

# 2021 Public Engagement – Collated feedback about Governance Framework

## Overview

Below is the amalgamated feedback based on the public engagement sessions that have been delivered as part of the Transition to Committee Programme, including written submissions.

The aim of the sessions have been to provide early engagement with members of the public on key themes and areas that comprise the move to the committee model of governance whilst it is still being formed and discussed. The sessions have been organised by officers, supported by the Centre for Scrutiny and Governance (CfGS) as independent advisors and overseen by Alexander Polak (Assistant Director of Governance).

Five sessions have been run so far, as follows

### Session 1

An invite-only discussion amongst key stakeholders who had previously identified themselves as interested parties, with the purpose of sharing information about plans and progress to date, and importantly asking for input into how to best conduct the council's engagement process over the coming months. This was facilitated and planned with the support of Jacqui McKinley from the Centre for Governance and Scrutiny and Nigel Slack, self-described Active Citizen, who provided a continuity link back to the Big City Conversation at this and subsequent events.

### Sessions 2 & 3

The remaining sessions 2-5 were open to the public and advertised via Sheffield Council comms channels. At first most attendees were already known to the council as people or organisations with an active interest in local authority governance, but the ratio of new faces has increased over time.

The second session was an in-person event at St Marys on the 22<sup>nd</sup> October and the third session was a virtual session that was run on Zoom on the evening of the 26<sup>th</sup> October. Both sessions followed the same agenda;

1. Introduction - Jacqui McKinlay – Centre for Governance and Scrutiny
  - Nigel Slack – Active Citizen also introduced the in-person session
2. Scene Setting - Alex Polak – Assistant Director (Governance)
3. Facilitated breakout sessions
4. Design Principles 1 - Facilitator Frances West (SCC)
  - SCC...is a trusted organisation where decisions are taken in an open and transparent way, and accountability is clear.

- SCC... is a council where all councillors are involved in and able to influence decision making
- 5. Design Principles 2 – Facilitator - Jacqui McKinlay (CfGS)
  - SCC...engages, involves and listens to citizens, communities and partners
  - SCC...has a modern and responsive approach to governance which reflects the increasingly complex policy making environment
  - SCC...is a reflective council that is committed to continuously improving governance
- 6. New ways of working (how the committee system works) – Discussion around the framework. Facilitator - Alex Polak (SCC).
- 7. New ways of working (how citizens get involved). Facilitator - Laurie Brennan (SCC)

#### Session 4

The fourth session was an in-person event on the evening of 8<sup>th</sup> November at the Vestry Hall in Burngreave.

The session had the following agenda:

1. Introduction - Jacqui McKinlay – Centre for Governance and Scrutiny
2. Scene Setting - Alex Polak – Assistant Director (Governance)
3. Facilitated breakout sessions
  - How the Committees should be organised – what should each committee focus on? Facilitator - Gillian Duckworth (SCC)
  - How should new committees work and link with Local Area Committees and other democratic decision-making groups? Facilitator - Jacqui McKinlay (CfGS)
  - How do we hold decision-makers to account - do we need separate scrutiny Committees? Facilitator - Alex Polak (SCC).

#### Session 5

The fifth session was a virtual event held on the 24<sup>th</sup> November

At the time of writing, the session was due to focus on the same areas as the in-person event on the 8<sup>th</sup>, however it was anticipated that the topics may alter at the last minute in light of the publication of committee papers earlier that week.

Feedback from this session is not yet incorporated into this document.

#### Written submissions

A small number of written submissions have been received as part of this exercise, primarily from individuals or organisations who felt there wasn't time at the workshops to put their full views across, after allowing fair time for other participants to speak. This approach has been most welcome and constructive for the wider

listening exercise, and so it is important that the written submissions are given the same weight and attention as the verbal comments captured. All written submissions have been fully incorporated into the summary below, with the exception of the submission from Its Our City, which is of a format which lends itself better to inclusion in full.

