

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 1 February 2017, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Denise Fox)

1	<i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i> Andy Nash Bob Pullin Richard Shaw	10	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Andy Bainbridge	19	<i>Nether Edge & Sharrow Ward</i> Mohammad Maroof Alison Teal
2	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	11	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Shaffaq Mohammed Paul Scriven	20	<i>Park & Arbourthorne</i> Julie Dore Ben Miskell Jack Scott
3	<i>Birley Ward</i> Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	12	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Abdul Khayum Alan Law Abtisam Mohamed	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> Mike Drabble Dianne Hurst Peter Rippon
4	<i>Broomhill & Sharrow Vale Ward</i> Michelle Cook Kieran Harpham Magid Magid	13	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	22	<i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i> Dawn Dale Peter Price Garry Weatherall
5	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Talib Hussain Mark Jones	14	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Lewis Dagnall Cate McDonald Chris Peace	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Leigh Bramall Tony Damms Jayne Dunn
6	<i>City Ward</i> Douglas Johnson Robert Murphy Moya O'Rourke	15	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Steve Ayris	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Penny Baker Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Crookes & Crosspool Ward</i> Craig Gamble Pugh Adam Hanrahan	16	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	25	<i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Keith Davis
8	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea Zahira Naz	17	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Lisa Banes Terry Fox Pat Midgley	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Martin Smith	18	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Tony Downing Gail Smith	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> John Booker Adam Hurst
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Paul Wood

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) and Councillors Nasima Akther, Sue Auckland, Roger Davison, Colin Ross, Zoe Sykes and Steve Wilson.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.1 Personal interests on the item relating to the petition calling on the Council to reverse the decision to close Hurlfield View - Agenda Item 4.(b).1. - were declared by Councillors Adam Hurst, Josie Paszek and Bob Pullin on the grounds that they were appointed by the Council to serve on the Council of Governors of Sheffield Health and Social Care Foundation Trust.
- 2.2 Councillor Leigh Bramall declared a disclosable pecuniary interest on the item relating to the petition calling on the Council to reverse the decision to close Hurlfield View - Agenda Item 4.(b).1. - on the grounds that he was a Non-Executive Director of Sheffield Health and Social Care Foundation Trust. Councillor Bramall was not present at the meeting for the consideration of the petition.
- 2.3 Councillor David Barker declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 10 - Notice of Motion regarding Health and Social Care Funding, due to him being employed by an NHS Trust.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

- 3.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 4th January 2017 be approved as a true and accurate record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

Dorothy Slingsby

The Lord Mayor reported that Dorothy Slingsby, one of the City's Women of Steel, had passed away on Christmas Eve 2016. She was aged 95.

4.1 Petitions

4.1.1 Petition Regarding the Waste Management Re-Tender Process

The Council received a petition containing 145 signatures regarding the Waste Management re-tender process.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Mr Pete Davies, GMB. Mr Davies explained that the petition asked the Council to reconsider

and open up discussions with the GMB to explore the option of in-sourcing the waste management service at this time and as part of the Sheffield waste management re-tender process. He said that the reasons given for not insourcing at this point in time which were contained within Cabinet report on this matter regarding equal pay and reputational damage were not accepted by the GMB.

Mr Davies commented that he did not believe that the Council officers were prepared to explore in-house or third sector options. The petition asked the Council to provide support for an option within the tender process to assist workers should they vote to support a co-operative or third sector bid in the event that the tender process continued.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for Environment. Councillor Lodge stated that the Council had been trying to achieve savings from the integrated waste management contract and had reached a point where the contract was not delivering the best service for the cost. There was nothing in the related Cabinet report which sought to denigrate the workforce. The Council wished to look at what was best for the City. There were a number of options and, on balance, it was considered best to break down the service into its constituent parts so as to increase flexibility.

The call centre would come back into the Council and the Council could take control of the development of the District Energy Network. Whilst there was a wish to in-source the Collection Service, there were time constraints. A seven-year contract would give time to identify changes in working patterns and nothing would be decided without negotiations with the workforce.

With regards to the Energy Recovery Facility (ERF), it had been considered whether the facility could be in-sourced. There were issues regarding volumes and it was not the right point at which to bring the facility back into the Council.

He referred to the example of the Housing Repairs Service which was being brought in house, having previously been provided by Kier. There was work which needed to be done to bring services in-house and that was what the Council wished to aim to do. With regards to the Collection Service, bidders would have to demonstrate what they would do, including the introduction of new ways of working to deliver greater efficiencies and continued safe working practices.

Councillor Lodge stated that there were a number of issues in relation to the integrated waste management contract with regards to which he would be pleased to meet with the petitioners.

4.1.2 Petition Requesting a Rent Rebate for Crystal Peaks Market Traders to Match the Moor Market

The Council received a petition containing 43 signatures, requesting a rent rebate for Crystal Peaks Market traders to match the Moor Market.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Iain Johnson. Mr Johnson stated that there was an issue regarding decreasing footfall at Crystal Peaks Market and he commented that a number of traders were struggling. Some people were going to the Moor Market and it was considered that there was an uneven playing field because traders at the Moor Market received subsidised rent.

He stated that a better plan was required to increase footfall and it was noted that a new manager was to be appointed, whose role would include addressing the issue of footfall. Facilities at Crystal Peaks Market were also inferior to those at the Moor Market. In addition, there were a large number of discount retailers at Crystal Peaks, which were in competition with market traders for customers.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mary Lea, Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure. Councillor Lea stated that markets were valuable to the City and they had economic and social benefits. Markets created jobs and contributed to the economy. The Moor Market was critical to the City Region. It was located in an outstanding building and footfall was increasing, as was the level of occupancy in the Market. The Council continued to discount rents for traders in the Moor Market as the situation was still fragile. Crystal Peaks Market had high occupancy and high footfall.

Councillor Lea stated that in the context of the financial savings which the Council was required to make, it would be difficult to agree a reduction in rents for traders at Crystal Peaks Market. She confirmed that a new Markets Manager was being recruited and they would consider improvements.

Councillor Lea said that she would be pleased to meet with the traders together with Council Officers to look at the problems and concerns which they had raised.

4.1.3 Petition Requesting the Council to Take Action to Remove all "To Let" Boards in Walkley, Crookes, Broomhill, Hunters Bar and Sharrow

The Council received an electronic petition containing 17 signatures, requesting the Council to take action to remove all "To Let" boards in Walkley, Crookes, Broomhill, Hunters Bar and Sharrow.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Tony Flatley. Mr Flatley stated that in certain parts of the City, there were a large number of privately rented homes and there were a high number of 'To Let' boards. Their use was poorly regulated and the signs were not necessarily used to advertise a property to let but did serve to advertise a company. He said that they had a negative impact on the visual amenity of an area and also contributed to opportunistic burglaries.

The petitioners sought a Regulation 7 Direction from the Secretary of State to remove deemed consent for 'To Let' boards. The petitioners had written to the Secretary of State and had met with a number of local Councillors, who had been supportive in relation to this issue.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport.

4.1.4 Petition Requesting the Council to Take Action to Remove all “To Let” Boards in the Shoreham Street Area

The Council received a petition containing nine signatures, requesting the Council to take action to remove all “To Let” boards in the Shoreham Street area.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport.

Councillor Iqbal responded to both petitions concerning “To Let” boards. He stated that he could empathise with people and that ward councillors had raised this matter with him. This was classed as advertising under the Town and Country Planning Act 2007. There was a voluntary code by which landlords and agents were expected to remove to let boards once a property had been occupied for 14 days. However, this did not always happen. As regards a Regulation 7 Direction, Council Officers would be looking at this and it would need further consideration. He said that the Council would continue to discuss this issue with Mr Flatley and he hoped that a resolution could be achieved.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing, stated that the Council was working with the University of Sheffield and with the private rented sector and the police in connection with the matters that had been raised by the petitions.

4.1.5 Petition Objecting to Potential Council Budget Cuts

The Council received a petition containing 260 signatures and objecting to potential Council budget cuts.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Alistair Tice. Mr Tice stated that he submitted a petition to the Council last February regarding budget cuts and the setting of a no-cuts budget by the Council through the use of reserves and borrowing powers and joining with other local councils with regards to a no cuts strategy. He said that the response at that time had been that reserves were earmarked for specific use and would not be used to avoid cuts. The budget which was then announced took £50 million from reserves to put to the pension fund.

The petition asked the Council to bring about the termination of the waste management contact with Veolia and to bring the service back in house. At the November meeting of Council, Mr Tice said that he had been told that it was not necessarily simple to change the contract but the Council subsequently announced that the contract with Veolia would be terminated and service would

be put out to the market.

Mr Tice also said that the Council should bring the highways service back in house. The Council's medium term financial strategy recognised that it was not possible to balance the Council's budget by a process of 'salami slicing' but that transformative changes were required, akin to NHS funding plans. He questioned whether that would mean the closure or privatisation of council services. Mr Tice referred to the ceasing of the Central Support Grant and use of business rates to fund local authorities. He said that it was time to make a stand against the Government otherwise there would be nothing left by 2020.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources. Councillor Curran stated that he agreed with the premise of the petition and he said that austerity had adversely affected people and some people were affected disproportionately. The Council had argued against cuts in funding to local government and also that any reductions in funding should be distributed in a fairer way as it was local authorities in the north of the Country which had borne the greatest impact of the cuts.

