

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 28 March 2018, 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 & Greenhill Ward</i>
Andy Nash
Bob Pullin
Richard Shaw | 10 | <i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i>
Andy Bainbridge
Steve Wilson | 19 | <i>Nether Edge & Sharrow Ward</i>
Mohammad Maroof
Jim Steinke
Alison Teal |
| 2 | <i>Beighton Ward</i>
Chris Rosling-Josephs
Ian Saunders
Sophie Wilson | 11 | <i>Ecclesall Ward</i>
Roger Davison
Shaffaq Mohammed | 20 | <i>Park & 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 & Sharrow Vale Ward</i>
Michelle Cook
Kieran Harpham
Magid Magid | 13 | <i>Fulwood Ward</i>
Sue Alston
Andrew Sangar | 22 | <i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i>
Dawn Dale
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
Tony Damms
Jayne Dunn |
| 6 | <i>City Ward</i>
Douglas Johnson
Robert Murphy | 15 | <i>Graves Park Ward</i>
Ian Auckland
Steve Ayris | 24 | <i>Stannington Ward</i>
David Baker
Penny Baker |
| 7 | <i>Crookes & Crosspool Ward</i>
Adam Hanrahan
Anne Murphy | 16 | <i>Hillsborough Ward</i>
Bob Johnson
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
Colin Ross
Martin Smith | 18 | <i>Mosborough Ward</i>
David Barker
Tony Downing
Gail Smith | 27 | <i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i>
John Booker
Adam Hurst
Zoe Sykes |
| | | | | 28 | <i>Woodhouse Ward</i>
Mick Rooney
Jackie Satur
Paul Wood |

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Pauline Andrews, Sue Auckland, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mark Jones, Alan Law, Moya O'Rourke, Vickie Priestley, Paul Scriven and Cliff Woodcraft.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.1 Personal interests in agenda item 5 – Notice of Motion regarding Homes in the Private Rented Sector - were declared by Councillors John Booker, Jack Clarkson, Dianne Hurst, Mazher Iqbal, Bob Johnson, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Shaffaq Mohammed, Andy Nash, Zahira Naz, Josie Paszek and Colin Ross, on the grounds of being private sector landlords, and by Councillor Talib Hussain on the grounds of his spouse being a private sector landlord.

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 Petitions

3.1.1 Petition asking for support for Peace for Kashmir

The Council received a petition containing 398 signatures, asking for support for peace in Kashmir.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Sarah Irshad, Professor Nazir Shawl and Barrister Majeed Tarabo. The petitioners outlined the situation faced by people in Kashmir, who were fighting for the right to self-determination for people in the disputed state of Jammu. They stated that women, children and vulnerable adults were subjected to abuse and violence and there was increasing concern about human rights and violence.

The petitioners commented that draconian laws were being put in place and tools of oppression and torture were employed, with many lives lost over the past 30 years of the dispute, including many civilian deaths. The petition requested that the UK Government take action to help to bring about a just peace in Kashmir and ahead of the Commonwealth Summit, which was to take place in London on 16 April, the Leader of the Council was requested to raise this matter with the Heads of Commonwealth countries and for intergovernmental organisations to become engaged with the issue. There was also a wish that negotiations between Pakistan and India be resumed, for the ceasefire to be respected and that people of Kashmir be included in dialogue.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council. Councillor Dore thanked the petitioners for bringing the matter to Council and she referred to the situation in Kashmir which also affected people, families, friends and colleagues in Sheffield. She said that the atrocities which had occurred had been subject of discussion by the Council and whilst there was a sense of frustration about the extent to which the

situation could be made to stop, the Council would do what it could. She said that some members of the Council had spoken at the event held this day concerning this issue. She explained that previously, it had been agreed by Council that a working party be established, led by Councillor Mohammad Maroof, to consider the situation in Kashmir and that a letter had been sent to the Foreign Office at that time and that she would arrange for the letter and any response to be circulated as appropriate.

Councillor Dore undertook to write to the Foreign Office again in relation to the concerns which had been raised by the petition. She said that she would enquire as to whether Sheffield could make representations to the forthcoming Commonwealth Summit formally or whether this might be done informally.

Councillor Dore said that collectively, the Government needed to be put under pressure to act in relation to the issues in Kashmir and to stop acts of atrocity against people in Kashmir and respect the wishes of the people there.

3.1.2 Petition regarding parking problems on Charles Ashmore Road

The Council received a petition containing 30 signatures, calling upon Council to implement measures to control inappropriate parking in the turning circle at the head of Charles Ashmore Road in front of entrance gates to Graves Park.

