

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

Strategy and Resources Policy Committee

Meeting held 2 August 2023

PRESENT: Councillors Tom Hunt (Chair), Fran Belbin (Deputy Chair), Angela Argenzio, Dawn Dale, Douglas Johnson (Group Spokesperson), Ben Miskell, Shaffaq Mohammed (Group Spokesperson), Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Martin Smith and Richard Williams

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 There were no apologies for absence.

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. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS RELATING TO THE ISSUES TO BE DISCUSSED

4.1 It was agreed that the public questions submitted would be considered immediately prior to the respective items.

4.2 Public Questions relating to Item 5

4.3 Representatives of Sheffield Racism attended to present the following questions that they had submitted:

1.What is the Sheffield City Council doing to hold schools accountable for the disproportionate number of permanent exclusions of black and brown boys? How are you supporting children sent to Spring Lane exclusion Centre?

2.What are you doing to build trust between schools and communities? How do you expect to support the diverse needs of BAME students if you are unaware of the issues they face?

3.What do you consider discrimination?

4.What protocols do you have in place to report racial abuse/discrimination? How will you address bias amongst staff who choose not to deal with or acknowledge race is an issue?

5.What is the Sheffield Council doing to ensure POC children are supported in primary

schools? and given the right support to be tested for SEND?

6.How is the Sheffield city Council protecting black and brown people in leadership positions or encouraging diversity in leadership roles? From nursing to teaching - People of colour of don't feel confident enough to work towards leadership roles as they are aware they won't be supported.

7.How will you use affirmative action to increase numbers of POC in leadership positions in schools. What are your targets over the next year?

8.How will you ensure this whole issue isn't just lip service and brushed under the carpet?

9.The resources for BAME communities in council housing is really low - what is the council doing to support these communities and their housing issues?

10.How do you plan to encourage more POC to join the board of governors at schools?

11.How do you plan on diversifying a curriculum that hasn't changed in 10 years?

12.I read the Annual Equality's report - how will you go beyond the data to understand POC experiences?

Response: In 2022 when the Race Equality Commission report was published, we said that we would not be afraid to change and adapt our practices and actions if the impact is not felt. We have begun to implement the recommendations of the Commission, but we know that the Council has not moved quickly enough, and the racial disparities identified by the Commission still affect the lives of many people. Reflecting on the discussions at the last meeting, I have called out in public for more to be done and for our work to be accelerated. The Council is committed to culture change and the action plan to be considered today shows that there is more to do. We are having this discussion on the progress now, in public so that we can be held accountable for our actions, is a sign that culture change is beginning to take effect. Large scale culture change cannot be achieved instantly, it will take time and effort.

We use the Equality Act definitions of discrimination including race discrimination and this covers both direct and indirect discrimination, harassment, and victimisation whether in the workforce or our services. In the Equality Act, race discrimination can mean discrimination on the basis of your skin colour, or your nationality (including your citizenship). It can also mean your ethnic or national origins, which may not be the same as your current nationality. These definitions of discrimination are used to inform our policies on dignity and respect within our workforce. But it is not a legal definition alone that we must have regard to, we must consider people's lived experiences. For example, the recent newspaper report on stop and search checks - this needs to be how we are informed and understand discrimination. In addition, when colleagues experience micro aggressions in the workplace, this is how we need to understand discrimination, so that unconscious bias is recognised and informs how we respond. It is not just a legal definition.

Data, as the Commission reported is critical, but we recognise this is only part of the picture. We are data rich in terms of our workforce, but insight comes through a wide range of channels. What we need to do next is capture it and make sure it is used to shape action. The Council is looking at an engagement strategy and engagement with our minoritised groups will be an essential element.

