

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

COUNCIL MEETING – 5TH SEPTEMBER, 2018

List of Amendments received by the Chief Executive

ITEM OF BUSINESS NO. 5 – NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING “DEVELOPING A FAIRER MODEL TO DISTRIBUTE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY IN SHEFFIELD”

1. Amendment to be moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Lisa Banes

That the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words “That this Council” and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) notes that the consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is currently live and after it concludes the Administration will consider responses before making any decisions about this issue, which considers a full range of issues around the Community Infrastructure Levy;
- (b) notes that, despite setting out objections, the main opposition group have not brought forward any alternative proposals, and therefore looks forward to their response to the consultation;
- (c) regrets that in their motion the main opposition group fail to recognise that some areas are not compensated for development through CIL at all, because development has led to a zero CIL requirement on the developer, due to lower levels of development value in some areas;
- (d) believes it is wrong and unfair to penalise communities because land is of a lower financial value through allocating the funding on the basis of the value of development, meaning that CIL funding would be disproportionately allocated to the areas with the highest level of land values;
- (e) (i) confirms that the Indices of Multiple Deprivation is a robust, nationally recognised and independently formulated means of calculating deprivation and notes the document ‘The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 – Frequently Asked Questions’ published by the Department for Communities and Local Government which states “The Index of Multiple Deprivation combines information from the seven domains to produce an overall relative measure of deprivation. The domains are combined using the following weights:
 - Income Deprivation (22.5%)
 - Employment Deprivation (22.25%)

- Education, Skills and Training Deprivation (13.5%)
- Health Deprivation and Disability (13.5%)
- Crime (9.3%)
- Barriers to Housing and Services (9.3%)
- Living Environment Deprivation (9.3%)”

and (ii) therefore believes that categorising this nationally recognised basis for calculating need “A Labour favoured area” is completely ridiculous and deeply troubling;

- (f) supports the use of the Index of Multiple Deprivation as a fair, balanced and more objective way of allocating funding, demonstrated by the fact that many local, national and international bodies use this set of indicators;
- (g) notes that poverty and inequality are amongst the largest challenges facing the city and believes that concerted, long-term policies like those of the Administration are needed to tackle them, especially so given government austerity measures enacted on Sheffield since 2010 which have disproportionality affected the poorest;
- (h) condemns the “Labour Favoured Areas” attacks on the Administration as being misrepresentative, out of step with public opinion and cheap political shots;
- (i) believes that the main opposition group are going back to their bad old ways of supporting failed right wing policies, through small-minded, mean-spirited and parochial approaches to public policy and the allocation of resources, whilst remembering that they supported the policy of the previous coalition government to impose the greatest level of cuts to councils with the greatest level of need, with the areas with the highest levels of deprivation getting the most cuts and the wealthiest parts of the country, comparatively, receiving the least; and
- (j) encourages local people to come forward and have their say on this important consultation and looks forward to welcoming the development of a fair, inclusive, balanced and just CIL policy in the near future.

2. Amendment to be moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, seconded by Councillor Alison Teal

That the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

- 1. the addition of new paragraphs (f) to (i) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (f) to (j) as new paragraphs (j) to (n):-
- (f) believes the consultation questionnaire contains 12 leading questions that can only be answered one way – in other words, asking questions

to secure a certain answer;

- (g) notes that a single question conflates both the proposal to take funding away from communities in areas where development is taking place and the concept of fairness, thus leading a respondent to answer in a certain way;
 - (h) recalls that this Council resolved in December 2017 that “in any consultation, it is vital to be open and clear about the most significant practical changes being proposed.”;
 - (i) believes this consultation fails to meet the test set by the Council and is therefore fundamentally flawed;
2. the deletion in the original paragraph (h) [new paragraph (l)] of the words “unless in a Labour favoured area” and the addition of the words “and believes this Council should recognise the impact of large-scale property development on residents’ quality of life, health and well-being, in particular with regards to the need for open and green space, better air quality, better protection from traffic congestion and improved community strength.”; and
3. the deletion of all the words in the original sub-paragraph (j)(i) [new sub-paragraph (n)(i)] and the addition of the words “request the Administration to abandon this consultation and instead require ward councillors to decide the spending of CIL arising from developments in the wards for which they are elected, on the basis of agreed ward priorities”.

