working group which includes councillors, officers and representatives from the business, community and voluntary sectors to identify, scope and commission such pilots? Will Sheffield Council appropriately fund these pilots? Recognising the urgency of addressing these issues will Sheffield Council agree to start a programme of such pilots within three months with an agreed and appropriate timescale to make an initial report on their findings?”

The Chair responded with the following answer:

We acknowledge and appreciate the input of community groups in providing local solutions for some recycling schemes. It is important that when providing recycling collections across the whole city we ensure that there are reliable and secure recycling outlets available for the materials we collect. Our existing services, which provide collections of paper, cardboard, glass, cans and plastic bottles have long established recycling markets, which means that the materials we collect for recycling are then sent for recycling. There are a number of other materials that could theoretically be collected through our recycling services but many have limited or unreliable outlets or have long-distance disposal options, which means we have to carefully consider the environmental, and financial viability of collecting such materials. The Chair stressed the importance of ensuring that materials that are collected are recycled, particularly where these are shipped abroad, and that residents have confidence that they are recycled.

With numerous upcoming changes expected through the Environment Act we do expect to be taking more recyclable materials in the next few years, including plastic pots, tubs and trays, and potentially cartons and soft plastics. The exact detail and timing for these new requirements has been long awaited from Government, and once confirmed this will inform the development of a new waste strategy that will set out how Sheffield will manage its waste and recycling over the coming years. Government is also expected to provide clarity on what funding will be made available to Local Authorities to help pay for these new requirements and as we continue through periods of restricted funding and pressured budgets.

The Environment Act will have a major impact on the waste industry, not just in terms of new recycling collections, but because product manufacturers will be required to pay fees on the products they place on the market, based on how recyclable their products are. This is important because they will be incentivised to reduce packaging, and where packaging is needed the fees will make sure it is reusable or recyclable. This should mean that manufacturers using hard to recycle materials for their packaging will move to using materials that are recyclable, and this will help to provide more secure and sustainable recycling markets in the future.

5.6 One question had been received from Simon Geller on behalf of Sustrans, the Sustainable Transport Charity. Simon Geller did not attend the meeting to ask the question therefore a written response would be provided.

5.7 Geoff Palmer attended the meeting to ask the following questions:

“Who at Sheffield Council supervises/monitors the work AMEY Contractors do?

Why are the management team at Amey continually allowed to "BLOCK" and refuse to do the necessary Road Repairs, they are totally out of control and should be made to face the Committee in person to face their failures.

I do have numerous letters from AMEY management which I would be prepared to show you as evidence of their continuing refusal to do works, if this is permitted."

The Chair responded with the following answer:

The Streets Ahead Highways Maintenance contract is based on the principle of self-monitoring. Sheffield City Council carries out sample checks to validate the Amey self-monitoring regime and any areas of non-compliance are dealt with accordingly. Sheffield City Council robustly challenge Amey where poor working practices are identified, and outcomes include financial and technical sanctions.

The overall road condition in Sheffield continues to benchmark well against national figures. Each carriageway and footway is assessed on a two-year cycle. Carriageways and footways that fail to meet the required standards are rectified in the following year cycle.

As part of Streets Ahead there is a team of highway safety inspectors who conduct inspections of each area of Sheffield. The frequency of inspections depends on the hierarchy of the road, with principal roads being routinely inspected on a monthly basis, and local estate roads routinely inspected on an annual basis. Should there be any potholes that require attention then they will be noted on these inspections and repaired accordingly. Any road or footway that is deemed dangerous or unsafe as part of a risk-based inspection will be addressed. We also encourage members of the public to report any issues which give cause for concern.

Repairs to hazardous potholes have shown good performance throughout the year. These are potholes which are greater than 40mm in depth. It is notable that during quarter 4 of 2022/23 which is the winter seasonal peak Amey achieved 98.7% quarter average.

However we know performance around lower category defects (potholes less than 40mm deep in carriageways) isn't as good as it should be and further detail is set out in closed Appendix 3 of the Amey Performance Report (Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee, 27 September 2023) for Cllrs to debate.

5.8 One question had been received from Chloe Cheesman. Chloe Cheesman did not attend the meeting to ask their question therefore a written response would be provided.