Leaders are encouraged and expected to create time to hear from the lived experiences of people of colour, an important activity, particularly as we recognise our leadership is not representative. The stories of people's experiences have to shape our approaches, policies and values moving forward, not just data. Data is just information, it is what you do with that information that matters. An example of this is the answer to your question re Spring Lane exclusion centre. Our data tells us that there is a higher likelihood of being in Sheffield Inclusion Centre (SIC) if you are Roma or from a dual heritage background in comparison to your peers in the City. We are also looking at our SEND data which links to this and indicates that if you are Roma or dual heritage in Sheffield Inclusion Centre you are less likely to have an Education, Health and Care Plan (EHCP) than your white peers at SIC and are more likely to be seen to have no SEN needs. We want to work with SIC to look in more in depth at these figures and also what this is saying across the system. We will work with our education partners to commission this work in the Autumn to help inform the Belonging Framework and our longer-term plans. That Belonging Framework will be based on ensuring children and young people feel that they belong in their family, in their local school and in their community. It needs to be evidence based and we will be developing this Framework in the autumn term. This will only be possible by listening to staff and students to better understand their lives, their sense of belonging and the challenges they face. We can look at particular cases. Data is necessary to help us diagnose the problem but it is not sufficient to find solutions. Lived experiences and deep listening is critical to that.

On Exclusions the Council is clear that it needs to do more lead and work across the education system to reduce exclusions overall and, specifically, to reduce the over representation of people of colour who have been permanently excluded.

We intend to initiate a programme of work with schools, led by the Strategic Director of Children's Services, from the Autumn, 2023, to ensure that school and community links are strengthened, the needs of people of colour are identified and met. The Belonging Framework referenced earlier, along with an overt commitment to become an anti-racist city will create permanent ways of working, so that the voice of young people, in their communities, will have a channel and will be heard by schools and by those working in the local authority and in local communities. We will continue to develop capacity to ensure that we regularly hear the voice of young people, and to ensure that this is taken into account in the decisions that we all make.

We are listening to people of colour in school leadership positions and those who do not feel leadership would be a safe arena for them. Our recruitment is also changing to enable us to increase the numbers of black and brown people in all our teams but we need to be much more representative of the city we serve. These are just some examples of how we are seeking to become an anti-racist organisation and to work with partners to make this an anti-racist City, whether we are talking about Education, Housing or other services - I am happy to follow up on the issues you raise in respect

of Burngreave. I would be keen to meet with you to listen as will my colleague Councillor Belbin who is arranging for young residents of the City to take over a Full Council meeting.

4.4 Olivier Tsemo, CEO, SADACCA LIMITED attended to present the following questions that he had submitted:

1. The Leadership of the Council has recognised that there has been slow progress on the implementation of the recommendations of the Race Equality Commission report and that is an observation shared by the community and key stakeholders. Why has there been slow progress? I represent a trusted voice in the community, who are not happy with progress, and I can advocate for the Council but we need to see progress. Could the committee produce a Rapid Improvement Plan to demonstrate how well they will effectively respond to the high priority recommendations?

2. Could the committee vote on an emergency budget to quickly address the high priority recommendations?

Response: The improvement plan is set out in the report today was published in December 2022. While we have begun to implement the recommendations of the Race Equality Commission (REC), we also know that the council has not moved quickly enough as an organisation. While a lot of good activity has taken place, not enough of it has outcome measures, hampering our ability to track improvement.

We need to go further and faster. I am clear about that and that is why we have the report today, to publicly hold ourselves to account. We are not calling this a rapid improvement plan but this is the language we perhaps need to be adopting if we are going to meet the recommendations in the timely manner that we need to. We agreed to respond to the recommendations in two years from the publishing of the report and so we have a limited amount of time left, eleven months to make some serious progress, so we have to be rapid.

There has not been sufficient resource allocated to this but where there are specific actions which need funding this will be defined by services and advice taken to the relevant committee for sign-off when plans are developed. We expect to dedicate budget to support the legacy body arrangements. I would welcome further discussions with you and your organisation. A further update will be submitted to this Committee later in the year.

