

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH, on Wednesday 2 December 2015, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

**PRESENT**

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Talib Hussain)  
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Denise Fox)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Mike Drabble Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Julie Gledhill Roy Munn Richard Shaw	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Nasima Akther Nikki Bond Mohammad Maroof
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison Shaffaq Mohammed	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> John Campbell Lynn Rooney Paul Wood
4	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	13	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Sheila Constance Alan Law	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Aodan Marken Brian Webster	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Leigh Bramall Tony Damms
6	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Ibrar Hussain Talib Hussain	15	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Steve Jones Cate McDonald Chris Peace	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Lewis Dagnall Robert Murphy	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Steve Ayris Denise Reaney	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Richard Crowther Keith Davis
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Rob Frost Anne Murphy Geoff Smith	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea	18	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Terry Fox Pat Midgley	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> John Booker Adam Hurst Zoe Sykes
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur



**1. MRS BETTY HORTON**

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) reported with sadness, the death of Mrs Betty Horton, who had served as Lady Mayoress of the City in 1987/88. Members of the Council observed a minute's silence in her memory.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jenny Armstrong, Isobel Bowler, Gill Furniss, Dianne Hurst, Sarah Jane Smalley, Ray Satur, Garry Weatherall, Steve Wilson and Cliff Woodcraft.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Ben Curran declared a personal interest in item number 7 on the Summons (Licensing Act 2003 – Statement of Licensing Policy) as he was a Trustee of Ben's Centre.

Councillor Aodan Marken declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in item 14 on the Summons (Notice of Motion concerning Junior Doctors' Industrial Dispute) as his partner was a junior doctor.

**4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING**

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that the minutes of the meeting of Council held on 4<sup>th</sup> November 2015 be approved as a true and accurate record.

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS**

**5.1 Petitions**

**5.1.1 Petition Requesting Selective Licensing of Housing in the Grimesthorpe Area**

The Council received a petition containing 120 signatures, requesting selective licensing of housing in the Grimesthorpe area.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Tommy Pyewell. He commented on the behaviour of some people in the area who were causing problems affecting other residents, including increased flytipping of items such as bedding and fridges. To clean up the resultant waste would, he said, be a cost to the Council and local residents. The petitioners were requesting that landlords be held responsible for the tenants living in their properties. If Selective Licensing was introduced, he asked whether the Council would then have the authority to make sure landlords behaved in a proper manner. The petition requested the

Council to consider proposals for the introduction of Selective Licensing in the Grimesthorpe area in order to improve the environment and conditions for residents.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing. Councillor Dunn invited Mr Pyewell, as lead petitioner to undertake a walk about of the area, together with Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, who had also approached her regarding the situation in Grimesthorpe, and Council officers. Councillor Dunn stated that the Council did make efforts to ensure that landlords were not mistreating tenants and it would not be complacent with regard to the matters raised.

5.1.2 Petition Requesting the Council to Save Adult and Community Education in the City

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 83 signatures, requesting the Council to save adult and community education in the City.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Grace Parry who stated that on 25 November, the Government announced reductions in spending on adult skills of £360 million. Whilst this was less than had been anticipated, it would still affect adult education and skills provision and the Council was requested to make efforts to lessen the effect of the funding reductions on adult community education. A small proportion of spending on education was devoted to adult further education and skills and the most recent announcement of funding reductions was in addition to the cuts in the adult skills budget and to ESOL (English Speakers of Other Languages) programmes which had already been announced. Adult education improved people's health and wellbeing, developed confidence and helped to build better communities. It also gave people, who may have been hindered in their learning at school, opportunities to learn. Examples were given of lifelong learning provision by Heeley Development Trust. Adult learning provided opportunities to learn in small, friendly classes which were not intimidating and the loss of provision would affect people. ESOL classes were also very important to people.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families. Councillor Drayton commented on the value of adult education and its capacity to change people's lives. She said that, unfortunately, it had been announced that £360 million would be cut from the Adult Skills budget over the lifetime of this Parliament, with savings being made through efficiencies and area based powers to rationalise college provision, which were likely to reduce college budgets.

Councillor Drayton said that the potential ring-fencing of budgets for Adult Learning might ensure those services were protected. Adult education comprised not only basic skills but other important provision including ESOL and informal learning which had the potential to attract people into learning who might then cross over and begin to learn formal subjects including English and Maths.

Councillor Drayton referred to a Notice of Motion given at the last Council meeting, which opposed cuts to Adult Education. After 2017, financial resources for Adult Education would be provided to the Sheffield City Region and there must be a commitment to protect adult learning for the most vulnerable and people with least skills. An undertaking was required from the Sheffield City Region in this regard so that the devolvement and deployment of the adult skills budget included protection for that budget as well. The Council would continue to do everything possible to protect the most vulnerable.

## 5.2 Public Questions

### 5.2.1 Public Questions Concerning Trees

Calvin Payne asked when the next bi-monthly Tree Advisory Forum would be held, given that the last Forum meeting was three months ago, on 2<sup>nd</sup> September?

Helen McIlroy asked whether the Independent Tree Panel was in place and who the members of the panel were, besides the Chair, Mr Andy Buck. She also asked what the cost of the Panel would be.

Dave Dilner asked the relative cost of felling trees versus renegotiation involving the adoption of sensitive engineering solutions (which campaigners believed was less expensive).

Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, responded to the questions. He stated that the Tree Advisory Forum had not met again since its September meeting. It had been agreed at the September meeting that a draft Tree Strategy would be submitted to the next Tree Advisory Forum and he was also asking for people's opinions regarding the format of future meetings of the Forum. The next Forum meeting would be in the new year and the date would be publicised.

Mr Andy Buck had been appointed chair of the Independent Tree Panel and the appointment of other Panel members was to be confirmed. The actual costs of the Panel would depend upon the level of response from residents in Sheffield and the information with regards cost could be obtained once it was known.

As regards the cost of tree felling and sensitive engineering solutions, Councillor Fox stated that he would contact the questioner with this information.

### 5.2.2 Public Questions Concerning Syria

Kaltun Elmi stated that she was grateful to the Labour Leader, Jeremy Corbyn as regards the position which he had taken against air strikes and military intervention in Syria. She said that in Sheffield, there was a tradition of opposing war and she asked the Councillor Julie Dore what her position was as the Leader of the Council.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council made reference to the debate

which would be taking place in the House of Commons regarding military action in Syria and to the Notice of Motion and amendment to that Motion which would be considered at this meeting of the City Council. Members of the Council were mindful of the horror of the recent attacks by Daesh (ISIL) terrorists worldwide and including in Paris. The decision making body in relation to whether or not the UK would commence airstrikes was the UK Parliament.

Councillor Dore stated that the situation with regard to Syria was complex and she was not in receipt of all of the evidence and information relating to this matter, although she did pay attention to the news items and listen to parliamentary debates pertinent to the situation in Syria. She stated that, if she was an MP walking into parliament today, she would vote against the proposal which was being put forward and that was a personal position based on what she knew. However, she also understood that the Commons debate would include many contributions, which may provide arguments which could change her view, although she was not privy to that information. She said that she believed the commencement of airstrikes in Syria was not appropriate at this time. She hoped that for the sake of the people affected by the situation in Syria and those who might be displaced, that the right decision was made by the House of Commons

#### 5.2.3 Public Question Concerning Anti-Social Behaviour

Adam Butcher asked what the Council was doing to help with the problem of anti-social behaviour caused by university students occurring in the early hours of the morning and which affected people's sleep.

Councillor Sioned Mair Richards, the Acting Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, responded that there were various things which could be done. Firstly, if someone felt threatened or they were in danger, they should phone 999. If the problem was one of noise nuisance, then they should contact the 101 telephone number and continue to record and report incidents. As the matter was reported in relation to university students, the Council could talk directly to the university and the students' union regarding the behaviour of the students. Councillor Richards suggested that she and Mr Butcher discuss the issues which he had brought to her attention and she would then take the matter up on his behalf.

#### 5.2.4 Public Question Concerning ESOL provision

Sarah Saxon asked the Council to also show commitment to defending ESOL provision on behalf of people for whom English was not their first language in the same way as it supported the opportunity for people to access lifelong learning.

Councillor Jackie Drayton responded, firstly by thanking SAVTE (Sheffield Association for the Voluntary Teaching of English) for their work over 40 years. She said that ESOL was included within the broader category of lifelong learning. She recalled an occasion when she had spoken with a lady from Somalia, who had told her about the difficulties she faced in successfully using public transport in Sheffield without having English language skills and the help she had received from a Somali man. It had, she said been a frightening experience, not having the language of the country to which she had come. Councillor Drayton confirmed that

the Council was supportive of ESOL provision.

#### 5.2.5 Public Question Concerning Devolution

Nigel Slack referred to public consultation relating to the Sheffield City Region devolution deal and commented that whilst it was for a six week period, it was unfortunate that it fell across the Christmas period.

Mr Slack stated that on 1 December, this had been on the front page of the consultation hub webpage and ran from 1 December until 16 January. On the evening of 1 December, it had moved to a lower priority page and was shown as running from 2 December to 15 January. He asked why these two days had been lost and commented that the details of the consultation and the links provided on the Sheffield City Council Consultation Hub had disappeared. He requested that the details be added to the home page of the Council's website.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that she would not recommend the proposals in the agreement as they stood, unless changes were made and that a press release was to be published in relation to the devolution deal consultation. She said that there were a number of issues within the devolution deal which the Government would need to clarify and that she did not believe that the consultation should commence until there was greater certainty with regard to those issues. Councillor Dore stated that in the eight weeks since the deal was announced, she had personally made representations regarding the issues and which related to the proposed mayoral model.