5.9 A group from Extinction Rebellion attended the meeting to ask the following questions:

“1. This motion is weak because it has no timeline. Please amend the motion to set a date by which Glyphosate will no longer be sprayed on our streets and pavements? 2025 would seem reasonable.

2.The background in this motion gives very little detail about the harmful effects of Glyphosate to nature or to human health. Do you realise we are currently experiencing the 6th mass extinction of species, and insects are taking the biggest hit. UK's flying insects have declined by 60% in the last 20 years. In 2019, Biological Conservation reported that 40% of all insects species are declining globally and that a third of them are endangered. The first thing to do to reverse this trend is to stop poisoning them with herbicides, insecticides and pesticides.

As well as destroying their food sources Glyphosate has a direct health impact on bees. It alters the beneficial gut flora of bees making them more susceptible to disease and it harms the bees navigation abilities which endangers the hives' survival.

3. In 1.4 in the motion it is noted that Glyphosate is deemed to be safe and efficacious for use as a herbicide. This ignores the conclusions from the International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) which labelled glyphosate as “probably carcinogenic”. Independent scientific studies have revealed numerous acute and chronic effects of glyphosate-based herbicides. In addition, the ingredients added to glyphosate products may be toxic. Many of these chemicals are trade secrets and we rely on the manufacturers to ensure the products have been tested to be safe. Studies have found that glyphosate-based herbicides can interfere with various organs and biochemical pathways in mammals. It causes imbalances in gut bacteria and some studies have found that glyphosate appears to accumulate in human cells. At low concentrations it damages liver, kidney and skin cells and long term effects include cancer, infertility, pregnancy problems, birth defects and respiratory diseases. Please amend 1.4 accordingly.

4. Also in 1.4 the motion mentions current legislation but not that the EU may well be about to ban Glyphosate.

5. Do you realise Glyphosate is found as a residue in many of the food products we eat. It has also been found in water, wine and beer. Testing has revealed that glyphosate is present in people’s urine in Europe, and in urine and breast milk in the USA.

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

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

8. In 2.5 it is stated “Annual usage figures of Glyphosate decreased from 140,000 litres of diluted product being used across this city in 2020 (pre-trial) to currently less than 50,000 litres of diluted product being used in 2023, representing a huge overall reduction in use of Glyphosate based products in the public realm.” But 2023 is not yet at an end. Is 50000 litres an estimate for the whole year, or is it the figure for just part of the year? If so what fraction of the year does it include?

9. In 3.1 it is proposed to continue spraying Glyphosate alternatives on soft surfaces. Does this include tree pits and areas surrounding trees? Is the Committee aware that Glyphosate damages the fungi on the tree roots that help the tree collect nutrients and water. It is very important for tree health not to spray Glyphosate near them.

10. In 3.3 you admit that the Glyphosate free trial was unsuccessful at evaluating the impact on the highway of not applying any chemical weed killers. This is a great shame. You have not identified what went wrong with the trial or how it could have been done better. Obviously you should not repeat the same mistakes, but surely further trials should be possible, on different terms, having learnt from previous mistakes.

11. In 3.7 it is stated “the Council are working with Amey to put in place a Contract Change Notice pursuant to the Contract which will enable a relaxation to some of Amey’s contractual obligations to manage weeds across the Council’s land”. Exactly what changes to the contract are being proposed?

12. In 7.2 it is noted that “the total potential cost implication of complete cessation in a worst-case scenario could be as high as £150 million of additional expenditure.” Has anyone costed the worst case scenario of continued use of Glyphosate? A court in the US which ruled that Roundup – which contains glyphosate as its key ingredient – was liable for a terminally ill man’s cancer and ordered the company to pay \$289 million in damages. This was the first case of its kind but there are another 8,000 similar cases pending in the US alone. Amey workers are regularly observed spraying Glyphosate without masks. When Graham Wroe asked one why he was doing this he said that masks are scary for the public. There is a big concern that in the future Sheffield Council could face massive compensation bills if workers ill from Glyphosate use take them to court. Apart from the possible legal costs, the worst case scenario for continued use of Glyphosate is the continued decline and possible extinction of many species of bees and other insects. Has anyone costed the implications of that?