Councillor Curran said that the Government had decided not to give the Council as much funding and, at the same time, the Council had a duty to set a legal, balanced budget. The Council's free reserves were at the lowest of any of the Core Cities as a percentage and in cash terms. Some reserves needed to be kept for future events, such as the flooding which occurred in 2007. Some reserves were earmarked for a particular purpose. There had been a shortfall in the pension fund and the Council had to decide whether to fund that shortfall from revenue budget or reserves and it was decided to use reserves in order to not have short term cuts.

He said that, theoretically, the Council could use reserves but, a consequence of the Council not balancing the budget in future might be that the Government may take over running of the Council. Sometimes, the Council used funding to invest in services to save money in the longer term. This might include early intervention services to prevent costs downstream. In relation to borrowing and prudential borrowing in particular, there was a revenue cost to pay back borrowing which made this expensive and something which did not work effectively. The Council would continue to lobby the Government and fight for a better deal for Sheffield.

Council Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, stated that with regard to the waste management contract, there would be costs regarding the proposals and these were included in the information considered by the Cabinet. He said that he was confident that the approach being taken with regard to the contract would deliver savings. It was the Council's aim to bring the waste management service in house but this could not be achieved immediately, as was demonstrated with the time taken in bringing the Housing Repairs Service back in house. The Council was looking to bring services back in house where this was appropriate and possible and such proposals needed to be worked through and the implications understood.

4.1.6 Petition Objecting to the Withdrawal of Grant Aid Funding to the Mental Health Action Group Sheffield (MHAGS)

The Council received a petition containing 1,329 signatures objecting to the withdrawal of grant aid funding to the Mental Health Action Group Sheffield.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Tim Jones who stated that MHAGS was a user led organisation supporting people with mental health issues, which received a small grant of £10K. Some £3.5K of this money went back to the Council towards the cost of rent. A meeting which had been organised with the Cabinet Members for Community Services and Libraries and Finance and Resources had not gone ahead.

Issues such as the benefits system caused problems for people with mental health issues. MHAGS was there to support people who were vulnerable and otherwise would not be able to cope. Those people needed the Council's empathy and support. However, he said that the dedicated services provided by the organisation would be put at risk if the grant of £10K was removed.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries. Councillor Scott said that a petition had previously been submitted to Council concerning funding for MHAGS. He said that he recognised the excellent work which was done by MHAGS with people who had mental health needs. As regards funding, a one year grant had been approved from April 2016 to the end of March 2017. He said that he hoped that MHAGS would apply for funding for the forthcoming financial year. The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources was due to meet with representatives from MHAGS soon.

Councillor Scott said that he anticipated an excellent application for funding from MHAGS. At the same time, every organisation which supported vulnerable people deserved a level playing field as regards the grant funding process and it would not be right for a decision to be made at this meeting with regards funding for MHAGS. Councillor Scott confirmed that MHAGS would not be charged rent for the premises it used from April 2017. He said that he would look forward to meeting with representatives of MHAGS and to receiving an application for grant funding from them.

4.2 Public Questions

4.2.1 Public Question Concerning USA Executive Order Regarding Travel Restrictions

Nigel Slack referred to the introduction of US President Trump's Executive Order banning travellers from Muslim countries and all refugees from entering the USA. He asked whether the Council would write to the Prime Minister to express the Administration's disgust at what he said was a racist, Islamophobic, inflammatory and politically opportunist decision that offends the principles of our Human Rights Act; will they urge the opposition parties (on the Council) to support this letter and allow their leaders to append their signatures; and will

they also urge the Prime Minister to withdraw the invitation of a 'State Visit', as currently requested by more than 1.7 million members of the public, including more than 17,000 from this City?

Mr Slack said that he had been encouraged by the sheer size of the peaceful anti-Trump protest outside the Town Hall on Monday and gratified to see the support voiced by so many Cabinet and other Members on social media. He said that he was also encouraged that, despite blocking Pinstone Street and preventing the Bus companies from conducting their lawful business, no arrests were made using the Trade Union laws. He asked whether the Council would join him in applauding the Police for putting Human Rights before corporate profits.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, thanked Mr Slack for his questions and stated that the matter of US travel ban had been discussed at meetings of her own Group on the Council and at which had been decided that it wished to express its deepest concerns to the Prime Minister. She said that she also hoped that she spoke for all other Councillors. President Trump had made his position clear during the US election campaign and in the way he carried out business and actions of the people around him and therefore, the Executive Order was not surprising. Councillor Dore said that she would be writing a letter to the Prime Minister and would circulate the draft to the Leaders of other groups on the Council so that an appropriate form of words could be found.

Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Deputy Leader of the Council, said that he thanked the Councillors that attended the rally to which Mr Slack had referred. He believed that everyone had spoken well and remarked that this was a large gathering outside of the Town Hall. The Prime Minister had a responsibility to send a signal in relation to the actions of the US President. This matter also had implications for the Muslim community in the UK. As regards the policing of the event, he said that he would not intervene in what the police did or did not do. The event was a positive one.

Councillor Dore also made reference to racist comments which had been made to a member of the Council as she left her home. She said that this was clearly not acceptable and this type of behaviour would be challenged.

4.2.2 Public Question Concerning War Memorial Trees Working Group

Nigel Slack stated that, having been present at the Economic & Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Meeting on 25th January 2017 and seeing Members arguing whether the Western Road War Memorial Trees working group should or should not talk about trees, whilst responding to the petition debate calling for the trees to be saved, would the Council provide more explicit guidance for the group on the issues they are charged with investigating?

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for the Environment, stated that the petition referred to the memorial, which comprised an avenue of trees and the memorial tablet and the Council was looking at how the memorial could be

maintained. There were variations as to the dates on which some trees had been planted and some trees that had been removed in the past had not been replaced. The Council wished to see the memorial maintained for the future and the Scrutiny Working Group had been tasked with considering the issue and putting forward recommendations.

4.2.3 Public Question Concerning Safety of Public Sector Employees

Adam Butcher asked how the Council would ensure that people working in the public sector were protected then carrying out their duties following the attack which occurred in Western Park in January.

Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, responded to the question and commented that the incident which had been reported in Western Park was a horrific attack although the victim was not a Council employee. Health and Safety for Council employees was taken seriously and risk assessments were carried out and there was also a policy regarding violence at work. If an incident occurred, there would be a review and learning from that event. The Council had a policy and procedure relating to lone working and a health and safety e-learning module was provided to employees. A health and safety committee was established, which included Council officers and trades unions and specific matters could be considered and policies reviewed at those meetings. Councillor Curran explained that he also chaired meetings of the Corporate Joint Committee which considered matters of dispute. The Council had a good track record with regard to health and safety matters.

4.2.4 Public Questions Concerning Children's Centres

Mike Levery made reference to the information provided in the call for views on the change to Family Centres from Children's Centres and concerning the location of a Family Centre in each of the City's seven locality areas. He asked how other areas would be covered, for example Chapelton, High Green, Burncross and Grenoside; will the Children's Centres which do not become Family Centres retain their Children's Centre status as defined under the Childcare Act 2006 and continue to be subject to Ofsted inspection; and what was a Linked Centre and how did it differ from a Children's Centre? Mr Levery also requested a written response to his question.

Alan Hooper stated that, in the information provided in relation to the changes to Family Centres from Children's Centres; it stated that the views of people most affected by the proposals were being sought. He asked how parents and carers and local communities were informed of the consultation; if the statistics on attendance at each of the drop in sessions would be published; and why the quarterly What's On was no longer being published at each of the Children's Centres.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, responded to the question. She said that the question raised would help her to address the issue of information which had been circulating regarding the Family Centres and in particular regard to Angram Bank

Children's Centre. There were 16 Children's Centres areas in the City, each of which was inspected by Ofsted. The Council was consulting on proposals to align the Children's Centre areas with the seven locality areas, rename Children's Centre areas to become Family Centres and widen the age range from 0 to 19 years old or to 25 years for young people with a disability. There would be seven Family Centres and each of the services which those provided would be subject to Ofsted inspection. Parson Cross/Ecclesfield was one of the named locality areas. She said that none of the Children's Centres would be closed but that some would be Linked Centres and some Family Centres. A linked Centre may also be a Children's Centre and the services provided there would continue and it might also provide outreach services. The proposals also tied into emotional and mental health and wellbeing work with young people and the emphasis upon prevention and early intervention.

Councillor Drayton said that she would provide written responses to Mr Levery. She confirmed that the Family Centres would continue to be inspected by Ofsted and be part of that inspection framework. Consultation included parents and carers, local communities, Children's Centre staff and stakeholders, voluntary and community sector organisations, local councillors; and partners which shared Children's Centres.

Various local media had been used to provide information and with regard to the consultation, including social media, a consultation website, an online questionnaire and consultation sessions in local areas. The attendances at drop in sessions would be published. The quarterly 'What's On' was no longer being published. However, the information was part of the Sheffield Directory and social media was being used instead, which was more up to date and cost less. There was also awareness that not everybody could access information on line or had access to social media and therefore information was provided in nurseries, schools and Children's Centres. The outcomes of the consultation on this matter would be considered by a Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee prior to being submitted to Cabinet.

