

South West Local Area Committee

Meeting held 17 March 2022

PRESENT: Councillors Andrew Sangar (Chair), Joe Otten (Deputy Chair), Sue Alston, Roger Davison, Tim Huggan, Mohammed Mahroof, Barbara Masters, Ruth Milsom, Shaffaq Mohammed, Martin Smith and Cliff Woodcraft

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 An apology for absence was received from Councillor Colin Ross.

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

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

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 There were no declarations of interest.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING

4.1 The minutes of the meeting of the Committee held on 16th September 2021, were approved as a correct record.

5. TRANSITION TO COMMITTEES

5.1 The Committee received a presentation from Craig Rogerson (Democratic Services) on Sheffield's new committee system which, subject to approval by the Council, would become effective from May 2022.

5.2 Mr Rogerson referred to the reasons for the change to the Council's governance structure, and the work undertaken so far. He stated that the principal aim of the new structure was to put the voice of residents at the heart of the decision-making process, and that a report on the new arrangements was to be considered at an extraordinary meeting of the Council to be held on 23rd March, 2022.

5.3 Mr Rogerson highlighted the proposed changes to the Council's governance structure, indicating that there was to be a move from the current leader/Co-operative Executive model to a system of multiple new policy committees, which would have cross-party membership, with the regulatory committees and Local Area Committees remaining. He referred to the new toolkit to be used by the new policy committees, which contained a list of 12 options relating to how they

proposed to engage with the public.

5.4 Councillor Sue Alston, as a member of the Governance Committee, which had been involved in the change process, stated that the Committee had spent a considerable amount of time listening to what the public wanted in terms of a committee system which fully engaged with local residents.

5.5 The Committee noted the information reported as part of the presentation now made.

6. APPROVAL OF THE SOUTH WEST LOCAL AREA COMMUNITY PLAN 2022-23

6.1 The Committee received a presentation from Denise Devoto (South West Local Area Committee Manager) on the South West Local Area Community Plan 2022/23.

6.2 The Plan comprised three sections, the first setting out information on what Local Area Committees (LACs) were, and including details of the members of the South West LAC and the officer team supporting the LAC. The second section contained specific information on the south west area, including statistical data, and the third section set out the South West Community Plan for 2022/23.

6.3 Ms Devoto reported on the funding for the LAC, both in respect of the South West Ward pots and the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL), and the three themes that the Committee would focus on (Transport and Highways, Local Environment and Community and Neighbourhoods). She provided a summary of issues not included in the Plan, which it was proposed would be referred to the relevant policy committees once the Council's new governance structures had been agreed, and concluded by reporting on what work the Committee would undertake going forward.

6.4 At the conclusion of the presentation, a series of breakout groups were organised which comprised members of the public in attendance, a Council officer and a Member of the Committee leading the discussion. Each group was asked to discuss a number of issues, including what their initial thoughts were on the Community Plan, what were the key things for 2022/23 that they thought the LAC should deliver this year and how they would like to be involved in delivering some of the actions. The Members of each group then summarised the comments raised at each table, as follows:-

The general feedback in terms of the contents of the Community Plan was very positive.

In terms of key priorities for 2022/23, the following comments were received:-

- Review of pedestrian crossings in the area
- Safer routes to schools

- encourage more walking and cycling, as well as having more traffic control officers
- concerns regarding idling cars and parking near schools
- need to expand the School Streets Projects

- Need for better enforcement action regarding inappropriate/illegal parking

- Need for additional activities to engage people of all ages

- Firmer action and stronger enforcement required in terms of crime and anti-social behaviour. Need for improved response from the police, including outcomes and fines

- Need to identify community hubs

- Renewable energy
 - Need to look at ways in how people could become more self- sufficient
 - The LAC presented an ideal opportunity to look at suitable initiatives

- Need to set smart targets in the Plan due to concerns as to what was actually achievable, and to include timings

- Need for an increased focus on the parks in the area, including the need for additional funding for facilities

- Speed Watch - look at how the public could assist in monitoring and collecting data on traffic speeds

- Recycling
 - Look at what other items could be recycled and look at other schemes, such as leaving items out on the street for use by others
 - Need for information in terms of how/what/where items were recycled.

