

## Petitions, Public Questions and Statements – Full Council

**Meeting Date: 2 October 2024**

*(Note: This document will be published prior to the Council meeting, containing details of statements received for the meeting and answers to questions relating to the remit of full Council. It will then be updated and re-published within 10 working days of the meeting, containing details of responses to petitions submitted to the meeting and answers to questions relating to items of business on the published agenda and supplementary questions relating to the remit of Full Council.)*

Details of ordinary petitions, and questions and statements received for this meeting from members of the public are set out below.

**Answers to questions relating to the remit of Full Council are published one clear day before the Council meeting.** These questions will not be asked and answered at the Full Council meeting.

All statements received from members of the public are published on the day prior to the Council meeting and circulated to all Members of the Council. If time allows, statements can be read out at the meeting. Statements do not require a response, but the Lord Mayor (as chair of the meeting) or Leader of the Council or relevant Committee Chair reserves the right to reply at the meeting.

Representations in relation to petitions can be made at the Council meeting, and the Leader of the Council or relevant Committee Chair will respond.

Questions relating to items of business on the published agenda and supplementary questions relating to the remit of Full Council (arising from the original written question and/or the response), can be asked at the meeting, and the Leader of the Council or relevant Committee Chair will respond. Written responses to both these types of questions are published within 10 working days of the meeting.

A period of up to 60 minutes shall be allocated at meetings of Full Council for members of the public to present ordinary petitions, ask questions and make statements. The order for receiving public participations within the allotted time is – 1) Petitions; 2) Agenda-Related Questions; 3) Supplementary Questions to the (Initial) Remit-Related Questions; 4) Statements (Agenda-related & Remit-related).

Questions (Remit)	Any received?	From	Response
<p>In October 2023 I purchased one of the Hall Park chalets, a council leasehold property. Since then, I've been confronted with multiple serious problems. There was a lack of transparency from the Council during the conveyancing process.</p> <p>After 48 hours in my new home, I was exposed to asbestos. I've since obtained information about an Asbestos Survey of the property from 2015 that identified 11 hazards.</p> <p><b>1. Why did the Council not share the findings of this survey during the purchase process?</b></p> <p>In response to resident's concerns, my MP visited the chalets with officers in 2022. In Spring 2023, the Council commissioned a survey after receiving complaints about damp and water ingress.</p> <p><b>2. (a) Why was information about these ongoing resident complaints not shared in the Leasehold Property Enquiries form?</b></p> <p><b>(b) Why were anticipated works to address the ongoing issues at the chalets not declared on the form?</b></p> <p>Earlier this year, the chalet above was flooded due to corroding heating pipes, rendering it uninhabitable. This is not the first instance of such an issue.</p>	Yes	Moira Gibbons	<p><b>From Councillor Zahira Naz (Chair of the Finance and Performance Policy Committee)</b></p> <p>1. The LPE1 asks us, as a landlord, to provide an asbestos report for the managed/common parts of the property. In accordance with legislation as Landlord we are not responsible for the asbestos inside a private property. We conducted an internal asbestos survey in 2015 due to works that were being carried out inside the property by our internal repairs team. This is common practice to ensure the safety of our operatives. As part of the sales process, we do not share any internal surveys as it is not required. As the property was privately owned at the point of sale, we would have no knowledge if the owner had changed any part of the property which meant the asbestos survey would no longer be relevant.</p> <p>2.a. The LPE1 form completed at the point of sale asks for reference to any formal disputes at which time there were none.</p> <p>b. At the time of the sale there were no planned works for these properties on any programme.</p> <p>3. The Council is committed to ensuring all properties remain safe and watertight and will ensure that any issues that occur are addressed in line with Council policy.</p>

<p><b>3. How many of the chalets will need to flood before the Council takes residents' concerns seriously and replaces corroding pipework?</b></p>			
<p>Supplementary Question?</p>	<p><b>Any received?</b></p>		<p><b>Response</b></p>
<p>1. I purchased 80 Hall Park Hill under a year ago for my retirement after 40 years working in the NHS. I planned carefully for my future mindful of my physical limitations. However, because of multiple, previously undisclosed, serious problems, the property is not somewhere I can make a home. Furthermore, it is unmarketable.</p> <p>Appendix C of the 2015 Asbestos Survey identifies ACMs that are presumed to be present in the structure of the property unless proven otherwise. As this information also covers parts of the managed building, why did the Council not share this report when completing the LPE1 form as it was legally obliged to do?</p> <p>2. In a letter dated 4 September, a Senior Council Officer stated that at the time of sale, it was understood and accepted that works were required. Legally defined, to anticipate is to expect something to happen or to know about something before it occurs. This being so, how can the Council contend that it did not have a duty to highlight that Section 20 works were anticipated on the LPE1 form given that the scheduling of such works within a programme would mean that they could no longer be construed as anticipated?</p>	<p>Yes</p>		<p><b>From Councillor Douglas Johnson (Chair of the Housing Policy Committee)</b></p> <p>1. It is the Vendor's responsibility to provide information about the property to future purchasers. The Vendor in this case was another private individual, not the Council. As part of the conveyancing process, Sheffield City Council, as the freeholder, provided the asbestos report dated 2011, in relation to the managed/common parts of the building as we were requested in your LPE1 form. You have confirmed this said there were no hazards indicated in that survey. The asbestos report which was conducted in 2015 was done due to works being undertaken by the Council inside this specific property and not in the common parts. The presumption referred to relates to asbestos in the items listed, not in the building itself. As the 2015 report related to the individual property, not the common parts, it was not requested or required in the LPE1 enquiry form as part of the sale process.</p> <p>2. The LPE1 form asks specifically "within the next 2 years, are any Section 20 works proposed to the Property?" At the time of the enquiry in May 2023, there were no planned works in our capital programme for these properties within the next two years. I understand that is still the case.</p>