Councillor Drayton said that she was disappointed that a leaflet had been produced concerning Angram Bank. There would not be closure of any Centres in this consultation. Parents were understandably worried and concerned about this. Angram Bank would probably get more services as a result of the changes proposed. She considered this to be good news for families in Sheffield.

4.2.5 Public Question Concerning the Housing and Planning Act

Carrie Hedderwick referred to the Housing and Planning Act and stated that she had previously requested the Council to join with her to oppose the Act and she had written to the Cabinet Member for Housing regarding the possibility of a joint statement. She made reference to the Housing Revenue Account item on the agenda for this meeting of the Council and to that fact that the Council had issued factual information to tenants.

She asked whether the Council would be prepared to issue a statement

regarding its opposition to the Housing and Planning Act, which did not address the housing crisis in the Country.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, stated that the Government was yet to publish the planning element of the changes brought about by the Act.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing, stated that the In Touch magazine was not political and the Council could not publish any content in the magazine which was not factual. The Council did not yet have the fine detail regarding fixed term tenancies. She said that a statement could be issued but that first, she would need to know detail and exactly what the implications were for Sheffield.

4.2.6 Public Question Concerning Mental Health Action Group Sheffield (MHAGS)

Stuart Warren asked about the future of Mental Health Action Group Sheffield and told Members what a positive effect the Group had on his life and said he was very concerned about what would happen if it was to close.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries, thanked Mr Warren for his question and for sharing his experiences about how important MHAGS was to him. He said that he hoped stories like his were reflected in the application which MHAGS submitted for funding as it demonstrated the difference that the Group made. He said that it would not be appropriate for him to comment on the funding for MHAGS at this meeting but he did look forward to receiving an application from them.

4.2.7 Public Questions Concerning Hurlfield View

Stella Garnham asked how much consultation had happened with the people that relied upon services which Hurlfield View provided and stated that there were some family carers and service users who had not been consulted in any form.

Garry Jackson stated that organised and planned respite was a lifeline for family carers and if this was taken away, their mental health and wellbeing would be affected. He said this would impact on a family carer's ability to care for their loved one at home and he asked what would happen then.

Susan Conlan stated that Sheffield had a strategy for maintaining care in the community for as long as possible. She asked whether closing the only facility that offered planned respite and day care went against the Council's own strategic aims.

Alison Wood stated that Hurlfield View was used by the Rapid Response Team when people were in crisis and sadly this facility was used frequently. She asked how this service would be provided in the future.

Lee Pearse asked how dispersing dementia care across the City could be as

high a level of service as was provided at Hurlfield View. He also asked what would happen to service users that the private sector refused to take.

Dawn Millington said that it had been stated that the closure of Hurlfield View was not a cost saving exercise. She asked why the Council was ceasing a specialist service where quality and expertise was delivered to meet the needs of individuals with dementia with complex and often challenging needs. The proposal was to deliver services by purchasing beds in private homes around Sheffield and, although this might provide adequate care to people with mild to moderate dementia, it would not manage complex needs in the same way as Hurlfield View without the necessary expertise, staff ratio or bed availability.

She challenged the Council's assertion that people did not want one facility, based in one area and said that the chances of accessing a bed in a facility which was local to someone would be challenging. Concerns had also been expressed regarding availability of a suitable place for anyone who is blocking a bed or in a crisis situation.

Dementia was on the increase and there was no cure and it would be a mistake not to deliver specialist dementia services at Hurlfield View. It would impact upon other issues including hospital admissions, abuse cases and family/carer breakdowns. She asked how the Council would identify issues and undertake monitoring when Hurlfield View closed and the service was being delivered differently.

Councillor Cate McDonald, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, responded to the questions. She stated that the Council had liaised with the Health and Social Care Trust to obtain information about the current users of Hurlfield View and over 200 letters had been sent and meetings had been held including in Stocksbridge. A helpline had been set up, staff had spoken with people in person and a consultation survey had been conducted by post and online. Councillor McDonald said that she would be concerned if there were people who had not been included in the consultation. She asked for people asking questions to let her have the details of those people who it was thought had not been included and she would address that.

Councillor McDonald said that she agreed that respite care was a lifeline for families and carers and affirmed that those services would not cease as the Council had found alternative services which would provide high quality services and with expertise in supporting people with dementia. She also agreed that it was important to maintain care for people in the community for as long as possible.

The Council wished to see a wider range of provision as part of the re-provision of services. Alternative provision had been procured for the rapid response service. There were a number of independent sector providers in Sheffield which could provide services for people with complex needs.

Services would be regulated and inspected by the Care Quality Commission (CQC) and Councillor McDonald stated that she had visited providers. As

regards the monitoring of incidents and falls, providers were required to have robust procedures and that would continue to be monitored.

4.3 Petition Requiring Debate

4.3.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Save Hurlfield View Day Centre from Closure

The Council received an electronic petition containing 9,954 signatures, requesting the Council to save Hurlfield View Day Centre from closure.

The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at a Council meeting. The wording of the qualifying e-petition was as follows:-

"Hurlfield View is the only facility in Sheffield that has day services and respite care for severely challenging individuals with dementia, the most complex cases in Sheffield."

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Sue Harding who stated that she had been a carer for many years and represented users and carers of Hurlfield View. The facility meant a lot to people, including carers who contributed to people's care by saving significant amount of money each year in relation to the cost of health and social care.

Sue Harding said that, although there had been consultation in relation to the proposals for dementia care, not enough people were consulted during that time. It was acknowledged that value for money was important and there was a context of cuts to council funding, which was not the fault of the Council. However, service users with dementia often failed in private health care and hospitals, whereas they thrived in specialised provision like that provided at Hurlfield View. It would cost a lot of money to place a person in alternative provision to Hurlfield View. It cost approximately £500 a week to keep someone at Hurlfield View, whereas it was £400 a day to keep someone in an NHS hospital bed. 85 percent of admissions to Hurlfield View were for people in crisis, be it the person suffering from dementia or the carer and people were able to return home owing to the skill and professionalism of the people working at Hurlfield View.

It would be difficult for people to navigate the many other providers of dementia care. Reference was made to the plans and aspirations of other providers, although it was hoped that these did not translate into service cuts. Carers wanted continuity, routine and long term support and despite the Council's plans etc., it seemed as if the strategy was broken.

The petitioners asked the Council to take a step back regarding the closure of Hurlfield View and to work with other organisations in the City to present a cohesive strategy for Sheffield using the financial resources available. She asked the Council not to close Hurlfield View.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.1(b), the Cabinet Member for

Health and Social Care responded to the petition, following which the Shadow Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care spoke on the matter.

Councillor Cate McDonald, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, thanked the petitioners and Sue Harding for presenting the petition to Council. She said that she was sympathetic to the concerns which people had expressed and with regard to their experiences of supporting a loved one with dementia and people's attachment to Hurlfield View. She wished to reassure people, families and carers and said that dementia services were a priority for the Council and everyone would continue to receive services. This was not a cost cutting exercise and the Council was reinvesting in dementia services.

Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust had informed the Council that it could no longer provide services at Hurlfield View Resource Centre within the budget provided to it. The changes to provision would not be happening at this time except that the Trust had said it would cease to provide services at Hurlfield View.

The Council was providing dedicated staff to work with individuals and their family carers to ensure that alternative arrangements were identified. The tender process had been completed and there would be communication about the changes.

Included in the tender, there would be 12 beds for short term and planned respite care available per week across the City and there would also be dementia day support. All of the providers were rated 'good' by the Care Quality Commission, which was the same rating as for Hurlfield View. There would be a budget available for additional respite care.

Councillor McDonald said that she the utmost respect for the work which was done by the staff at Hurlfield View.

The Shadow Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care then spoke on the matter and Members of the City Council then debated the matters raised by the petition, as summarised below:-

Members gave personal accounts of family members and friends who were dementia sufferers and the experience of those that cared for them.

It was suggested that the decision regarding Hurlfield View was reconsidered by Cabinet with a view to maintaining the high quality provision during the transitional period to a new structure.

Reference was made to an involvement exercise, which had been undertaken in 2012 with people who suffered from dementia and their carers, which had considered how communities could better understand people's needs and provide support and how change could be made which also protected existing users. The process had found that people wanted a community of carers and help them to carry on their lives in the normal way for as long as possible. People wanted help and support early to avoid crisis and which was locally

based and the Council also wished to provide community based services for people sooner.

For some people suffering with the most challenging forms of dementia, moderate types of care provision would not be appropriate to their needs. Hurlfield View had been improved in 2012 because it provided care of a specialist nature. The number of people requiring support was likely to increase. It was thought that this matter should be considered again by Cabinet.

This was a difficult decision for the Council and Health and Social Care Trust. The Impact assessment stated that the change would be a positive change, but with reduced beds and places, it appeared to be a cut in services. This would have an impact on people using the service at present. It was suggested that the matter was referred to a Scrutiny Committee in order that there could be examination of what providers, including the Health and Social Care Trust, could offer and what the impact would be.