4.5 Rafia Hussain attended to present a petition on behalf of Sheffield Stand Up to Racism, Sheffield Trades Council, SADACCA and several other organisations calling on Sheffield City Council to:

- Provide transparent and detailed information about the personnel comprising its established 'Race Equality Body' and the processes of consultation involved in the appointment of these individuals.
- Provide a detailed and transparent action plan, with an appropriate budget and time frame of when, appropriate targets that are identified will be actioned .
- Produce a detailed plan of how key anchor organisations are going to respond to the report and meet the key recommendations that are highlighted by the

- Race Equality Commission report.
- Organise an open meeting, where Sheffield's key anchor institutions, partners, third sector organisations and members of the public are invited to discuss ways to address the issues highlighted by the Race Equality Commission Report.

Response: Thank you for presenting the petition. We recognise that we need to do more, this is a high priority and a further update report will be submitted later in the year, when we can be held to account again. In March the Sheffield City Partnership Board (SCPB) agreed the establishment of a time-limited REC Legacy working group with an independent chair, Richard Stubbs. This working group is made up of representatives from communities, private sector and anchor organisations. It is developing a set of options for long-term legacy arrangements which will hold the city to account in its work to become anti-racist. In the Autumn, the group will present a recommendation back to SCPB on the most appropriate model for the Legacy Body and how it should be implemented, including a transparent model for recruitment as appropriate.

The Commission's recommendations envisioned the legacy arrangements holding the whole city to account for progress. It has taken some time to work through the best way in which to set up to do that in a way which engenders confidence. These working group arrangements give us a clear forum in which to come to an agreement on next steps.

The report today sets out our interim progress against our action plan set out in December 2022. Following this report we are setting out coming back to the committee with further progress in December 2023.

Sheffield City Council are committed to working with our partners and in July we set up and facilitated a meeting of anchor organisations to discuss progress we had all made. At that meeting we all committed to attending an event in the Autumn with communities to report back on our progress.

We are committed to holding an open event in the Autumn bringing together individuals, community organisations, anchor organisations and other stakeholders etc to discuss progress and actions against the REC, and we will provide more details of this shortly.

4.6 Public Questions Relating to Item 6

- 4.7 Introduction from the Chair: Thank you everyone for coming today and for asking your questions. We have also received a lot more questions from people who can't be here today.

The way we are going to do this today is that I will invite everyone here today to ask their questions in turn. After everyone has asked their questions, I will then respond with a statement before we turn to the main committee report about the Local Plan.

The reason for doing this is that the report we will shortly be discussing addresses directly many of the concerns you have raised in the tabled questions, in particular

about the site at Eckington Way. Many of the issues that the questions relate to are covered in the report and because that report has not yet been discussed or agreed, it would be premature for me, on behalf of the committee, to provide definitive answers to the questions before the committee has discussed the report and decided on what the next steps are for the Local Plan.

4.7 Fiona Hinson, Springwell Community Group, attended the meeting to present the following questions that she had submitted:

1. How did Mosborough Councillors manage to get items removed from the draft plan before it was made public?

2. Once the plan was made public, this element of the plan attracted significant opposition with over 2,000 signatures. Why bother to consult if you're not going to listen to objections and respond accordingly? There were 2 petitions, which was only as a result of the complexity of the council system not allowing amendments, and other council parties "honed in" that more signatures were on the Traveller Site than the Industrial Development, even accusing of "racism". This is factually incorrect. The petitions were always to be considered as one and this needs to be formally noted.

3. An exceptional LAC meeting was held in early 2023 around the plan once we as residents got to know about this local plan. We requested this as we'd not been made aware of it before then. We asked for this to be recorded, but were advised as exceptional it couldn't be. At this meeting, with all residents who will concur, the planners who attended "admitted" they had not visited the site. In recent emails since, they advise "officers in the wider team have visited and are familiar with the wider context. Under "freedom of information" when was this site visit done? What was the outcome of specific issues raised relating to gradients and loss of privacy?

4. As a working group, representing the Springwell Community, we have asked questions through LAC, through councillors and have yet to receive an adequate response:

Q1. What other sites were considered? What are the detailed reasons for rejecting - other than this is council land?

Q2. Why are you looking at industrial development, when less than a mile away at Westfield, there is a field with existing road access, put in for industrial units, which stand empty as you've been unable to attract any business?