13. a) In 8.1 the motion concludes that approval of the recommendations will allow “A continuous reduction in the use of glyphosate in highway areas across all of Sheffield.” You really need to set a timescale for this reduction.

b) Secondly the motion says it will allow “The opportunity to work with residents in various areas of the city to promote awareness and encourage action in line with the Nature Emergency outcomes. This will achieve an important step in the city’s response to the declared Nature Emergency. Working with residents on this is to be welcomed, but it is vital for the Council to take the lead. You have declared a Nature Emergency, so you must act on this now.

c) Thirdly it says it will allow “Alignment with the timescales for further central government guidance and/or legislation and future licensing of information on the future licensing of Glyphosate.” This Government is best friends with the Chemical and Oil industries. Sheffield can’t wait for them to take action. Sheffield needs to take the lead.”

The Chair responded with the following answers:

1. The Committee report opens with a clear recommendation that officers are to return to Committee as soon as central government guidance and/or legislation on the use of pesticides in the public realm has been published, with an update promised before the end of 2025.

At this time, given the Council's financial situation, the indicative £150 million cost of a complete cessation of Glyphosate to the Authority and a lack of licensing for alternative products for use on hard surfaces mean that this is realistically out of the Council's control and is a matter for Central Government and regulatory bodies to drive forward.

As soon as we get specific guidance we will be coming back to Committee for a decision on the best way forward.

2. The Committee report is clear that Glyphosate will not be used on soft surfaces, flowerbeds, shrub beds etc where bees and other insects would acquire their food source. As per the Health and Safety Executive publication, Glyphosate is not a neonicotinoid; these types of pesticides are insecticides and are used to treat crops against the actions of certain insects such as pollen beetles, this is not how we operate weed control in the public realm.

The report also cites at 1.5 Academic Studies such as Tarazona et al (2017) around concerns of the potential effect upon insects and bees so does recognise this school of thought.

Glyphosate will only be used on weeds which have already emerged in pavements on a "spot treatment" basis. The trials so far using this methodology have yielded reductions in usage down to around one-third of what it previously was.

The Committee report is clear that residents can help us further reduce usage by removing weeds from hard surfaces from pavements in their neighbourhoods. Put simply - when teams arrive at a street, if there are no weeds, no Glyphosate will be used.

3. As per Tarazona et al (2017), since Glyphosate was introduced in 1974, all regulatory assessments have established that glyphosate has low hazard potential to mammals.

We acknowledge that the IARC reported in 2015 that Glyphosate was "probably carcinogenic". The carcinogenic status from the IARC places Glyphosate in the same tier as red meat and night shift working.

The IARC conclusion was however **not** confirmed by the EU assessment nor by joint World Health Organisation (WHO) Food and Agriculture Organisation / FAO evaluation, both of which used additional information beyond that reviewed by the IARC in coming to their decision.

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

The Chair asked the questioner to send links to studies that had been referenced in the question.

4. Britain is no longer a member of the EU so this would be out of scope of the report.

On 19 September 2023, the Commission put forward to the Member States a revised Renewal Report and a draft Regulation which actually proposes the renewal of approval of Glyphosate's license, not the removal of it.

5. Yes, this is reflected in section 6.3.2 where the report recognises that Glyphosate is used in food production in the UK – it is routinely used in cereal crops such as wheat and barley hence why it appears in end-user food and drink products such as wine, beer and bread.

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

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

7. The Health and Safety Executive as the regulatory body are clear that Glyphosate is not a neonicotinoid; these types of pesticides are insecticides and are used to treat crops against the actions of certain insects such as pollen beetles, this is not how we operate weed control in the public realm.

8. Figures reported were to just before the report was prepared, it is acknowledged a small further increase may be encountered, but given the incredibly rainy summer weather, spraying had substantively stopped by the time of writing as this product is not used in adverse weather conditions where the rainfastness time is unlikely to be achieved (i.e. if rain is forecasted).

9. As the question had been altered since it had been submitted, a written answer would be provided after the meeting.

10. The areas of the trial were subject to a large number of residents and 3<sup>rd</sup> parties spraying the highway. We have worked with Edinburgh Council (more detail in the report) and listened to our consultation outcomes and will work with residents and volunteering groups to embrace this willingness to help remove weeds on the highway and reduce the amount of chemical we have to use.