Cases of Dementia were increasing and it was important that respite was available for carers and families. Hurlfield View had received a 'good' rating from the Care Quality Commission and had received praise for the services provided there and such provision should be supported.

It was unfortunate that the Health and Social Care Trust was not to continue with the provision of services at Hurlfield View one year into a three year contract. The Council had looked at options and had asked questions about the issue. There would not be a gap in service provision for people and there was an individual plan for every user and carer. The changes were not intended to save money. There would be extra capacity for day support and services closer to people's homes. The CQC had inspected providers which were to be used and had rated them as 'good'.

A centre providing specialist care was needed together with a rapid response team in cases where a situation at home had broken down. There were talented members of staff that would lose their jobs and there was concern about the training and standards of care which were to be provided to people. The service provided at Hurlfield was what service users and carers wanted. Nonetheless, it was also understood that there was considerable pressure on social care.

People wished to have respite which was close to their homes and reference was made to a Notice of Motion on the Summons for this meeting concerning funding for social care. There was reliance on carers and especially in relation to dementia and it was important to make sure there was respite available for them. The Council needed to work with carers and make sure their concerns were addressed. Sometimes, families regarded staff in care settings as friends and family and breaking up that relationship would potentially cause distress.

Some care homes could provide care for dementia support but others were not able to do so. It might be difficult to provide a bed at short notice. Hurlfield View was an important asset with well trained staff. Assurance was needed with regard to the provision of beds and it was acknowledged that the Cabinet

Member would contact people that had not been involved in the consultation relating to Hurlfield View.

The lead petitioner, Sue Harding, exercised a right of reply. Said that she did not intend to apportion blame. There were 16 beds available at Hurlfield View and more, not less beds were needed. There were 5000 people in the City suffering from dementia and one out of 20 needed the services of the type provided at Hurlfield View. Other residential care was also needed and people wanted quality rather than proximity to their homes. She said that the private sector did not necessarily know how to cope with people with conditions such as the service users at Hurlfield View.

She said that nobody wanted Hurlfield View to close and the Council was asked to look elsewhere for the funding and not to close Hurlfield View.

Councillor Cate McDonald, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. She commented that the petitioners were sincere in their concerns about the issue of dementia care and Hurlfield View. She clarified that the Council had procured 12 beds for short term/planned respite care available per week and 4 beds available per week for short term care for the provision of emergency/unplanned admissions. In addition, there would be an additional budget for respite, for those people who needed such provision. The Council was certainly not seeking a low quality or generic service. It was to work with specialist providers which were registered with the Care Quality Commission and comply with the standards associated with specialist dementia provision as well as having skilled members of staff.

The Council had listened carefully to people and it was important that the Council acted in the best interests of services users, families and carers and so that provision was in place for people with dementia.

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

Proposal 1

It was moved by Councillor Cate McDonald, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that this Council notes the petition calling on the Council to “reverse the decision to close Hurlfield View”, and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care to check that appropriate consultation has been undertaken on the matter and to monitor the delivery of the alternative provision which has been commissioned.

Alternative Proposal 2

It was moved by Councillor Bob Pullin, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council notes the petition calling on the Council to “reverse the decision to close Hurlfield View”, and refers the petition to the Cabinet for reconsideration.

On being put to the vote, alternative proposal 2 was not carried.

The votes on alternative proposal 2 were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

- For alternative proposal 2 (25) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, Alison Teal, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker.
- Against alternative proposal 2 (48) - Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Moya O'Rourke, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.
- Abstained from voting on alternative proposal 2 (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

Proposal 1 was then put to the vote and carried as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council notes the petition calling on the Council to “reverse the decision to close Hurlfield View”, and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care to check that appropriate consultation has been undertaken on the matter and to monitor the delivery of the alternative provision which has been commissioned.

(NOTE: Councillor Leigh Bramall, having earlier declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the above item, was not present for the duration of the item.)

4.4 Public Questions

4.4.1 Public Questions Concerning Highways Trees

Colin Carr stated that campaigners had to resort to Freedom of information requests, internal reviews and the Information Commissioner to get an admission from the Council that Flexi Pave had never been used in the Streets Ahead project to save mature, healthy, highway trees. He said that the Cabinet Member for Environment had stated at the Council meeting of 7 December 2016 that it had not been demonstrated to him that Flexi Pave could be used safely with raised roots and said that he would be meeting with representatives of Flexi Pave to obtain this assurance. Mr Carr said that such a reassurance could have been obtained at the start of the Streets Ahead contract from Amey as the Operations Manager for Amey was the contact for Flexi Pave when it was successfully used in Birmingham. Mr Carr asked whether the Cabinet Member had met with representatives of Flexi Pave and if so, what the outcome of the meeting was.

Helen McIlroy referred to the Western Road War Memorial and the Working Group of the Scrutiny Committee which had been established to look at the issue. She asked whether particular councillors would be able to maintain a neutral stance on the issue, given what she said was their antipathy to the campaign to save Sheffield's healthy street trees and whether other more neutral Members should take their places instead.

Dave Dilner asked why the Chair of the Scrutiny Committee was being allowed to change the wording and aim of a petition regarding the 23 trees on Western Road in the Scrutiny process.

Justin Buxton asked whether the Cabinet Member or the Council could provide a list of people with access to Schedule 2 of the Streets Ahead contract. Secondly, he asked for confirmation of a statement regarding the use of alternative engineering solutions to retain street trees. Thirdly, Mr Buxton asked a question about the use of Flexi Pave and for the documentary evidence that it had been used.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, responded to the questions. He said that he had not yet met with representatives of Flexi Pave but that this meeting was being arranged and he was looking forward to meeting with them. Councillor Lodge said that he was aware of the use of Flexi Pave elsewhere and said that assurance was needed regarding its use on pavements and in dealing with roots. He said he would be pleased to discuss the outcomes of the meeting with Flexi Pave and more generally, the Council would provide information for people and would wish to talk with people about these issues.

With regard to the question concerning comments made by Councillors Wilson and Gibson, Councillor Lodge said that he was confident that Councillors were subject to the Members' Code of Conduct and would conduct themselves appropriately.

Councillor Lodge said that the Council assessed the information which was put forward. However, there was some misinformation in the public domain and the Council was attempting to dispel myths. For example, just over 6,000 trees were to be replaced over the core investment period. As regards the Working Group of the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee Scrutiny concerning the Western Road Memorial, Members were subject to the Code of Conduct and they would consider the information that was put before them.

The petition referred to trees and the memorial and he had said that the Council should ensure that the memorial was maintained. Age assessments of the trees had been communicated and it had been confirmed that some trees post-date others. Other trees had been replaced over the years and 26 trees had been removed in the past and had not been replaced. The Memorial comprised the avenue of trees and the stone tablet. The referral by Council to the Scrutiny Committee was clear that the trees and stone tablet should be preserved as a memorial. The terms of reference for the Working Group would be discussed at the meeting of the Working Group on 2 February.

In response to the matters raised by Mr Buxton, Councillor Lodge said that he would provide a written response as these were technical points. As regards Schedule 2 of the contract and the method statement, Councillor Lodge stated that he had had discussions about the outputs of the contract, monitoring and access to parts of the contract which had not been redacted. He asked Mr Buxton to inform him of the specific parts of the contract to which he was referring and he would provide a written answer.

Flexi Pave was a trade name and that product had not been used as part of the Streets Ahead contract. Flexible paving was a terminology and solutions of that type had been used.

4.5 Petition Requiring Debate

4.5.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Save the Trees on Rivelin Valley Road

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 6,186 signatures, requesting the Council to save trees on Rivelin Valley Road.

The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at a Council meeting. The wording of the qualifying paper and e-petition was as follows:-

"We, the undersigned, refute the assertion that the felling of 31 trees on Rivelin Valley Road, Sheffield is necessary. This road is the second longest avenue of Lime trees in the UK and is an invaluable asset to Sheffield and its heritage. We demand, and believe it imperative, that sensitive, alternative highway engineering specifications for footway, kerb and drain be adopted and implemented to enable the long-term retention of these trees."

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Rebecca Hammond. She stated that the Rivelin Valley Road was built in 1906 and was the second longest avenue of Lime trees in the UK. 31 Lime trees were listed for felling and most of those trees were situated near to the fire station and the park and therefore their removal would have a definite visual impact. The area was important habitat for bees and other wildlife. She said that alternative engineering solutions were included in the Streets Ahead contract and this could be done at no additional cost, so could not the Council mandate the use of these alternatives. The petition represented people from every postal code district in the City and people valued street trees. She said that the trees on Rivelin Valley Road were special, but not more so than any other trees in Sheffield.

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

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, responded to the petition. He said that there had been previous petitions and debates concerning street trees and that the number of signatories to the petition was acknowledged by the Council. The Council had responsibilities for people across the City and Members did care about the people that they represented, although constituents and elected Members may not necessarily always agree with each other.

