

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 6 December 2017, at 5.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

**PRESENT**

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Anne Murphy)  
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Magid Magid)

1	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Andy Nash Bob Pullin Richard Shaw	10	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Andy Bainbridge Steve Wilson	19	<i>Nether Edge &amp; Sharrow Ward</i> Mohammad Maroof Jim Steinke Alison Teal
2	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Ian Saunders Sophie Wilson	11	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Roger Davison Shaffaq Mohammed Paul Scriven	20	<i>Park &amp; Arbourthorne</i> Julie Dore Ben Miskell Jack Scott
3	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	12	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Abdul Khayum Abtisam Mohamed	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> Mike Drabble Dianne Hurst Peter Rippon
4	<i>Broomhill &amp; Sharrow Vale Ward</i> Michelle Cook Kieran Harpham Magid Magid	13	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Garry Weatherall
5	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Talib Hussain	14	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Lewis Dagnall Cate McDonald Chris Peace	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Mike Chaplin Jayne Dunn
6	<i>City Ward</i> Douglas Johnson Robert Murphy Moya O'Rourke	15	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Sue Auckland Steve Ayriss	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Penny Baker Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Crookes &amp; Crosspool Ward</i> Adam Hanrahan Anne Murphy	16	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; 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 &amp; Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	18	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Tony Downing	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> 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 Councillors John Booker, Dawn Dale, Tony Damms, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mark Jones, Alan Law, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Gail Smith, Zoe Sykes and Cliff Woodcraft.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 2.1 Councillors Olivia Blake, Mike Drabble and Paul Scriven each declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 6 - Notice of Motion regarding Access To Urgent Primary Care (See Minute 6 below) - (a) as a Non-Executive Director of Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust, (b) due to him providing mental health counselling services in non-urgent primary care, and (c) due to his partner being employed by NHS England as a Medical Director, respectively.
- 2.2 Councillor Jack Scott declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 7 - Notice of Motion regarding Crisis in Children's Social Care (See Minute 7 below) – as Chief Executive of Home-Start South Yorkshire, an organisation which provides support for parents and children.
- 2.3 Councillors Douglas Johnson and Alison Teal each declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 13 – Changes To The Constitution (See Minute 13 below) – in so far as it related to the Monitoring Officer Protocol, on the grounds that a proposed revision in Section 4 of the Protocol (Procedure For Dealing With Complaints Regarding City, Parish And Town Councillors And Co-Opted Members) is to include a reference to the Monitoring Officer reserving the right to deal with any issues arising in the course of business that concerns the conduct or alleged conduct of a Member in the absence of a complaint if the Monitoring Officer deems it reasonable and appropriate to do so. Councillor Johnson stated that the reason for him declaring this interest was that the Monitoring Officer had recently made such an allegation against him, which he fully denies, and Councillor Teal stated that the reason for her declaring this interest was that the Monitoring Officer has been attempting to proceed with such a complaint against her since April 2017, despite the absence of such a power.

**3. SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

- 3.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Peter Rippon, and formally seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that approval be given, for the duration of this meeting, to certain revisions to the Council Procedure Rules, as set out in the schedule included with the agenda for this meeting, in order to apply the changes to the operation of this meeting that were used at the September, October and November Council meetings as part of a pilot exercise being overseen by the Review of Full Council Meetings Member Working Group.
- 3.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and

formally seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, as an amendment, that the Motion be approved with the exception of the rule relating to CPR 10.2 relating to a limit on the number of motions, and, furthermore, re-approves the revised formula for the order of the motions adopted indicatively at the meeting of this Council in October 2017.

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

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

RESOLVED: That approval be given, for the duration of this meeting, to certain revisions to the Council Procedure Rules, as set out in the schedule included with the agenda for this meeting, in order to apply the changes to the operation of this meeting that were used at the September, October and November Council meetings as part of a pilot exercise being overseen by the Review of Full Council Meetings Member Working Group.

#### **4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS**

##### **4.1 Petitions**

##### **4.1.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Take Action to Reduce Air Pollution**

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 305 signatures, requesting the Council to take action to reduce air pollution.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Graham Jones. Mr Jones stated that he was presenting the petition on behalf of the Burngreave Clean Air Campaign. Air pollution caused by traffic contributed to the premature death of many people annually and especially vulnerable groups included older people, unborn children, taxi drivers and people living in poorer areas such as Burngreave, which had several schools in one of the most polluted areas of Sheffield, with busy A roads running through it.

The petition also sought to support the introduction of anti-idling measures and Mr Jones said that children walking to school, rather than being taken in cars, would be better for people. Local people had been responsive when approached about this issue. Monitoring of pollution in Burngreave had been carried out and which showed high levels of Nitrogen Dioxide. The petitioners sought to increase awareness of the issue of air quality as well as reducing the effects of pollution. One of the measures which could be taken was to introduce walking buses for school children and to move traffic away from residential areas. He said that he was pleased that the Council had developed a Clean Air Strategy with proposals concerning anti-idling measures.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability. Councillor Scott stated that the Council had published a report to Cabinet concerning a Clean Air Strategy. He said that

there were many challenges relating to clean air, other than transport, and these included issues of inequality and fairness, exclusion and social justice. Clean air was a fundamental right for people and it was the most vulnerable in society who were affected by polluted air. He commented on the work being done, including with Burngreave Ward Councillors who had championed work with regard to air quality. He agreed that the situation could be described as one of crisis and a public health emergency and expressed concern that the negative health effects of pollution contributed to the deaths of some 500 people in Sheffield annually. This was an issue which needed to see improvement for everyone and a closing of the gap between areas where air quality was best and worst. He commented that the Government did not appear to be taking action on air quality which was sufficient to the challenges it presented.

He said that air pollution was also a major drain on the City's economy, put at £200 million annually and that there was not necessarily a tension between clean air and economic growth. There was also a Public Transport Vision, which had been submitted to the December meeting of Cabinet. Meanwhile, the Air Quality Strategy set out immediate actions, including in relation to vehicle idling, working with communities towards a Neighbourhood Champion Scheme, improving air quality around schools and in relation to winning hearts and minds to change behaviours.

Councillor Scott said that he was grateful to the petitioners for bringing this issue to Council. He commented that some of the solutions with regard to air quality were not easy, cheap nor always popular, that but they were required and they were the right thing to do. He said that he looked forward to working with the petitioners and the Burngreave Clean Air Campaign and with local councillors.

4.1.2 Petition Objecting to Planning Application 17/01437/FUL (1-11 Rotherham Place, Orgreave Road)

The Council received a petition containing around 600 signatures, objecting to the planning application for the development of a gas standby power generation facility on the site of 1-11 Rotherham Place, Orgreave Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Eric Chambers. Mr Chambers stated that the petition concerned objections to a planning application for the development of a gas standby power generation facility. He said that people were shocked that, having been withdrawn previously, this matter had been submitted to the Planning and Highways Committee and that the officer report relating to the application had said that it was recommended for approval. He asked why local people had only found out about the application through the newspapers.

Mr Chambers commented on increased levels of Nitrogen Dioxide which could be emitted from the proposed facility and that the recent Council report concerning Air Quality had stated that the Nitrogen Dioxide should be reduced in the Orgreave area of the City. Two similar facilities in the area

had already been given planning approval. In addition, there was a proposal for some 200 additional homes in the area and which would also mean additional traffic.

He said that the report referred to the Local Planning Authority having dealt with the planning application in a positive and proactive manner and having sought solutions to problems in accordance with the requirements of the National Planning Policy Framework. Mr Chambers quoted the National Planning Policy Framework in as far as it referred to taking into account the views of the community, natural environment, minimising pollution etc. He also made reference to objections which had been submitted and which were published on the planning website, including in relation to toxic gas, noise pollution, proximity to a proposed school and housing. He asked that the Council look at this matter further.