# Feedback about the Governance Framework

## Committee System Discussion Framework

### Overarching ideas

- Many people are pretty sceptical about this whole idea.
- There are lots of different models for what democracy is, what it should be, what it means to be elected and what your role and purpose is if you are elected. Many councillors don't realise that they hold views on this, they don't realise that the way they think about democracy and their roles is just one of many ways of thinking about it. For example do they see themselves as a simple channel for, and amplifier of, local voices, or as a delegate who is supposed to make informed decisions in the best interests of residents, even if they disagree?
- Politics in Sheffield feels like it's always on a war footing. The language and tone used by councillors in public settings like Council meetings is inappropriately rude and aggressive, but they get away with it! If you don't change this culture, the rest of this is sunk
- Need a better system for holding members to account for their behaviour, not just for their decisions
- The Council needs to make the most of the hung council opportunity to work with everyone amongst their differences - A culture of collaboration is what we want.
- Hansard do an annual audit of political engagement at a national level. Could we bring somebody in to do this periodically in Sheffield, could help build trust
- How do you make the city as a whole less dependent on the Council? It is like a crutch, this is a bad thing.
- The committee model is confusing with the LAC also happening. LAC is muddying the waters.
- The current four-year voting cycle within the council is a big blocker and needs to be addressed. Having 1/3 of the members up for election three out of every 4 years is disruptive to ctee system. An all-out election system is better, as more stable practices within decision making processes. Changing this would be an important step
- With good governance, the voice in the community will be very strong.
- Council doesn't reflect diversity but needs to. Including across committees.
- In committees, need a safe space for people to be real, without feeling that their jobs are at risk. The committees need private space as well as public, transparent decision-making.
- Many UK cities/large councils already use committees to make decisions (including Core Cities, larger than Sheffield). SCC's decisions are not fundamentally different to, or more numerous than other cities/large councils. So, no reason to think the shape of Sheffield's system needs to be fundamentally different from the norm.
- All councils changing to an MCS have explicitly done it without increasing costs or bureaucracy. Surely, Sheffield will follow this national blueprint?
- Costs - Based on the national MCS design norms & meeting frequency, cost/meeting (provided by SCC officers) and existing SCC allowances for committee chairs - £49,000/year less than SCC's old system (6 themed ctees meeting 12 times per year)

- Gives scope to, e.g., incentivise community stakeholders
- Committee chairs & vice-chairs both have allowances
- Vice-chairs must also play important role & so have an allowance in the new system, that they didn't before
- All councils have explicitly decided from the start that change to an MCS will be cost-neutral

### Full Council

- The elephant in the room is that we all know Full Council is a pantomime. All roads may lead to Council but since that setting is always stitched up in advance this is unhelpful. This is why scrutiny or some alternative body needs to have a meaningful independent oversight role to hold Full Council to account.
- My feeling about full Council is that it's theatre; not a good look if you're a member of the public wanting answers
- This idea of call-in at Full Council – what is the purpose of this and the impact on the committees?

### Leaders Role

- We want to see the Leaders Role as safe-guarder of constitution and local democracy. More strategic in purpose.
- They are accountable to ward and other councillors from their party but what about all the citizens outside their ward and outside the wards of their party members?
- There should be a male and female Leader jointly doing the role
- Should the role rotate between the parties like the mayoralty?
- Should the Leader's power be checked so that it is easier for them to be politically neutral?
- It appears they will have very little legal power in the new system but still plenty of political power
- When there's no overall control the deputy Leader should be from another party (same at all committees)
- Monitoring officer lost a lot of power in recent years

### Lord Mayors Role

- No specific feedback

### Themed committees

- Communities in Sheffield are not listened to and if they are, it is not being brought forward. Themes should be around the social determinants of society
- Disability Access Liaison Group is not a committee, but the people involved in it apparently feel like it has a powerful effect, it feels like an independent group which manages to influence policy and decision-makers, e.g. in the way the Council consults on new schemes. Sheffield Transport for All is a similar idea. Could this be a model for how voices of interest groups are heard at decision-making-committee-level?
- Housing have implemented a new rule which has led to the formation of a group of tenants feeding back to the council about their role as landlord, this seems to feel good and influential too.
- What about independent Chairs of committees? They should not be attached to the council – they could be part of the universities etc.