Councillor Dore read part of the press release concerning consultation on the devolution deal, which stated that further work was needed to clarify issues concerning the Mayor in any majority vote to make sure the right checks and balances were in place and there were potential amendments to achieve a preferred geography of the region. She stated that the system proposed was potentially undemocratic and inequitable. It was felt that the Combined Authority worked comparatively well. She said that having a regional mayor for whom half of the City Region's population was entitled to vote but the other was not, was not a good model. However, it was understood that the Government was willing to listen and may amend legislation with regard to the veto of county councils to rectify the situation.

#### 5.2.6 Public Question Concerning Public Involvement

Nigel Slack stated that he had been calling for broadcasting of council meetings online (webcasting) for a number of years and that this was mostly for reasons of greater transparency of council decision making and greater public engagement. He said that there was, however, also the thought that having some conduct of councillors exposed to the public gaze may modify the disrespectful behaviour sometimes evident in the chamber.

He said that, as someone who would like to see greater public involvement at all levels of the council, he supported Councillor Marken's motion at item 18 on the

agenda. He asked if the Council would accept one suggestion from the public benches, at item 18 (i) and asked whether the Council would make any meeting not only accessible to the public but also involve the public in the discussion.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded that the issue of webcasting was something that was being looked at and she would ask Council officers to resolve the issue. Item 18 on the Summons for this meeting related to issues raised by Mr Slack. Public questions could be asked at Council, Cabinet and to other bodies of the Council. Public engagement and discussion happened at the Health and Wellbeing Board where items were to be considered that would benefit from further dialogue and discussion. Cabinet in the Community sessions had taken place for four years at which the public, Cabinet Members, local Councillors and stakeholders were present and there was opportunity for people to engage with Cabinet Members. This year, the Cabinet in the Community sessions included a session asking for people's views as to how they engaged with the Council and she stated it was for the public to tell the Council how they would like engagement to take place.

#### 5.2.7 Public Question Concerning Trees on Cemetery Avenue

Nigel Slack stated that on 3<sup>rd</sup> June 2015, he put a question to Council about the trees on Cemetery Avenue between Ecclesall Road and the General Cemetery gates. Councillor Fox had responded and followed up with a more detailed answer by e-mail, which Mr Slack had included in his written question.

Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, stated that in June 2015, he had only recently taken up post as Cabinet Member. He said that the tree replanting target for November 2015 to April 2016 was 1500 trees. In that period, 580 trees had been planted. 2,332 trees had been planted in the year to date and the target for the end of the season was 3,625 trees being planted, weather permitting.

#### 5.2.8 Public Questions Concerning Questions at November Council

Martin Brighton stated that at the last Full Council, part of the answer given to his questions was a referral to answers given to another citizen. He said that the recording of those answers was obtained, which indicated that answers were not given. Mr Brighton asked the following questions:

1. Will the Leader please provide and publish specific written responses to questions 1 - 4 that were asked in November.
2. Given this Council's stance for, and the expressed public opinion against, an elected executive mayor, which Messrs Osbourne and Pickles have each said will not be imposed, why is the Council proceeding with an elected executive mayor and what will it take for the Council to back down?
3. For question 5 at the last Full Council it was described how this Council went into Deny and Lie mode when a document encouraging breaking the law was disclosed. The Leader's reply was to 'refute' that such a document



existed. Discussions about the damning document have taken place with the department concerned, so how was it possible for the Leader to refute the existence of that document in this Chamber without first having confirmed, or otherwise, its existence?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated with regard to question 1 above, that she genuinely believed that she had provided answers to Mr Brighton. As regards Question 2 above, regarding an elected Mayor, she had already given a clear answer on that subject.

Councillor Dore stated that in reference to question 3, she would refute that the Council encouraged breaking the law. She added that she did not know to which document Mr Brighton was referring. Councillor Dore requested that Mr Brighton show her the document concerned and she would be able to provide a straight answer to him.

#### 5.2.9 Public Questions Concerning Excess Winter Deaths

Martin Brighton stated that last year, at around this time, a citizen asked what this Council had planned to reduce excess deaths due to winter conditions. He said that the reply given at Full Council was uplifting with high aspiration but unfortunately, the rhetoric did not match the reality. Mr Brighton asked the following questions:

1. What went wrong with last year's Council plans?
2. How will this year's Council plans be different?
3. Who will be held to account for the failures that lead to even more excess deaths than last year?

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living responded that the information regarding the actual number of winter deaths in Sheffield was not yet available. However, it was known that nationally, the number of deaths over the winter period had increased in 2014/15. Sheffield had previously been below the average with regards the number of excess deaths during the winter. The number of winter deaths had declined in the previous 10 to 20 years. It would be unfair to say that the plans 'went wrong'. There were a number of factors to consider. In 2014/15, there was a virulent strain of the flu virus and the effectiveness of the flu vaccine was also a factor, in addition to the extent of take up of the vaccine, which needed to be addressed. It was thought that in other years the vaccine protected 50% to 70% of the people who received it. However, in 2014/15, only 35% of people were effectively protected.

People with circulatory conditions and respiratory diseases were also of concern and would need to be considered. This year, older people and those with respiratory or circulatory conditions, people who were isolated and those with mental health conditions were considered to be most at risk and they would be identified as those most at risk. There had been schemes in Lowedges, for example, which could be replicated elsewhere. Community Support Workers would be asked to help identify the most vulnerable.

Councillor Lea stated that there was a widespread programme of flu vaccination and work was being done with primary care services in this regard. There were initiatives including £6 million from the Big Lottery for South Yorkshire Housing to help address loneliness and isolation and schemes to improve service take up and programmes to improve home insulation and warmth and the Decent Homes programme had also improved homes. The Big Sheffield Switch programme was designed to help people save money on energy bills. Advice was available from advice services, such as the Citizen's Advice Bureau, to help mitigate the effects of a reduction in welfare benefits.

There would be, Councillor Lea stated, co-ordination of effort by health and social care services and there was a role for both health champions and health trainers. Services were working on the principle of 'every contact counts', so that people at potential risk over the winter period were identified earlier in the year. The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) had recommended that public services should work together to help reduce the numbers of winter deaths. As such, it was not one organisation or person that was accountable on this issue and there were a number of factors to consider. She said that the issue was also on the agenda of the Health and Wellbeing Board.

#### 5.2.10 Public Questions Concerning Reports as to Conduct

Martin Brighton stated that this chamber's consensus on the following would be appreciated:

*"Those who fail to respond appropriately to reports of abuse, or condone in any way the behaviour of those determined as abusers, become, by definition, abusers themselves."*

"In the name of the council ruling party, a group of party members bully, insult, undermine a democratically elected community group member, and the target's organisation, in a protracted campaign to take control of another group, for their own party political purposes?"

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that she believed that she did respond to reports concerning abuse. She said that, if Mr Brighton believed that had not been the case, he should take this up through the complaints process or to the Local Government Ombudsman.

With regard to the second part of Mr Brighton's question, Councillor Dore stated that this was ambiguous and she did not know to what he was referring.

#### 5.2.11 Public Question Concerning Bus Services

Diana Stimely stated that the punctuality of buses was of concern as older people often found it problematic to stand and wait for a bus to arrive. She expressed concern that people's ability to travel and their ability to have reasonable lives might be affected by the poor punctuality of bus services. This question was

referred to Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

5.3 Petitions

5.3.1 Petition Requesting the Reversal of Changes to Bus Service Nos. 66, 1 and 1A, and 85 and 86

The Council received a petition containing 437 signatures, requesting the reversal of changes to bus service nos. 66, 1 and 1A, and 85 and 86.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by John Yale. He stated that the petition was on behalf of the High Green Action Team and said that changes to bus services had affected older people and disabled people and students in High Green, Burncross, Chapeltown and Grenoside. He asked that a meeting be arranged with the Cabinet Member regarding the concerns outlined in the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

5.3.2 Petition Requesting Urgent Reconsideration of the Proposed Changes to the Route of the No. 10a Bus Service

The Council received a petition containing 148 signatures, requesting urgent reconsideration of the proposed changes to the route of the No. 10a bus service.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Mrs Collins, who stated that the 10 and 10A bus service served communities in Netherthorpe and Uppertorpe and was operated by Sheffield Community Transport for the Passenger Transport Executive (STPTE). However, route changes had occurred on 1 November 2015, which altered the route to West Street, meaning the bus became stuck in traffic behind tram services.

The loss of a stop on Charter Row affected people's access to the Moor Market and shops as they would need to walk from the pick-up point on Furnival Gate, which some older and disabled people would not be able to do. A letter to SYPTE had not been answered but passed to Sheffield Community Transport. People would like the bus to return to the original route and timetable, which had been punctual and had allowed people better access to the hospital connections from the Hallamshire Hospital.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

5.3.3 Petition Requesting a Public Meeting with Councillor Terry Fox and the Sheffield Bus Partnership to Discuss the Changes to the Bus Services

The Council received an electronic petition containing 16 signatures, requesting a

public meeting with Councillor Terry Fox and the Sheffield Bus Partnership, to discuss the changes to the bus services.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

#### 5.3.4 Petition Opposing Cuts to Sheffield Bus Services

The Council received a petition containing 512 signatures, opposing the cuts to Sheffield bus services.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Sharon Milsom, who stated that since changes to bus services had been implemented, people had been late for work and journey times had increased. These were cuts to services, representing some 8 to 10 percent of the network, which was not mentioned in the literature relating to the service changes.