11. A temporary 2-year relaxation of Performance Requirements relating to weed

growth in grass verges, under hedgerows and in shrub beds to ensure that they are not penalised for alternative products being less efficacious.

12. Employees transferred under TUPE regulations from the Council into the private sector in 2012. Amey's manage any risks to their employees, which includes detailed risk assessments, COSHH assessments and appropriate controls and Personal Protective Equipment Policies as well as health surveillance for their staff.

13. a) With reference to earlier sections - timescales are outlined in the report which are aligned to likely forthcoming clarification from central government on the usage of Glyphosate prior to 2025.

b) Agree, we hope the volunteer sector and those who are actively engaged in wanting to help us reduce the use of Glyphosate will spread the word that if there are no weeds in the pavement, then no Glyphosate will be sprayed and encourage people to become more involved at community level as has been so successful for Edinburgh Council in their Pesticide Free Balerno campaign.

c) The Health and Safety Executive are the relevant licensing body for pesticides in England and once we get clarification we will be able to return to committee to seek a decision on the way forward.

5.10 Joel Gilbert attended the meeting to ask the following question:

"There is a feeling SCC has given up when it comes to supporting residents who have to walk in the city. Primarily, for me, this about pavement parking to such an extent the pavement becomes impassable, including having vehicles having all 4 wheels on the pavement sometimes for weeks at a time! As an example when walking my nephew to the park along Shirecliffe Lane last week I had to push the buggy (uphill) along the middle of the road to face oncoming traffic as both pavements were unpassable. This is not something that should need a consultation to remedy, walking a 15 month-old on a pavement s is not a nice to have, so what steps are the committee planning on introducing to make sure pavements are more accessible for humans?"

The Chair responded with the following answer:

There is no general legislation outside of London for an offence of pavement parking. A specific Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) must be written to prevent parking on pavements in any locations that the council would want to prohibit pavement parking. The TRO must be consulted on. Signs and lines also have to be installed to show where pavement parking begins or ends. The policy to introduce pavement parking restrictions has designated the city centre as the only location pavement parking enforcement will currently be introduced. The responsibility for transport policy and any amendments to this approach sit with the Transport, regeneration, and Climate Policy Committee. However, locations where double yellow lines are installed may also allow the enforcement of parking on the pavement. The double yellow line applies from the centre of the road up to the nearest barrier or wall, so may encompass a pavement in some

circumstances. Double yellow lines also need TRO's which must be consulted on. Requests for new parking restrictions are dealt with by the council's Strategic Transport and Infrastructure Service. They have a limited budget which is used to prioritise new measures in the areas of greatest risk. I would encourage any evidence of the risks posed in areas of the city be sent to [transport@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:transport@sheffield.gov.uk)

In addition to raising concerns with the council's transport team to collate evidence, I would also encourage any instances of obstructive parking on the pavement as described in this incident to be reported to the police via the non-emergency number of 101 or online at [smartcontact.southyorkshire.police.uk](https://smartcontact.southyorkshire.police.uk) The police can enforce obstruction of the highway without there being a traffic regulation order present.

The Chair added that an operation by the Sheffield North West Neighbourhood Policing Team called Operation Parksafes was running in northwest Sheffield and there was a consultation on whether to extend the operation to the rest of the city. The Chair also noted that the Committee would be considering a review of the Council's Parking Enforcement Policy later in the meeting which would strengthen some of the enforcement powers that the Council has.

5.11 James Martin attended the meeting and asked the following questions in relation to item 11 on the agenda on behalf of Disability Sheffield:

"1. Noting 4.4.2, Disability Sheffield would welcome constructive and proactive engagement with SCC officers as the design of the reporting and feedback mechanism will be vital to help ensure this is accessible for the full breadth of the disabled community who are affected by issues such as parking across dropped kerbs and pavement parking. Will the committee require this?

2. Additionally, can the committee consider requiring that regular publication/reporting of the number of reports, final outcome/action taken, general geographic area should be built into reporting and enforcement systems to give suitable oversight (hopefully to seeing an improvement over the coming years)?