- Old committees had a more clustered model for example bringing adults and children's services together has been a benefit, as previously there were no communications between disability services and adults services
- Example of Committee Remits (Just examples. Sheffield will choose remits to best fit the challenges it faces) 1. Education, Children & Families 2. Housing, Health & Social Care 3. Climate change, Environment, Transport & Development 4. Communities, Equalities & Culture 5. Business, Regeneration & Investment 6. Long-term Strategy & Governance
- 'up to ten' sounds a bit worryingly big – surely that's far too many to be efficient and accountable?
- Seems like instead of 3-10 you should have 3 committees or as few as possible the number of councillors involved should depend on the number of councillors in the committees rather than the number of committees. It has to be politically proportioned. There is a fine balance between too many councillors' to policy issues
- It's hard for the public to say which policies should go together I think it should be a number like 6 committees as it's the same number that other similarly sized cities do and is a lower cost than 10 committees.
- Deciding a number might have to be a process of trial and error.
- Number of members on each committee should depend on the size of the work that committee must do.
  - Maybe they should rotate frequently – short terms of membership on committees
  - Changing committee members every year gives them the opportunity to hide from responsibilities. It would be better if councillors stay in longer instead of an individual making a mess in one place then moving to another committee to make the same sort of mistakes.
- A Modern Committee system for a city the size of Sheffield, based on similar councils, will have: 6 policy committees (Maximum. Some have fewer), 14 councillors per committee, Around the same number of meetings for each councillor compared to the previous system. Cost of this for SCC = £49,000/year less than old system.
- 6 committees is the norm. Replaces the 10 councillors in the cabinet (No reason for 10 members with portfolios in 'strong leader' system – just the legal maximum). Each Policy committee gets the remit from Full Council to make decisions in its policy area. No 'Executive' committee (recommend from national experts)
- There should be roles for the business community in committees
- Things that are going wrong is giving businesses too much of a chance to say what they want, licencing should be priority e.g., barriers for cane users. The deals and approaches in Kelham Island when trying to get into the bakery areas without drop kerbs forcing cane and wheelchair users onto the road instead of the pavement
- There should be a group of people who are a part of the councillors table, if those affected were at the table designing the systems those individuals would not feel left out. **If we start off at a good point a lot of issues would already be ticked off**
- Co-opting people onto these committees sounds good if it brings in more knowledge but maybe they shouldn't have voting rights as they are not elected?
- New committees should have an obligation to consult communities (without overwhelming them)

- When chairs are from the administration deputy chairs should all be from other groups. Would send a message.
- 14 councillors per committee (Legally, must be politically proportionate)
- Chairs (of 6 ctees) should be politically proportionate: Labour 3, LibDem 2, Green 1. Vice-chairs from a different party to the chair
- I Would like stability with councillors sticking around for more than 3 years, but I understand that councillors depend on the political party at the time, you need to have a continuous way of working when councillors change.
- What happens if your own local councillor isn't on a particular committee? Does that mean your own interests aren't and can't be represented?
- Regarding this call for consensus - If parties on a committee disagree on an a issue is that really a problem? Different viewpoints is what you would hope for on an effective team.
- Should all committees operate on a simple majority for decisions, or should the threshold be higher to encourage this way of working?
- Committee chairs & vice-chairs [should] both have allowances. Vice-chairs must also play important role & so have an allowance in the new system, that they didn't before
- Typical frequency of meetings
  - Committees do not need lots of meetings to make better informed decisions than the limited time/knowledge available from 1 Cabinet member
  - The 5 Policy committees meet 12 times/year
  - Full council meets 6 times/year
  - Long-term Strategy committee meets 6 times/year
  - Old scrutiny committees not needed. Built into the decision-making process (~21 fewer meetings/year for SCC)
  - Councillors will go to around the same number of meetings as before

### Overarching Committee

- If you have overarching committee you risk going back to an Executive, especially if one party has an overall majority and the whole idea of referendum was to move away from one party monopolising.
- Moving to a more consultative, cross-party approach is important.
- An overarching committee needs a different name. It is strategic coordination, that's central to it and needs to focus on tone, culture etc

### Local Area Committees

- LACs seem to be part of the new design. Concerned about these as they are blunt instrument. Just 7 across the whole city. How will they succeed when other similar schemes have not worked? Big differences at each of the LACs according to people who have attended a few. Only pay lip service – something needs to change with these but not sure of the answer. A distraction at the moment from democratic change.
- What should their future be? What is their role? Lots of confusion about their role amongst local people.
- There needs to be more clarity around what a LAC is, what it's responsible for and what the committees will be responsible for and how public engagement plugs into both. "So many issues are city-wide, so this might frustrate people who turn up to LACs if the LACs' role is mostly just to be an ear to the ground"