There had been some concessions made and the solution proposed by the Bus Partnership was the addition of 25 double decker buses. However, this would not help people who now had no bus service. People affected had to use alternatives, including taxi services or asking somebody to drive them to their destination. She said that there would be a future consultation regarding concessionary fares. The petitioners asked for a quality contract and for bus services to be brought back into public ownership.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

#### 5.3.5 Petition Requesting that the Cuts to Bus Services are Reversed

The Council received a petition containing approximately 900 signatures, requesting the reversal of changes to bus services.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Andy Nash. He stated that the changes which had been made to bus services were not felt to be sensible and the removal of some routes amounted to cuts. Concerns had been raised through the local media, through petitions and local councillors.

Mr Nash stated that, to his credit, the Cabinet Member had admitted to flaws with the consultation. He asked why the consultation period had not been extended or repeated. Small changes had been made to proposals but the implementation of changes had been poorly communicated. Leaflets were not necessarily relevant to services for the areas from which people were travelling. Bus drivers were also not always properly trained on new routes and buses had been very full, although it was understood that double decker buses were being introduced on some routes. In some cases, buses did not arrive at all and the 'Change.org' website contained examples of how changes had affected people. For example, people were late to work and pupils were late to school. These were not considered only

to be teething troubles but would require substantial change and it would need the City Council to speak with members of the Bus Partnership to reverse changes.

5.4 Petition Requiring Debate Requesting the Reversal of the Changes to Buses in Sheffield from November 2015

The Council received an electronic petition containing 12,384 signatures, requesting the reversal of the changes to buses in Sheffield from November 2015. The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at the Council meeting. The wording of the petition was as follows:-

*"The buses in Sheffield changed on 1st of November. It has been horrendous the first week of implementation. Full buses and less services are affecting all walks of life. It appears that the congestion is worse in the first week - although this is yet to be established. Please return the services that worked and allowed everyone to get to where they are going."*

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Joanne Lumley, who stated that she appreciated people taking the time to sign the petition and to comment upon the subject of bus services. She stated that people were passionate about this issue and concerned as to the effect of changes to bus services. People were unhappy with a lack of services and with regard to punctuality and capacity. The deployment of double decker buses had helped on some routes. She also remarked on the queues of people waiting for buses which formed on Pinstone Street.

Joanne Lumley said that she personally loved using the bus as it meant that she did not have to drive. However, the recent changes to services would mean that she would use the car more, which was not something that she had intended.

Traffic conditions had not been taken into account as part of the implementation of change, including traffic at peak times. The reduction in bus frequency and lateness were also problems. For example, the 86 Bus left at 5.02pm and the next one was at 5.40pm and this affected her ability to collect her children. The online information service was also not functioning correctly. Similar comments on bus services had been received from other people.

In relation to ticket prices, not everyone was benefitting from reductions to the cost of fares as some people now needed to catch more buses to complete their journey. The 28 day ticket was not valid on tram services. She raised concerns about capacity and said that she did not feel safe and would not take her children on the bus because of the number of passengers. There was not sufficient space for pushchairs and prams nor was there space for disabled people to use wheelchairs. This restricted people's capacity to access employment and affected the start and finish times of people at work.

Some services did not commence until 7.45 am on Saturdays and Sundays. For her own family, this required her to take her husband to work by car and collect him and take two small children on both journeys. There were no direct bus

services to the Northern General Hospital on Herries Road (where most of the out-patient services were situated) from the Greenhill area.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.1 (b), the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport responded to the petition, following which the Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport spoke on the matter.

Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, responded to the petition. He thanked people for bringing their petitions and questions to Council. Councillor Fox agreed that the present situation with regards bus services was unacceptable. This was not what was promised, which was a sustainable, reliable and punctual bus network. He said that he had had the bus companies in to speak with him twice, so far. He clarified that the Council was not responsible for timetables, network or programmes for the buses. However, that did not mean that the Council would not take action and hold people to account.

The 10A bus service was previously the circular service and people had striven to ensure there was a service, which included Upperthorpe, Netherthorpe, Manor Top and Hallamshire Hospital. He said that firm discussions would take place with bus operators. In relation to services to and from High Green, he had spoken with local people and local councillors. He had been assured that there would be a service every 5 minutes.

The Council was faced with funding cuts of £300 million to date and there were repercussions from a loss of such an amount of funding. Social isolation was of concern and the Council wanted to make sure that services were provided for communities. Buses were vital to transport people to places of work, leisure and to use other facilities. There was an option to include tram travel within multi-operator weekly and monthly tickets, through an additional payment.

Additional double decker buses had been deployed to help increase capacity. Councillor Fox stated that reliability and punctuality were all matters of concern to the Council, together with making sure there was increased patronage. It would be expected that there was improvement before the meeting of the Combined Authority Transport Committee, which would be held on 29 February 2016. That meeting would be one which was an open meeting for the public to attend. There would be scrutiny of the changes to the City's bus network.

The Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport (Councillor Joe Otten), then spoke on the matter and Members of the City Council then debated the matters raised by the petition, as summarised below:

The 25 day consultation period had been inadequate and the bus network had been subject to change and which had caused confusion. Some bus drivers had also been confused in relation to the changes.

A well run bus service would help to make a well run city. Deregulation had meant that private companies would run a public service for profit and the benefit of shareholders. A question was whether the best had been done for people in Sheffield.

In 1986, the Transport Act had led to the privatisation of bus services outside of London. Until that point in time, Sheffield had the best buses and the cheapest fares. The Council sold the bus network and fares increased and had increased every year since. In 2012, the Sheffield Bus Partnership had helped to stabilise the network. In order for the partnership to work, it required all partners to work together. People were told that things would be better, including fares and services. Further meetings were planned to consider the issues.

The number of signatories to the petitions was impressive. The Council was an equal partner in the Bus Partnership and the agreement of the Partnership specified resources and routes and set out the network. Changes to the agreement could not take place without agreement of the Partners. Whilst changes included a more simple fare structure, they also meant changes to bus numbers and frequencies. There were not always enough buses at peak times and people were affected by lateness due to journey times.

The changes also affected children's journeys to school. The Council's priorities relating to strengthening the economy, reducing inequalities, and improving health and ensuring access for people would not be helped by a declining bus service. Public transport was a vital part of the City's infrastructure and required real investment and a regulated model. The Buses Bill had been included in the Queen's Speech and there was an opportunity to lobby the Government in relation to regulation of bus services.

Members had received comments from constituents regarding the number 3 and number 22 services and the change of location of the bus stop for those services from Pinstone Street to Arundel Gate, which some older people found difficult as it was more problematic if they found it difficult to walk and a letter had been sent to the bus operator in that regard. Members of the public were urged to contact their local councillor with regards to concerns about changes to bus services.

Changes to bus services had affected people and their families. It was considered that the Partnership was not working and the forthcoming Transport Committee meeting in February would be too long for people to wait.

The petitioners had made comments about the effect of changes to bus services on individuals, communities and households. The access to the Moor Market was a serious issue for the Council. It had been acknowledged that there were problems with the consultation and it was important to now deal with the issues which had arisen and hold the bus operators to account.

People felt let down in as far as they were told there would be more frequent services and at no time during the consultation were people told that there would be a significant reduction in services. Concern was raised as to whether the Council had been informed of the proposed reductions and as to the legality of operators' actions and possibility of taking this matter to the transport regulator.

There were human consequences to the changes which had been introduced. Some people had given up their voluntary work because of problems which

stemmed from changes to bus services and their ability to make journeys. However, there was an effort to make public transport work effectively in a restrictive funding environment.

Changes had been introduced under the Partnership of which the Council was a part. Consultation had been limited and although some changes were incorporated following the consultation, it would have better to have had a longer period of consultation. Members had all received representation from their constituents. Concern was expressed that the direct route of the 70 Service to the hospital was now broken at rush hours and people would be required to use a car to access the Hallamshire hospital via the Park and Ride at Millhouses. There was currently more congestion as people resorted to using their cars. Services should be restored so people could rely on them.

The bus companies' role in the Bus Partnership was in improving the reliability etc of bus services; the Passenger Transport Executive had a coordination role and the Council's role was one relating to infrastructure such as road layouts, bus stops and enforcement, including of bus lanes. The bus companies instigated change in respect of services. Fares were significantly less expensive and both reliability and patronage had been increasing. The Partnership had been successful prior to the introduction of these changes, which, it was recognised, fundamentally had not worked. The Council could use its bargaining position to bring about change. Funding cuts had contributed to de-stabilising the bus network, which was why the changes had to be made.

People were using alternative forms of transport to make journeys and had been subject to changes such as catching more than one bus to complete a journey or walking further to or from a bus stop to their destination. People had also experienced significant increases to journey times. The Council would need to be robust in the dealing with the Bus Partnership.