Q3. We have asked for updated air quality reports. What's happened with them? In 2015, the air quality in this area was worse than Sheffield City Centre is now where you've imposed clean air charges! With further industrial development, diesel generators we have further increased air pollution and noise in a residential living area. How will you address this?

Q4. Why is the local plan not addressing the most important issue around road infrastructure? The council have made so many "silo" decisions and approvals over the last 10 years, the road infrastructure is completely inadequate. It needs an holistic review of all projects and approvals, traffic monitoring, parking, which we have

provided photos and videos to the transport regeneration councillor - yet nothing has happened or confirmed how you plan to address this. This needs to happen before any development is even considered.

Q5. What has happened to the February request to have this re-assessed?

Additional questions submitted:

1. Despite 4 petitions with over 4,000 signatures opposing SES03, the recommendation is that the proposed site allocation should be retained. However, the draft plan does NOT adequately address any of the issues raised. The council are being asked to recommend to move issues down the line to planning with no real plan of how to address them.

2. In section 1.4.36 - do the council honestly believe that artic lorries that carry Gypsy traveller equipment, running from diesel generators, will not create any noise disruption or add to the already hazardous levels of air pollution? Also, with over 100,000 sq feet of unlet industrial units currently, why do we need more? How can losing agricultural land be outweighed by building more of what you can't fill already in a mile radius?

3. With the proposed "buffer" this reduces the plan of the site by 46% - how is all of this going to fit, and the gradient of land losing privacy which affects our equal rights?

4. When did the council do an actual site visit of the land, with measurements, consideration of the gradients from the suburban housing? They had not been as admitted at February LAC. So when? And what are the published findings of this actual site visit?

5. We have made continual requests about air pollution. Your only response is you "feel" it could be mitigated? How exactly?

6. The key issue around traffic congestion and the fact that all your individual approved silo projects have created a completely broken infrastructure, are not even addressed. You talk about a document expected mid-24. How can you as a council believe adding more to an existing problem for which you don't even have a solution is a good idea to progress the recommendation?

7. Nobody is arguing you have to make provision for Gypsy travellers. It just needs to be in the right site and location. You are still to provide us with all sites reviewed and why rejected other than this being council owned, no matter what cost. You have not responded to any of the objections. You are just pushing to get a plan done that is completely inadequate to say it has been done. As a council tax payer, and based on your archaic way of calculating council tax, we are Band E, what will these travellers pay for the same amenities? Will you review the bandings due to impact of house values - which have been proven through local estate agents for recent sales stating reduced due to this pending issue? Also, I want to ask, seeing as this proposed development means physical changes to the landscape, we can propose a new council tax band? What commitment would there be to honouring this by the council?

Response: Thank you for your questions. It is not an easy thing to come to a meeting like this and ask questions, so I am grateful to you for attending. As I mentioned

earlier, many of the issues that your questions relate to are covered in the report and because that report has not yet been discussed or agreed, it would be premature for me, on behalf of the committee, to provide definitive answers to your questions before the committee has discussed the report. However, I can assure that after the meeting full written responses will be provided to everyone who has asked a question.

The Local Plan matters. Your questions and the passion, the concern, and the sense of belonging that we heard today demonstrates that.

The Plan is of huge significance for everyone in our city. It sets out the vision and policies for how and where development will take place in the city over the next 15-20 years.

Having a Local Plan – after many years without one – would mean that Sheffield finally has a plan for where new homes will be built for our children and grandchildren, and where employment sites can be located. It allows us to plan infrastructure effectively and having a Plan would enable us to protect the Green Belt.

That is not to say that the process of developing a Local Plan is easy – and today's meeting, your questions, clearly demonstrate that. I have read all the questions submitted and listened carefully to all of the questions and I understand and acknowledge the strength of feeling on this matter.

In a moment we will hear from our colleagues in from the Planning Department. Having heard your questions, I would like to ask the officers to consider whether there is a way in which the strength of feeling can be fully acknowledged in the Local Plan process.