4.1.3 Public Questions Concerning Planning Application 17/01437/FUL (1-11 Rotherham Place, Orgreave Road)

Neal Varns asked if it was true that the first unit was proposed on Council officers' delegated approval and without local councillors, Members of Parliament or residents being informed.

Ian Crombie referred to Council policies which sought to protect the environment and improve air quality. He asked why the Council envisaged supporting an industrial development near to a residential area, the impact of which might negate the benefits of other previous good work.

Amanda Gipson asked several questions, as follows:

When a councillor is a member or chair of Planning Committee and is also an elected councillor for an area very close to a development; how do they balance their duties with the duty of care owed to the people who elected them, particularly with regard to local residents' concerns about air quality?

Why does the air quality impact report in respect of the proposal not seem to take account of the cumulative effect of the similar proposals already granted [permission] within the same neighbourhood?

Has the Council been given or promised money or any other incentive by central government to find sites for these units in the area, which was already a designated air quality improvement zone?

Since the Government's air quality strategy said that, in air quality improvement zones, planning permission should only be given to developers offering significant local employment opportunities, why was permission given for the developments already granted when so few people will be employed there?

Does the Council read and act upon comments made on the planning website, particularly when they are made by respected bodies such as the

## Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trusts?

Could the Leader of the Council reassure people that no decisions will be made until all the questions raised both on the planning website and in writing by local councillors, residents and Members of Parliament, have been addressed?

Carol Booth asked whether any councillor or member of their family would like one or more of the proposed units in close proximity to their property. She also asked why the area was being let down by the approval of such a development and why only Woodhouse Councillors were supporting residents and not those from Richmond Ward, that had a duty to represent people in Handsworth?

The Council referred the petition and the questions to Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Planning and Development and to Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability. Councillor Curran thanked the petitioners and those people who had asked questions. He clarified that the Administration of the Council did not have the powers to decide upon planning applications as this was a function of the Planning and Highways Committee. However, he said that he took on board the concerns which had been raised and would be pleased to meet with people to discuss the matter further. He said it should not be the case that elected members and residents were not informed in relation to planning applications in their area. Applications would normally be advertised and a weekly list of applications was also provided to councillors. He said that he would find out what happened in this case.

Councillor Curran said that no decision had yet been taken in respect of the planning application, despite an officer recommendation that the proposal was granted. The Planning and Highways Committee would listen to representations and take on board the information presented to them so they might determine the application. Councillor Curran said that there would be opportunity for people to make representations to the Committee.

He said that he would speak with the Chair of the Committee and to the Council's Head of Planning to make sure the application was not considered before there had been sufficient time to look at this issue.

The report relating to the planning application made reference to the cumulative effect of the proposal with other similar schemes and it stated that this was not considered material to the application. In relation to the question concerning government funding for such schemes, he said that he would look at that issue to make sure it was not the case.

Councillor Curran stated that councillors were able to view material on the planning website and planning reports. In certain cases, site visits were also made to particular locations subject to planning applications. He stated that issues regarding local councillors should be raised with the councillors concerned.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability, clarified that he was not a member of the Planning and Highways Committee. However, several local councillors had made him aware of the issues which had been outlined in the petition. He said that he would also be pleased to meet with people about their concerns. He commented on the potentially wide range of Nitrogen Dioxide levels and any increase which may be brought about by the proposal and said that more modelling would be required in relation to the public concerns and which would help to inform the Planning and Highways Committee. Modelling had also been requested on the effect of a higher chimney as part of the proposals. The issue of air quality relating to the application had been taken seriously and a mitigation approach had been used.

4.1.4 Petition Requesting Measures to Control the Inappropriate and Dangerous Parking of Vehicles in the Vicinity of Norton Lane

The Council received a petition containing 16 signatures, requesting the implementation of measures to stop the inappropriate and dangerous parking of vehicles in the vicinity of Norton Lane.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Graham Nevin. Mr Nevin stated that the petition requested the consideration of solutions in respect of the dangerous and inconsiderate parking of vehicles on Norton Lane and Little Norton Lane and at the T-Junction of the highway. Vehicles were parked on or over large speed bumps and on the pavements. There were particular problems at times when school children were taken to or collected from school when vehicles also parked over double yellow lines. Vehicles parking, such as on the corner of Little Norton Lane and Norton Lane resulted in blind spots being created, which were a danger to pedestrians and drivers.

School pupils crossed the road via a pedestrian crossing point on Bochum Parkway to get to Meadowhead School and they were also at risk because of the parking problems. Some vehicles were parked on the road by employees of nearby car dealerships, although there had been assurances that there would be adequate parking for employees on site. The petitioners called upon the Council to explore parking restrictions on the highway to help resolve this issue.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability. Councillor Scott commented that Norton Lane was narrow and it was therefore surprising that there were no parking restrictions on the road and he understood why parking was problematic. He said that he was pleased that the car dealerships had taken some action but it was apparent that more could be done.

Councillor Scott said that he would be pleased to meet with the petitioners. Any changes would require consultation and possibly traffic regulation orders. It would also not be acceptable to take action in one place which



only served to move parking problems to somewhere else. This was an issue which needed to be given further consideration and especially if it affected pupils walking to and from Meadowhead School.

#### 4.1.5 Public Question Concerning Norton Lane

Rosemary Markham asked what consideration the Council gave to local roads and residents when planning permissions were granted as experience had shown that there was not always an understanding of the impact and repercussions.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development, responded that every planning application was assessed by a highways specialist so as to consider the potential impact and steps which might be taken to mitigate issues. Each development had an impact upon the transport network and there was a need to find a balance between proposed development and the impact on an area.

#### 4.1.6 Petition Requesting Security Measures at High Wincobank Allotment Site

The Council received a petition containing 50 signatures, requesting security measures at High Wincobank Allotment site.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mary Lea, Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure. Councillor Lea responded that she was already aware of the issues outlined in the petition and was working with local councillors on the matter.

#### 4.2 Public Questions

##### 4.2.1 Public Question Concerning Wheelchair Users on Buses

Craig Williams stated that as a wheelchair user, he frequently used the buses in Sheffield. On the Stagecoach buses, there was a sign saying that the wheelchair space must by law, be kept clear for wheelchair users and buggies and prams must be moved by law to allow a wheelchair user to have the space. On First buses, there was no such sign and on two occasions recently, he said that he had been left on the pavement as the bus driver had informed him that there was a pram in the space allocated for a wheelchair and they could not ask for it to be moved. He asked whether the Council had any power to force First buses to apply the law and, if not, who did have this power.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability said in response that he apologised to Mr Williams that he was put in that position and commented that it was an appalling situation. He said that he would take this matter up with bus operators First and Stagecoach as it was completely unacceptable. Bus companies had to keep a space available for

wheelchairs by law and he would do everything that he could to put this situation right.

#### 4.2.2 Public Questions Concerning Tree Replacement

Tony May stated that despite recent reports in the press, television programmes and court injunction, protesters continued to disrupt the lives of residents. He asked how much longer people had to wait for some of the highway trees to be replaced.

Secondly, Mr May asked whether councillors would please accept that claims of intimidation towards Sheffield Tree Action Groups supporters on a street in Wadsley were a complete reversal of the truth. He said that people in the neighbourhood were tired of the situation. They also loved trees but some of the larger ones were damaging pavements, walls and surfaces.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, responded to the questions. He said that the Council regularly heard questions which implied there was one voice in the City which was against the tree replacement programme. He remarked on the courage shown by someone [with a different view]. He made reference to intimidation by masked protesters and said that many comments had been received from people who felt that they had been intimidated and he quoted some of those comments.