Government funding cuts had reduced spending, including that of the Passenger Transport Executive and the proportion of funding cuts to the Department of Transport had been larger than those to local government or welfare. There had been reductions to grants for operators and rural subsidy grants, which affected many services.

The problems with bus services affected people, business, journeys for school and work and the City's reputation and there was potential social isolation for some people. The number 19 Service had been cut and there was no direct link to Woodseats. People were resorting to using their cars, which was not necessarily the intended result of change.

There had been improvements in relation to bus fares and some changes had led to improvements. In those cases where there were difficulties, the operators should be held to account and concerns dealt with properly so that solutions were found.

Andy Nash on behalf of the lead petitioner, exercised a right of reply and referred to problems with the consultation prior to the changes to bus services and to the



need for communications and for the relevant organisations to listen to people's concerns.

Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. He stated that there was a plan of action to address the problems arising as a result of the changes to bus services. Some changes had been made as a direct response to passengers' concerns. There were also issues to tackle, including punctuality and reliability. The Operators in the Bus Partnership had been told that they would be given time and opportunity to rectify the problems. The matter would be referred to the relevant Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee for consideration and to the Combined Authority Transport Committee in February 2016 to provide opportunity to hold people to account. The Council had pressed for improvements to 25 bus routes and timetables by January 2016 and the operators had said that these would be delivered. The Council would meet with bus users and listen to concerns and hold operators to account.

The outcome of the debate on the petition was as follows:-

It was moved by Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing that:

"The 6 petitions reported to this meeting relating to the changes to bus services in the city from 1st November 2015, be noted, and the issue be referred to the appropriate Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee and the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive for consideration"

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, seconded by Councillor Brian Webster, as an amendment, that the motion be amended by the addition of the following words:

"and be brought to the attention of the Minister for Transport for consideration as part of the forthcoming Buses Bill announced in this year's Queen's Speech."

On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That the 6 petitions reported to this meeting relating to the changes to bus services in the city from 1st November 2015, be noted, and the issue be referred to the appropriate Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee and the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive for consideration, and be brought to the attention of the Minister for Transport for consideration as part of the forthcoming Buses Bill announced in this year's Queen's Speech.
--

## 5.5 Petitions

### 5.5.1 Petition Requesting Speed Reduction Measures on Brooklands Avenue

The Council received an electronic petition containing 16 signatures, requesting speed reduction measures on Brooklands Avenue.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

5.5.2 Petition Requesting Action in Connection with Parking Issues on Norwood Close and Norwood Drive

The Council received a petition containing six signatures, requesting action in connection with parking issues on Norwood Drive and Norwood Close.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport.

5.5.3 Petition Opposing Development on Land at Burncross Road and Chapel Road

The Council received a petition containing 81 signatures, opposing development on land at Burncross Road and Chapel Road.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Housing.

5.5.4 Petition Requesting the Council to Provide Accommodation and Support for at Least 50 Syrian Refugees

The Council received an electronic petition containing 11 signatures, requesting the Council to provide accommodation and support for at least 50 Syrian refugees.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore.

## **6. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

### **6.1 Urgent Business**

There were no questions relating to urgent business under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6(ii).

## 6.2 Questions

A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated and supplementary questions under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4 were asked and were answered by the appropriate Cabinet Members.

## 6.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

There were no questions relating to the discharge of the functions of the South Yorkshire Joint Authorities for Fire and Rescue or Pensions under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6(i).

## 7. **REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES**

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that (a) approval be given to the following changes to the memberships of Boards, etc.

Licensing Committee - Remove Councillor Mick Rooney to create a vacancy

Emergency Planning Shared Services Joint Committee - Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to replace Councillor Jayne Dunn

(b) representatives be appointed to serve on other bodies as follows:-

Duke of Edinburgh Awards Scheme - Councillor Alan Law to fill a vacancy

Sheffield Galleries and Museums Trust - Mr Neil MacDonald to replace Mr Michael Day

(c) Councillor Julie Gledhill be appointed as the Council's representative on the Sheffield Money Board

(d) it is noted that, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its Annual Meeting held on 20 May 2015, the Chief Executive had authorised the following appointments:-

South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel - Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to replace Councillor Isobel Bowler

Emergency Planning Shared Services Joint Committee - Councillor Jayne Dunn to replace Councillor Ben Curran

(e) it be noted that the costs of the additional Special Responsibility Allowance resulting from the Leader's appointment of an Acting Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, anticipated to amount to approximately £5,450 (being 6

months' Band A SRA of £9,083 per annum plus on-costs) in 2015/16, will be met from within the 2015/16 cash limit for the Members' Allowances budget through management actions to contain expenditure over the course of the year.

## **8. LICENSING ACT 2003 - STATEMENT OF LICENSING POLICY**

It was moved by Councillor David Barker, seconded by Councillor Geoff Smith, that the Statement of Licensing Policy under the Licensing Act 2003, as set out in the report of the Executive Director, Place now submitted, be approved.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, seconded by Councillor Brian Webster, as an amendment, that the Statement of Licensing Policy under the Licensing Act 2003, as set out in the report of the Executive Director, Place now submitted, be approved with the addition, after the section within the Crime and Disorder Policy on "Use of Glassware" on page 15, of the following wording relating to "Retailing for Off-Sales":-

### **"Retailing for Off-Sales**

The Licensing Authority is concerned about the negative impact on the licensing objectives created by irresponsible consumption of alcohol from retail alcohol sales.

The Licensing Authority may not approve applications for off sales in the following locations:

- Near to alcohol addiction recovery activities or buildings
- In areas where street drinking affects any of the licensing objectives

Where applications are granted the Licensing Authority will have due regard to imposing relevant conditions where appropriate.

These may include:

- Ban on the sale of high strength beers or ciders
- Minimum of two staff to be on duty at times the premises remain open for sale
- No single cans or bottles of beer or cider will be sold
- Staff must obtain nationally recognised training on responsible alcohol retailing within 2 months of employment
- High strength beers or ciders will be for sale behind a counter accessed only by staff
- All alcoholic drinks will be clearly labelled or marked with the name of the premises"

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negated.

The original Motion was then put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That the Statement of Licensing Policy under the Licensing Act 2003, as set out in the report of the Executive Director, Place now submitted, be approved.

**9. GAMBLING ACT 2005 - STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES (POLICY)**

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Geoff Smith, seconded by Councillor David Barker, that the Statement of Principles (Policy) under the Gambling Act 2005, as set out in the report of the Executive Director, Place now submitted, be approved.

**10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR IAN AUCKLAND**

**Sheffield Plan Consultation**

It was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Steve Ayris, that this Council:-

- (a) is committed to defending Sheffield's reputation as the greenest city in the country – affording our green and open spaces the protection they deserve;
- (b) recognises the importance of demonstrating a five-year economically-deliverable supply of housing within the City's Local Plan;
- (c) therefore notes with concern the current Green Belt Review taking place at the same time as the Sheffield Local Plan is being developed;
- (d) also notes with caution a number of urban green spaces, parks and recreation grounds that have been earmarked as an 'identified opportunity site' and therefore 'suitable for housing';
- (e) notes that the independent URBED report 'Sheffield: Garden City?' has much higher estimates for homes on brownfield and urban sites than the Council's own projections, for example, through 'Urban remodelling' of the Neepsend and Attercliffe areas of the city, this could supply 8,714 homes and 14,924 respectively, but the Sheffield City Council report has only 1,900 and 2,400 homes in these areas, and believes that these higher figures would take the strain off other places and preserve our green open spaces;
- (f) notes that there is currently planning permission in Sheffield for 7,840 new dwellings that are currently not being developed or are incomplete;
- (g) notes that developers will often shun brownfield sites for development as it is often easier and more profitable to them to develop on greenfield sites;

- (h) however, believes that using the New Homes Bonus to invest in brownfield sites and bring more empty homes back into use, could avoid the need to concrete over greenfield and Green Belt land;
- (i) regrets that in the last financial year only £0.3m of the New Homes Bonus was spent on enhancing hard to develop sites and bringing long term empty houses back into use, whilst £0.8m was spent on building a cycle path from Park Square to Norfolk Park and £0.6m improving local centres in what is believed to be the Administration's favoured areas;
- (j) notes that developers will often 'sit' on undeveloped land until its value rises and believes the Liberal Democrat policy of a Site Value Rating tax would discourage this;
- (k) furthermore, hopes the Administration will re-investigate density and height requirements within the inner ring-road to help protect important green spaces;
- (l) hopes the Administration will not use the Green Belt Review to remove any of the 125 sites either wholly or partly in the green belt, suggested by developers in the 'Call for Housing', from the green belt so they can be developed;
- (m) opposes a wholesale Green Belt review until more innovative ways of delivering Sheffield's five-year housing supply have been exhausted;
- (n) calls on the Administration to do more to encourage development, such as using the New Homes Bonus to enhance hard to develop sites; and
- (o) calls on the Administration to commit to protecting our parks and urban green spaces, affirming that no parkland will be developed for housing in the next 5 years.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor George Lindars-Hammond, as an amendment, 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) recalls the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) under the Coalition Government, which requires local authorities to have a local plan in place to meet their local housing need over the next 20 years;
- (b) notes that the NPPF requires local authorities to allocate a five-year supply of immediately and economically deliverable sites, which, with severe cuts made by the Coalition Government to brownfield remediation, have made it increasingly difficult to build on brownfield land;
- (c) notes that despite these challenges, the current Administration does not want to build on the green belt and is committed to maximizing building on

brownfield land and protecting green spaces;