5. UPDATE ON SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL'S RESPONSE TO THE RACE EQUALITY COMMISSION

- 5.1 The Director of Policy and Democratic Engagement submitted a report updating the Strategy and Resources Committee on progress against the Council's December 2022 response to the Race Equality Commission and setting out recommendations to increase the pace and monitoring of change. This is important if we are to meet our goal to become an anti-racist organisation and implement all aspects of the Race Equality Commission report.

The recommended actions should empower senior leaders to take an active role in monitoring performance and outcomes across their teams, and ensure action plans are fit for purpose to achieve our goals. By doing this we will be working towards addressing racial disparity and seeing equality, diversity and inclusion being integrated into service plans and becoming part of the way we do things within the Council. We will also be able to monitor progress more accurately and be ready to report into the final legacy arrangements.

These recommendations will support us to build an organisation that anyone can feel welcome in and proud to work for and help us to see the services we deliver for every resident improved to tackle the inequalities and racial disparity set out so starkly by the Commission.

In addition, in September we will work with anchor organisations and others to jointly hold an event for community representatives and anchor representatives. This event will enable reflection on the work that has been done and challenge us all to go further and faster over the coming year. The Committee clearly expressed its displeasure at the progress made so far in response to the Race Equality Commission and stated the need for urgency to increase the pace and monitoring of change. There was a clear view that progress must be accelerated.

5.2 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That Strategy and Resources Policy Committee:-

(a) notes the progress made against the Council's response to the Race Equality Commission agreed at their meeting on 5 December 2022 and agrees the need to increase the pace and monitoring of change;

(b) compile and analyse the learning from the activity to date and set out to the Chief Executive during September a plan to further define priority actions, identify gaps and target support and challenge;

(c) use that plan to support senior leaders to challenge their services, including corporate functions, to set out timebound actions which are realistic and for which impact is measurable;

(d) build on work under our three underpinning areas: learning and development, awareness raising; de-biasing; and data, particularly improving how we gather employee views;

(e) support the work of the legacy working group so that it leads to proposals which enable us to work with anchor organisations, partners and the community to support, learn from, and challenge each other as we seek to make progress; and

(f) agrees that the Strategic Equality Inclusion Board monitors this work and that a further progress report is brought to this Committee in December 2023.

5.3 Reasons for Decision

5.3.1 To learn from early experiences in our response to the Race Equality Commission and refine our approach to increase the pace of change and monitoring.

5.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

5.4.1 This Committee agreed that the Council should pursue a specific response to the Race Equality Commission. This report does not recommend a change to that approach.

6. CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON THE PUBLICATION DRAFT SHEFFIELD PLAN

6.1 The Executive Director of City Futures submitted a report and associated appendices recommending the Council's response to the representations received as a result of public consultation on the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan that took

place from 9th January to 20th February 2023. The main body of the report highlights the key issues that were raised and outlines the recommended Council response. Recommended responses to all the main issues raised in the representations are set out in the Consultation Statement on the Publication Draft Plan (Appendix 1).

Appendix 2 recommends a schedule of suggested amendments to the Plan that are derived from the recommended responses. Officers consider that these amendments are needed to make the Publication Draft Plan 'sound'. If approved by full Council, they would be submitted to the Government alongside the Draft Plan. The amendments will then be considered by an independent Planning Inspector as part of the public examination (following submission of the Plan to Government).

Appendix 3 of the report lists recommended other minor amendments to the Plan to correct errors (mainly typographical) or update factual information that has altered since the Plan was approved by full Council in December 2022. These do not need to be considered by the Planning Inspector.

The proposed amendments are set out in a tracked change version of the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan at Appendix 4 (showing all the suggested changes that are listed in Appendices 2 and 3).

Appendix 5 provides a list of the 'submission documents' and, when relevant, refers to updated positions on these documents. Updates will generally have resulted in response to comments received as part of the public consultation, and/or owing to the iterative nature of these documents.

The report also sets out the timetable and process for submitting the Sheffield Plan to the Government for public examination.

