

# CONSULTATION WORKSHOPS

## SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

### Contact details:

Mark Daly ([mark.daly@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:mark.daly@sheffield.gov.uk))

Air Quality Officer

Environmental Protection Service

Sheffield City Council

2-10 Carbrook Hall Road

Sheffield S9 2DB

Tel +44 114 273 4655

Fax +44 114 273 6464

For more information about the consultation processes in Sheffield, click [here](#) for the motorway related AQMA and [here](#) for the city centre AQMA.

### The aim or purpose of the process:

Sheffield has declared two Air Quality Management Areas, and a Clean Air Partnership has been established to assist in drawing up an Action Plans for each (M1 Corridor Clean Air Partnership, or M1CCAP, and the City Centre Clean Air Partnership, or CCCAP).

### Description of the process:

Separate processes are being run for both partnerships, although the emergence of different issues means that the timescales are slightly different. The work to date has included a fairly long lead time, particularly with the M1CCAP, before any workshops were undertaken. A lead time was built in to the process to allow the development of a common information base and has given the opportunity for issues and conflicts to be drawn out. The result is that after 3 or 4 meetings, all of the partners felt they were starting from the same level. Two half day sessions with BDOR Consultants were organised with local AQ officers on hand at each table grouping to provide input on technical issues. The CCCAP is somewhat lagging behind and there have been problems engaging with key stakeholders, and in particular, those with an interest in economic regeneration. This has been exacerbated by the fact that, whereas the M1 Air Action Zone is situated in an area with a vocal and active community group, the city centre does not have a defined residential community. In order to involve some of these hard to reach stakeholders, the Stockholm Environment Institute (SEI) from the university of York has been contracted to undertake outreach and engagement work. There appears to have been some initial success with this as interest has started to grow these groups. SEI was also involved in the second CCCAP workshop where maps were used by partners to actually draw on where they thought the problems were, where improvements could be made etc. The process now involves doing a more detailed evaluation of the outcomes from the workshops using AEA Technology's "AirAction" software. The aim is to produce a draft plan that will be taken to each Partnership for their comments in order for a final set of proposals to be included in the completed action plan (deadline October 2002).

**Follow up reporting:**

Running in parallel with "AirAction" evaluation, each of the Partners will be approached individually to obtain commitment to any actions that their organisation had either been suggested, or volunteered to carry out. For example, the large out of town shopping centre Meadowhall is currently examining the potential for a de facto Low Emission Zone for deliveries, a comprehensive travel plan, sponsorship of walking buses, and a general publicity campaign. Resources used: This work has been enabled through the Supplementary Credit Approval funding regime. An accurate assessment of costs is not currently available, but further funding from SCA specifically for continued action planning (mostly the kind of work outlined plus printing and other associated costs) which amounts to approximately £90,000.

**Advantages/disadvantages:**

**Advantages:** Transparent, inclusive, widespread and diverse partners mean that the action plan is less likely to fall at the last hurdle (i.e. getting it through committee/cabinet) and is far more likely to be implemented. The workshops have been very well received and very productive, and the use of large maps has allowed participants to gain a much better grasp of the issue.

**Disadvantages:** workshops may produce options that all participants can agree with but may not mean much for AQ improvement - e.g. planting trees. The work is time consuming and would be difficult for poorly resourced/debt free authorities with low staff numbers to replicate effectively.

**Pitfalls to be avoided:**

What would be done differently if there was the chance? Ensure interest from important parties earlier by using a third party, make sure that senior managers and politicians are involved, try and keep momentum going through the process - the web page has helped this.