- Need to get older people into schools to learn skills, such as ICT

- Need to get more younger people involved in the Community Plan

- Need for more facilities/activities for young people, particularly teenagers. Need for a mapping exercise regarding such facilities

- Concerns regarding the isolation of people of all ages, but mainly older people living on their own. Need to expand the people Keeping Well initiative

- Need for improved support for business fora, and need to help businesses access funding to improve the local area

- Concerns regarding the quality of the local bus service

- Concerns that this approach has been tried in the past, through the Area

Panels, Community Assemblies and Local Area Partnerships, without too much success

- Need to focus on something large-scale and radical, to give the LAC some credibility, as opposed to several small priorities which may not be achievable.
- Community Infrastructure Levy monies should be spent in the area
- Need for clarity regarding the link between the LAC and the relevant policy committee, following the introduction of the new committee system
- Fly tipping – need for better enforcement action taken against perpetrators
- Need for a critical path in terms of what the LAC was proposing with regard to delivery - need for clarity in terms of how projects would be delivered
- Need to make sure the LACs worked together, city-wide, and not just within their respective boundaries, and including different sectors
- Dog fouling - stronger enforcement action required as current methods not working
- Car parking problems, particularly on the Abbeydale Road corridor - suggest more park and ride schemes to encourage use of those car parks currently being underused
- Need to work better/closer with schools, making use of their excellent facilities, such as open spaces.

6.5 RESOLVED: That:-

- (a) approval be given to the South West Community Plan 2022/23 as a statement of the priorities of the area;
- (b) authority be given to the Community Services Manager to produce a final version of the Community Plan document, incorporating any amendments approved by the LAC at this meeting, and to publish it on the webpages of the South Local Area Committee; and
- (c) notes that future LAC decisions relating to funding must fit with the priorities set out in the Community Plan and following engagement with the community.

6.6 Reasons for Decision

The proposal to approve the South West LAC Community Plan is recommended on the basis that the Plan provides a clear framework in how the LAC will direct its resources to address key issues identified through community consultation.

6.7 Alternatives Considered and Rejected

None. A key element in establishing LACs is the principle that each LAC will develop a Community Plan.

7. UPDATE ON WARD POTS AND COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY FUNDS/SPEND

7.1 The Committee received a presentation from Denise Devoto on the South West Ward Pots and Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) spend for 2021/22.

7.2 Ms Devoto reported on what the ward pots and CIL funds were, and referred to the allocations made from both the ward pots and through the CIL funds, to groups/organisations in each of the four wards in 2021/22.

7.3 The Committee noted the information reported as part of the presentation now made.

8. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

8.1 The Committee received the following questions from members of the public who had submitted the questions prior to the meeting:-

(a) Tim Hodgson

I am unable to attend the meeting this week, but wish to give my views on Riverdale Road parking and Notre Dame School. I have sent numerous emails to Councillor Sue Alston about this issue and she has done her best to help, but I feel the only way forward is for Notre Dame School to take the issue seriously, particularly the parking at the top of Riverdale Road/Fulwood Road at school starting and finishing times.

The selfishness of parents is extraordinary, and one day someone will be knocked over as a result. Parents park on double yellow and single yellow lines and rarely is any action taken. The lines are pointless if wardens do not patrol the area on a regular basis (I am certain they could issue numerous fines on a daily basis if they did). Unless Notre Dame take the issue seriously, all this is hot air and a waste of time.

I have always felt they have little regard for the school neighbourhood. I am certain teacher parking could be negotiated with local car parks at the Florentine and Canton Orchard (but this would require a payment which Riverdale Road does not charge for). I hope you can find a way forward with the school before a pupil is injured or worse killed due to selfish and lazy parking.

A full written response would be sent to Mr Hodgson.

(b) Christopher Pennell

As I understand it, the LAC system was set up in advance of the successful Sheffield governance referendum so that its current role is confined to pre-referendum thinking. In short, the transitional process for determining how the

Council will be run may yet significantly change the role of LACs. In particular, it may be the case that that role will change in a way which requires the LACs to have significantly wider powers and broader budgets. This being so, it is extraordinarily difficult to prepare a reliable forward annual plan for a LAC when the role and powers and budget of each LAC may change within 3 months: I sympathise with your difficulty.

However, it is useful in the meantime to speculate about what role the LACs might have, such as:

1. They may have delegated powers to address specific issues in each of the seven LAC Areas, and have budgets to fund positive action on those issues. So far as LACs are currently defined, those areas where such powers and budgets exist are extraordinarily modest – and not requiring 12 councillors and several officers to spend so much time on them (as was said at the last meeting) – such as the ward pots and fly-tipping. I for one would find it wasteful of my time to attend my LAC meetings if the LAC's executive powers remain as limited as they now are.
2. They may have a role in better publicising Council initiatives and third party initiatives which could be useful for local communities to be aware of (such as grant schemes and coronavirus measures). This is already happening on a hit and miss basis, but could be got onto a more organised basis as the LACs develop and as community channels get more clearly defined.
3. They may have a role in giving the chance to local communities to say to the Council what they want of their Council and to comment constructively on citywide schemes as they might impact on specific localities. The key problem here is how open-ended is the range of subject areas where LACs can 'advise' the wider Council decision-makers on how to make their initiatives more sensitive to the needs and wishes of the wide range of different communities in Sheffield.