Councillor Lodge stated that, as regards Rivelin Valley Road, 700 trees had been planted originally and 527 trees were reviewed. 36 trees were affected, including 8 which were classified as dangerous, 4 of which were dead, 2 dying and 2 decaying. Of the 36 trees, 21 were found to be damaging the road or pavement. The trees had been assessed by an Arboriculturalist and highways engineer. Whilst he understood that people might question decisions which had been made with regards to trees, there was in some cases misinformation and sometimes the expertise and knowledge of people working on the Streets Ahead programme was criticised. 56 properties were surveyed and 6 responses were made, 3 of which disagreed with the proposals regarding the trees on Rivelin Valley Road. The matter was therefore referred to the Independent Tree Panel in March 2016 and the Panel would consider the matter. A number of engineering solutions had been used at other locations in the City, although it had not been stated as a matter of public record where such engineering solutions had been used. Councillor Lodge said that officers had been requested to make this information available.

The Tree Panel would suggest options with regards to the trees on Rivelin Valley Road and the Council would consider those options to see whether they were reasonable and viable. He commented that financial resources were restrictive. The contract specification was put together, beginning in 2006 to 2009 and documentation was collated and sent to prospective bidders for the tender.

Councillor Lodge acknowledged that this was an emotive issue for people and that there was a process of review and consultation regarding Rivelin Valley Road. At this point in time, the matter was with the Independent Tree Panel. He said that he would request that officers ask the Tree Panel for an indication of when it would be able to provide the results of its deliberations regarding Rivelin Valley Road. When the results were known, the Council would consider all the options that were available.

The Shadow Cabinet Member for the Environment then spoke on the matter and Members of the City Council then debated the matters raised by the petition, as summarised below:-

Would the Council listen and consider alternative engineering solutions rather than continue to apply narrow criteria in relation to street trees. The 700 trees on Rivelin Valley Road had been planted in 1906 and the area was an important part of the City. The proposals included the replacement of a number of trees and to ensure there would be a continuing legacy and an avenue of Lime Trees. The trees should not be removed unless there was a real need. Information with regard to the outcomes of the Independent Tree Panel would be published.

Reference was made to financial penalties if core investment work of the Streets Ahead programme was not completed within time. It was questioned why the Tree Panel had been established in these circumstances as few decisions regarding the proposed felling of street trees had been changed by the Panel. People were not assured that the Tree Panel would report in plenty of time. The Council was urged to look at the options available with regard to maintaining the trees on Rivelin Valley Road.

The Rivelin Valley was a beautiful area and one which families could enjoy. Safe use of the highway needed to be considered, including for cyclists and in relation to parking. It was recognised that some trees may need to be felled but there also needed to be trust in the process which was applied. More trees would be planted than were to be removed.

Reference was made to similar work undertaken by Amey in Birmingham, where trees had been maintained as part of a highways maintenance programme. The Independent Tree Panel was established following the call of action by petitioners, in order to give an independent view to confirm or ascertain whether proposals could be applied or whether there were other options. The contract, which was a Private Finance Initiative (PFI), was inherited and was the only option at that time. Where possible, the contract would be renegotiated. Discussions had been held with the Sheffield Trees Action Group and proposals had been put forward by them and by the Council. The Action Group has asked for information and that would be provided to them.

The lead petitioner, Rebecca Hammond, exercised a right of reply. She said that issues raised relating to parking and cyclists were not applicable in the area of Rivelin Valley Road which was affected. There was Department for

Transport guidance relating to highways infrastructure and a straight kerb line was not mandatory and reduced surface regularity may be acceptable. She said that the Woodlands Trust, while supportive of the Council's tree planting initiative, was critical of the programme relating to street trees. Members were asked to look at the diagram relating to urban trees, which had been circulated, for information. She said that this was about valuing street trees as multi-faceted assets.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. He said that trees would be there for the future. The contract was approved by Members in 2008 and there was a large amount of detail contained within it. If Amey was not able to achieve the works which were part of the core investment, as part of the Streets Ahead programme, there would be financial penalties. Councillor Lodge reasserted that the matter of trees on Rivelin Valley Road was with the Independent Tree Panel for its consideration and suggested that the outcome of the Panel's deliberations was awaited.

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

Proposal 1

It was moved by Councillor Bryan Lodge, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that this Council notes the petition entitled "Save the Trees on Rivelin Valley Road", and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Environment to consider in conjunction with the advice awaited from the Independent Tree Panel in relation to those trees.

Alternative Proposal 2

It was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that this Council notes the petition entitled "Save the Trees on Rivelin Valley Road", and refers the petition to the Cabinet to consider changing the policy with regard to the Streets Ahead programme, as relates to these street trees.

On being put to the vote, alternative proposal 2 was not carried.

Proposal 1 was then put to the vote and carried as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council notes the petition entitled "Save the Trees on Rivelin Valley Road", and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Environment to consider in conjunction with the advice awaited from the Independent Tree Panel in relation to those trees.

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

- 5.1 A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated.
- 5.2 Supplementary questions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule

16.4), questions relating to urgent business (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6ii) and questions relating to the discharge of the functions of the South Yorkshire Joint Authorities for Fire and Rescue and Pensions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6i), were not able to be asked before the meeting terminated (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 5.5) after four hours and 30 minutes duration.

6. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

6.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that approval be given to the following changes to the memberships of Committees, Boards, etc:-

- | | | |
|--|---|--|
| Monitoring and Advisory Board (Adult Services) | - | Councillors Pauline Andrews and Douglas Johnson to be appointed as additional members of the Board |
| South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority | - | Councillor Mick Rooney to replace Councillor Nasima Akther |
| South Yorkshire Pensions Authority | - | Councillor Ben Curran to replace Councillor Mazher Iqbal |

(NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted against the appointment relating to the South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority, and asked for this to be recorded.)

7. AUDIT COMMITTEE ANNUAL REPORT 2015/16

7.1 The Council received an Annual Report of the former Audit Committee which provided an overview of its activity during the 2015/16 Municipal Year.

7.2 RESOLVED: That the 2015/16 Annual Report of the former Audit Committee be noted.

8. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN & HRA BUDGET 2017-18

8.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Jayne Dunn, seconded by Councillor Karen McGowan, that:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2017/18 as set out in appendix A to the report is approved;

- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget 2017/18 as set out in appendix B to the report is approved;
- (c) rents for council dwellings, including temporary accommodation, are reduced by 1% from April 2017 in line with the requirements in the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016;
- (d) from 2017/18, garage rents will change to a single rate for garage plots and a single rate for garage sites; once implemented this will apply to new garage tenants immediately and to existing garage tenants once improvements have been made to existing sites and plots;
- (e) the community heating unit charge for tenants who receive metered heating is reduced by 10% from April 2017; community heating charges for those tenants receiving unmetered heating will remain unchanged from April 2017;
- (f) following the review of sheltered housing service charges in 2015, as approved by the Cabinet Member for Housing, and work undertaken on future charging for communal heating in sheltered schemes, as reported to the Cabinet Member, the existing weekly charge of £14.89 will be amended to £15.54 to recover the cost for communal heating in sheltered schemes;
- (g) burglar alarm charges are to remain unchanged from April 2017; and
- (h) charges for furnished accommodation are to remain unchanged from April 2017.

8.2 (NOTE: The final paragraph (paragraph i) of the recommendations made by Cabinet, as set out in the agenda papers published for this Council meeting, was withdrawn from consideration on the grounds that it was included in the agenda in error, having not been approved at the Cabinet meeting on 18th January 2017.)

9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ADAM HURST

Child Poverty

9.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Adam Hurst, and formally seconded by Councillor Zahira Naz, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the recent publication of analysis by the Trade Union Congress (TUC), from Office for National Statistics (ONS) figures, finding that the proportion of household debt is at its highest level for five years; on average UK homes owed 26.5% of their annual income to loans and credit cards in the third quarter of 2015, the highest rate since 2008; and the average amount owed by households is now £12,887, the highest figure recorded, and the calculations do not include mortgages;

- (b) is concerned by the need for households to be relying on such high levels of debt, demonstrating that the Government's handling of the national economy is fundamentally flawed – with average earnings falling below 2% since October - as increases in earning slow, household debt increases and this situation could have serious detrimental long term consequences for raising families out of poverty;
- (c) recalls the findings in July 2015, by the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) which found that 63% of children living in poverty were in working families in 2013/14 (compared with 54% in 2009/10); and regrets that in the last year, according to the IFS, child poverty has increased by over 200,000 and notes further reports by the IFS which suggest that the UK is set for the biggest increase in child poverty in a generation and that by 2020 child poverty will have risen by 50%;
- (d) wishes to further highlight that the cycle between debt and poverty is well known, and that for children in debt-ridden families, they are more likely to be locked into a cycle of poverty; the Children's charity Barnardo's states that "poverty is the single greatest threat to the wellbeing of children and families";
- (e) reiterates the motion passed at December's Full Council meeting, which noted that Sheffield Brightside and Hillsborough has the 14th highest levels of child poverty of any constituency in the country with 39.7% of children (11,706 children) living in poverty and in Sheffield Central 34.9% of children (5,452 children) are living in poverty;
- (f) believes it is outrageous that in the fifth richest country in the world [i.e. the UK] children are increasingly having to suffer the consequences of poverty, and notes that from the beginning of the Coalition Government in 2010, children's charities have been warning that the Government's policies would result in increased child poverty and this has been seen through the significant growth in foodbanks in recent years;
- (g) regrets that the changes to Universal Credit announced in the Autumn Statement do not address the huge cuts made by this Government and recalls that the cuts to Universal Credit introduced by this Government have taken £2,100 per year from 2.5 million working families today and the measures in the Autumn Statement will give them back as little as £150;
- (h) notes research from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation which highlights that lone parents with 2 children, working full time on the National Living Wage, have lost £2,586 per year due to changes in benefits since 2015; and
- (i) welcomes Labour's proposal to reverse cuts to Universal Credit Work Allowances, to restore the important principle abandoned by this Government that work will always pay.