Councillor Lodge referred to the democratic process and to local elections held in 2016 and by-elections since that time. It was acknowledged that there were indeed different points of view and it was right to defend the right of people to speak.

#### 4.2.3 Public Question Concerning a Community Building

Yvonne Wray asked for a meeting with the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development with regard to the Council facilitating a community building for people of African descent.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development, stated that a question was asked at the November meeting of Council, following which his office had requested further information as to the requirements for a community building. He said that he understood that Yvonne Wray wished for a meeting to be arranged with him in this regard after mid-January 2018.

#### 4.2.4 Public Question Concerning Somaliland

Kaltun Elmi stated that the community was proud that the Council had recognised Somaliland as an independent state with aspirations to work for democracy, the rule of law, respect of human rights, women playing an active part in decision making and continuing the fight against female genital mutilation. She said that free and fair presidential elections had been

held in Somaliland. She asked whether the Council would continue to press the Government to lead the way in recognising Somaliland so that it might use its full potential to work with the international community to address issues including poverty, injustice, piracy and terrorism. She asked for a commitment by the Leader of the Council to join the community at a celebratory event, which would take place on Saturday 16 December in Barker's Pool.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, thanked Kaltun Elmi for the reminder of the events held in 2014 relating to the recognition of Somaliland. With regard to the Council pressing the UK Government to recognise Somaliland, the Council had put pressure on the Government to use its influence to enable the international community to recognise Somaliland. Actions taken in Sheffield were the start of a process of recognition and Councillor Dore said that she would welcome ideas and suggestions as to how this might be progressed.

Councillor Dore said that with regard to the celebration event on 16 December, she believed it was in her diary and she knew that the invitation was also extended to all Members of the Council.

#### 4.2.5 Public Questions Concerning Walk-In Centre and Minor Injuries Unit

Linda Jones made reference to the Notice of Motion on the agenda for this Council meeting concerning access to Urgent Primary Care. She asked what the Council could do to safeguard local services, including the Walk-In Centre at Broad Street and the Minor Injuries Unit at the Hallamshire Hospital. She said that she had attended a meeting of the City's Clinical Commissioning Group and commented that all three of the options included in the consultation would lead to the closure of these facilities.

Councillor Cate McDonald, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, responded to the question. She said that there were three things that the Council could do to help safeguard services provided by the NHS.

Firstly, the Council could advocate for the NHS at every opportunity. For example, the Council made representations with regard to the Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STP), which it was considered was a top down arrangement with a lack of transparency and accountability.

Secondly, Council meetings could be used to bring matters of concern for debate and raise the profile of issues through motions and amendments to motions. At this meeting of Council, there was both a Notice of Motion and amendments in respect of Urgent Primary Care.

Thirdly, the Council's Scrutiny function had a responsibility to look at proposed major changes to health services and it also had a power to refer matters to the Secretary of State in cases when it considered that a proposal was wrong.

4.2.6 Public Questions Concerning Procurement

Jenny Carpenter referred to the motion concerning a review of Council procurement procedures which was passed on 1 October 2014 and she asked what progress had been made to take any action on this resolution and where was it published.

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Deputy Leader of the Council said that there had been a large amount of consultation regarding procurement and the issue had been considered at a Scrutiny Committee to develop a policy and approach to the issue. As regards ethical procurement, the code of conduct principles were included in tender documentation sent out by the Council. Relevant information would be requested from those who made bids for contracts and bidders could be excluded on the grounds of misconduct.

The final policy had not been approved at this point in time. However, it would be the subject to an individual Cabinet Member decision. The documents relating to this issue would be published on the Council website. Councillor Blake said that she would be pleased to meet with Jenny Carpenter regarding this matter.

4.2.7 Public Question Concerning the Old Town Hall

Diana Stimely stated that the Council had said that funding would be found to enable urgent repairs to the Old Town Hall building. She asked why this had not been done.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development, stated that he had met with the Friends' group and artists at an event during the summer in relation to the Castlegate area. A partnership had been established which included the Friends' group and other stakeholders in relation to regenerating the Castlegate area.

There were particular challenges relating to the Old Town Hall. The Council would fund a survey of the building but had not committed to carry out work to it. The building was owned by a private landowner, not the Council. The outcome of the survey would help to determine the work which was required. There was apparently substantial investment required for the Old Town Hall building. The Council was in contact with other stakeholders and the ambition was to find a partner to work with the Council and the stakeholder group. Once the survey was complete, this would be shared with the Friends group. However, financial commitments relating to the Old Town Hall building could not be made at this time.

4.2.8 Public Question Concerning Notice of Motion Regarding the Budget

Peter Garbutt asked the Council to explain why there was a Motion on the agenda for this meeting concerning the UK budget, when he said there were many more relevant issues to discuss.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded that she was astonished that it was not accepted that the national budget had an impact on Sheffield. The Notice of Motion concerned with the Budget included important issues such as homelessness, Universal Credit, housing, etc., which were all critical issues that affected people in the City.

#### 4.2.9 Public Question Concerning Streets Ahead

Annette Taberner stated that roads had been closed, restricting access for people and trees felled above parked vehicles and she asked for the name of the company which had carried out work in this way, stating that Amey had refused to provide this information. She also stated that assurances had been given that work would not commence before 7.00am. However, people were beginning work in the early hours of the morning. She also referred to unidentified security personnel on the street at these times and asked whether the Council was monitoring the situation.

Sheldon Hall made reference to the Core Investment Period for the highway works and asked firstly, why priority had seemingly been given to tree felling over works to the highway.

Secondly, he asked what mechanisms there were to monitor the work done or not done by Amey and, where necessary, to take action in relation to breaches of health and safety regulations, including earlier today the reported injury to a child by flying tree debris.

Thirdly, he asked in relation to value for money, whether the Council had commissioned an independent assessment of the cost of retaining memorial trees as a comparison.

Fourthly, he asked whether the Council would agree that, in the light of recent court actions, it was inappropriate for the memorial plaque to the Kinder Scout trespass to be displayed on the wall of the Town Hall and that it should be removed to be consistent with current policy.

Russell Johnson asked if a progress report could be given on negotiations to extricate the Council from the Amey-PFI (Private Finance Initiative) contract.

Secondly, he asked whether the Council believed that paying a barrister £15,000 a day in an attempt to criminalise an elected member was good value for the City's taxpayers.

Thirdly, he asked for an assessment of the damage caused to the Council's reputation by alleged assaults by security staff, believed to have been hired by Amey, in the past week.

David Dilner asked a question concerning safe passage on footways and referred to many images which were available of pavements blocked by

Amey barriers. He said that images which he had submitted had been ignored or passed to Amey and asked when the Council would address its statutory responsibilities.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, responded to the questions. He said that the unidentified security guards to whom the question had referred, were stewards employed by Amey due to masked protesters stopping work.

In relation to the Core Investment Period of the Streets Ahead contract, condition surveys had been carried out and work was scheduled according to the survey results. Approximately sixty percent of the highway network would be completed by the end of the Core Investment Period and the other streets would be worked upon as part of the life-cycle phase of the contract. Trees were replaced using the 6 Ds criteria meaning that they were either dangerous, dead, dying, diseased, damaging or discriminatory. The Council's contract monitoring team monitored issues. Amey was in contact with the Health and Safety Executive and Councillor Lodge suggested that issues and concerns relating to health and safety were reported, which could be investigated by the Health and Safety Executive.

As regards the memorial trees, the cost of work by Amey was derived from the tariff for work. The cost was more competitive than had been the case when highways work was performed by Street Force and also when compared to information within other bids for the Streets Ahead contract. The estimated costs relating to the memorial trees would be £500,000.

Councillor Lodge said that he did not agree with the proposal as put by the questioner relating to the Kinder Scout memorial plaque.

He said that the Council was not in negotiations to end the Streets Ahead contract, although there had been an erroneous report relating to this matter in the press.