- (d) further notes that the national planning practice guidance issued by the Coalition Government, which sets out how a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) should be undertaken, states that 'sites, which have particular policy constraints, should be included in the assessment for the sake of comprehensiveness';
- (e) recalls that a SHLAA was published in March 2011, when the main opposition group was in control of the Council, and that this included a list of 17 green belt sites, including one on Baslow Road, Totley;
- (f) therefore believes the main opposition group is displaying breathtaking hypocrisy and a wilful intention to mislead the public on this issue;
- (g) notes that if a local plan isn't in place, when a developer applies for planning permission on sensitive sites, the Council's power to refuse is increasingly weakened;
- (h) understands therefore that Sheffield needs to have a local plan in place that complies with the NPPF introduced by the Coalition Government; and
- (i) looks forward to hearing local residents' views on options for the nature and scale of growth in their areas over the next 20 years, following the publication of the Sheffield Plan: Citywide Options for Growth to 2034.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

Following a Right of Reply by Councillor Ian Auckland, the original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) recalls the introduction of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) under the Coalition Government, which requires local authorities to have a local plan in place to meet their local housing need over the next 20 years;
- (b) notes that the NPPF requires local authorities to allocate a five-year supply of immediately and economically deliverable sites, which, with severe cuts made by the Coalition Government to brownfield remediation, have made it increasingly difficult to build on brownfield land;
- (c) notes that despite these challenges, the current Administration does not want to build on the green belt and is committed to maximizing building on brownfield land and protecting green spaces;
- (d) further notes that the national planning practice guidance issued by the Coalition Government, which sets out how a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) should be undertaken, states that 'sites, which have particular policy constraints, should be included in the

assessment for the sake of comprehensiveness’;

- (e) recalls that a SHLAA was published in March 2011, when the main opposition group was in control of the Council, and that this included a list of 17 green belt sites, including one on Baslow Road, Totley;
- (f) therefore believes the main opposition group is displaying breathtaking hypocrisy and a wilful intention to mislead the public on this issue;
- (g) notes that if a local plan isn’t in place, when a developer applies for planning permission on sensitive sites, the Council’s power to refuse is increasingly weakened;
- (h) understands therefore that Sheffield needs to have a local plan in place that complies with the NPPF introduced by the Coalition Government; and
- (i) looks forward to hearing local residents’ views on options for the nature and scale of growth in their areas over the next 20 years, following the publication of the Sheffield Plan: Citywide Options for Growth to 2034.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) to (e) and (g) to (i) and abstained on Paragraph (f) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR TERRY FOX**

### **Bus Services In Sheffield (2)**

It was moved by Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, that this Council:-

- (a) recalls cuts made under the Coalition Government for funding bus services, including the Bus Services Operators Grant and the Rural Bus Subsidy Grant, which have put pressure on bus services across the country;
- (b) recognises that the bus partnership, implemented in 2012, has improved the reliability of the network and reduced fares for many passengers, despite Government cuts, thereby helping to improve the sustainability of bus services;
- (c) however, believes that bus companies have a duty to provide an effective bus route network across the city, and notes that from 1 November, when the bus companies implemented their changes to Sheffield’s bus network, this has not been demonstrated;
- (d) demands that the bus companies swiftly address the problems that have occurred on several routes in recent weeks, and ensure that improvements are put in place as soon as possible; and



- (e) welcomes the action taken by Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to call in the bus companies to answer for these problems.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, as an amendment, 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 recent disastrous cuts to Sheffield bus services by the Sheffield Bus Partnership;
- (b) believes the changes were poorly communicated and the changes were misguided as a result of a flawed consultation that failed to reach, or listen to, those who depend upon our bus services;
- (c) notes that despite representatives of the Sheffield Bus Partnership admitting the consultation could have been improved, the Partnership agreed to go ahead with the changes;
- (d) dismisses the attempt by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to pass the blame for these cuts solely onto the bus companies of Sheffield, as these changes were agreed by the Sheffield Bus Partnership, of which this Council is a part;
- (e) demands that the Sheffield Bus Partnership swiftly addresses the problems that have occurred across the city in recent weeks, and ensure that improvements are put in place as soon as possible, to assure members of the public receive the service they need and rely on; and
- (f) calls on the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to accept responsibility for his role in the poor consultation and poorly thought out cuts to Sheffield's bus services.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negatived.

It was then moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, seconded by Councillor Brian Webster, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (e) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (e) as follows:-

- (b) notes also the three decades of decline in the bus network in Sheffield and across the country (except London) since deregulation of bus services outside of London in 1985;
- (c) recognises that the Sheffield Bus Partnership is a voluntary agreement and gives local authorities no statutory powers over companies operating bus services in the city;
- (d) believes the changes implemented to the bus network in Sheffield on 1st

November are an example of the problems created by a network run for private profit over public service; and

- (e) requests the Chief Executive to write to the Minister for Transport outlining the decline of Sheffield's bus network, the inadequacy of voluntary agreements in providing a sustainable service and requesting powers to franchise bus services in all metropolitan areas to be brought forward in the Buses Bill announced in this year's Queen's Speech.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negated.

It was then moved by Councillor Keith Davis, seconded by Councillor John Booker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (d) and the substitution of a new paragraph (d) as follows:-

- (d) requests that all affected routes are returned to the timetable prior to these changes until a satisfactory and effective solution can be found, and believes that the people of Sheffield should not be made to suffer during this unacceptable period of inadequacy; and

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negated.

It was then moved by Councillor Tony Downing, seconded by Councillor Terry Fox, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (f) as follows:-

- (f) resolves to refer this issue to the appropriate Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee and the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

Following a Right of Reply by Councillor Terry Fox, the original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) recalls cuts made under the Coalition Government for funding bus services, including the Bus Services Operators Grant and the Rural Bus Subsidy Grant, which have put pressure on bus services across the country;
- (b) recognises that the bus partnership, implemented in 2012, has improved the reliability of the network and reduced fares for many passengers, despite Government cuts, thereby helping to improve the sustainability of bus services;
- (c) however, believes that bus companies have a duty to provide an effective bus route network across the city, and notes that from 1 November, when the bus companies implemented their changes to Sheffield's bus network, this has not been demonstrated;

- (d) demands that the bus companies swiftly address the problems that have occurred on several routes in recent weeks, and ensure that improvements are put in place as soon as possible;
- (e) welcomes the action taken by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to call in the bus companies to answer for these problems; and
- (f) resolves to refer this issue to the appropriate Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee and the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) and (c) to (f) and abstained on Paragraph (b) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

**12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL**

**Local Plan Consultation (2)**

At the request of Councillor Leigh Bramall and with the consent of the Council, the Notice of Motion Numbered 11 on the Summons for this meeting was withdrawn in accordance with Council Procedure Rules 17.10 and 11(x).

**13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED**

**Action Against Daesh (ISIL) Terrorists**

It was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, that this Council:-

- (a) notes with horror recent attacks worldwide by Daesh (ISIL) terrorists, including, but not exclusive to, the murder of 130 innocent civilians in Paris, the 224 killed when a plane from Egypt to Russia was bombed, the many hundreds more murdered or injured in bombings in Beirut, Turkey, Iraq and elsewhere, and those murdered on the beach in Tunisia;
- (b) notes with sadness the millions of people displaced from their homelands in Daesh controlled areas;
- (c) believes the use of force in defeating Daesh as a territorial power to be justified under the terms of the NATO Treaty and by the recent UN Security Council resolution;
- (d) believes, however, that bombing alone has proven ineffective in similar scenarios, and that ground troops from allies in the region will be needed;

- (e) supports calls for co-operation between NATO powers, Iraq, Russia, Saudi Arabia and Iran in taking action against Daesh;
- (f) recognises that while foreign policy mistakes in the past may have contributed to instability in the region, responsibility for Daesh outrages lies entirely with the perpetrators of those outrages;
- (g) believes that we should hold fast to the values of democracy, freedom, tolerance, inclusivity and human rights in defiance of Daesh;
- (h) notes that Daesh's primary focus is the conquest and control of territory in the Middle East, to which end they have killed, raped and enslaved large numbers of Muslims and non-Muslim minorities;
- (i) believes Daesh to be a threat to the safety and security of peoples of all faiths and none, many of whom have lived peacefully side by side in the region for centuries, and that division between Muslims and non-Muslims is what Daesh is trying to achieve;
- (j) welcomes efforts of the Council to promote peace and understanding between the diverse communities in this city; and
- (k) resolves that a copy of this motion be sent to Sheffield's six MPs and to the United Nations.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Geoff Smith, seconded by Councillor Leigh Bramall, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (c) to (k) and the addition of new paragraphs (c) to (e) as follows:-

- (c) believes that we should hold fast to the values of democracy, freedom, tolerance, inclusivity and human rights in defiance of Daesh;
- (d) believes Daesh to be a threat to the safety and security of peoples of all faiths and none, many of whom have lived peacefully side by side in the region for centuries, and that division between Muslims and non-Muslims is what Daesh is trying to achieve; and
- (e) welcomes efforts of the Council to promote peace and understanding between the diverse communities in this city and welcomes the recent inter-faith march which demonstrated the unity of people of all faiths and none in the City.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council

- (a) notes with horror recent attacks worldwide by Daesh (ISIL) terrorists, including, but not exclusive to, the murder of 130 innocent civilians in Paris, the 224 killed when a plane from Egypt to Russia was bombed, the many hundreds more murdered or injured in bombings in Beirut, Turkey, Iraq and elsewhere, and those murdered on the beach in Tunisia;
- (b) notes with sadness the millions of people displaced from their homelands in Daesh controlled areas;
- (c) believes that we should hold fast to the values of democracy, freedom, tolerance, inclusivity and human rights in defiance of Daesh;
- (d) believes Daesh to be a threat to the safety and security of peoples of all faiths and none, many of whom have lived peacefully side by side in the region for centuries, and that division between Muslims and non-Muslims is what Daesh is trying to achieve; and
- (e) welcomes efforts of the Council to promote peace and understanding between the diverse communities in this city and welcomes the recent inter-faith march which demonstrated the unity of people of all faiths and none in the City.