- What is the proposed solution to people and groups who are based on the boundaries between two groups? (Lucky you! You get two LACs representing you...)
- If LACs have the power to make changes in their local areas and meaningfully run things differently, will various issues become a postcode lottery? And will inconsistency creep in on things like approach to street furniture? Will we just end up with seven district councils under one city council?
- There are historic perceptions that various parts of the city get more support than others. Is this playing out at or via LACs?
- Consistency is important when it comes to accessibility – it is actually a bit of an issue that the LACs operate in such different ways (and that some are better than others re accessibility)
- We think some areas the LACs have been much better than others... and the engagement has been better in some areas than others. Are the other areas learning from them? And how are they learning from them?
- More budget would make all the difference
- Been to 5/7 LACs so far, no strategic aim or vision seen so far
- Attendance at NE LAC meeting was alienating. Held in a sports hall, seats 2m apart as it should be. All Councillors sitting together, not distanced or masked at tables in a long row, they had microphones and I felt like the audience. The Chair did more talking than anyone. This is not community involvement, this is paying lip service
- Digital is the way to do this e.g. have a LAC based citizen type app to register interest in issues or report issues. If people get that feedback loop, can see services being delivered in their area. Recognise also need to cope with digital divide too
- Need to get some quick wins, LACs set up in hurry, not sure how to measure how successful they'll be. The LAC survey is very simplistic, just three questions. We're then expected to get a local plan from that in Jan. If system is to work, people need to understand how it works. Experience in LAC meetings, people didn't know how it worked. People need to understand how to engage with LACs, we need better communications to get the message out.
- From South side to North side, people should have same level of investment and services. For e.g., now living in Dore, phone with a problem, addressed immediately. In Burngreave, you can see the same derelict houses from 40yrs ago. Money spent, but not in right places. Then community gets blame. People who live here don't have a say, and people don't feel they have a say.
- LACs aren't politically proportionate, so they're as bad as the old cabinet in that specific way – whatever party has local majority can control that LAC. Is this democratic?
- LACs need to find some way of rewarding people for being involved, incentive. Spending money isn't incentive and should be happening anyway.
- LACs have been given money, coming up with a plan. The community would benefit from more physical contact in all local areas. Similar to Citizens Advice, a place where you can go, a hub for engaging with the council.
- LACs have two areas of focus; interact and spend money. If there's not much money to spend, can they get involved in other committees? What are the Check point for LACs, how will we know if they are they being successful?
- LACs not diverse or representative, they need to listen/interact with whole community, not just those that come forward, even those who don't vote. The Cllrs in a LAC could all be from a single party, so not everyone's represented.

## Statutory Scrutiny

- Old scrutiny committees not needed. Built into the decision-making process (~21 fewer meetings/year for SCC)
- Don't use the word 'Scrutiny' – that word means something to Councillors but means nothing to the public. Need a new word to represent the new system
- We want the Council to challenge *issues* not just *decisions* e.g., Health & Wellbeing inequalities, Race inequalities
  
- What is the purpose of scrutiny, is it an 'are we on the right track?' committee or is it about making sure people don't abuse power?
- The purpose should be to:
  - Give people what they need
  - Ensure that people are heard
  - 'Action and Collective' – don't just listen to us, take action with us
  
- Previous Scrutiny model didn't work – people didn't know what the Scrutiny committees were for, and everything was based around cabinet and their power – no direct link between cabinet roles and Scrutiny roles, e.g., there was a cabinet member for CYP, but no Scrutiny member for CYP
- In the previous model, Scrutiny seemed to simply mean 'proportional political representation' – what about the Scrutiny of diversity, e.g., of the inclusion / exclusion of marginalised groups?
- The previous committee system (before cabinet system), and current Scrutiny committees did bring in community experts which was a positive
  
- Scrutiny in the old system needed to be strengthened and have more power to force change as it has not been effective in the past - How effective is Scrutiny, if Scrutiny can't make decisions?
- How can we give scrutiny control over the budget so that the chairs of the committees don't just nod their own budgets through at the overarching committee, if that committee is just made up of committee chairs?
- A need to think about how SCC works with partner organisations, and how Scrutiny can be communicated beyond SCC's responsibility for a committee's theme. E.g., housing committee – not just thinking about Council housing, but housing in a wider context
- Danger that a new environment will throw decision-making awry, if for example the city faces a brand-new challenge that doesn't fit into one of the new committees, and therefore the new committee system doesn't have the expertise to address it, resulting in reliance on other agencies
- Would 3 political parties self-scrutinising each other work? Seems like there would always be an incentive to maintain the status quo. Need some scrutiny from non-councillors.