3. Amendment to be moved by Councillor John Booker, seconded by Councillor Keith Davis

That the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (k) as follows:-

- (k) believes that CIL is an unfair levy and is predominantly a consequence of value and viability and is concerned that this gives the impression of perverse incentives in place for councils to consider developments based more on value than suitability

4. Amendment to be moved by Councillor Richard Shaw, seconded by Councillor Steve Ayris

That the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (k) to (n) as follows:-

- (k) believes there is a loss of public confidence and a lack of trust, truth and transparency in the way the current Administration operates, most recently in how the Administration has dealt with providing information

related to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);

- (l) notes that officers have confirmed that illustrative calculations were provided to the current Administration showing the amount of neighbourhood CIL money that would be spent in each ward if the current proposals were accepted;
- (m) notes that, despite requests for this information to be made available more widely, the Administration has failed to do so; and
- (n) believes that this information should have been included in the consultation document.

ITEM OF BUSINESS NO. 6 – NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING “SUPPORTING THE TUC’S GREAT JOBS AGENDA”

5. Amendment to be moved by Councillor Martin Smith, seconded by Councillor Joe Otten

That the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words “That this Council” and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) notes that trade unions have been a force for good in our country, championing the rights and living standards for everyone;
- (b) believes the British economy is simply not working for enough people today and is not fit to face the challenges of tomorrow, in that:
 - (i) the inequalities of wealth and income are getting worse;
 - (ii) the economy is geographically and sectorally unbalanced, and productive investment is too low; and
 - (iii) much economic activity is unsustainable, threatening the planet on which future generations depend;
- (c) notes that a substantial portion of UK health & safety regulations and workers’ rights originated from the European Union;
- (d) notes a government impact assessment has identified workers’ rights as an area that might be used to ‘maximise regulatory opportunities’ after Brexit;
- (e) notes that the Prime Minister has pledged not to erode workers’ rights after the UK leaves the EU but has failed to commit to maintaining any specific protections;
- (f) agrees therefore that the greatest current threat to those rights and living standards is leaving the European Union; and

- (g) resolves to:
 - (i) support the creation and widespread adoption of a ‘good employer’ standard covering areas such as paying a living wage, avoiding unpaid internships and using name-blind recruitment to make it easier for customers and investors to exercise choice and influence;
 - (ii) support an independent review to consult on how to set a genuine Living Wage across all sectors of the UK economy;
 - (iii) support the extension of transparency requirements on larger employers to include publishing the number of people in the organisation who are paid less than the Living Wage, together with the ratio of top and median pay; and
 - (iv) write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions and ask for a formal commitment to maintain or enhance all of the employment rights currently derived from EU law.

6. Amendment to be moved by Councillor Alison Teal, seconded by Councillor Martin Phipps

That the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (d) to (g) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraph (d) as a new paragraph (h):-

- (d) believes that insecure work is the product of a system which prioritises profit over people;
- (e) believes that, while the current system exists, there can be no reasonable expectation of seeing an end to the problems identified in the TUC’s Great Jobs Agenda;
- (f) notes this Council first took steps in July 2009 to implement the Living Wage, on the motion of Green Councillor, Bernard Little;
- (g) believes the TUC’s Great Jobs Agenda description of a great job outlines merely the minimum standard all employees ought to expect.