#### **14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JAYNE DUNN**

##### **Housing**

It was moved by Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Pat Midgley, that this Council:-

- (a) is concerned that, if passed, the Government's Housing and Planning Bill would threaten the provision of affordable homes through:-
  - (i) forcing 'high-value' council homes to be sold;
  - (ii) extending the right-to-buy to housing association tenants; and
  - (iii) undermining requirements on private developers to provide affordable homes;
- (b) notes that there is no commitment in the Bill that affordable homes will be replaced on a like-for-like basis in the local area;
- (c) further notes that, whilst measures to help first-time-buyers are welcome, the 'starter homes' proposals in the Bill will:-

- (i) be unaffordable to families and young people on ordinary incomes in most parts of the country; and
  - (ii) be built at the expense of genuinely affordable homes to rent and buy; and
- (d) believes that the Bill undermines localism by providing new wide and open-ended powers to the Secretary of State over councils, including the ability to mandate rents for council tenants, and, in effect, to impose a levy on stock-holding councils, violating the terms of the housing revenue account self-financing deal.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Steve Ayriss, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows:-

- (e) recalls the motion on this topic proposed by the Liberal Democrat group at September's full Council meeting and therefore proposes that:-
  - (i) this Council works with other neighbouring authorities and housing associations to oppose the current Government proposals; and
  - (ii) a copy of this Motion is sent to our local MPs asking them to support the Council's position; to speak up in Parliament for more social housing and not less and to push for a genuine "one for one" replacement but not at the cost of losing more Council housing.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negatived.

The original Motion was then put to the vote and carried as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) is concerned that, if passed, the Government's Housing and Planning Bill would threaten the provision of affordable homes through:-
  - (i) forcing 'high-value' council homes to be sold;
  - (ii) extending the right-to-buy to housing association tenants; and
  - (iii) undermining requirements on private developers to provide affordable homes;
- (b) notes that there is no commitment in the Bill that affordable homes will be replaced on a like-for-like basis in the local area;
- (c) further notes that, whilst measures to help first-time-buyers are welcome, the 'starter homes' proposals in the Bill will:-

- (i) be unaffordable to families and young people on ordinary incomes in most parts of the country; and
- (ii) be built at the expense of genuinely affordable homes to rent and buy; and
- (d) believes that the Bill undermines localism by providing new wide and open-ended powers to the Secretary of State over councils, including the ability to mandate rents for council tenants, and, in effect, to impose a levy on stock-holding councils, violating the terms of the housing revenue account self-financing deal.

**15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BRIAN WEBSTER**

**Junior Doctors' Industrial Dispute**

It was moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, that this Council:-

- (a) believes in the fundamental principle of the NHS - that quality healthcare should be accessible by all, and free at the point of access - and understands that this would not be possible without the contributions made every day by the dedicated and highly skilled professionals who work in the health service;
- (b) notes that Sheffield is privileged to be the location of a number of world-class NHS hospitals, which not only help to keep people healthy and save lives, but are also major employers in this city;
- (c) believes that junior doctors are a vital part of the healthcare team that keeps hospitals in Sheffield and across the country functioning at their best, and believes that without their efforts the NHS would be unable to function;
- (d) believes it is only fair that those who are working hard to protect the health and wellbeing of the people of Sheffield should be fairly rewarded for their efforts, with appropriate compensation and with adequate safeguards to prevent staff being required to work excessive hours;
- (e) notes the nearly unanimous (98%) support from junior doctors balloted for strike action in response to the proposed new junior doctors' contract, on a turnout of 76%;
- (f) respects this result, fully supports the right of junior doctors to take industrial action, and agrees with the British Medical Association's (BMA) assessment that the proposed new contract is "unsafe for patients and unfair for doctors";
- (g) welcomes the commitment of the BMA to take steps to ensure that urgent and essential care can be provided by other doctors and NHS staff in the

event of a strike;

- (h) hopes that strike action by junior doctors can be avoided by a fair and mutually agreeable deal being reached between the BMA and the Secretary of State for Health, and therefore urges the Secretary of State to accept the BMA's offer of going to the Acas mediation service for further negotiations to reach such a deal;
- (i) believes that if a fair resolution to this dispute cannot be found, the Secretary of State risks driving many junior doctors out of the profession, or even out of the country entirely, in search of fair pay and employment conditions, and believes that this would be a regrettable outcome and deeply damaging to Sheffield's hospitals and to the NHS in general;
- (j) calls upon all Members to support junior doctors in their ongoing fight for a fair contract, including in the event of industrial action; and
- (k) requests officers to send a copy of this motion to the Secretary of State for Health, and to the Yorkshire Regional Junior Doctor Committee.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, seconded by Councillor Brian Webster, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (h) and the addition of a new paragraph (h) as follows:-

- (h) hopes that strike action by junior doctors can be avoided by a fair and mutually agreeable deal being reached between the BMA and the Secretary of State for Health, so welcomes the commencement of talks via the Acas mediation service, the Secretary of State's temporary lifting of his threat to impose the new contract, and the consequent postponement of the first day of strike action which had been scheduled to occur on 1st December, 2015;

On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes in the fundamental principle of the NHS - that quality healthcare should be accessible by all, and free at the point of access - and understands that this would not be possible without the contributions made every day by the dedicated and highly skilled professionals who work in the health service;
- (b) notes that Sheffield is privileged to be the location of a number of world-class NHS hospitals, which not only help to keep people healthy and save lives, but are also major employers in this city;
- (c) believes that junior doctors are a vital part of the healthcare team that keeps hospitals in Sheffield and across the country functioning at their best, and believes that without their efforts the NHS would be unable to function;



- (d) believes it is only fair that those who are working hard to protect the health and wellbeing of the people of Sheffield should be fairly rewarded for their efforts, with appropriate compensation and with adequate safeguards to prevent staff being required to work excessive hours;
- (e) notes the nearly unanimous (98%) support from junior doctors balloted for strike action in response to the proposed new junior doctors' contract, on a turnout of 76%;
- (f) respects this result, fully supports the right of junior doctors to take industrial action, and agrees with the British Medical Association's (BMA) assessment that the proposed new contract is "unsafe for patients and unfair for doctors";
- (g) welcomes the commitment of the BMA to take steps to ensure that urgent and essential care can be provided by other doctors and NHS staff in the event of a strike;
- (h) hopes that strike action by junior doctors can be avoided by a fair and mutually agreeable deal being reached between the BMA and the Secretary of State for Health, so welcomes the commencement of talks via the Acas mediation service, the Secretary of State's temporary lifting of his threat to impose the new contract, and the consequent postponement of the first day of strike action which had been scheduled to occur on 1<sup>st</sup> December, 2015;
- (i) believes that if a fair resolution to this dispute cannot be found, the Secretary of State risks driving many junior doctors out of the profession, or even out of the country entirely, in search of fair pay and employment conditions, and believes that this would be a regrettable outcome and deeply damaging to Sheffield's hospitals and to the NHS in general;
- (j) calls upon all Members to support junior doctors in their ongoing fight for a fair contract, including in the event of industrial action; and
- (k) requests officers to send a copy of this motion to the Secretary of State for Health, and to the Yorkshire Regional Junior Doctor Committee.

(Note: Councillor Aodan Marken, having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the above item, took no part in the debate or voting thereon.)