With respect to the question concerning the costs of a barrister, Councillor Lodge stated that if people were not trying to breach the injunction and breach barriers around safety zones, the Council would not have to take action to enforce the injunction. He commented that he had faith in the legal system and would respect the decisions of the court.

Councillor Lodge said that he would follow up the issues reported by Mr Dilner concerning the obstruction of pavements by barriers and asked that the photographs and details were provided to him in order that he could take the issue to Amey. He also stated that the remaining improvements to the highways would be completed.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded that with regard to the Council's reputation, she was deeply saddened by damage to Sheffield's reputation caused by misrepresentation by protesters.

4.2.10 Public Question Concerning Central Library Building

Russell Johnson asked if the Council agreed with him that the deal with the Chinese developer to convert the Central Library building was most unwise and had made the Council look even more of a 'laughing stock'.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that the Council had an opportunity to work with a major investor towards the obtaining of much needed investment in Sheffield. Whilst the question referred to a deal, it was a Memorandum of Understanding which had been signed by the Council and the Construction Group. There was a chance that an organisation wished to invest major funding in the City, which she did not consider to be a matter which would make the Council a 'laughing stock'.

4.2.11 Public Question Concerning the Inner Ring Road

Martin Phipps referred to plans relating to the Inner Ring Road and said that Kelham Island had been in breach of the legal safe limits for Nitrogen Dioxide since the creation of such limits. He commented that studies had shown that widening roads was often not effective in reducing congestion. He asked why it was thought appropriate to suggest the widening of the road to three lanes on each side and how did this help to reduce the amount of Nitrogen Dioxide to within a safe legal limit and help Sheffield to meet pollution reduction targets.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability, responded to the question. He stated that the proposed scheme for the Inner Ring Road between Corporation Street and Saville Street was subject to consultation. The proposals were concerned with the efficiency of the junction, which was not effective, including for public transport. The intention was to redesign the road junction rather than to implement a road widening scheme as such and to mitigate against increased traffic congestion. The revised scheme included more cycling infrastructure than the original scheme.

Councillor Scott said that he would be pleased to meet with Mr Phipps in relation to why he thought that the area was in breach of the safe level of Nitrogen Dioxide and to see whether he had further information. He said that the nearest monitoring location on Gibraltar Street had exceeded the legal level of Nitrogen Dioxide (which was 40 micrograms per cubic metre) but this had been in 2007. That was not to say that there was not an air quality problem in Sheffield and the Council had set out a vision of what action would be taken to address the issue.

4.2.12 Public Question Concerning Sheffield Newsroom

Richard Davis made reference to an item on the Council's Newsroom website regarding a letter to Michael Gove, Secretary of State for Environment and with regard to the Department for Transport being party to the Streets Ahead contract.

He also made reference to a notice of contravention and a statement regarding breaches of the law.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded to the question and said that before she gave an answer to the question, she would need to look at the specific information published on the Council Newsroom website to ascertain whether the information was correct or not.

## **5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

### **5.1 Urgent Business**

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

### **5.2 Questions**

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

### **5.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities**

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

## **6. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "ACCESS TO URGENT PRIMARY CARE" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR STEVE AYRIS AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED**

6.1 It was moved by Councillor Steve Ayris, and seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council:-

- (a) is committed to good access to our local NHS services for all our citizens;
- (b) notes the progress update report to the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 15th November 2017, "Reviewing Urgent Primary Care across Sheffield";
- (c) is concerned that the proposals involve the closure of the Walk-In Centre at Broad Lane and the Minor Injuries Unit at the Royal Hallamshire Hospital;



- (d) also notes:-
  - (i) that the majority of consultation respondents in the report feel that the proposed changes will not make it simpler to know where to go if they need urgent care (treatment for minor injuries or illnesses within 24 hours); and
  - (ii) public concerns about the possible impact on emergency services (A&E/Ambulances) and lack of availability for those living in large parts of the City;
- (e) therefore calls on the Clinical Commissioning Group to abandon any plans to close the Walk-In Centre at Broad Lane or the Minor Injuries Unit at the Royal Hallamshire Hospital and revise their plans accordingly; and
- (f) will mount a campaign to prevent closure of these facilities, and in order to achieve this, calls upon the Leader of the Council to set up a group of Party Leaders on the Council to co-ordinate the Council's opposition to the closure of the Walk-In Centre on Broad Lane and the Minor Injuries Unit at the Royal Hallamshire Hospital.

6.1.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the Motion (Councillor Steve Ayris), the Motion as published on the agenda was altered by the substitution, in paragraphs (c) and (e), of the word "Lane" for the word "Street".)

6.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Lewis Dagnall, and seconded by Councillor Kieran Harpham, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (f) and the addition of new paragraphs (f) to (i) as follows:-

- (f) notes the sustained damage which has been inflicted on NHS services since the formation of the Coalition government in 2010, and the beginning of austerity;
- (g) further notes that since Labour created the NHS in 1948, spending on health had increased every year by over 4%, rising to almost 7% per year during the Labour governments of 1997-2010; since 2010, however, the Department of Health's budget has grown by just 1% per year in real terms, far below what would be required in any decade - let alone in one in which the country faces new health challenges such as an ageing population;
- (h) will, in partnership with the "Save Our NHS Group", which was set-up as a response to austerity, call on NHS England and the Department of Health to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to avoid the proposed closure of the Broad Lane Walk-in-Centre and the Minor Injuries Unit at the Royal Hallamshire Hospital; and

- (i) agrees to submit a copy of this motion, as signed by all political parties on the Council, to the Head of NHS England and the Secretary of State for Health.

6.3 It was then moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and seconded by Councillor Magid Magid, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (d) to (f) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (d) to (f) as new paragraphs (g) to (i):-

- (d) is disappointed that the consultation does not include options, or invite public comments, on the closure of the Minor Injuries Unit and Walk-in Centre;
- (e) is further disappointed that NHS officials declined to share the draft consultation paper with the cross-party Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee at its meeting on 20 September 2017, despite the consultation going live on 25 September;
- (f) believes that, in any consultation, it is vital to be open and clear about the most significant practical changes being proposed;

6.4 After contributions from other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Steve Ayris, the amendment moved by Councillor Lewis Dagnall was put to the vote and carried.

6.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was then put to the vote and was carried, with the exception of the proposed new paragraph (e), which was negated.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) is committed to good access to our local NHS services for all our citizens;
- (b) notes the progress update report to the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee on 15th November 2017, "Reviewing Urgent Primary Care across Sheffield";
- (c) is concerned that the proposals involve the closure of the Walk-In Centre at Broad Lane and the Minor Injuries Unit at the Royal Hallamshire Hospital;
- (d) is disappointed that the consultation does not include options, or invite public comments, on the closure of the Minor Injuries Unit and Walk-in Centre;

- (e) believes that, in any consultation, it is vital to be open and clear about the most significant practical changes being proposed;
- (f) also notes:-
  - (i) that the majority of consultation respondents in the report feel that the proposed changes will not make it simpler to know where to go if they need urgent care (treatment for minor injuries or illnesses within 24 hours); and
  - (ii) public concerns about the possible impact on emergency services (A&E/Ambulances) and lack of availability for those living in large parts of the City;
- (g) therefore calls on the Clinical Commissioning Group to abandon any plans to close the Walk-In Centre at Broad Lane or the Minor Injuries Unit at the Royal Hallamshire Hospital and revise their plans accordingly;
- (h) notes the sustained damage which has been inflicted on NHS services since the formation of the Coalition government in 2010, and the beginning of austerity;
- (i) further notes that since Labour created the NHS in 1948, spending on health had increased every year by over 4%, rising to almost 7% per year during the Labour governments of 1997-2010; since 2010, however, the Department of Health's budget has grown by just 1% per year in real terms, far below what would be required in any decade - let alone in one in which the country faces new health challenges such as an ageing population;
- (j) will, in partnership with the "Save Our NHS Group", which was set-up as a response to austerity, call on NHS England and the Department of Health to work with the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) to avoid the proposed closure of the Broad Lane Walk-in-Centre and the Minor Injuries Unit at the Royal Hallamshire Hospital; and
- (k) agrees to submit a copy of this motion, as signed by all political parties on the Council, to the Head of NHS England and the Secretary of State for Health.