7. Amendment to be moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, seconded by Councillor Kaltum Rivers

That the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (e) to (h) as follows:-

- (e) furthermore, notes that the governments of recent years have not so much removed workers’ rights as the means of obtaining those, and condemns:

- (i) cuts to legal aid that helped workers enforce their employment rights against employers who broke the law;
 - (ii) the unlawful introduction of employment tribunal fees to deter claimants from seeking their rights; and
 - (iii) the abolition of the Equality and Human Rights Commission's free advice helpline and grant funding for legal advice and representation to challenge breaches of anti-discrimination and human-rights legislation;
- (f) recognises that timely advice on employment rights is critical to maintaining decent jobs and has a hugely beneficial social impact;
- (g) notes the drastic reduction of free employment advice services in the city; and
- (h) therefore asks officers to take steps to identify funding to support three full-time equivalent posts to provide employment advice in not-for-profit advice services in the city.

ITEM OF BUSINESS NO. 7 – NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING “THE RECYCLING SERVICE”

8. Amendment to be moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar

That the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words “That this Council” and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) notes that in Sheffield, only 29.6% of household waste was recycled last year, the worst recycling performance in Yorkshire and ranked 314th out of 350 in the national recycling league table;
- (b) notes that the current recycling scheme only covers plastic bottles, cans, glass and paper and excludes all other plastic waste such as food trays and bottle tops, whereas these items can be recycled in neighbouring Chesterfield;
- (c) notes that in Watford, a Liberal Democrat-controlled council, they have weekly black bin and recycling collections and increased their recycling rate to 43%, significantly higher than the rate in Sheffield;
- (d) notes the widespread public concern about plastic waste following the BBC's Blue Planet series and the growing call for local councils to recycle more types of plastics to reduce the threat to our ecosystem;
- (e) believes that, instead of cutting funding to recycling services, Sheffield City Council should invest in and expand recycling services to improve

performance and no longer be towards the bottom of the league table and a national embarrassment;

- (f) notes the Sheffield Liberal Democrats will introduce a 'Keep Sheffield Green' fund where local communities can use the money to invest in recycling; and
- (g) requests the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene to bring forward proposals to cover more types of plastic waste in Sheffield's recycling service and make it easier for people to recycle their household waste.

9. Amendment to be moved by Councillor Martin Phipps, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy

That the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraph (a) and the addition of a new paragraph (a) as follows:-
 - (a) notes that:
 - (i) Sheffield City Council was most recently ranked 314 out of 350 authorities for "Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting" as of 2016/17 (last collective set of data), as derived by letsrecycle.com from the waste reporting portal WasteDataFlow which is used by authorities to report waste figures to the government;
 - (ii) although in 2017/18 only 0.28% of household waste was sent to landfill, over two-thirds (67.31%) was sent to the incinerator, with only 32.41% recycled or composted in this year; and
 - (iii) notes that CO2 emissions from the incinerator have been growing steadily over the last decade, contrary to the national trend for reductions in emissions;
2. the deletion of sub-paragraphs (b)(i) to (iii) and the addition of a new sub-paragraphs (b)(i) to (iii) as follows:-
 - (i) welcomes the trial of electric bin lorries and the introduction of plastic recycling into flats, something the Green Councillors have long campaigned for;
 - (ii) understands, however, the concerns of residents over where the brown bins will go;
 - (iii) notes this is an overall reduction in the number of litres of recycling capacity that may be collected;

3. the deletion of paragraph (c) and the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-
 - (c) notes that:-
 - (i) to change the waste services offered to Sheffield would require a renegotiation of the 35-year Veolia contract, which could be costly;
 - (ii) Cabinet decided to retender the waste contract in January 2017;
 - (iii) bringing contracts back in house would give the Council and Sheffield much more control over the services offered to residents; and
 - (iv) residents of Sheffield, including opposition councillors, do not have access to full information about the Council's contracts to know whether the service they are paying for is good value for money;
4. the deletion of sub-paragraph (d)(iii) and the addition of sub-paragraphs (d)(iii) and (iv) as follows:-
 - (iii) that the Council will ask officers to research further how it can influence the packaging used in retail in Sheffield to be recyclable and sustainable via a policy of incentives, disincentives and/or other means; and
 - (iv) that the council will request the Administration to fully disclose the Veolia contract to the public and opposition councillors for improved transparency, accountability and democracy in allowing others to access information that will facilitate alternate proposals which can then be considered for the benefit of Sheffield people.