## **16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER**

### **Common Fisheries Policy**

It was moved by Councillor John Booker, seconded by Councillor Keith Davis, that this Council:-

- (a) believes the Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) has been an economic, social

and environmental disaster for the UK, with the result that, we, a once great sea-faring nation with the greatest trading seaborne empire the world has ever seen, are reduced to importing two thirds of the fish we consume;

- (b) regrets that the British political class are seemingly unconcerned about this perceived betrayal, and that the Liberal Democrat, Labour and Conservative parties seem to believe that the perceived vast waste of taxpayers' money and the plundering of our waters with no thought for the future, are a price worth paying for EU membership;
- (c) further regrets that, when former Prime Minister, Edward Heath, two weeks after his election victory in 1970, signed the CFP deal, this led to what amounted to an invasion of British coastal waters – whilst having almost 80% of Europe's fishing grounds, the UK has only 13% of Europe's fishing quota;
- (d) agrees with the late Labour politician, Aneurin (Nye) Bevan, when he described Great Britain as an "island made of coal, surrounded by a sea of fish", and regrets that these jewels in our crown have seemingly been abandoned and surrendered;
- (e) places on record the facts that, in 1970, 948,000 tonnes of fish were landed from British vessels and by 2015 it was 405,000 tonnes, the reduction of fishermen over that period was from 20,751 to 12,450, and we now import £2.66 billion worth of fish annually; and
- (f) further, states we must put a stop to what this Council believes to be a scandal, and the only way to do so is to leave the EU and reclaim our seas.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Roger Davison, as an amendment, 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 European Union's Common Fisheries Policy (CFP) was adopted in 1983 to protect declining fish stocks, protecting not only the environment but the interests of the fishing industry and consumers;
- (b) believes that a free-for-all of fishing would lead to the destruction of fish stocks through over-fishing, threatening the future of the fishing industry for all nations;
- (c) notes that as fish are unaware of the boundaries of territorial waters, no single country can have an effective policy to maintain their own fish stocks;
- (d) welcomes the 2014 reforms of the CFP which includes:-
  - (i) a ban on discards – the controversial practice of discarding often edible fish;

- (ii) a legally binding commitment to fishing at sustainable levels; and
  - (iii) more decentralised decision making, allowing Member States to agree the measures appropriate to their own fisheries;
- (e) regrets that UKIP MEPs abstained on this reform in the European Parliament; and
- (f) believes that the leader of UKIP, Nigel Farage MEP's attendance record of 1 out of 42 meetings of the European Parliament Fisheries Committee during the three years he was a member of that Committee demonstrates UKIP's complete lack of commitment to sustainable fishing and the future of the fishing industry.

On being put to the vote, Paragraph (f) of the above amendment was carried and all of the remaining paragraphs were negatived.

(Note: The Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain), The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Mohammad Maroof, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney and Jackie Satur voted for Paragraph (f) and against Paragraphs (a) to (e) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded).

The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council believes that the leader of UKIP, Nigel Farage MEP's attendance record of 1 out of 42 meetings of the European Parliament Fisheries Committee during the three years he was a member of that Committee demonstrates UKIP's complete lack of commitment to sustainable fishing and the future of the fishing industry.
---

## **17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ROGER DAVISON**

### **Social Care Funding**

It was moved by Councillor Roger Davison, seconded by Councillor Sue Alston, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the cross-party support for the Coalition Government policy to cap care costs following the Dilnot Commission, and that the Conservative Party was elected to Government with a clear and unambiguous promise in their manifesto to cap care costs from 2016 onwards;
- (b) notes that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Rt. Hon. George Osborne MP's emergency budget in July 2015 provided no extra funding for social care;
- (c) notes with concern the recent Government announcement to shelve plans for a cap on care costs, with an estimated £100m of public money spent on preparation set to be wasted and uncertainty for the future of those who will be needing these care services;
- (d) notes that social care has suffered from chronic underfunding and, unlike the NHS, has not enjoyed any protection and that an underfunded social care system simply increases costs in the NHS;
- (e) therefore calls on the Government to ensure that social care is sustainably funded to ensure that people receive the right care in the right place at the right time and that no one faces catastrophic care costs;
- (f) calls on the Government to cancel the increase in the allowance threshold for inheritance tax and use the saving to support these reforms, thereby protecting the homes of those in need of care; and
- (g) requests that a copy of this motion be sent to the Secretary of State for Health.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Mary Lea, seconded by Councillor Jack Scott, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition in paragraph (d), after the words "suffered from chronic underfunding", of the words "in no small part due to swingeing cuts to local authority budgets under the Coalition Government";
2. the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows and the re-lettering of the original paragraphs (e) to (g) as new paragraphs (f) to (h):-
  - (e) notes that adult social care is one of the areas to which the current Administration will continue to provide the greatest protection, despite expecting to have to find a further £50m from the Council's budget next year;

On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the cross-party support for the Coalition Government policy to cap care costs following the Dilnot Commission, and that the Conservative Party was elected to Government with a clear and unambiguous promise in their manifesto to cap care costs from 2016 onwards;
- (b) notes that the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Rt. Hon. George Osborne MP's emergency budget in July 2015 provided no extra funding for social care;
- (c) notes with concern the recent Government announcement to shelve plans for a cap on care costs, with an estimated £100m of public money spent on preparation set to be wasted and uncertainty for the future of those who will be needing these care services;
- (d) notes that social care has suffered from chronic underfunding in no small part due to swingeing cuts to local authority budgets under the Coalition Government and, unlike the NHS, has not enjoyed any protection and that an underfunded social care system simply increases costs in the NHS;
- (e) notes that adult social care is one of the areas to which the current Administration will continue to provide the greatest protection, despite expecting to have to find a further £50m from the Council's budget next year;
- (f) therefore calls on the Government to ensure that social care is sustainably funded to ensure that people receive the right care in the right place at the right time and that no one faces catastrophic care costs;
- (g) calls on the Government to cancel the increase in the allowance threshold for inheritance tax and use the saving to support these reforms, thereby protecting the homes of those in need of care; and
- (h) requests that a copy of this motion be sent to the Secretary of State for Health.

(Note: Councillors Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker and Katie Condliffe voted for Paragraphs (a) to (c) and (e) to (h) and against Paragraph (d) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

**18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR RICHARD SHAW**

**Gender Recognition**

It was moved by Councillor Richard Shaw, seconded by Councillor David Baker,

that this Council:-

- (a) notes that 20<sup>th</sup> November was the International Transgender Day of Remembrance, a day to remember transgender people who have lost their lives through hate-fuelled violence;
- (b) notes that transgender and intersex individuals experience similar levels and types of discrimination within society, including, but not limited to, hate crime, health discrimination, and difficulty obtaining documents in the correct gender;
- (c) notes that the transgender and intersex communities are too often marginalised, with little or no emphasis on their needs from government or third sector organisations;
- (d) notes transgender and intersex people are at a higher risk of mental health issues and suicidal ideation than the general population and the rest of the LGBT+ population, especially among BME transgender and intersex people;
- (e) notes current practices in data collection make it difficult for a transgender person to have their gender recorded accurately under the terms of the Data Protection Act 1998, and that, without a gender recognition certificate, their transgender status is not guaranteed to be treated as protected or sensitive data;
- (f) notes with regret the recent death of Vicky Thompson, a transgender woman who had been living as a woman for 4 years, who committed suicide after she was sent to a male prison as she did not possess a gender recognition certificate, and the even more recent death within a male prison of another transgender woman, Joanne Latham;
- (g) believes that variations in sex and gender, however they manifest, are a simple fact of human physiology and psychology, and neither the state nor society should pass judgement on people who deviate from what is considered the norm;
- (h) welcomes the Liberal Democrat campaign to introduce 'X' gender markers on UK passports;
- (i) calls on the Administration to introduce an 'X' gender option and 'Mx.' title option on all its forms for non-binary gendered individuals as a small move towards acceptance; and
- (j) calls on the Government to introduce a 'X' gender option for UK passports and requests that a copy of this motion be sent to the Home Secretary.

(Note: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of Councillor Richard Shaw (the mover of the motion), Paragraph (f) of the Motion as included on the Council Summons, was altered by the addition of the following words, after the

words “gender recognition certificate”:

“and the even more recent death within a male prison of another transgender woman, Joanne Latham;” )

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Nikki Bond, seconded by Councillor Jackie Drayton, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of the following words at the end of paragraph (a) “and further notes the remembrance event held at the Winter Gardens, organised with the Council and supported by E.D.E.N Films and LGBT Sheffield”;
2. the addition of the following words at the end of paragraph (c) “but notes the Equality Hubs set up by the current Administration which work to ensure LGBT communities are well represented within Sheffield”;
3. the replacement in paragraph (d) of the words “LGBT+ population” by the words “LGBT and intersex population”;
4. the addition of the following words at the end of paragraph (f) “and also draws attention to other instances of people in prisons not compatible with their recognised gender”; and
5. the deletion of paragraphs (h) to (j) and the addition of new paragraphs (h) and (i) as follows:-
  - (h) calls on the Government to consult with the gender neutral community on Gender ‘X’ passports; and
  - (i) asks officers to consult with minority communities to ask how they wish to be addressed on Council forms.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

(Note: Councillors Pauline Andrews, Keith Davis and John Booker voted for Paragraph 5 and against Paragraphs 1 to 4 and asked for this to be recorded.)

The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that 20<sup>th</sup> November was the International Transgender Day of Remembrance, a day to remember transgender people who have lost their lives through hate-fuelled violence and further notes the remembrance event held at the Winter Gardens, organised with the Council and supported by E.D.E.N Films and LGBT Sheffield;
- (b) notes that transgender and intersex individuals experience similar levels

and types of discrimination within society, including, but not limited to, hate crime, health discrimination, and difficulty obtaining documents in the correct gender;

- (c) notes that the transgender and intersex communities are too often marginalised, with little or no emphasis on their needs from government or third sector organisations, but notes the Equality Hubs set up by the current Administration which work to ensure LGBT communities are well represented within Sheffield;
- (d) notes transgender and intersex people are at a higher risk of mental health issues and suicidal ideation than the general population and the rest of the LGBT and intersex population, especially among BME transgender and intersex people;
- (e) notes current practices in data collection make it difficult for a transgender person to have their gender recorded accurately under the terms of the Data Protection Act 1998, and that, without a gender recognition certificate, their transgender status is not guaranteed to be treated as protected or sensitive data;
- (f) notes with regret the recent death of Vicky Thompson, a transgender woman who had been living as a woman for 4 years, who committed suicide after she was sent to a male prison as she did not possess a gender recognition certificate, and the even more recent death within a male prison of another transgender woman, Joanne Latham, and also draws attention to other instances of people in prisons not compatible with their recognised gender;
- (g) believes that variations in sex and gender, however they manifest, are a simple fact of human physiology and psychology, and neither the state nor society should pass judgement on people who deviate from what is considered the norm;
- (h) calls on the Government to consult with the gender neutral community on Gender 'X' passports; and
- (i) asks officers to consult with minority communities to ask how they wish to be addressed on Council forms.