Representations of behalf of the petitioners were made by Paul Dial who stated that the petition was requesting the Council to implement measures to control parking. He said that the area was busy given that it included the Graves Park leisure facilities. Whilst there was a small pay and display car park available vehicles were parked and left in the turning circle, particularly during weekends and during the summer. Vehicles which were parallel parked caused difficulties for refuse, emergency services and delivery vehicles requiring access. Mr Dial said that he accepted the positive and negative aspects of living near to the Park and that the petition had been signed by all of the local residents.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability. Councillor Scott stated that a petition had been received by the Council concerning parking on little Norton Lane, which had outlined similar problems to those outlined by Mr Dial in respect Charles Ashmore Road. He commented that the petitioners had been fair in saying that the situation with regard to parking was difficult.

Councillor Scott said that the Council would need to work with people, including those who did and did not want parking restrictions. He also said that the situation might be affected by any new development and at school times. He assured the petitioners that the Council was committed to considering this matter and said that he looked forward to working with people, including residents and the local Member of Parliament in this regard.

3.2 Public Questions

3.2.1 Public Question Concerning Request For Lease of Former Prince Edward School Building / De Hood

Mark Caterer informed the Council that he had lost a significant amount of weight since being at De Hood and he spoke of the health benefits of being a member of the De Hood gym. He asked why it was proposed to take this facility away from people.

Pete Walker asked what the effect on air pollution would be if the former school was demolished and a retail park was constructed in its place.

Anthony Chan stated that at least 1000 houses were to be constructed and he asked a question concerning community facilities for the residents of those new homes for recreational and community activities.

Gina Crowder spoke about her son who had been attending activities at De Hood and which had helped him greatly and she asked what the cost would be to keep a child in an inclusion centre, with involvement of the MAST (Multi-agency) team and child and adolescent mental health services to prevent them from following the wrong path in life.

Kyle Timms stated that he had complex mental health and physical health needs and De Hood had helped him greatly in learning to walk again. He said that there was nothing else like it in the City and asked where he would get support if De Hood was to close or moved location.

Reagan Denton said that he was the founder of De Hood and he informed Members of the Council that it had helped to reduce crimes involving knives and fires in the local community. He asked what the cost would have been to other statutory services such as the Council, Police, Fire Service and NHS, had De Hood not been there and could a value be placed on the benefits of the activities at De Hood. He commented that De Hood demonstrated successful teamwork and said that people really wanted their voices to be heard on this issue.

Leroy Young spoke of his own circumstances relating to alcohol and drug addiction and of having lost his family and his job. He said that rehabilitation had not been successful in his case, despite considerable investment. However, in 2016, he started to attend De Hood and had not drunk alcohol since that time. He was now a volunteer at De Hood.

Mick Hartley described the kick back recovery group which he had set up at De Hood. 45 people attended the weekly meetings of the group at the De Hood centre, which assisted in their recovery in the community from drug and alcohol problems. He had successfully carried out fund raising for the sessions which occurred five times each week. Work was also being done with the Archer Project to enable people who were being supported by the Archer Project to attend sessions at De Hood. He asked where people using the recovery group would go if De Hood was shut down?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded to the questions and said that it may not have been easy for people to share their personal experiences relating to this issue but that the sharing of experiences helped the Council to make decisions. She referred to the petition which had been submitted in relation to the former Prince Edward School site and which would be subject to a debate at this meeting.

Councillor Dore said that no decision had yet been made in relation to the former Prince Edward School. The license for organisations to occupy the premises, which had been deemed surplus to requirements at that time, was temporary. She said that De Hood had achieved wonderful and amazing things and that those services and successful activities should not be lost, neither for the local area nor for the City. The Council should be working with De Hood with regard to the services which it provided for people now and for those that needed them in the future, whether this was in the existing premises or elsewhere. The alternative options would be given serious consideration and people's experiences were important in order to understand the services which they needed.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability, stated that this was important for the City and for the local area. He said he was blown-away and very proud of the achievements of De Hood, including the activities and classes which were available and the large number of members. It had a long term effect on people living more healthily, their own discipline and their aspirations. People's journeys to better health and recovery were very powerful and compelling.