This brings me to the breadth of issues which a LAC might get involved in. If a LAC's role is principally focussed on 1 above, the relevant issues are currently very narrow and, even if they are extended post-transition in May this year, they are unlikely to become massive. On the other hand the issues to be covered by LACs under 3 above could be relatively unlimited if the LACs turn into locally based pressure groups for better reflection of local characteristics and needs in overall Council thinking and decision-making.

This brings me to Slide 10 in the current SW Community Plan pack. In so far as this slide attempts to define 'what we know about the SW Area', it is overwhelmingly confined to the people in the SW – as to their number, age, ethnicity, educational attainment, health, gender, income, deprivation levels, plus housing tenures and the main working sectors. And yet, when you asked local people what they liked about their area, they said overwhelmingly from Slide 17 countryside, green space, parks and trees and the closeness to both the Peak District and to the city, and what they wanted to see improved, they said transport and highways. What this suggests to me is that there is an enormous gap so far in how this Area Plan chooses to define the SW Area. It talks predominantly about its

people, but neglects the environment within which they live; and yet that environment is one huge significant feature which distinguishes the SW from most of the other LAC Areas. These LAC plans surely need to describe the differing environments within which the occupants of each LAC live, and highlight what the occupants value in their environment and what they would like to improve. There almost seems to be a sense that the LACs are avoiding matters which might be regarded as more the preserve of Planning and yet surely Planning must have regard to the variety of environments which Sheffielders live in with an eye for what needs protecting and what needs to be improved. There is a danger that these plans will focus solely on what needs improving because that is the obvious role of an active Council; but it may neglect the areas where protection of what is valued is regarded as a vital activity just as much as improving what is inadequate. For example, surely we are allowed to assume from the consultative responses that there is a strong consensus in the SW that people value their closeness to a National Park, the openness of the Green Belt and the availability of good quality green space and ecosystems services, and that therefore they would expect the Council to safeguard those benefits just as much as improving poor public transport and better managing speeding and parking.

I am under no illusion that the SW of Sheffield is a good deal better off than many other areas of Sheffield which do not enjoy the easy relationship with beautiful landscapes, recreational green spaces and ecosystem benefits as we do; so, of course, the greater effort needs to be put into active improvements in facets of life elsewhere in the city. But that does not justify neglecting the active need to protect and enhance what is environmentally good, while also improving what is poor elsewhere. I am fearful that a plan for the SW which fails to address this important particular characteristic of the SW because it doesn't fit the presumed role for LACs will sell our area short.

A full written response would be sent to Mr Pennell.

(c) Alan Kewley

I've been trying to follow this process of change since the original People's Petition in 2019 triggered a city-wide Referendum, postponed until 6 May 2021. This resulted in the establishment of 7 Local Area Committees throughout the city. The new South West LAC presented its proposals in Sept 2021, with more details in February 2022, now to be discussed & implemented by May 2022.

I assume the main purpose of these changes is to give the electorate more influence on decision-making processes in their City Council. But this would require more transparency to enable them to be more aware of, understand & comment-on any proposals, so that adjustments could be made before Decisions are implemented. This may require focus groups on particular issues in the Wards affected.

About 33% of the electorate responded to the city-wide Referendum in May 2021, mostly in favour of change. Their new South-West LAC then called an introductory meeting on 16th September, 2021, which I attended and submitted questions. Its detailed proposals were published later in February 2022, to be discussed at its

next public meeting on 17th March 2022, which I plan to attend.

Section 4 in the draft Community Plan gives details of responses from the four Wards in the SW LAC area. But these percentages could be misleading, for only about 2% of the local electorate actually responded to these surveys. I suggest a wider response is desirable before any big decisions are made.

My previous questions in September 2021 (attached) suggested that the main dialogue with Local Electorates should be via Ward Forums & their elected Councillors, with suitable support. I'd now welcome a fuller response to my email from September 2021 as below

PUBLIC QUESTIONS FROM 16TH SEPTEMBER –

1) I welcome this long-overdue review, but would request a pause for thought, to enable local electorates to consider these proposals more carefully, including the need for Ward Forums, to give citizens easier access to our City Council's new devolved decision-making processes.

2) The City Council's main website has become too complex to provide easy access to information on local issues. Could local websites be introduced at LAC or Ward level to provide better access to local information, rather than the junk emails which are now being sent-out & received ?

3) Who is responsible for Scrutinizing this new process to ensure its Effectiveness & Good Value, and How do they plan to get feedback from the electorate?

A full written response would be sent to Mr Kewley.