## **19. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR AODAN MARKEN**

### **Public Engagement**

It was moved by Councillor Aodan Marken, seconded by Councillor Brian Webster, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that full Council meetings are an important mechanism for



demonstrating the Council's accountability to Sheffield residents;

- (b) recognises that all Councillors want to represent their constituents and the city well, and that a great deal of this work inevitably takes place outside of the full Council meeting;
- (c) believes that full Council meetings could run better than they have done in the past, and that the best way to achieve that is via mutual respect on the part of all Members and dialogue between Council political groups;
- (d) notes the comments from the Leader of the Council, following the July full Council meeting, stating that 'we can improve the way the Council meeting operates', comments which were supported by the leaders of opposition groups;
- (e) believes that heckling Members from other parties is a sign of disrespect to the voters who chose their Councillor to represent them;
- (f) notes with disappointment the actions taken in addition to the recommendations of the Interim Director of Public Health for Sheffield's annual 2015 report at the November full Council meeting, and believes that these additions were made with little regard for normal procedure;
- (g) notes that Green Councillors have previously called for audio-broadcasting of meetings, to allow wider public access;
- (h) is pleased that the recording of full Council meetings is being explored, and believes that this should be expedited for the purposes of local democracy and transparency;
- (i) calls on the leaders of all political groups on the Council to hold a publicly accessible meeting to discuss how best to improve full Council meetings; and
- (j) proposes that an annual survey of Council Members should be used to improve and assess progress in improving the conduct of all public Council meetings.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Ibrar Hussain, seconded by Councillor Alan Law, as an amendment, 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 full Council meetings are one of many ways for demonstrating the Council's accountability to Sheffield residents;
- (b) notes the many other types of Council meetings open to the public, including Cabinet, Scrutiny Committees and Planning & Highways Committee;

- (c) further notes additional ways that people are able to engage with the Council, including through Ward Councillors, consultations, equality hub networks and social media;
- (d) recognises that all Councillors want to represent their constituents and the city well, and that a great deal of this work inevitably takes place outside of the full Council meeting;
- (e) welcomes the current Administration's plans to make the Council more of an in-touch organisation, and notes that the theme of this year's Cabinet in the Community is asking people for their views on how they would like to engage with the Council moving forwards;
- (f) believes this should be part of a wider piece of work looking at engagement, and is open to exploring ways to improve all forms of engagement and commits to involving all groups in this process on a non-political basis; and
- (g) believes it fully appropriate for the Council to stand up for the city, and therefore believes it was proper for the Labour Group to oppose unfair Government cuts to public health funding at November's full Council meeting, and is disappointed this was not supported across the Council.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried.

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that full Council meetings are one of many ways for demonstrating the Council's accountability to Sheffield residents;
- (b) notes the many other types of Council meetings open to the public, including Cabinet, Scrutiny Committees and Planning & Highways Committee;
- (c) further notes additional ways that people are able to engage with the Council, including through Ward Councillors, consultations, equality hub networks and social media;
- (d) recognises that all Councillors want to represent their constituents and the city well, and that a great deal of this work inevitably takes place outside of the full Council meeting;
- (e) welcomes the current Administration's plans to make the Council more of an in-touch organisation, and notes that the theme of this year's Cabinet in the Community is asking people for their views on how they would like to engage with the Council moving forwards;

- (f) believes this should be part of a wider piece of work looking at engagement, and is open to exploring ways to improve all forms of engagement and commits to involving all groups in this process on a non-political basis; and
- (g) believes it fully appropriate for the Council to stand up for the city, and therefore believes it was proper for the Labour Group to oppose unfair Government cuts to public health funding at November's full Council meeting, and is disappointed this was not supported across the Council.

(Notes 1: Councillors Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, David Baker and Katie Condliffe voted for Paragraphs (a) to (d) and (f) and against Paragraphs (e) and (g) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) to (d) and (f) and abstained on Paragraphs (e) and (g) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **20. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ANDREW SANGAR**

### **Climate Change**

It was moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Richard Shaw, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the 21st Session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP21) is scheduled to take place in Paris, France from 30 November to 11 December 2015;
- (b) believes this will be a crucial conference, as it needs to achieve a new international agreement on the climate, applicable to all countries, with the aim of keeping global warming within 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels;
- (c) notes the achievements of Liberal Democrats in government from 2010 to 2015 in maintaining momentum towards a new global treaty on climate change, working constructively with other EU member states for more ambitious action on green growth and making progress towards decarbonising the UK economy;
- (d) condemns the Government for what this Council believes is an ideologically-motivated decision to end support for onshore wind power, which can only serve to increase the cost of the low-carbon transition while at the same time losing jobs and investment and harming the UK's international competitiveness;

- (e) therefore calls upon the Government to:-
  - (i) play a leading political and diplomatic role as part of the EU negotiating effort to secure agreement on a fair, effective and legally binding new global climate treaty at the conference; and
  - (ii) ensure that the UK meets its own targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and plays a leadership role within Europe and internationally on efforts to combat climate change; and
- (f) requests that a copy of this motion be sent to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:

1. the deletion of paragraph (c) and the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-
  - (c) notes the achievements of the previous Labour government on climate change, including:
    - (i) introducing the Climate Change Act, which legislated for an 80% reduction in emissions by 2050, making the UK the first country to legislate for deep, long-term cuts in emissions; and
    - (ii) helping to broker the Kyoto Treaty – the world's first legally binding climate treaty.
2. the addition of a new paragraph (f) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraph (f) as a new paragraph (g):-
  - (f) is alarmed by the Government's decision to cut spending on home energy efficiency by 83% and break its election pledge to commit £1bn for carbon capture and storage technology in the recent Comprehensive Spending Review;

On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraph 2 and abstained on Paragraph 1 of the above amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

It was then moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Aodan Marken, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (f) as follows, and the relettering of original paragraph (f) as a new paragraph (g):-

- (f) welcomes the 'Time for the Climate' event which was held in Sheffield on 28th November 2015 by Sheffield Climate Alliance as part of the Global

People's Climate March;

On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried.

It was then moved by Councillor John Booker, seconded by Councillor Keith Davis, as an amendment, 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) believes the relentless push to create an international agreement on climate change is anything but international;
- (b) is concerned that the consequences of our drive to an ever lower carbon economy means Britain's capacity to generate power is dangerously low;
- (c) notes that figures from the Department of Energy and Climate Change show spare capacity in electrical generation will be perilously close to zero this winter and could fall even further, leaving Britain short of power by the winter of 2016-17;
- (d) believes that Great Britain should invest in renewable energy where it can deliver electricity at competitive prices, and that, at the moment, only hydro can achieve this;
- (e) notes that wind power is hopelessly inefficient and that wind farms rely heavily on reserve back-up from conventional power sources, and believes that they spoil our landscapes and put money into the pockets of wealthy landowners and investors, while pushing up bills for the rest of the population; and
- (f) further believes that closing perfectly good coal-fired power stations to meet unattainable targets for renewable capacity is a seriously flawed policy.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negated.

The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the 21st Session of the Conference of the Parties to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (COP21) is scheduled to take place in Paris, France from 30 November to 11 December 2015;
- (b) believes this will be a crucial conference, as it needs to achieve a new international agreement on the climate, applicable to all countries, with the aim of keeping global warming within 2 degrees Celsius above pre-industrial levels;
- (c) notes the achievements of the previous Labour government on climate

change, including:

- (i) introducing the Climate Change Act, which legislated for an 80% reduction in emissions by 2050, making the UK the first country to legislate for deep, long-term cuts in emissions; and
  - (ii) helping to broker the Kyoto Treaty – the world's first legally binding climate treaty;
- (d) condemns the Government for what this Council believes is an ideologically-motivated decision to end support for onshore wind power, which can only serve to increase the cost of the low-carbon transition while at the same time losing jobs and investment and harming the UK's international competitiveness;
- (e) therefore calls upon the Government to:-
- (i) play a leading political and diplomatic role as part of the EU negotiating effort to secure agreement on a fair, effective and legally binding new global climate treaty at the conference; and
  - (ii) ensure that the UK meets its own targets to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and plays a leadership role within Europe and internationally on efforts to combat climate change;
- (f) is alarmed by the Government's decision to cut spending on home energy efficiency by 83% and break its election pledge to commit £1bn for carbon capture and storage technology in the recent Comprehensive Spending Review;
- (g) welcomes the 'Time for the Climate' event which was held in Sheffield on 28th November 2015 by Sheffield Climate Alliance as part of the Global People's Climate March; and
- (h) requests that a copy of this motion be sent to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change.

(Note: Councillors Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, David Baker and Katie Condliffe voted for Paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) to (h) and against Paragraph (c) and asked for this to be recorded.)