Councillor Scott said that air quality measurements taken at Manor Top were an example of the air pollution experienced especially in deprived areas. Whilst the air quality there had improved since 2013 (the level of Nitrogen Dioxide having fallen), this was not a particular comfort for people. He said that planning conditions with regard to air quality would be part of the consideration of any proposed building development.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, said in relation to members of De Hood, that they had been on an inspiring journey. She said that she was very pleased that Gina Crowder's son was back in school, thanks to the support of De Hood and the volunteers there. She clarified that a school would have the funding for a pupil, even if that pupil was in alternative provision.

Councillor Drayton said that the Council wished for children to be education and to achieve their potential and that Gina Crowder's son had found something which had helped to bring him back to school.

3.2.2 Public Question Concerning the Leader of the Council

Russell Johnson asked whether Councillor Dore agreed that her political career was coming to an end and that this would enable the rebuilding of the City's reputation through improved governance.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, explained that she could choose to put herself forward for selection as a candidate for her Party and would, if selected, subsequently be put forward as a candidate for a particular ward. The outcome of the election was the decision of the electorate of the Park and Arbourthorne Ward. The Council would decide its leader.

3.2.3 Public Questions Concerning Chief Executive's Salary

Russell Johnson asked why the salary of the Council's Chief Executive had not been adjusted to reflect the reduction in the turnover of the Council during the recent period of austerity imposed by the government.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded that the salary of the Chief Executive had been adjusted, as had the pay of all Council employees. Employees had taken a real term pay cut as a result of austerity. She said that this was not acceptable. This year, a 2 percent pay increase was proposed, although this did not match the inflation rate.

3.2.4 Public Question Concerning Student Accommodation in City Centre

Nigel Slack referred to recent announcements regarding proposals for student flats in the city centre. He asked how many student flats/beds were in the development pipeline for the City Centre; how many students flats/beds there were at present; and, with a predicted downturn in student numbers and most Universities having money issues, was this sustainable?

3.2.5 Public Question Concerning the Heart of the City

Nigel Slack referred to a question put to council officers at the Cabinet meeting in March and concerning the Heart of the City. A Cabinet Member had asked whether any grade 2 or other listed buildings were to be demolished as part of the redevelopment. The answer was that no star grade buildings would be demolished. He asked for clarity on this matter and whether, under the Heart of the City proposals, any listed buildings would be liable for demolition.

(Note: A third question asked by Mr Slack was not accepted because it was considered to be of an offensive nature and a general misuse of the opportunity. Furthermore, the Lord Mayor determined that the questions asked at paragraphs 3.2.4 and 3.2.5 above would not be answered at this time as this was not considered to be appropriate given the context of the third question).

3.2.6 Public Question Concerning Streets Ahead Programme

Ann Anderson made reference to cabling workings carried out to Abbeydale Park Rise by telecoms engineers, which she said had resulted in successful flattening of pavements considered to have significant surface issues. She asked whether the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene would acknowledge his previous commitment made in June 2016, which was to carry out root excavations to 12 healthy trees to identify whether these could be

retained. She asked if he would also assure residents of the street that no further trees would be felled, unless it could be proved beyond doubt that felling was truly a last resort.

David Dillner asked whether those responsible for the 17,500 target in the PFI contract would be investigated for failure to exercise due diligence.

Justin Buxton asked whether it was legitimate to fell a tree as part of highways maintenance to facilitate television reception.

Justin Buxton asked a question concerning who in the Council and Amey was party to the South Yorkshire Police Silver Command responsible for Operation Quito.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, stated that he was aware that Darren Butt, Amey, had received a question relating to Abbeydale Park Rise and that a response had been made on 22 March. Councillor Lodge stated that the response was that this matter was being reviewed and that was the position at this time.

Councillor Lodge said that there was no target in relation to the number of trees being replaced.

With regards to whether it was legitimate to fell a tree to facilitate television reception, Councillor Lodge stated that the criteria for tree replacement were the six D's (i.e. dead, dying, discriminatory, diseased, damaging or dangerous). Further information in regard to the categories was available on the Council's website and which explained work which could and could not be done regarding trees.

In relation to the South Yorkshire Police Silver Command, Councillor Lodge stated that this matter was also the subject of a Members' question to which he had provided a written answer, as follows:

"One officer attends on a rota basis shared between Director of Culture and Environment, Head of Highways and Highways Officers. A communications officer attended the first couple of sessions, but no longer attends. The Council attends in our role as Highways Authority and any associated decisions or communications. For example to answer questions on land ownership, Temporary Traffic Regulation Orders etc. Operational planning and delivery is led by Amey. SYP role is to ensure safety and prevent crime. The Council has no role in operational planning or delivery."