## Types of potential scrutiny

- There should be a 'scrutiny and oversight' committee with an elected independent Chair
  - Non-councillor stands for election on a 3 year term.
  - Is directly elected by the people of Sheffield
  - Apolitical role, shouldn't be aligned to a party, not elected by councillors

- Scrutiny and oversight cttee must have the power of budgetary veto (go / no go) on major projects
- Ideas should only work if this treasury committee chaired by a non-councillor agrees
- Whatever scrutiny is, it should not be whipped, must have independence
- What chance do the public get to scrutinise?
  - We never get an opportunity to comment on decisions. Putting this in place would increase accountability, there is a need for a mechanism to ask for feedback, consult and record and dissent received through consultation
  - Community groups are a part of the city as well as being a community, and shouldn't be considered in isolation, but as part of the whole
  - For local issues, ensure Scrutiny by having the decisions physically made in the local area in question – increases transparency
  - Local residents need to get involved in the area and with each other, in order to then get involved with decisions
  - How to choose *who* represents the area?
  - Communicate decisions needing to be made with communities in advance
  - Use schools, churches, mosques, supermarkets to get messages to residents
  - How to ensure that every community is able to make its voice heard?
  - Hear us, but don't then ignore what we say
  - Community Infrastructure Levy - £90million still unspent, yet some areas have still seen no investment. Where is the residents of these areas' opportunity to challenge this?
- Could LACs be used as a mechanism for the public to provide Scrutiny on committees' decisions or as independent Scrutiny?
- An external Scrutiny body would be a good idea – not associated with SCC
  - Members appointed, or elected through a committee
  - Sourced from the voluntary sector? Voluntary sector tends to unite the local organisations and know the feelings on the ground in a community
  - Different community representatives could be brought in for Scrutiny, depending on the matter at hand. E.g., community nurses for health & social care decisions
  - Ensure that the voices of the seldom heard, are heard
- Scrutiny should naturally be built in to cttee system as committees will be cross-party. If there need for a separate scrutiny role, could this be focused on officer decisions?
- There should still be room for things to be called in and scrutinised. The model for Scrutiny would depend on how broad the committees' remits are
- During the pandemic, SCC has carried out Scrutiny on the impact of the pandemic on different groups within the city – want to ensure that this continues, and that community Scrutiny isn't lost post-Covid
- Need to ensure that behaviours of members are challenged
  - Independent Scrutiny of Councillors' behaviour

#### Other Committees

- No direct comments so far

## Public Engagement

- People's lack of understanding on how the council works is a blocker for them to be involved in this process.
- My main issue is after a decision is made **customers are an afterthought** receiving emails like 'would you like to give your thoughts on...' after they made the decision
- Council is a remote entity – doesn't feature in life except for paying Council Tax. This needs to be changed
- Google doesn't know about this committees lark – you need to get onto google and a better web presence
- More events should be held where there is a clear process which leads to decision-making, making decision-making accountable and where EVIDENCE is being used and evaluated in really clear ways
- It's hard work getting people interested in this issue. They didn't even know about it when they were voting on the day. Most people at polling stations didn't understand the question or why they were being asked it
- Can I just go and represent a body or an individual at a committee when I need or want to?
  - Just being able to go to a LAC isn't enough
  - How do we get these voices heard at the right, useful, relevant, important time? On our timescales, not the Council's?
  - How do we help people know when is a good time to influence things?
  - Do we need different avenues for individuals and groups?
- Can the public enter questions into all the committees when established?
- Public questions should get public responses. Ideally at the time during the meeting. If that's not possible a clear answer should be reported at the next Council meeting and the resident gets that same response in writing
- Talked about people not getting involved – whole sectors or groups not getting involved or having any say.
- Concerns about not getting **personalised feedback** from committees or Councillors, too many standard letter responses
- New committee system should allow engagement as and when they require it
- Engagement in community is limited. Even if you go to your Cllr. Even if they hear you, they don't take it into consideration, don't even feedback, keep on going back to ask for feedback, but get no response. If we move to this new system, how will people's voice be heard.
- Very daunting to take a petition to committee, stand up and speak, so the average person might not do it.
- Why doesn't the council tweet every time a meeting is scheduled, to say what's on the agenda?
- Why doesn't the council let people sign up to be told about forthcoming decisions on certain topics, and then email them when they appear on agendas?
- Why doesn't the council tweet about all the decisions councillors make?
- Improving legitimacy:
  - More inclusive decision-making Especially when the ruling group (whether Labour or LibDem, recently in Sheffield) has a low electoral mandate, from a low voting turnout
  - Power-sharing and cooperation Cross-party, with stakeholders, communities & those the council has found it hard to listen to
  - Committees involving outside voices