			<p>I understand some emergency work was identified to stop an issue with a leak between the date of the enquiry and you moving in. As this repair was going to cost more than £250 per leaseholder we are required to issue s.20 notices. These works were not anticipated because the leak was unknown at the time of the LPE1 enquiry.</p>
<p>Will the Council please add their backing to the Veterans of this City, and those who wish to remember appropriately those who sacrificed their lives that we may live in freedom, by applying pressure to the English Football Association and the Police to alter the timing and, if possible, the date of the Sheffield United/Sheffield Wednesday football match from twelve noon Remembrance Sunday to a more appropriate time.</p>	<p>Yes</p>	<p>Patricia Davey</p>	<p><b>From Councillor Tom Hunt (Chair of the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee and Leader of the Council)</b></p> <p>Thank you for your question. Remembrance Sunday is an important day which honours those who serve to defend our democratic freedoms and way of life and provides a valuable opportunity to remember the service and sacrifice of the Armed Forces community from the UK and the Commonwealth.</p> <p>The scheduling of football matches is not determined by the local authority. This is done by the Football Association. As such I can confirm that Sheffield City Council played no part in decisions made about the date or timing of the Sheffield United versus Sheffield Wednesday fixture on Sunday 10<sup>th</sup> November.</p> <p>I understand that since you asked your question, the kick off time of the fixture has been moved from 12pm to 12:30pm.</p> <p>The changed time will enable everyone who wishes to attend both the Remembrance Service at 11:00am and the football fixture the opportunity to do so.</p> <p>When a football match takes place on a Remembrance Sunday, both football clubs pay</p>

			respects at the ground with their fans. We expect that fans from each team will show respect throughout the day on the 10 <sup>th</sup> November this year.
Supplementary Question?	Any received?		Response
	No		

Questions (Published Agenda)	Any received?	From	Response (Include link to minutes)
	None		

Page 5

Statements (Remit)	Any received?	From
	None	

Statements (Published Agenda)	Any received?	From
	None	

Petitions	Any received?	From	Response (Include link to minutes)
<p><b>Petition Calling on the Council to Implement a Residents' Parking Scheme in Crookes – 6 signatures - <a href="#">ePetition - Residents Parking Permits in Crookes   Sheffield City Council</a></b></p> <p>We the undersigned petition the Council to implement a residents parking scheme to encourage others who park on our street to use public transport. People who park their cars and then walk into town are causing congestion and problems for actual residents to find a parking space on their own road.</p> <p>This problem has been going on for a long time. Ever since Broomhill was parking permitted, this has caused people who are not willing to pay to use on-street parking to park further out of the city. They leave their vehicles all day, leaving little on-street parking for the residents of Crookes to park their vehicles.</p> <p>We pay high rents and mortgages to live in this area, but already competitive parking spaces are taken up by people visiting the area and leaving their cars for hours on end. A parking scheme</p>	Yes	Karen Littlewood	<p><b>From Councillor Ben Miskell (Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee)</b></p> <p>Thank you for your petition requesting permit parking in Crookes, which I know can be incredibly stressful.</p> <p>I want to explain that we do appreciate the vehicle parking in Crookes, and I'm aware of the pressures, especially during peak working hours.</p> <p>As you note, this is largely due to workers at the hospitals and university parking in the area, an issue that's been brought to my attention by your local councillors, Councillor Minesh Parekh and Councillor Ruth Milsom. I understand that they have been busy gathering evidence informally for some time and have also met with transport officers to discuss the feasibility of addressing the problem.</p> <p>As you may know, implementing schemes like permit parking is quite costly. To give you an idea of costs, a larger, area-wide scheme with permit parking and pay-and-display bays can cost over £500,000 to introduce.</p>

would encourage others to use public transport, or walk, or cycle to work, which would benefit the environment and public health. There are particular issues on Forres Road, Nairn Street and Lydgate Lane.

Unfortunately, covering just a few streets, as petitioners have proposed, often isn't viable due to the high costs and the risk of simply shifting the parking problem to nearby streets. That's why we need to think about solutions across a larger area, as well as tackle the root cause of the problem. It is therefore important to note that parking schemes are just one way to tackle the issue of over-demand.

Transport officers regularly engage with large employers to encourage more active and sustainable commuting options. This is part of a broader approach needed to address parking challenges in your area.

We also recognise the need for long-term solutions, particularly when it comes to commuter parking, and improving public transport is a key part of that.

I'm therefore pleased that South Yorkshire's Mayor, Oliver Coppard, has brought the trams back into public ownership and is working hard to bring buses under local control. Once that happens, we'll have more control over routes, timetables, and fares, making it easier for people to choose public transport for their commute.

In the end, this is fundamentally about addressing car-based commuting. We need a strategic approach, including improving public transport options, in order to tackle the issue effectively.

When we receive petitions, as part of the Constitutional requirements, I am required to suggest a way forward within our system of Governance, I

			would therefore like to refer this petition to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, for any further action that may be necessary.
--	--	--	--