3.2.7 Public Question Concerning Access to the Council Meeting

Justin Buxton asked which rule was invoked to prohibit members of the public from the public gallery at the Council meeting.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that this matter was also the subject of the Members' questions for this meeting of Council to which

written answers had been provided. She said that she had made it clear in the answer to the written question that she did not take any part in the decision regarding the exclusion of members of the public from the public gallery. She said that Mr Buxton may wish to ask this question of the Chief Executive by sending an email for his response.

3.3 Petition Requiring Debate

Petition Requesting the Council to Grant to De Hood Community Project a Long Lease on the Building at the Former Prince Edward School

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition containing 6,430 signatures, requesting the Council to grant to De Hood Community Project a long lease on the building at the former Prince Edward School. The Council's Petitions Scheme required any petition containing over 5,000 signatures to be the subject of debate at the Council meeting. The wording of the qualifying petition was as follows:-

"De Hood Community Project needs to secure a long term lease on its existing premises "The Old Prince Edward School Buildings" at Manor Top from Sheffield City Council. The Council would like to demolish the building and grant planning permission to build another Retail Park. We are looking for your support so that we can continue to grow the project and make a difference to the local community, however, without a lease on the building, the future for De Hood is up in the air. The project has made a massive impact on the local community, both young and old, and provides a number of much needed community based activities for the local people to engage."

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Mr Mark Wilkinson. He stated that the petition aimed to secure a long term lease for De Hood on Manor Top. He commented that the Council had been very supportive with a short term lease of the former Prince Edward School. A meeting was held on 26 March chaired by the Deputy Leader of the Council, Councillor Olivia Blake, to begin discussions concerning the role of De Hood in the community and he thanked Councillor Blake for her contribution to the discussions.

De Hood understood the financial constraints on the Council due to austerity and was seeking to secure funds to help run activities and services for the community. Mr Wilkinson said that De Hood had become an essential asset in the community and a long term lease would be of considerable worth and not necessarily in terms of monetary value. There had been a drop in crime and the incidence of fires in the area, with a reduction in fires of 75 percent in five years. This allowed the police and fire service to utilise resources in other areas.

Mr Wilkinson stated that other benefits brought about by De Hood related to the health and wellbeing of its members and it supported the community by bringing people through its doors, some of whom had particularly sad stories to tell. De Hood was inclusive of disabled people, whether the disability was seen or unseen. It provided services, including work placements, and 20 people

were now in work following support from the organisation, some of whom had been long-term unemployed. De Hood gave direction, mentoring and discipline to support people. To support young people, De Hood made sure that it had facilities to help provide nutritional food and food banks and was supported by local supermarkets and businesses. It provided for all types of physical activity including exercise, dance and boxing.

Mr Wilkson said that a local GP had remarked on the improvement in the community's health and wellbeing. For example, in one year members of a morning fitness group had, in total, lost over 180 stone in weight and Mr Wilkson commented on the substantial cost to the community and to other services if such issues were not addressed by De Hood. He said that part of the magic of De Hood was the extent to which members of the community were interacting and the evident improvement in people's wellbeing.

The organisation had continued to grow from having four members at the beginning to 1,500 members ranging from age 6 to 84 years old. The membership was diverse and reflected communities in Sheffield. He acknowledged the support of the Council and asked for continued support and partnership with the City Council to secure a base for De Hood.

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

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Deputy Leader of the Council, responded to the issues raised in the petition. She said that it was good to hear about the positive effect which De Hood had on individuals and the community in relation to exercise and the structure which its activities provided to people's lives. She said there were two main issues, namely the building in which De Hood was located and the services which it delivered for the community. These were matters which had been discussed at the meeting with De Hood which she had attended on 26 March.

She said there was a range of options which the Council would like to look at with De Hood and continue to work with them on. This was to make sure that, even if the sale of the former school site did go ahead, a range of options could be found in trying to find what was best for De Hood and within a 1 mile radius of the current site. The Council wanted De Hood to continue to work to provide excellent services to the community as described earlier in this meeting.

Councillor Blake said that the site of the former King Edward School had been declared surplus to requirements some time ago. De Hood had an agreement with the Council to use the site on a temporary basis and now wished to formalise its relationship with the Council and to secure a lease. The Council had gone out to market and received an offer in relation to the site of the former school, which could potentially bring a substantial capital receipt. Substantial Business Rates would also be generated as well as significant investment in the area and job opportunities. At the same time, it was recognised that people wanted to see that there was provision of services for

the community. The community's support for De Hood was evident in the fact that petition had received much support with over 6,000 signatures.