- Co-opting stakeholders who pledge to facilitate 2-way connections with their networks
- Use more modern, flexible, efficient and open ways of securing input, as highlighted during pandemic
- Vital to clearly show the impact and influence of this input on decisions

### Communications

- Language is important. “Passing up” to the Leader, “down to” LACs sounds revealing about your attitudes. This devalues what the cttee does. Citizens are seen as the lowest rung.

### Schemes of Delegation

- It’s important that we have an officer scheme of delegation, Councillors can’t make all decisions.
- Important that officer decisions (over certain level) are visible.
- How do we give confidence, engage with members of public about this?
- Culturally shift from cabinet to cttee system is major.
- Public could theoretically find decisions made by officers, but don’t know where or when to look and it can’t just be on website. More engagement routes needed to help people know that a decision has been made, and about what- Social media, developing an app, etc.

### Statutory Responsibilities for Members (became: members’ responsibilities in general)

- There is a lot of ‘dead wood’ councillors who need to be accountable to those who they are representing.
- The pay that councillors receive won’t attract the right people. It’s too low to attract people except from older retired or middle class folk and not younger people or those who have to earn a living to support themselves or others.
- What metrics/professional standards are councillors measured against?
- What sanctions are in place for member if they are not fulfilling their obligations?
- ‘Work needs to be done with councillors to actually talk to their people, not just when an election coming up
- People might be encouraged to think more about who they actually elect if they see that we’re providing development for Councillors and a higher standard is expected.
- How do we make something happen on the ground? What levers are available to members to make something happen?
- The best type of accountability is how members react to what people want and go back and say I did it. Then people may appreciate the role of Councillors
- Political parties can’t be seen to be agreeing with policies implemented by other parties, so they scrap things or argue against them even if they’re working. For example, Surestart which was stopped and this creates Mental health issues, especially for young people who are impacted by closing Youth Clubs.
- Councillors should be independently minded and should not go in with a preconceived mindset of ideas

### Staffing, Relationships and Casework

- No specific comments so far

## Other comments

- Confusion around what is meant when you say 'The Council' – who do you mean? Officers? Councillors?
- New constellations is a forward thinking plan for Sheffield that involves the council but isn't really promoted anywhere and needs to be considered in this and other forward thinking work.
- Holistic concern about the scale of ambition and resources available. No resources to hold citizens assemblies on climate change – if we are trying to steer activity in the city, people going with their prejudices won't get us there. Need to evolve a consensus from dialogue from residents – this is very resource intensive. Think this is the way it should be, but if the Council can't commit to something like citizens assembly, then is it realistic? Don't want to design something that can't be achieved.
- Biggest challenge is understanding people's needs, what the gaps are, and leadership – you never get anything good designed by a committee. Finding ways that make people feel engaged and listened to, and then having people who are bold enough and have those **leadership** skills to take what they hear, have a vision for the city, and see it done
- Whatever is done, we don't want to change the look and feel of the character of Sheffield, we've a very vibrant city. We want to progress and move on but we don't want to live somewhere we don't recognise. We need to capture wide and diverse opinions
- There's a confrontational nature within the council. Hopefully committees will address this. Cllrs need to focus on the 90% of things they agree on, rather than 10% they don't, as is done now.
- All decision-making has to have a rigorous theme that goes to the problem, we have to say services have to be rigorously gone through to avoid services fighting with one another. If you can work with the community, you can then go to the service and ask if the problem can be solved. This process is not easy and would need the voices of the community
- We have the opportunity to get Sheffield back on the rails and catch up with other cities e.g., the Olympic legacy park investments needs to be coordinated and not always led by councillors, forming partnerships with investors and businesses will bring money back into Sheffield
- We need good people asking questions, Barrow-in Furness have been wanting a marina for 10 years which would cost £21 million to complete just the dredging. Sheffield airport is an e.g. of projects that have gone wrong we need to listen to those in the community, the people off the street

This page is intentionally left blank