6.6.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) to (g) and (k) of the Substantive Motion, voted against paragraphs (h) and (i) of the Motion and abstained from voting on paragraph (j) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

**7. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "CRISIS IN CHILDREN'S SOCIAL CARE" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ANDY BAINBRIDGE AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR JACKIE DRAYTON**

7.1 It was moved by Councillor Andy Bainbridge, and seconded by Councillor Jackie Drayton, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that the past seven years of austerity has hit some of the most vulnerable in our society the hardest and that in the last year alone, 646,120 children in England sought support after suffering from neglect or emotional abuse;
- (b) further notes that since 2010 the number of child protection investigations nationally have increased by 108% to 185,450 cases a year - with little to suggest that this trend is likely to change without major intervention from central government;
- (c) believes that early intervention is crucial but with reducing funds and an increasing number of children requiring emergency support, many councils have been forced to cut back on preventative services;
- (d) notes the recent warnings by three leading children's charities (Children's Society, Action for Children and the National Children's Bureau) that early intervention services had been hit hardest by government cuts since 2010, and the formation of the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition, with targeted funding for early intervention having fallen by 55%;
- (e) further notes that by the end of the decade it is set to fall another 29% in real terms (or £808 million) with the most-deprived councils having to cut funding six times more than the least-deprived;
- (f) reaffirms this Administration's commitment to protecting vulnerable children and that, even in the face of continuing funding cuts, the Administration believes in the importance of early preventive action for children and young adults;
- (g) acknowledges earlier commitments made by this Administration, most recently at October's Full Council meeting, to provide additional support for early years and those affected by adverse childhood experiences (ACEs);
- (h) notes that rather than reduce children's services, this Administration has reconfigured centres to expand from 0-5 years to provide a range of children's services to family centres for 0-19 years (and to 25 for those with learning difficulties);
- (i) further notes that this Administration has also brought children

centres closer to people with outreach services now running from a variety of services such as schools and GP surgeries - covering all of the city;

- (j) believes that the Liberal Democrats opportunistically opposed the newly configured children's services, and erroneously and repeatedly stated that children centres, such as Angram Bank, would be closing, when in reality no such closures were ever proposed or have subsequently taken place;
- (k) believes that this Administration will do everything it can to protect the city's children, but that without additional funding from central government, it is becoming increasingly difficult;
- (l) notes the results of a recent survey by Action for Children which found that, of 500 Conservative Councillors surveyed, over 50% believed that central government funding cuts have made it harder for their council to support services for children and young people, and further notes that the Local Government Association (LGA) has warned that the number of children in care was at a "tipping point" with record high numbers continuing to rise;
- (m) notes, with shock and anger, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's recent budget provided no additional funds for children's services and he made no mention of children services in his speech to the Commons;
- (n) further notes that the Government's own economic predications denote that absolute child poverty is projected to increase by four percentage points, with about three-quarters of that increase - or 400,000 children - accounted for by planned tax and benefit reforms, with the freeze to most working-age benefits and the limiting of means-tested benefits to the first two children being of particular importance;
- (o) believes that the next few years are likely to be tough for living standards, with benefit cuts making things tougher still for poorer households - especially those with children - and regions and nations where poor households are more dependent upon benefits for their income are likely to bear the brunt of the increase in child poverty, which will have a damaging impact in Sheffield; and
- (p) supports the Labour Party's position to oppose the two child benefit cap, oppose the continued roll out of Universal Credit, and backs its manifesto commitment to reverse the damaging cuts to children's services since 2010.

7.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Alison Teal, and formally seconded by Councillor Magid Magid, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the replacement, in paragraph (k), of the words “believes that this Administration will do everything it can to protect the city’s children” by the words “believes that this Administration has a moral duty to protect the city’s children”; and
2. the deletion of paragraph (j) and the relettering of paragraphs (k) to (p) as new paragraphs (j) to (o).

7.3 It was then moved by Councillor Colin Ross, and seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, 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 amongst the Lib Dem achievements in government related to young people, was the roll out of Free School Meals for all Key Stage One pupils and the extension of pre-school education;
- (b) notes that Liberal Democrats support the principal of Universal Credit, however, are deeply concerned by the delays in some people receiving their payments, and therefore, calls on the Government to pause the rollout of Universal Credit until it has managed to resolve the issues related to delayed payments;
- (c) also notes that key Lib Dem policies related to welfare and young people include the following:-
  - (i) abandoning the two-child policy on family benefits and abolishing the “rape clause”;
  - (ii) reversing cuts to work allowances in Universal Credit and housing benefit for 18 to 21 year olds;
  - (iii) increasing Jobseeker’s Allowance and Universal Credit for 18 to 24 year olds;
  - (iv) upgrading working-age benefits at least in line with inflation; and
  - (v) extending free childcare to all two-year-olds and to the children of working families from the end of paid parental leave; and
- (d) requests that the Leader of Council writes to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions requesting that he notes the contents of this motion and pauses the rollout of Universal Credit.

7.4 After a contribution from another Member, and following a right of reply from Councillor Andy Bainbridge, the amendment moved by Councillor Alison Teal was put to the vote and negatived.

7.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Colin Ross was then put to the vote and was also negated.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that the past seven years of austerity has hit some of the most vulnerable in our society the hardest and that in the last year alone, 646,120 children in England sought support after suffering from neglect or emotional abuse;
- (b) further notes that since 2010 the number of child protection investigations nationally have increased by 108% to 185,450 cases a year - with little to suggest that this trend is likely to change without major intervention from central government;
- (c) believes that early intervention is crucial but with reducing funds and an increasing number of children requiring emergency support, many councils have been forced to cut back on preventative services;
- (d) notes the recent warnings by three leading children's charities (Children's Society, Action for Children and the National Children's Bureau) that early intervention services had been hit hardest by government cuts since 2010, and the formation of the Conservative-Liberal Democrat coalition, with targeted funding for early intervention having fallen by 55%;
- (e) further notes that by the end of the decade it is set to fall another 29% in real terms (or £808 million) with the most-deprived councils having to cut funding six times more than the least-deprived;
- (f) reaffirms this Administration's commitment to protecting vulnerable children and that, even in the face of continuing funding cuts, the Administration believes in the importance of early preventive action for children and young adults;
- (g) acknowledges earlier commitments made by this Administration, most recently at October's Full Council meeting, to provide additional support for early years and those affected by adverse childhood experiences (ACEs);
- (h) notes that rather than reduce children's services, this Administration has reconfigured centres to expand from 0-5 years to provide a range of children's services to family centres for 0-19 years (and to 25 for those with learning difficulties);
- (i) further notes that this Administration has also brought children centres closer to people with outreach services now running from a variety of

- services such as schools and GP surgeries - covering all of the city;
- (j) believes that the Liberal Democrats opportunistically opposed the newly configured children's services, and erroneously and repeatedly stated that children centres, such as Angram Bank, would be closing, when in reality no such closures were ever proposed or have subsequently taken place;
  - (k) believes that this Administration will do everything it can to protect the city's children, but that without additional funding from central government, it is becoming increasingly difficult;
  - (l) notes the results of a recent survey by Action for Children which found that, of 500 Conservative Councillors surveyed, over 50% believed that central government funding cuts have made it harder for their council to support services for children and young people, and further notes that the Local Government Association (LGA) has warned that the number of children in care was at a "tipping point" with record high numbers continuing to rise;
  - (m) notes, with shock and anger, that the Chancellor of the Exchequer's recent budget provided no additional funds for children's services and he made no mention of children services in his speech to the Commons;
  - (n) further notes that the Government's own economic predications denote that absolute child poverty is projected to increase by four percentage points, with about three-quarters of that increase - or 400,000 children - accounted for by planned tax and benefit reforms, with the freeze to most working-age benefits and the limiting of means-tested benefits to the first two children being of particular importance;
  - (o) believes that the next few years are likely to be tough for living standards, with benefit cuts making things tougher still for poorer households - especially those with children - and regions and nations where poor households are more dependent upon benefits for their income are likely to bear the brunt of the increase in child poverty, which will have a damaging impact in Sheffield; and
  - (p) supports the Labour Party's position to oppose the two child benefit cap, oppose the continued roll out of Universal Credit, and backs its manifesto commitment to reverse the damaging cuts to children's services since 2010.