6.2 RESOLVED: That Strategy and Resources Policy Committee:-

(a) endorses the recommended responses to the main issues raised in representations on the Publication Draft Plan set out in the Consultation Statement (Appendix 1);

(b) endorses the suggested amendments to the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan set out in Appendix 2 and shown as tracked changes within Appendix 4;

(c) endorses the suggested other minor amendments to the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan set out in Appendix 3 and shown as tracked changes within Appendix 4;

(d) notes the ongoing evidence updates with respect to the relevant 'submission documents' as set out in the main body of the report and within Appendix 5;

(e) delegates authority to the Chief Planning Officer, in consultation with the Chair, Deputy Chair and Spokesperson of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, to bring forward further minor amendments to the Publication

Draft Sheffield Plan and updates to associated documentation prior to consideration by full Council; and

(f) refers this report to full Council in accordance with the constitution to seek approval to submit the Draft Sheffield Plan and associated documentation to the Government for independent examination.

(NOTE: (1) The result of the vote on the resolution was FOR - 7 Members; AGAINST - 4 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members; and (2) During the discussion of the above item the Committee agreed, in accordance with Council Procedure rules, that as the meeting was approaching the two hours and 30 minutes time limit, the meeting should be extended by a period of 30 minutes).

6.3 Reasons for Decision

- 6.3.1 Once adopted, the new Sheffield Plan will make a major contribution to the future development of the city and will guide development over the next 15-20 years. It is important that the plan is adopted as soon as possible.
- 6.3.2 The documents that are the subject of this report (Part 1: Strategy, Sub-Area Policies and Site Allocations, Part 2: Development Management Policies, Annex A: Site Allocation Schedule, Annex B: Parking Guidelines, Policies Map and Glossary) comprise the draft development plan documents for Sheffield. They were published under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 (as amended). The submission documents will include such documents as fall within the definition at Regulation 17 (as agreed by full Council on 14th December 2022).
- 6.3.3 The suggested amendments to the Draft Sheffield Plan set out in Appendix 2 of this report (and shown as tracked changes in Appendix 4) may or may not be supported by the Inspector. The Planning Inspector will only consider whether the plan is sound and whether it complies with the legislation. However, proposing amendments now should help to save time at the public examination hearings. It also shows respondents to the consultation how the Council has been able to take on board their comments
- 6.3.4 The Draft Sheffield Plan represents the Council's firm proposals for the development of the city over the period to 2039. The public consultation, seeking views on the 'soundness' of the Plan is a required stage before the Draft Plan is submitted to the Government for public examination.
- 6.3.5 The recommendations reflect earlier decisions taken by full Council on 14th December 2022 for decisions on any desired amendments to the Plan to be taken by the Strategy & Resources Policy Committee and then full Council.

6.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

- 6.4.1 The options available to the Council in terms of proposing amendments to the Sheffield Plan are outlined in paragraphs 1.5.1 to 1.5.6 of the officer report. This will be a matter for the Strategy & Resources Committee and Full Council to

consider.

7. FUTURE SHEFFIELD MEMBERS ASSURANCE

7.1 The Chief Operating Officer submitted a report seeking agreement to put in place Member assurance for the Future Sheffield change programme.

7.2 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** That Strategy and Resources Policy Committee:-

(a) agrees the establishment of a Future Sheffield Members Working Group, as detailed in the report now submitted;

(b) agrees Councillor Fran Belbin – Deputy Leader, as the chair of said working group; and

(c) approves the appended Terms of Reference for the Future Sheffield Members Working Group.

7.3 Reasons for Decision

7.3.1 The recommendations are critical in ensuring that Future Sheffield has Member oversight and assurance.

7.4 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

7.4.1 Rely solely on officer assurance – this was rejected because it would not provide Members with assurance over the delivery of activities in Future Sheffield and would prevent Member input.

7.4.2 Provide Member updates via newsletters or written briefs – this was rejected because this engagement method would prevent direct involvement and would not enable constructive discussions to take place.

7.4.3 Provide Member assurance via regular reports to Strategy and Resources Committee - this was rejected because the amount of time that could be dedicated to Future Sheffield at committee meetings would be insufficient for the scale of the programme. Regular update and monitoring reports will however be brought to the committee to provide broader public oversight and transparency about the progress being made.