9.2 Whereupon it was formally moved by Councillor Joe Otten, and formally seconded by Councillor Steve Ayris, 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) recalls the findings in July 2015, by the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) in the report "Living Standards, Poverty and Inequality in the UK: 2015", which found that "Income inequality has fallen back to levels last seen one or two decades ago, depending on the measure. Relative poverty is lower than before the recession, ..." and that more recently "There was also no significant change in absolute or relative poverty for any of the major demographic groups (children, pensioners and working-age adults without children). ... Key factors acting to hold child poverty down in 2013–14 were employment increases, falls in poverty among workless lone-parent families and falls in poverty among children of self-employed parents.";
2. the deletion, in paragraph (f), of all the words after the words "consequences of poverty";
3. the addition of a new paragraph (h) as follows, and the relettering of original paragraph (h) as a new paragraph (i):-
 - (h) notes that many of the harshest cuts made by this Government, including cuts to Universal Credit, were blocked during the last Parliament by the Liberal Democrats;
4. the deletion of the original paragraph (i).

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

9.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and formally seconded by Councillor Magid Magid, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (j) as follows:-

- (j) welcomes the Green Party's support for the principle of a universal basic income, which ensures that work will always pay and also addresses the unacceptable hardship of poverty, and looks forward to the results of pilot programmes in Finland, Glasgow and Fife.

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

9.6 It was then formally moved by Councillor Peter Rippon, and formally seconded by Councillor Lisa Banes, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (j) as follows:-

- (j) supports the Private Member's Bill tabled by Dan Jarvis MP, which will

receive its second reading in Parliament on Friday 3rd February, and the related campaign to end child poverty; and this week's subsequent national Labour Party campaign in support of this.

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

9.8 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 recent publication of analysis by the Trade Union Congress (TUC), from Office for National Statistics (ONS) figures, finding that the proportion of household debt is at its highest level for five years; on average UK homes owed 26.5% of their annual income to loans and credit cards in the third quarter of 2015, the highest rate since 2008; and the average amount owed by households is now £12,887, the highest figure recorded, and the calculations do not include mortgages;
- (b) is concerned by the need for households to be relying on such high levels of debt, demonstrating that the Government's handling of the national economy is fundamentally flawed – with average earnings falling below 2% since October - as increases in earning slow, household debt increases and this situation could have serious detrimental long term consequences for raising families out of poverty;
- (c) recalls the findings in July 2015, by the Institute for Fiscal Studies (IFS) which found that 63% of children living in poverty were in working families in 2013/14 (compared with 54% in 2009/10); and regrets that in the last year, according to the IFS, child poverty has increased by over 200,000 and notes further reports by the IFS which suggest that the UK is set for the biggest increase in child poverty in a generation and that by 2020 child poverty will have risen by 50%;
- (d) wishes to further highlight that the cycle between debt and poverty is well known, and that for children in debt-ridden families, they are more likely to be locked into a cycle of poverty; the Children's charity Barnardo's states that "poverty is the single greatest threat to the wellbeing of children and families";
- (e) reiterates the motion passed at December's Full Council meeting, which noted that Sheffield Brightside and Hillsborough has the 14th highest levels of child poverty of any constituency in the country with 39.7% of children (11,706 children) living in poverty and in Sheffield Central 34.9% of children (5,452 children) are living in poverty;
- (f) believes it is outrageous that in the fifth richest country in the world [i.e. the UK] children are increasingly having to suffer the consequences of poverty, and notes that from the beginning of the Coalition Government in 2010, children's charities have been warning that the Government's

policies would result in increased child poverty and this has been seen through the significant growth in foodbanks in recent years;

- (g) regrets that the changes to Universal Credit announced in the Autumn Statement do not address the huge cuts made by this Government and recalls that the cuts to Universal Credit introduced by this Government have taken £2,100 per year from 2.5 million working families today and the measures in the Autumn Statement will give them back as little as £150;
- (h) notes research from the Joseph Rowntree Foundation which highlights that lone parents with 2 children, working full time on the National Living Wage, have lost £2,586 per year due to changes in benefits since 2015;
- (i) welcomes Labour's proposal to reverse cuts to Universal Credit Work Allowances, to restore the important principle abandoned by this Government that work will always pay; and
- (j) supports the Private Member's Bill tabled by Dan Jarvis MP, which will receive its second reading in Parliament on Friday 3rd February, and the related campaign to end child poverty; and this week's subsequent national Labour Party campaign in support of this.

9.8.1 The votes on the Substantive Motion were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e), (g), (h) and (j) of the Substantive Motion (72)

- Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Magid Magid, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Moya O'Rourke, Adam Hanrahan, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Andy Bainbridge, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Gail Smith, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley,

Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e), (g), (h) and (j) of the Substantive Motion (0)

- Nil

Abstained on paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e), (g), (h) and (j) of the Substantive Motion (1)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox)

For paragraphs (c), (f) and (i) of the Substantive Motion (55)

- Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Magid Magid, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Moya O'Rourke, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Pauline Andrews, Andy Bainbridge, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against paragraphs (c), (f) and (i) of the Substantive Motion (17)

- Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley.

Abstained on paragraphs (c), (f) and (i) of the Substantive Motion (1)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox)

10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR GEORGE LINDARS-HAMMOND

Health and Social Care Funding

- 10.1 It was formally moved by Councillor George Lindars-Hammond, and formally seconded by Councillor Kieran Harpham, that this Council:-
- (a) believes that all health and social care staff should be thanked for their tremendous hard work and that their commitment and dedication should be acknowledged; it is not staff who are to blame for the continuing crisis at the NHS, but a government who consistently fail to fund this vital service;
 - (b) recognises that staff at the Northern General Hospital have been under incredible pressure this Autumn and Winter, and in October 2016, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust missed their A&E target with only 85.6 per cent of patients being seen within the four hours, against a target of 95 per cent (meaning that 2,633 patients waited too long), and believes this pressure on health services is leading to greater pressure on social care;
 - (c) supports NHS England's four-hour standard, which sets out that a minimum of 95 per cent of all patients to A&E will be treated within four hours; notes the widespread public and medical professional support for this standard, and believes that it is most concerning that the Secretary of State for Health, the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Hunt MP, recently suggested that the four-hour target may be downgraded and no longer apply to minor injuries, and further believes that abandoning the four hour waiting time would be, in the words of Jonathan Ashworth MP, Shadow Secretary of State for Health, "a total admission of failure by this government";
 - (d) notes that ambulance services are also increasingly under pressure and deep condolences are given to the friends and family of a gentleman, aged 79, who died in the city after waiting two hours and forty minutes for an ambulance; the call was initially assessed as code Yellow, meaning that the incident involved a "potentially serious condition" and, under guidelines, the ambulance should have arrived in 40 minutes;
 - (e) wishes to further highlight that the NHS is coming under increasing pressures, in part due to the crisis in social care - £4.6 billion has been cut from the social care budget since 2010, and that NHS funding will fall per head of population in 2018-19 and 2019-20;
 - (f) supports calls on the Government to bring forward extra funding now for social care to help hospitals cope this winter, and to pledge a new improved funding settlement for the NHS and social care in the March 2017 Budget;

- (g) welcomes the Labour Party's call to the Government for an urgent £700 million for social care, and is deeply concerned that the Prime Minister Theresa May's government rejected this proposal, implicitly failing to understand the impact social care has on the wider NHS;
- (h) believes that Sheffield's Children's Hospital should be commended for seeing 98 per cent of youngsters within four hours, but raises concerns that such achievements will become increasingly unlikely without appropriate funding; and
- (i) understands that the NHS is experiencing the largest financial squeeze in its history and that 2017 will be a make or break moment for adult social care for local services provided by local councils and the NHS.

10.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and formally seconded by Councillor Bob Pullin, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

- 1. the deletion of paragraph (g) and the relettering of original paragraphs (h) and (i) as new paragraphs (g) and (h); and
- 2. the addition of a new paragraph (i) as follows:-
 - (i) backs the campaign, co-ordinated by former Health Minister, the Rt. Hon. Norman Lamb MP, supported by local MPs Nick Clegg and Clive Betts, calling on the Government to establish a cross-party NHS and Care Convention to examine the future funding requirements of these services and agree a new, long-term settlement to guarantee their sustainability for future generations.