ITEM OF BUSINESS NO. 8 – NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING “TRANSPORT FUNDING”

10. Amendment to be moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Mohammad Maroof

That the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words “That this Council” and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) welcomes the recent news that Doncaster Sheffield Airport has been named the best in the UK following a survey of passengers;
- (b) believes the development and future growth of the Airport represents an economic opportunity for the region and could lead to the

development of significant job and business growth and improved local and national transport connectivity;

- (c) notes that phase two of the Finningley and Rossington Regeneration Route Scheme will play a significant role in supporting the development of the Airport as well as supporting other economic opportunities in the area such as the inventive and job creating iPort;
- (d) welcomes that phase one has been a catalyst for business expansion of the Airport with 55% passenger growth over the past two years, making it one of the fastest growing airports in the UK;
- (e) notes that the Great Yorkshire Way has helped to create over 400 new jobs at the Airport itself and many more with over 100 businesses occupying another half a million square feet of space there;
- (f) notes that the road scheme has also opened the door to major housing projects and the wider regeneration of the local community;
- (g) welcomes the comments from the Mayor of Doncaster: “We always said Great Yorkshire Way was the route to jobs and growth. The pace and scale of private sector development delivered as a result of this new road in just two years is quite remarkable. We must remember that none of this existed a couple of years ago. The impact on our economy and the wider region is simply startling. Hundreds of millions of pounds worth of private sector investment has come into Doncaster, over 1,400 new jobs have so far been created and hundreds of new homes have been built”;
- (h) notes the overwhelming evidence illustrating the disparity in transport spending between the north and the south of England and supports the growing campaign across the north of England to get a fairer transport settlement for the North of England;
- (i) is astounded that, instead of campaigning for a fairer settlement for the north of England, the Green Party are calling on the removal of economic development projects in the region and believes it should not be an ‘either/or’ situation in improving transport infrastructure and connections for Doncaster Sheffield Airport or funding the development of an improved local transport network in the region;
- (j) welcomes that the people of South Yorkshire overwhelmingly rejected what this Council regards as the anti-jobs Green Party candidate in the recent Sheffield City Region mayoral election and instead elected Mayor Dan Jarvis to secure the transport investment and economic growth the region needs, including supporting the implementation of the 2015 Sheffield City Region deal; and
- (k) believes that all companies should pay their fair share of tax and believes that a more effective means of tackling tax avoidance would be pursued under a Labour government than under the current

government and previous coalition government.

11. Amendment to be moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Mohammed Mahroof

That the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) notes the ongoing development of Doncaster/Sheffield Airport, a great example of "swords into ploughshares" giving Sheffield, South Yorkshire and the wider City Region an airport with world class potential, and offering Sheffielders easy access to a range of popular holiday destinations;
- (b) congratulates the Airport on being voted as the 'UKs Favourite Airport' in a customer satisfaction survey by Saga and 'Best UK Airport' for the second time running in a survey by Which? magazine;
- (c) further notes Which? Magazine comments "that with its ambitions to expand, Doncaster Sheffield could soon become the go-to airport for holidaymakers in the North if it can maintain its high standard.";
- (d) notes that long term infrastructure improvements have timescales which often well exceed political and administrative cycles;
- (e) notes and deplores the fact that the UK remains an overcentralized state, especially so in England, and so, irrespective of political differences, local government, including Sheffield, often must adopt a pragmatic approach to secure the delivery of much needed improvements to the local economy;
- (f) believes that Sheffield needs to be better connected, within local communities in Sheffield, within the City Region, and more widely, including internationally by air transportation;
- (g) notes that the real issue of concern is the long term transport funding injustice between London and the South East, and the "North";
- (h) re-affirms concern at the failure of the Labour Leaders in South Yorkshire and the Labour administration of this Council to unlock long-term funding of £30 million per annum over 30 years (£900 million in total), by means of the City Region Devolution deal, in contrast to the support given to the development of the Airport; and
- (i) requests that a copy of this motion be forwarded to the Sheffield City Region Mayor and the Minister of State for Transport.