3. Finally, we would like to flag that the consultation period was run for a very short period, and we are concerned that all those negatively affected by pavement parking and parking across dropped kerbs were not able to make representations of trouble spots. Choosing which areas to prioritise or tackle first will be important to start unblocking access (some locations will have a longer distance to the next crossing point) and some areas of contravention will also create safety issues for pedestrians who can work around the obstruction. It would be helpful if officers were to take some time with the disabled community to understand what offences cause the most problems in order to give confidence on the approach being taken. Will the committee be interested in Officers using Access Liaison Group time to assist in this manner?

To note, there may be issues for disabled drivers which we have not had time to analyse."

The Chair responded with the following answers:

The committee would welcome Disability Sheffield's input into the designing of the reporting and feedback function.

The committee would like to see inclusion of the statistics requested in the annual parking report.

The committee would welcome the input of the access liaison group in helping shape the priority areas.

## **6. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

6.1 There were no questions from Members of the Committee.

## **7. WORK PROGRAMME**

7.1 The Principal Democratic Services Officer submitted a report containing the Committee's Work Programme which detailed all known, substantive agenda items for forthcoming meetings of the Committee to enable the Committee, other Committees, officers, partners and the public to plan their work with and for the Committee.

7.2 Members requested that additional items be added to the Work Programme on reducing the use of Single Use Plastics and reviewing Hackney Carriage Vehicle fares.

7.3 Members asked for clarification on the timescales for the Future Waste Collection Strategy and noted that this item related to public questions asked at the meeting. Officers agreed to provide a briefing for Members on the development of the new strategy.

7.4 In response to requests from Members, officers agreed to arrange a visit for Members to see the work being done and lessons learned from the Page Hall Waste Trials and to seek clarification on whether the flood strategy fell within the remit of this Committee. Officers also agreed to provide a briefing for Members on the proposals for the development of a policy for Sexual Entertainment Venues.

7.5 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee:-

1. agrees the Committee's work programme, as set out in Appendix 1 be agreed, including any additions and amendments identified in Part 1;
2. considers the further additions or adjustments to the work programme presented at Part 2 of Appendix 1; and
3. considers any further issues to be explored by officers for inclusion in Part 2 of Appendix 1 of the next work programme report, for potential addition to

the work programme.

## **8. QUARTER 1 BUDGET MONITORING (2023/24)**

8.1 The Head of Accounting presented a report which brought the Committee up to date with the Council's outturn position for the revenue budget for 2023/24 at the end of Quarter 1.

8.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee notes the updated information and management actions provided by this report on the Quarter 1 2023/24 Revenue Budget Outturn as described in this report.

### **8.3 Reasons for Decision**

8.3.1 To record formally changes to the Revenue Budget

### **8.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

8.4.1 The Council is required to both set a balance budget and to ensure that in-year income and expenditure are balanced. No other alternatives were considered.

## **9. REVIEW OF AMEY PERFORMANCE CHALLENGE**

9.1 The Interim Service Manager for Highway Maintenance introduced the report which provided an update on contract performance and notified the Committee of proposed new ways of working in relation to a Contract for Highways Maintenance between Sheffield City Council and Amey Hallam Highways (AHH) (subcontracted to Amey LG (Amey)). The Business Director for Amey attended the meeting via video link to answer Member's questions.

9.2 The Business Director for Amey agreed to follow up on specific cases raised by Members on behalf of residents and Members were asked to notify the Interim Service Manager of any further areas of concern so that these could be followed up with Amey.

9.3 In response to Member's questions regarding how the relationship between utility companies, Amey and the Council was managed to coordinate work that impacted roads, officers proposed to invite the Council's Network Management Team to a knowledge briefing session and noted that Yorkshire Water would be attending the Committee meeting in November.

9.4 The Business Director for Amey agreed to seek clarification on who had responsibility for maintaining heritage street furniture and how to report faults.