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

10.3.1 (NOTE: Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for part 2 of the amendment, and abstained from voting on part 1 of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that all health and social care staff should be thanked for their tremendous hard work and that their commitment and dedication should be acknowledged; it is not staff who are to blame for the continuing crisis at the NHS, but a government who consistently fail to fund this vital service;
- (b) recognises that staff at the Northern General Hospital have been under incredible pressure this Autumn and Winter, and in October 2016, Sheffield Teaching Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust missed their A&E

target with only 85.6 per cent of patients being seen within the four hours, against a target of 95 per cent (meaning that 2,633 patients waited too long), and believes this pressure on health services is leading to greater pressure on social care;

- (c) supports NHS England's four-hour standard, which sets out that a minimum of 95 per cent of all patients to A&E will be treated within four hours; notes the widespread public and medical professional support for this standard, and believes that it is most concerning that the Secretary of State for Health, the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Hunt MP, recently suggested that the four-hour target may be downgraded and no longer apply to minor injuries, and further believes that abandoning the four hour waiting time would be, in the words of Jonathan Ashworth MP, Shadow Secretary of State for Health, "a total admission of failure by this government";
- (d) notes that ambulance services are also increasingly under pressure and deep condolences are given to the friends and family of a gentleman, aged 79, who died in the city after waiting two hours and forty minutes for an ambulance; the call was initially assessed as code Yellow, meaning that the incident involved a "potentially serious condition" and, under guidelines, the ambulance should have arrived in 40 minutes;
- (e) wishes to further highlight that the NHS is coming under increasing pressures, in part due to the crisis in social care - £4.6 billion has been cut from the social care budget since 2010, and that NHS funding will fall per head of population in 2018-19 and 2019-20;
- (f) supports calls on the Government to bring forward extra funding now for social care to help hospitals cope this winter, and to pledge a new improved funding settlement for the NHS and social care in the March 2017 Budget;
- (g) welcomes the Labour Party's call to the Government for an urgent £700 million for social care, and is deeply concerned that the Prime Minister Theresa May's government rejected this proposal, implicitly failing to understand the impact social care has on the wider NHS;
- (h) believes that Sheffield's Children's Hospital should be commended for seeing 98 per cent of youngsters within four hours, but raises concerns that such achievements will become increasingly unlikely without appropriate funding; and
- (i) understands that the NHS is experiencing the largest financial squeeze in its history and that 2017 will be a make or break moment for adult social care for local services provided by local councils and the NHS.

10.4.1 The votes on the Motion were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

- | | | |
|--|---|---|
| For paragraphs (a) to (f) and (h) and (i) of the Motion (73) | - | Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Magid Magid, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Moya O'Rourke, Craig Gamble Pugh, Adam Hanrahan, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Andy Bainbridge, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Gail Smith, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood. |
| Against paragraphs (a) to (f) and (h) and (i) of the Motion (0) | - | Nil. |
| Abstained on paragraphs (a) to (f) and (h) and (i) of the Motion (1) | - | The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox). |
| For paragraph (g) of the Motion (56) | - | Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Magid Magid, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Moya O'Rourke, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Pauline Andrews, Andy Bainbridge, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David |

Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

- Against paragraph (g) of the Motion (17) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley.
- Abstained on paragraph (g) of the Motion (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED

Sheffield City Region Devolution Deal

- 11.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and formally seconded by Councillor Martin Smith, that this Council:-
- (a) notes that the election of the regional mayor for Sheffield City Region has been postponed until May 2018;
 - (b) notes with concern the press statement issued by the Leader of Barnsley Council (Councillor Sir Stephen Houghton) and the Mayor of Doncaster (Ros Jones) in support of exploring a Yorkshire-wide devolution option;
 - (c) asserts that there is currently no Yorkshire-wide devolution deal on the table and notes the comments made by Northern Powerhouse Minister, Andrew Percy MP “I would urge leaders in South Yorkshire not to walk away because they will be in a position like the North-East where we take the proposal off the table because they have rejected it.”;
 - (d) believes that the economic geography of the Sheffield City Region is distinct from the rest of Yorkshire and has strong links across the county borders with areas such as Bassetlaw and Chesterfield;
 - (e) wants the best for our local economy and is therefore disappointed that devolved powers and funding for Sheffield City Region are now at risk

because of local leaders' parochial disagreements;

- (f) believes this is further evidence, along with the disagreements on HS2, of a lack of effective local leadership; and
- (g) calls on the Leader of the Council to do everything in her power to reassure the public and businesses of Sheffield and to get the SCR Devolution Deal back on track.

11.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Julie Dore, and formally seconded by Councillor Jack Scott, 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 the election of a Sheffield City Region Mayor has been delayed due to the High Court ruling in December which required the City Region to undertake further consultation before the Secretary of State can make a final decision;
- (b) remains fully committed to the Sheffield City Region and the devolution deal which was hard fought following extensive negotiations with central government and will see significant investment for economic development into Sheffield City Region and greater local control of powers currently determined by central government in areas such as skills;
- (c) agrees that the geography of Sheffield City Region reflects our functional economic area and that the model of devolution which the Government is offering is fundamentally about economic regeneration in recognised travel-to-work areas, and welcomes the inclusion of Chesterfield and Bassetlaw as full constituent members of the Combined Authority;
- (d) welcomes that all partners are still committed to the Sheffield City Region and the Devolution Deal, which is the only deal on the table; and
- (e) believes that the additional consultation required should be undertaken as quickly as possible to ensure that the Sheffield City Region deal is finalised and all parliamentary approvals are secured as soon as possible to allow the region to secure the additional investment crucial to growing the economy and creating more jobs in Sheffield City Region.

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

11.3.1 (NOTE: Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraph (a) of the amendment, and abstained from voting on paragraphs (b) to (e) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

11.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, and formally seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph as follows:-

- () calls on the Leader of the Council to be open to all options that would benefit Sheffield and the wider region through greater devolution of powers and funding.

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

11.6 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 the election of a Sheffield City Region Mayor has been delayed due to the High Court ruling in December which required the City Region to undertake further consultation before the Secretary of State can make a final decision;
- (b) remains fully committed to the Sheffield City Region and the devolution deal which was hard fought following extensive negotiations with central government and will see significant investment for economic development into Sheffield City Region and greater local control of powers currently determined by central government in areas such as skills;
- (c) agrees that the geography of Sheffield City Region reflects our functional economic area and that the model of devolution which the Government is offering is fundamentally about economic regeneration in recognised travel-to-work areas, and welcomes the inclusion of Chesterfield and Bassetlaw as full constituent members of the Combined Authority;
- (d) welcomes that all partners are still committed to the Sheffield City Region and the Devolution Deal, which is the only deal on the table; and
- (e) believes that the additional consultation required should be undertaken as quickly as possible to ensure that the Sheffield City Region deal is finalised and all parliamentary approvals are secured as soon as possible to allow the region to secure the additional investment crucial to growing the economy and creating more jobs in Sheffield City Region.

11.6.1 (NOTE: Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraph (a) of the Substantive Motion, and abstained from voting on paragraphs (b) to (e) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR NEALE GIBSON

LGBT History Month

- 12.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Neale Gibson, seconded by Councillor Ben Miskell, that this Council:-
- (a) fully supports the commencing in February of LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender) History Month and welcomes the promotion of this throughout the city by the City Council and local LGBT groups;
 - (b) acknowledges the importance of raising awareness and advancing education on matters affecting the LGBT community; to work to make educational and other institutions safe spaces for all LGBT communities and to promote the welfare of LGBT people, by ensuring that the education system recognises and enables LGBT people to achieve their full potential, so they contribute fully to society and lead fulfilled lives, which in turn benefits society as a whole;
 - (c) believes LGBT History Month is a time when we can explore and share some hidden aspects of our country's past, both recent and remote and that this hidden history belongs to all of us and is part of our inheritance;
 - (d) recognises that throughout history we can find many examples of people who refused to conform to the outward signs of the sex to which they were born, and we also find many stories of people who loved their own sex; some of them experienced serious persecution and some are remembered for the contributions they made to our culture and society, in particular in Sheffield, the Socialist, Edward Carpenter; and
 - (e) acknowledges that their personal lives have often been suppressed or censored; to understand our present and imagine our future, we must first gain insight into our past; this is true of us as individuals, it is also true of societies; and believes that the Council has a moral obligation to ensure that this is well understood and as such:-
 - (i) supports the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Corbyn MP, Leader of the Labour Party, in his stance that a Labour government would add LGBT History Month to the national curriculum and that radical policy changes in the school curriculum would be implemented to better reflect gay issues;
 - (ii) supports the issuing of a formal apology to all gay men who were convicted under now abolished restrictive sex laws – and deplors the actions of the Conservative government in “talking out” a Private Member's Bill – the so-called Turing Bill - which would have pardoned all men living with UK convictions for same-sex offences committed before the law was changed; and
 - (iii) will fight against inequality and injustice wherever it is seen, and

recognises that a key part of this battle is in raising awareness and levels of education on these issues and this is why initiatives such as LGBT History Month are so important and should be encouraged throughout Sheffield.