7.6.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) to (d), (f) to (i), and (k) to (o) of the Motion, and voted



against paragraphs (d), (j) and (p) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

2. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a) to (i) and (k) to (p) of the Motion, and abstained from voting on paragraph (j) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded).

**8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "NATIONAL BUDGET" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR OLIVIA BLAKE AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR ABTISAM MOHAMED**

8.1 It was moved by Councillor Olivia Blake, and seconded by Councillor Abtisam Mohamed, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that this year's Budget was further evidence that we have an out-of-touch Government with no idea of the reality of people's lives and no plan to improve them;
- (b) notes that real wages are lower than they were in 2010 and the Budget confirmed a further hit to living standards with disposable income set to fall in 2017, but despite these dire predictions, the Chancellor of the Exchequer made no mention of Local Government funding;
- (c) further notes that national economic growth is the lowest it has been since the Conservatives came to office and the recent Budget confirms that failure, with growth revised down in every year of the forecast, and the National Living Wage revised down to £8.56 per hour;
- (d) further notes that productivity has been revised down every year, while business investment has been revised down next year and each following year, and that rather than pause the rollout of Universal Credit, the Chancellor offered help which is only a fraction of the £3 billion a year cuts made to the scheme;
- (e) supports the Labour Party's alternative budget which would scrap the public sector pay cap, pause and fix the Universal Credit roll-out, and introduce a real living wage of at least £10 an hour by 2020; Labour would bring forward investment in infrastructure across every region and nation to create high-wage, high-productivity jobs, and start a large-scale housebuilding programme, backed up with controls on rents;
- (f) believes that the small-scale tinkering with councils' borrowing for housing falls far short of what is needed – as recent changes will provide only an average of £293m a year over three years; further believes this national picture is not good enough and notes that in Sheffield we are ready to build more homes for the city, if only the Government would lift the borrowing cap;

- (g) believes that all Government ministers since 2010 should be ashamed by the number of people homeless or sleeping rough in this country, with the number of people sleeping on UK streets having more than doubled since 2010, a remarkable failing of recent Governments given that, under Labour, rough sleeping fell by three-quarters;
- (h) notes that the budget also did nothing for the country's 4.5 million private renting households; whereas a Labour Government would control rents, make three-year tenancies the new norm, and introduce new minimum standards;
- (i) believes that the Chancellor has not done nearly enough to end the current misery caused by the rollout of Universal Credit as the Government are still offering a desperate choice to those moving on to Universal Credit - wait 5 weeks to receive support or take a Government loan, going further into debt to make ends meet;
- (j) believes that the social security system should seek to prevent people from getting into debt, not encourage it, and support is given to the Labour Party's calls for the Chancellor to ensure that two week payments are rolled out across the country;
- (k) further contends that the budget did very little for self-employed people, second earners, lone parents or disabled people, all of whom have seen their living standards suffer particularly acutely under Universal Credit, and that the Chancellor failed to mitigate the £3 billion a year cuts slashed from the programme by his predecessor, and he also failed to address the impact of the social security freeze in Universal Credit, due to push millions into poverty;
- (l) reaffirms previous calls on the Government to pause and fix Universal Credit, with support given to the Labour Party's calls to:-
  - (i) reduce the six-week wait for payment, so that it lines up with the way people are paid, with all applicants to receive fortnightly payments if they so choose;
  - (ii) ensure everyone has the opportunity to have their rent paid directly to the landlord, to stop the spate of pre-emptive eviction notices that we are now seeing from private landlords;
  - (iii) allow households to have split payments instead of just one going predominantly to the male, so setting back women's financial autonomy;
  - (iv) change the monthly assessment for self-employed workers to a yearly one, to account for volatile working patterns; and
  - (v) restore the work allowances slashed from Universal Credit in

2015; and that the Chancellor should also end the freeze in social security payments, and ensure all children are supported through Universal Credit, not just the first two;

- (m) reaffirms the commitment by this Administration that no tenant of Sheffield City Council will be evicted solely as a result of delayed payments from Universal Credit;
- (n) notes that the Budget provides almost nothing extra for schools, moreover, we have already seen the steepest cuts to school funding in a generation (£2.7 billion since 2015 according to the National Audit Office) and a cap on public sector pay that has seen the average teacher lose £5000 since 2010, leading to teachers leaving the classroom in record numbers – with nearly 1-in-4 who joined since 2011 having left;
- (o) believes that the Government has completely mishandled business rates and that, although the shift from Retail Price Index (RPI) to Consumer Price Index (CPI) is to be welcomed, consideration should have been given to exempt new investment in plant and machinery from valuations, give business access to a proper appeals process and introduce statutory annual revaluations; and
- (p) believes that whilst the change in business rates will provide a much needed lift to our small businesses, it is feared that once again it will be local authorities who will have to bear the brunt of the costs for this; noting that, in Sheffield, the earlier changes to the Business Rates multiplier will lower Sheffield City Council's income by approximately £1.5m – and although the Government have hinted that councils will be compensated for the changes, there is currently no guarantee of this, and further notes that this Administration is committed to ensuring that as much pressure as possible is put on the Government to ensure that any losses are fully mitigated.

8.1.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the Motion (Councillor Olivia Blake), paragraph (m) of the Motion as published on the agenda was altered by (a) the substitution of the words “the commitment by this Administration” for the words “the decision by this Administration’s Cabinet” and (b) the insertion of the word “solely” between the words “evicted” and “as”.)

8.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and seconded by Councillor Magid Magid, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (n) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (n) to (p) as new paragraphs (o) to (q):-

- (n) notes that, in Sheffield, only Council tenants can be evicted from their homes if they cannot pay water bills on time and therefore calls on the Administration to end this practice by accounting for water bills separately from rent accounts and ceasing to pursue eviction in the

courts because of water rates;

8.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Adam Hanrahan, and formally seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) notes that the national Budget was an opportunity to address a number of significant issues facing our country, many of which have local government repercussions and which local government can play a part in the solution;
- (b) believes that this Budget woefully falls short of addressing these issues;
- (c) notes that the Budget failed to fundamentally get to grips with the housing crisis in the UK, which has real impacts here in Sheffield, despite its billing as 'the housing budget';
- (d) notes that the Chancellor of the Exchequer put more money aside for Brexit contingencies than for schools, the NHS or the police;
- (e) regrets the continuation of the public sector pay cap;
- (f) believes that, by putting a penny on the pound in income tax, an additional 6 billion pounds of funding can be secured each year to fund our NHS and social care system;
- (g) regrets that Sheffield will lag further behind the devolved areas after further transport funding was announced for devolved areas; and
- (h) directs that a copy of this motion be sent to the Chancellor.