9.5 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee:-

1. notes the Amey Contract Performance Report at closed Appendix 3 together

with the proposal for officers to continue to monitor Amey's performance of the Contract considering Appendix 3 and report back to Committee by February 2024 as to progress;

2. notes the trials on new ways of working for street cleansing, leafing and planned drainage programmes;
3. notes areas of improvement to strengthen monitoring and auditing function; and
4. notes full compliance on carriageway and footway surfacing and that Amey are no longer in default.

#### 9.6 **Reasons for Decision**

- 9.6.1 The reason for this report is for the Committee to note the points outlined above and in the closed Appendix 3 and note Officers proposed way forward.

#### 9.7 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 9.7.1 There were no alternatives considered and rejected.

### 10. **GLYPHOSATE REDUCTION TRIAL UPDATE: HIGHWAYS**

- 10.1 The Acting Service Manager (Highways) introduced a report that detailed the outcomes of the Council's trials in reducing the usage of Glyphosate.
- 10.2 Members requested that a report be brought to the Committee in six months' time that set out options for phasing out the use of Glyphosate by 2025.
- 10.3 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee:-

1. agrees to the continuation of the city-wide reduction in the use of Glyphosate where viable until December 2025, pending central government guidance and/or legislation on the use of pesticides in the public realm and to bring a further report to committee once that guidance and/or legislation has been published;
2. agrees to implement a suite of educational and informational measures as to what citizens can do to help the Council in delivering a weed free environment to be implemented when seasonally relevant, until December 2025; and
3. requests that a report be brought back to the Committee in February 2024

setting out options for phasing out the use of Glyphosate.

#### 10.4 **Reasons for Decision**

##### 10.4.1 Approval of the recommendations will allow:

- A continuous reduction in the use of glyphosate in highway areas across all of Sheffield.
- The opportunity to work with residents in various areas of the city to promote awareness and encourage action in line with the Nature Emergency outcomes. This will achieve an important step in the city's response to the declared Nature Emergency.
- Alignment with the timescales for further central government guidance and/or legislation and future licensing of information on the future licensing of Glyphosate.

#### 10.5 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

10.5.1 The option to 'do nothing' was considered and discounted considering both the declaration of a Nature Emergency and the support received for the petition against the use of Glyphosate.

10.5.2 The option to cease the use of Glyphosate on all land immediately was considered but discounted due to high level of cost/expenditure. Sheffield has 1,064,045.03 square metres of high usage footways and 8,77,757.67 square metres of lower use footways in the city.

Based on a "worst case scenario" of around 10% of the footway network failing between 2023 and 2037 due to weeds and vegetation this is estimated to cover around £116 million pounds in resurfacing.

Additional Street Cleansing Costs have also been modelled based on 42 additional operatives, additional road sweepers, and other vehicles, and plant machinery being brought into the operation to uplift street cleansing service to manually remove weeds has also been costed at around £2.4 million per year – circa £32 million over the remainder of the PFI contract.

Therefore, the total potential cost implication of complete cessation in a worst-case scenario could be as high as £150 million of additional expenditure. This may however be mitigated should there be a legislative change.

(NOTE: During the discussion of the above item, the Committee agreed, in accordance with Council Procedure rules, that, as the meeting was approaching the 2 hours and 30 minutes time limit, the meeting should be extended by a period

of 30 minutes.)

## **11. CIVIL PARKING AND BUS LANE ENFORCEMENT POLICY**

11.1 The Head of Street Scene Services and the Parking Services Manager introduced a report that sought approval for an updated Civil Parking and Bus Lane Enforcement Policy.

11.2 The policy would provide updated information and guidance on:

- national regulations and government guidance;
- how to carry out enforcement for parking and bus lane contraventions;
- service objectives for enforcement; and
- the appeals process that motorists must follow to dispute a parking or bus lane ticket and a guide to our cancellation policies.

The aim was to ensure that the policy reflected national regulations and guidance and provided transparency and consistency.

11.3 Members enquired about an online reporting tool that was being introduced for members of the public to report parking enforcement issues. Officers advised that it would be launched in the next few weeks and Members would be sent a link to the web-based tool.

11.4 Councillor Joe Otten proposed two amendments, seconded by Councillor Tim Huggan, which would alter the policy as follows:

1. retain the two-month period for Penalty Charge Notices issued by post for contraventions recorded by CCTV; and
2. retain the ten-minute observation period for Transits and other larger vehicles where street loading is permitted.