- 12.1.1 (NOTE: Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker voted for paragraphs (a) to (d) and (e)(ii) and (iii) and voted against paragraph (e)(i) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOE OTTEN

Waste Management

- 13.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Joe Otten, and formally seconded by Councillor Richard Shaw, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the recent Cabinet report "Waste Management Policies" which was passed by the Administration last month;
- (b) has concerns about some of the policy changes laid out by the Administration in this report, in particular, the proposal for a £20 charge for replacement black bins, even when a replacement is needed through no fault of the resident, such as theft or criminal damage;
- (c) believes that this charge is unfair and, with other savings that the Administration expects to be delivered through changes to the waste management contract and other policy changes, unnecessary;
- (d) believes that this charge will lead to more thefts of bins and more littering and fly tipping, which in turn will incur cleaning costs for the Council; and
- (e) calls on the Administration to reconsider this charge until further consultation is undertaken.

- 13.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Tony Downing, and formally seconded by Councillor Andy Bainbridge, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (e) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (f) as follows:-

- (b) reaffirms that the £20 charge will not apply when a bin is damaged by the collection crew or is reported to have gone into the back of the collection vehicle;
- (c) reaffirms that, under the proposal, no customer is being charged for the new brown recycling bins and that the £20 charge for a replacement bin is a fair way to mitigate the cost of providing containers and will reduce the overall cost of the service to the Council and, in turn, local taxpayers;

- (d) states that the proposal for a £20 charge for a replacement bin brings Sheffield in line with the other South Yorkshire local authorities, and that the proposed charge is actually less than the cost incurred in Rotherham and Doncaster and equal to the cost in Barnsley;
- (e) believes that the new bins will be much more durable and robust than the smaller blue bin-box currently used, and introduced by the previous Council Administration, and should therefore lead to less damage and loss; and
- (f) welcomes the replacement of the box-bin with an additional recycling bin.

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

13.4 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 recent Cabinet report “Waste Management Policies” which was passed by the Administration last month;
- (b) reaffirms that the £20 charge will not apply when a bin is damaged by the collection crew or is reported to have gone into the back of the collection vehicle;
- (c) reaffirms that, under the proposal, no customer is being charged for the new brown recycling bins and that the £20 charge for a replacement bin is a fair way to mitigate the cost of providing containers and will reduce the overall cost of the service to the Council and, in turn, local taxpayers;
- (d) states that the proposal for a £20 charge for a replacement bin brings Sheffield in line with the other South Yorkshire local authorities, and that the proposed charge is actually less than the cost incurred in Rotherham and Doncaster and equal to the cost in Barnsley;
- (e) believes that the new bins will be much more durable and robust than the smaller blue bin-box currently used, and introduced by the previous Council Administration, and should therefore lead to less damage and loss; and
- (f) welcomes the replacement of the box-bin with an additional recycling bin.

13.4.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston,

Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a), (e) and (f), and voted against paragraphs (b) to (d) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER

Boxing

14.1 It was formally moved by Councillor John Booker, and formally seconded by Councillor Jack Clarkson, that this Council:-

- (a) recognises that boxing and related training can help where many social problems manifest themselves, for example, deprived communities and disadvantaged people, many who face a world of "gritty" social issues, such as gang-related crime, violence in their schools and local areas;
- (b) acknowledges that boxing has been described as "a universal language" and as a "working class sport played all over the world";
- (c) believes that, rather than serving as a release for aggression, the role of boxing is better viewed as a replacement for aggression;
- (d) further believes that everyone involved in boxing knows its benefits; it is a vehicle to learn or develop values and skills which lead to discipline, self-control and defence, exercise, fitness and diet, and above all, self-belief and confidence;
- (e) hopes to see more boxing gyms in more areas and boxing training available in all schools for those who wish to take part; and
- (f) further recognises that sport holds a unique position within the field of development, despite a limited understanding of the vital role it plays.

14.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Lisa Baines, and formally seconded by Councillor Mark Jones, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

- 1. the insertion, in paragraph (a), of the words "all sport, including" between the words "recognises that" and "boxing"; and
- 2. the addition of new paragraphs (g) to (k) as follows:-
 - (g) believes that though boxing can have a positive impact on individuals, it is essential that proper safeguards are in place for the safety of participants and that boxing clubs in our city, and throughout the country, comply with the proper safeguards, health and safety and care and protection of young people attending boxing clubs; and understands that medical studies have shown that there can be negative long-term

effects for professional boxers and this is why it is so crucial that proper safety measures are in place for amateur boxing in our city;

- (h) acknowledges that Sheffield has a proud history of supporting boxing; the Olympian boxing team of 2016 trained at the English Institute of Sport and reference should be given to the legendary Brendon Ingle gym in Wincobank, where hundreds of children and adults train at the gym every week, together with professionals, and many Champions have been produced from the gym – specifically 4 x World Champions, 6 x European Champions, 15 x British and Commonwealth Champions - which makes him one of the most successful trainers ever to grace the sport; and notes that many of the children and young adults never actually box but enjoy the training, and youngsters from difficult backgrounds and from many different cultures attend and a lot of work is done within the community in breaking down racial barriers; Dominic Ingle often takes his boxers into schools, helping to build social cohesion and overcome racial tensions; and furthermore, Brendon Ingle was awarded the MBE a few years ago for his commitments to Boxing and the Wincobank Community and he and his trainers and volunteers are very highly respected and loved by the local community;
- (i) recognises that the present Administration has shown consistent commitment to helping boxing clubs which meet the required level of safeguarding and is taking action against unlicensed boxing in the city; of particular note in this is the Council’s work with the group Youth Justice and their member responsible for gangs in the city, Ronnie Tucker; with work being done to clamp down on unlicensed, or “white collar”, boxing that does not have the proper medical support on site, and work is being done to stop unlicensed boxing taking place at Council venues; Ronnie Tucker was commended by Sports England for his work with boxing in schools and he has stated publically about the support he has had from Councillors Mike Drabble and Jackie Drayton;
- (j) asserts that there are many more examples than the aforementioned of the work done by this Administration in support of all sporting clubs, including boxing, in our city and that, as long as proper safeguards are enforced, this Administration will continue to champion sporting clubs, such as boxing, in the city; and
- (k) asserts that Sheffield is a very safe city and that gang violence is comparatively low, but contends that Sheffield City Council will continue to work with communities on improving this.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) recognises that all sport, including boxing and related training can help where many social problems manifest themselves, for example, deprived communities and disadvantaged people, many who face a world of "gritty" social issues, such as gang-related crime, violence in their schools and local areas;
- (b) acknowledges that boxing has been described as "a universal language" and as a "working class sport played all over the world";
- (c) believes that, rather than serving as a release for aggression, the role of boxing is better viewed as a replacement for aggression;
- (d) further believes that everyone involved in boxing knows its benefits; it is a vehicle to learn or develop values and skills which lead to discipline, self-control and defence, exercise, fitness and diet, and above all, self-belief and confidence;
- (e) hopes to see more boxing gyms in more areas and boxing training available in all schools for those who wish to take part;
- (f) further recognises that sport holds a unique position within the field of development, despite a limited understanding of the vital role it plays;
- (g) believes that though boxing can have a positive impact on individuals, it is essential that proper safeguards are in place for the safety of participants and that boxing clubs in our city, and throughout the country, comply with the proper safeguards, health and safety and care and protection of young people attending boxing clubs; and understands that medical studies have shown that there can be negative long-term effects for professional boxers and this is why it is so crucial that proper safety measures are in place for amateur boxing in our city;
- (h) acknowledges that Sheffield has a proud history of supporting boxing; the Olympian boxing team of 2016 trained at the English Institute of Sport and reference should be given to the legendary Brendon Ingle gym in Wincobank, where hundreds of children and adults train at the gym every week, together with professionals, and many Champions have been produced from the gym – specifically 4 x World Champions, 6 x European Champions, 15 x British and Commonwealth Champions - which makes him one of the most successful trainers ever to grace the sport; and notes that many of the children and young adults never actually box but enjoy the training, and youngsters from difficult backgrounds and from many different cultures attend and a lot of work is done within the community in breaking down racial barriers; Dominic Ingle often takes his boxers into schools, helping to build social cohesion and overcome racial tensions; and furthermore, Brendon Ingle was awarded the MBE a few years ago for his commitments to Boxing and the Wincobank Community and he and his trainers and volunteers are very highly respected and loved by the local community;

- (i) recognises that the present Administration has shown consistent commitment to helping boxing clubs which meet the required level of safeguarding and is taking action against unlicensed boxing in the city; of particular note in this is the Council's work with the group Youth Justice and their member responsible for gangs in the city, Ronnie Tucker; with work being done to clamp down on unlicensed, or "white collar", boxing that does not have the proper medical support on site, and work is being done to stop unlicensed boxing taking place at Council venues; Ronnie Tucker was commended by Sports England for his work with boxing in schools and he has stated publically about the support he has had from Councillors Mike Drabble and Jackie Drayton;
- (j) asserts that there are many more examples than the aforementioned of the work done by this Administration in support of all sporting clubs, including boxing, in our city and that, as long as proper safeguards are enforced, this Administration will continue to champion sporting clubs, such as boxing, in the city; and
- (k) asserts that Sheffield is a very safe city and that gang violence is comparatively low, but contends that Sheffield City Council will continue to work with communities on improving this.