(d) Don Lennox

(1) “The Adult & Social Care update report of the City Council refers to a new model of home care which is planned to be ‘neighbourhood based’”

What does this mean for the South West Area?

The context for the question are the issues identified in the draft LAC plan:

- Working with PKW team
- Increasing the use of community assets
- Encouraging volunteering
- Loneliness

In addition, the Care & Wellbeing Home Care model, as one of its foundations, that it should be neighbourhood based and have ‘clear links’ with the ‘voluntary sector’.

In response, Chris Boyle, Commissioning Officer, Adult Social Care stated that the Council recognises that, at present, the home care sector, both locally and nationally, is experiencing significant challenges, particularly in relation to

recruitment and retention of care workers. This can impact upon people in receipt of care and their families and carers. The Council has developed, and is now enacting, plans for transforming how home care is organised and delivered across Sheffield, including therefore the South-West of the city.

There are multiple strands to this work. One of the first elements is what we have termed a 'controlled implementation' of the new Care & Wellbeing model. The term 'controlled implementation' refers to the process of implementing the foundations for the model in several adjacent areas in the city, creating the opportunity for learning and building an evidence-base over the following two years. The 'development partner' (responsible for care delivery) will collaborate with the project team, local stakeholders, and SchARR (evaluation partner, Sheffield University) to collectively develop and evaluate the new model. There will be a strong focus on listening to people in receipt of care, their carers and families, and their care workers, to develop and refine the model. The procurement process for the development partner commenced on 1st February 2022 and the contract is scheduled to start at the end of May.

The development partner will be required establish an office / base within the controlled implementation area. At the outset, they will commit to quickly developing excellent knowledge and understanding of the local communities and build links with statutory services and voluntary, community and faith organisations (VCF) in the area. The development partner will also consider innovative ways they are able to play an active role in the community and will explore the potential for partnership working with the VCF sector, care homes or educational sites, which may facilitate both innovative options for supporting people to achieve outcomes and reduce reliance on formal support, while also enhancing the resources of the local community.

The controlled implementation is taking place in the Uppertorpe, Netherthorpe and Walkley areas, so will not be of immediate impact for the South-West. However, another significant element of the transformation will be the re-procurement of contracts for home care services for all areas of Sheffield in early 2023. It is not possible to share many details of the new contract at present because this is under development and commercially sensitive, however it will be informed by the learning from, and principles of, the controlled implementation, including establishing strong links with other services and stakeholders in the community, and being organised in geographical areas that support joint-working. This is most likely to be the 7 Adult Social Care 'localities', which are the same boundaries as the Local Area Committees.

A full written response would be sent to Mr Lennox.

(2) Question from 16th September, 2021

The Sheffield Plan says there should be smaller homes and "older peoples' independent living accommodation" in Ecclesall (Greystones area). There is derelict land at the top of Murray Road – old garages / abandoned cars / old buildings. This could be a suitable site. How could this be achieved?

An initial response had been sent to Mr Lennox early January 2022, but a further written response would be sent to him after the meeting, which would also respond to a further note he provided to Ms Devoto and Councillor Andrew Sangar at this meeting (17th March, 2022).

(e) Joanne Meaney

I wanted to present the question that Long Line Residents Association and Ringinglow Village Residents would like to table at the Committee meeting on 17th March 2022.

Long Line Residents Association and Ringinglow Village Residents:-
Traffic speed and “rat-running” are significant and particular problems in this part of the city. There is an absence of long-term physical measures to control traffic speed and dissuade people from using long straight country lanes to travel at speed regardless of the topography of the narrow lane and with limited regard to other users of these lanes. Resources need to be prioritised to meet these challenges, whilst smiley faces have an initial impact there is a diminishing impact over time and only physical restrictions, for example road narrowing have long term impact and return on investment for all.

In terms of supplementary evidence, please find attached the report recently used against a planning application, which contains accident and usage data for the area.

A full written response would be sent to Ms Meaney.

8.2 The Committee received the following question from Mike Hodson, who raised it at the meeting:-

Will the LAC take notes of the diversion between its response to questions about public involvement in decision-making, with the aspirations of the Council leadership to involve the public more in decision-making for the policy committees, and how could this dilemma be solved?

In response, the Chair stated that the Council was undergoing a major change, which involved the establishment of LACs in 2021, and it was hoped that the public appreciated how the Council was trying to find a way of using the LACs to encourage public participation. The Council was in the process of moving from a Cabinet/Scrutiny system to a committee system, which would hopefully make its decision-making process more inclusive. The Council had an aspiration to engage with as many people as possible in connection with its public policy implementation, and LACs would play a major part of this process.

A full written response would be sent to Mr Hodson.