On being put to the vote, the amendments were lost.

(NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR – 3 Members; AGAINST – 6 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Councillors Sue Alston, Tim Huggan and Joe Otten asked for their votes for the amendments to be recorded.)

11.5 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee approves the updated Civil Parking and Bus Lane Enforcement Policy as amended and presented by officers at the meeting.

### **11.6 Reasons for Decision**

11.6.1 The Department for Transport sets out that civil enforcement policies should be consistent, fair and effective. The existing policies need updating to reflect current

regulations and enforcement options available to the local authority.

It is recommended that Members approve the policy in order for the updated recommendations to be implemented

## **11.7 Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 11.7.1 Leave the observation period for restrictions where loading exemptions apply at 5 minutes but just reduce this to 3 minutes for yellow lines near schools. Initial patterns noted from observations carried out by CEOs suggest that most loading activity is spotted within the first few minutes. Applying 3 minutes generally is more consistent than doing so just at certain locations and would contribute to more efficient enforcement.

(NOTE: During the discussion of the above item, the Committee agreed, in accordance with Council Procedure rules, that the meeting should be extended by a further period of 30 minutes.)

## **12. CHRISTMAS PARKING OFFER**

- 12.1 The Head of Street Scene Services introduced a report that set out options for Member's consideration in terms of parking concessions in the City Centre, seeking to increase footfall to support the Christmas retail and hospitality offer.

- 12.2 The report contained three options for Members' consideration. Following discussion, Members agreed to discount option 2 (free all-day parking on Saturdays and Sundays in all council pay and display bays across the city between 2 & 3 December and 16 & 17 December 2023) and put option 1 (free all-day parking in the city centre on Sundays between 19th November and 24th December) and option 3 (do nothing) to a vote.

- 12.3 On being put to the vote, option 1 was lost.

(NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR – 3 Members; AGAINST – 6 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Councillors Sue Alston, Tim Huggan and Joe Otten requested that their votes for the recommendation be recorded. Councillors Mike Chaplin, Alexi Dimond, Tony Downing, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Mark Jones and Sioned-Mair Richards requested that their votes against the recommendation be recorded.)

- 12.5 On being put to the vote, option 3 was carried.

(NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR – 6 Members; AGAINST – 3 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Councillors Mike Chaplin, Alexi Dimond, Tony Downing, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Mark Jones and Sioned-Mair Richards requested that their votes for the recommendation be recorded. Councillors Sue Alston, Tim Huggan and Joe Otten requested that their votes against the recommendation be recorded.)

- 12.6 The second recommendation, as set out in the report, was then put to the vote and was carried.

(NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR – 5 Members; AGAINST – 4 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Councillors Sue Alston, Alexi Dimond, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Tim Huggan and Joe Otten requested that their votes for the recommendation be recorded. Councillors Mike Chaplin, Tony Downing, Mark Jones and Sioned-Mair Richards requested their votes against the recommendation be recorded.)

12.7 **RESOLVED:**

- 12.7.1 That the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee agrees to option 3 as detailed in the report: that a Christmas parking offer will not be implemented in the city centre.

- 12.7.2 That the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee notes that the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee may authorise officers to liaise with the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority to identify potential measures to promote and / or incentivise the use of public transport over the Christmas period, and further recommend that it does so.

12.8 **Reasons for Decision**

- 12.8.1 This report sets out options for consideration in terms of parking concessions in the City Centre, seeking to increase footfall to support the Christmas retail and hospitality offer. Any decision to implement such an approach should be made in the context of the potential cost and impact on footfall of the proposed approach.

12.9 **Alternatives Considered and Rejected**

- 12.9.1 The Council could choose to support a public transport offer to promote the use of public transport and/or active travel in partnership with transport operators and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority. It could alternately make a decision to invest in the cost of supporting offers to increase public transport take up.

It should however be noted that this would be a matter for the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee. A decision from that committee would be required so as to take such a proposal forward.

On that basis, this Committee may therefore wish to consider making a recommendation to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee that it authorises officers to liaise with the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority to identify potential measures to promote and / or incentivise the use of public transport over the Christmas period.