8.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Cate McDonald, and formally seconded by Councillor Steve Wilson, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (q) to (s) as follows:-

- (q) believes that the budget was also notable for the absence of any meaningful funding for local government and our schools and did nothing to address the crisis in social care;
- (r) notes that, on becoming Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon Theresa May MP promised an inclusive government that would deal with the concerns and issues of the many who have been left behind by the government and we are, therefore, disappointed but not surprised to hear of the complete resignation of the Social Mobility Commission board, led by the former Labour and Conservative Cabinet Ministers, Alan Milburn and Gillian Shephard, saying they could not continue because they had 'little hope' Theresa May and

her government could deliver the changes necessary to bring about greater social mobility in the UK; and

- (s) notes that the Local Government Association (LGA) assessed the state of local authority funding for adult social care in the wake of the budget and stated that local government as a whole faces a funding gap of £5.8 billion by 2020, with Councils urgently requiring an additional £1 billion to cover unavoidable costs (such as demography, inflation and the National Living Wage) as well as a minimum of £1.3 billion to stabilise the adult social care provider market.

8.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was put to the vote and negated.

8.6 The amendment moved by Councillor Adam Hanrahan was then put to the vote and was also negated.

8.7 The amendment moved by Councillor Cate McDonald was then put to the vote and was carried.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that this year's Budget was further evidence that we have an out-of-touch Government with no idea of the reality of people's lives and no plan to improve them;
- (b) notes that real wages are lower than they were in 2010 and the Budget confirmed a further hit to living standards with disposable income set to fall in 2017, but despite these dire predictions, the Chancellor of the Exchequer made no mention of Local Government funding;
- (c) further notes that national economic growth is the lowest it has been since the Conservatives came to office and the recent Budget confirms that failure, with growth revised down in every year of the forecast, and the National Living Wage revised down to £8.56 per hour;
- (d) further notes that productivity has been revised down every year, while business investment has been revised down next year and each following year, and that rather than pause the rollout of Universal Credit, the Chancellor offered help which is only a fraction of the £3 billion a year cuts made to the scheme;
- (e) supports the Labour Party's alternative budget which would scrap the public sector pay cap, pause and fix the Universal Credit roll-out, and

introduce a real living wage of at least £10 an hour by 2020; Labour would bring forward investment in infrastructure across every region and nation to create high-wage, high-productivity jobs, and start a large-scale housebuilding programme, backed up with controls on rents;

- (f) believes that the small-scale tinkering with councils' borrowing for housing falls far short of what is needed – as recent changes will provide only an average of £293m a year over three years; further believes this national picture is not good enough and notes that in Sheffield we are ready to build more homes for the city, if only the Government would lift the borrowing cap;
- (g) believes that all Government ministers since 2010 should be ashamed by the number of people homeless or sleeping rough in this country, with the number of people sleeping on UK streets having more than doubled since 2010, a remarkable failing of recent Governments given that, under Labour, rough sleeping fell by three-quarters;
- (h) notes that the budget also did nothing for the country's 4.5 million private renting households; whereas a Labour Government would control rents, make three-year tenancies the new norm, and introduce new minimum standards;
- (i) believes that the Chancellor has not done nearly enough to end the current misery caused by the rollout of Universal Credit as the Government are still offering a desperate choice to those moving on to Universal Credit - wait 5 weeks to receive support or take a Government loan, going further into debt to make ends meet;
- (j) believes that the social security system should seek to prevent people from getting into debt, not encourage it, and support is given to the Labour Party's calls for the Chancellor to ensure that two week payments are rolled out across the country;
- (k) further contends that the budget did very little for self-employed people, second earners, lone parents or disabled people, all of whom have seen their living standards suffer particularly acutely under Universal Credit, and that the Chancellor failed to mitigate the £3 billion a year cuts slashed from the programme by his predecessor, and he also failed to address the impact of the social security freeze in Universal Credit, due to push millions into poverty;
- (l) reaffirms previous calls on the Government to pause and fix Universal Credit, with support given to the Labour Party's calls to:-
  - (i) reduce the six-week wait for payment, so that it lines up with the way people are paid, with all applicants to receive fortnightly payments if they so choose;

- (ii) ensure everyone has the opportunity to have their rent paid directly to the landlord, to stop the spate of pre-emptive eviction notices that we are now seeing from private landlords;
  - (iii) allow households to have split payments instead of just one going predominantly to the male, so setting back women's financial autonomy;
  - (iv) change the monthly assessment for self-employed workers to a yearly one, to account for volatile working patterns; and
  - (v) restore the work allowances slashed from Universal Credit in 2015; and that the Chancellor should also end the freeze in social security payments, and ensure all children are supported through Universal Credit, not just the first two;
- (m) reaffirms the commitment by this Administration that no tenant of Sheffield City Council will be evicted solely as a result of delayed payments from Universal Credit;
- (n) notes that the Budget provides almost nothing extra for schools, moreover, we have already seen the steepest cuts to school funding in a generation (£2.7 billion since 2015 according to the National Audit Office) and a cap on public sector pay that has seen the average teacher lose £5000 since 2010, leading to teachers leaving the classroom in record numbers – with nearly 1-in-4 who joined since 2011 having left;
- (o) believes that the Government has completely mishandled business rates and that, although the shift from Retail Price Index (RPI) to Consumer Price Index (CPI) is to be welcomed, consideration should have been given to exempt new investment in plant and machinery from valuations, give business access to a proper appeals process and introduce statutory annual revaluations;
- (p) believes that whilst the change in business rates will provide a much needed lift to our small businesses, it is feared that once again it will be local authorities who will have to bear the brunt of the costs for this; noting that, in Sheffield, the earlier changes to the Business Rates multiplier will lower Sheffield City Council's income by approximately £1.5m – and although the Government have hinted that councils will be compensated for the changes, there is currently no guarantee of this, and further notes that this Administration is committed to ensuring that as much pressure as possible is put on the Government to ensure that any losses are fully mitigated;
- (q) believes that the budget was also notable for the absence of any meaningful funding for local government and our schools and did nothing to address the crisis in social care;

- (r) notes that, on becoming Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon Theresa May MP promised an inclusive government that would deal with the concerns and issues of the many who have been left behind by the government and we are, therefore, disappointed but not surprised to hear of the complete resignation of the Social Mobility Commission board, led by the former Labour and Conservative Cabinet Ministers, Alan Milburn and Gillian Shephard, saying they could not continue because they had 'little hope' Theresa May and her government could deliver the changes necessary to bring about greater social mobility in the UK; and
- (s) notes that the Local Government Association (LGA) assessed the state of local authority funding for adult social care in the wake of the budget and stated that local government as a whole faces a funding gap of £5.8 billion by 2020, with Councils urgently requiring an additional £1 billion to cover unavoidable costs (such as demography, inflation and the National Living Wage) as well as a minimum of £1.3 billion to stabilise the adult social care provider market.

8.8.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) to (d), (f), (i) and (k) to (s) of the Substantive Motion and voted against paragraphs (e), (g), (h) and (j) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

2. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (m) and (p) of the Substantive Motion and abstained from voting on paragraphs (a) to (l), (n), (o) and (q) to (s) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

**9. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY OF MEMBERS AND OFFICERS" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ROBERT MURPHY AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS JOHNSON**

9.1 In view of the consent of the Council having not been given to a request made by the mover of the Motion (Councillor Robert Murphy) for permission to alter the wording of paragraph (a) of the Motion as published on the agenda, the Notice of Motion regarding "Public Accountability of Members and Officers" at item 9 on the Summons for this meeting, was withdrawn at the request of Councillor Murphy and with the consent of the Council, in accordance with Council Procedure Rules 11(a)(x) and 17.10.