12. Amendment to be moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, seconded by Councillor Alison Teal

That the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (l) to (o) as follows:-

- (l) notes that the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority Transport Committee was wound up and has not met since 8th May 2017;
- (m) notes that this Committee was previously cross party, held meetings in public and was webcast;
- (n) believes it is important that major decisions, such as support for the proposed airport link, are transparent and open to effective scrutiny in public; and
- (o) asks for the Leader of the Council to use her place on the Combined Authority to push for greater transparency and scrutiny through the revival of the Transport Committee.

13. Amendment to be moved by Councillor John Booker, seconded by Councillor Keith Davis

That the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (l) to (v) as follows:-

- (l) believes that a commercially viable, fully operational airport in Sheffield would be an enormous asset for the city;
- (m) notes that Sheffield City Airport was built as a CAP168 code 2C airport as per the agreement between The Sheffield Development Corporation (SDC), Glenlivet Ltd and Tinsley Park Ltd, dated 27th October 1995 and subsequent lease of August 1997; and that the definition of "Airport" for the purposes of the agreement is laid out in Article 106 of the Air Navigation Order of 1989 and is consistent with the definition as originally laid out in clause 1.17 of the agreement between SDC and British Steel Corporation;
- (n) further notes that in 1997, Sheffield City Airport opened as a CAT 5, code 2C airport, which means it should have had, and maintained, all the facilities needed to cope with an aircraft capable of carrying up to 115 passengers;
- (o) also notes that the Airport started commercial services some three years earlier than originally planned, with the successful introduction on 16th February 1998, of KLM's three times daily Amsterdam service, which was an instant success, with KLM saying it was their best start-up service ever, and that services followed to Jersey, London, Dublin, Belfast and Brussels and in 1998, 75,157 passengers passed through its terminal;

- (p) recognises that Sheffield Development Corporation estimated it would take at least seven years after opening before the airport would make any return on capital, and that this fact was well known and, indeed, as early as 1990, had been referred to by the SDC;
- (q) is interested to know how Peel Holdings and the airport operator, just eight weeks after them acquiring one half share of the Airport, were allowed to start downgrading it; for example (i) at the end of September 2001 they reduced airport Rescue and Fire Fighting Services cover from a CAT 5 to a CAT 3, (ii) by the end of September 2002 they reduced cover from CAT 3 to a CAT 1 and also turned off the Instrument Landing System (ILS) and (iii) at the end of August 2002 they started turning the terminal building into a business centre (offices) without planning permission;
- (r) regrets that all of these actions were quite clearly contrary to the intention of the lease, as well as Civil Aviation Authority legislation for a code 2C airport;
- (s) places on record that it is abundantly clear that the intention of the lease/agreement was for an operational airport to be in existence for at least "the reverter period", a minimum of ten years from the date of opening;
- (t) strongly asserts that rules and regulations should be abided by, and the closure of Sheffield City Airport was done in a most unsatisfactory manner, causing Sheffield one of its worst civic lost opportunities;
- (u) further notes that Sheffield City Airport closed to all traffic in 2008, and that an area of eighty acres of prime development land, described as the best site on the M1 corridor between Leeds and Leicester, was transferred to Sheffield Business Parks Ltd, for a notional £1.00, which has never been collected; and
- (v) further regrets that the City has lost an airport and has allowed Peel Holdings to profit from the land developments.