**10. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "PLAY STREETS" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ALISON TEAL AND TO BE SECONDED BY THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (COUNCILLOR MAGID MAGID)**

10.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Alison Teal, and formally seconded by Councillor Magid Magid, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the importance of active play for the health and wellbeing of young people, and the success of organisations like Bristol-based CiC Playing Out in promoting the temporary use of residential roads for 'playing out sessions' to encourage active play;
- (b) further notes that Playing Out has found that the level of dangerous nitrogen oxide air pollution on the roadside can be significantly decreased during a play street session, providing an additional health benefit;
- (c) welcomes the fact that a small number of playing out sessions have already been held in Sheffield, including in May 2017 on Wake Road, but believes that Sheffield City Council can do more to support and promote this positive initiative;
- (d) believes that playing out sessions will be most successful if they are resident-led, but that Sheffield City Council has an important role to play in supporting residents to plan and run these sessions on their own streets; and
- (e) therefore calls upon the Administration to instruct officers to:-
  - (i) develop a policy framework to enable a pilot to take place in Sheffield in the summer of 2018, including designing a quick and simple application process for residents wishing to facilitate playing out sessions on their street, and removing barriers to them doing so;
  - (ii) make contact with relevant officers where similar schemes are currently operating successfully, such as Leeds, Hackney, and Bristol, to learn about the key steps to successfully implementing the policy, and to research the concept on the Playing Out website; and
  - (iii) present proposals to Cabinet within two months for approval, with a view to advertising the new scheme in time for communities to come forward to be part of the pilot during the school summer holidays 2018.

10.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Jim Steinke, and formally seconded by Councillor Neale Gibson, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraphs (c) and (e), and the re-lettering of paragraph (d) as a new paragraph (c); and
2. the addition of new paragraphs (d) to (m) as follows:-
  - (d) notes that this Administration is already designing a transparent policy on street play events;
  - (e) further notes that there has been a lot of recent interest for play events in Sheffield and, over recent years, there has been an increase in the number of applications that the Council receive for such events and that it is, therefore, important that applicants are dealt with fairly and the policy will give this confidence;
  - (f) further notes that during the one year trial for the Play Streets scheme, the frequency of road closures to facilitate the events would be no more than once a month and that any objections to a Street Play event will be reported to and considered by the relevant Cabinet Member, local councillors and local residents;
  - (g) notes that this Administration wants to help Sheffield deliver the aspirations of the Move More Plan which sets out a five year framework for the promotion of physical activity in Sheffield and provide overall direction for increasing physical activity in Sheffield by securing and aligning stakeholder commitment to work together to achieve the vision to make Sheffield the most active city by 2020;
  - (h) notes that the number of 5 – 15 olds achieving the required level of activity has reduced nationally over the years, with only 21% of boys and 16% of girls in 2012 being sufficiently active;
  - (i) believes that play is one of the main ways in which children learn, as it helps to build self-confidence by giving a child a sense of his or her own abilities and to feel good about themselves;
  - (j) notes that empowering communities and changing the environment to make it easier to be physically active are two outcomes from the Move More Plan, of which the Playing Out Scheme is derived;
  - (k) notes that this Administration trialled street play events as part of the introduction of 20mph zones, and that the on-going roll out of the zones across the city is making our streets safer to enjoy and travel;
  - (l) notes that this Administration is working with wider community organisations, such as Mosques, Churches and schools, and with residents to ensure that playing out events get the support and publicity they need; and
  - (m) notes this Administration's commitment to take radical action to improve the city's air quality through the revised Clean Air Strategy

and recent innovations including Sheffield planning to be the first local authority in the country to implement fines for car drivers who leave their engine running while idle outside of schools.

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

10.3.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for parts 1 and paragraphs (d) to (l) of part 2 of the amendment and voted against paragraph (m) of part 2 of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

10.4 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 importance of active play for the health and wellbeing of young people, and the success of organisations like Bristol-based CiC Playing Out in promoting the temporary use of residential roads for 'playing out sessions' to encourage active play;
- (b) further notes that Playing Out has found that the level of dangerous nitrogen oxide air pollution on the roadside can be significantly decreased during a play street session, providing an additional health benefit;
- (c) believes that playing out sessions will be most successful if they are resident-led, but that Sheffield City Council has an important role to play in supporting residents to plan and run these sessions on their own streets;
- (d) notes that this Administration is already designing a transparent policy on street play events;
- (e) further notes that there has been a lot of recent interest for play events in Sheffield and, over recent years, there has been an increase in the number of applications that the Council receive for such events and that it is, therefore, important that applicants are dealt with fairly and the policy will give this confidence;
- (f) further notes that during the one year trial for the Play Streets scheme, the frequency of road closures to facilitate the events would be no more than once a month and that any objections to a Street Play event will be reported to and considered by the relevant Cabinet Member, local councillors and local residents;
- (g) notes that this Administration wants to help Sheffield deliver the

aspirations of the Move More Plan which sets out a five year framework for the promotion of physical activity in Sheffield and provide overall direction for increasing physical activity in Sheffield by securing and aligning stakeholder commitment to work together to achieve the vision to make Sheffield the most active city by 2020;

- (h) notes that the number of 5 – 15 olds achieving the required level of activity has reduced nationally over the years, with only 21% of boys and 16% of girls in 2012 being sufficiently active;
- (i) believes that play is one of the main ways in which children learn, as it helps to build self-confidence by giving a child a sense of his or her own abilities and to feel good about themselves;
- (j) notes that empowering communities and changing the environment to make it easier to be physically active are two outcomes from the Move More Plan, of which the Playing Out Scheme is derived;
- (k) notes that this Administration trialled street play events as part of the introduction of 20mph zones, and that the on-going roll out of the zones across the city is making our streets safer to enjoy and travel;
- (l) notes that this Administration is working with wider community organisations, such as Mosques, Churches and schools, and with residents to ensure that playing out events get the support and publicity they need; and
- (m) notes this Administration's commitment to take radical action to improve the city's air quality through the revised Clean Air Strategy and recent innovations including Sheffield planning to be the first local authority in the country to implement fines for car drivers who leave their engine running while idle outside of schools.

10.4.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) to (l) of the Substantive Motion and voted against paragraph (m) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **11. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS**

11.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that the minutes of the extraordinary meeting and the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 1<sup>st</sup> November 2017 be approved as true and accurate records.

**12. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES**

- 12.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that Councillor Peter Rippon be appointed to serve on the Senior Officer Employment Committee in place of Councillor Mazher Iqbal.

**13. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION**

- 13.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that this Council adopts the changes to the following parts of the Constitution, as set out in the report of the Chief Executive now submitted, and its Appendices, including the revised page 2 to Appendix D circulated at the meeting:-

- (a) Part 4 – Contracts Standing Orders;
- (b) Part 5 – Monitoring Officer Protocol;
- (c) Part 5 – Procedure For Dealing With Complaints Regarding City, Parish And Town Councillors And Co-Opted Members (Appendix to the Monitoring Officer Protocol); and
- (d) Part 7 – Management Structure and Statutory/Proper Officers.

- 13.1.1 The votes on the revision of the Monitoring Officer Protocol in so far as it related, in Section 4 (Procedure For Dealing With Complaints Regarding City, Parish And Town Councillors And Co-Opted Members), to the inclusion of reference to the Monitoring Officer reserving the right to deal with any issues arising in the course of business that concerns the conduct or alleged conduct of a Member in the absence of a complaint if the Monitoring Officer deems it reasonable and appropriate to do so, were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

- For the revision (49)
- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) and Councillors Ian Saunders, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Moya O'Rourke, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Jim Steinke, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter

Rippon, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against the revision  
(25)

- The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Alison Teal, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson and Keith Davis.

Abstained from voting  
on the revision (0)

- Nil