She suggested that the Council and the De Hood board, together with local elected members, discussed this matter further so as to make sure that appropriate support was available. If a decision was taken to sell the site of the former school, then the Council would make sure that it worked with De Hood to ensure the organisation was located in the best place possible.

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

The work of De Hood was important to the local community and the wider community in the City as demonstrated by the petition and the Council needed to do what it could to enable the organisation to continue its work. It was important to make sure that De Hood was able either to stay in its current location or to identify another location and it should be up to De Hood to decide whether that was appropriate and the Council should listen to them.

De Hood had begun as a small concern located in the back of a public house and had grown into a much larger facility for the community with involvement and contributions from many people. Councillors had been privileged to hear people's stories of how De Hood and people in the community had helped to change their lives and how its services and facilities were available to people who might not be able to afford membership of a private gym.

There was a balance to be found between urban regeneration and the needs of communities. Other organisations delivered services for the community on the Manor and these should be thanked. However, whilst services in that area might be delivered by many outsourced organisations, people approached the Council when they wanted support. Commercial assets and jobs had to be considered but also in balance with the community itself. The South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service had provided funding from its community fund to support the development of De Hood, which had in turn delivered for the community. It was very important to continue the dialogue on this matter so that a place could be found from which De Hood was able to deliver activities and services for the local community and the wider City community.

There was much support for De Hood. It was located in a place with little economic wealth but one which was rich in human resources and this was something which needed to be harnessed. De Hood gave opportunities to people who might not otherwise have them and there was a need to balance the potential for jobs and economic development with these factors. Whilst the building was important, the teamwork was the most important thing which people involved with De Hood had established, which was something that needed to be retained and supported. De Hood had found a way to help people who were suffering the effects of loneliness and social isolation and those who were frightened.

There were personal testimonies from people about the positive affect of De Hood's activities on young people including from their parents in respect of boxing exercise, health and wellbeing and the other less tangible benefits which De Hood gave to people. The Council should strive to come to the right resolution and to find a place which allowed De Hood to flourish and grow further.

De Hood was run by and for the community and provided a variety of activities and allowed young people to grow as individuals and help to prevent people following a negative path, teaching new skills, discipline confidence and the value of a community, creating hope and opportunity and the Council was urged to support De Hood to help it thrive and grow.

There were retail and employment problems in Manor Top and Manor Castle and it was important to address those issues. However, what was said in the petition was also accepted and the Council had given a commitment that De Hood would not close and it was the Council's responsibility to make sure it fulfilled the needs of the organisation. It was important that dialogue happened between the organisation and the Council to make sure it succeeded but was not necessarily limited to staying at its present location, in relation to which there were other economic impacts. It was hoped that everyone could work towards achieving both a suitable place for De Hood and a development in one of the most deprived wards in the City.

Sometimes statutory health and Council services for people with mental health needs presented barriers which prevented people from getting the treatment and interventions they might need. Whereas, De Hood did not have those barriers and provided help to lots of people who might have faced those barriers previously. It had enabled them to make changes and provided a catalyst which made the changes possible for them to lose weight or address drug and alcohol problems or for young people who had problems staying in mainstream schools. There was a 'magic ingredient' which De Hood delivered to people and which helped them to make such changes. It was also important that the team of people were able to retain a bond and stay together. A dialogue had opened with a view to working together and finding a solution to the problem as outlined by the petition and to deliver services which were critical to that community.

De Hood had demonstrated that it did fantastic work for the community. The difficulties in getting people on board for community projects was acknowledged and De Hood had clearly been effective in doing so and in getting the support of so many signatories to the petition now being considered. It was not where De Hood was located that was important, it was what it was doing and it appeared as though the Council was going to help find somewhere just as good.

De Hood was a tremendous asset to the community and those involved had done a wonderful job. The boxing training provided by De Hood promoted facets such as self-control, discipline, exercise, fitness and diet, which led to self-belief and confidence. It was possible that other such projects and boxing

gyms could be promoted and established in Sheffield. There was support for De Hood and the wish to secure a lease.

The experiences of those who had spoken at this meeting were very moving. The services and provision at De Hood made a tremendous difference to people's lives giving them significance and meaning, to which it was difficult to put a value. It was suggested that whatever happened to the former school building, the organisation and the things that it provided to the community should be allowed to continue, by alternative accommodation or space being found in the new development.

Organisations such as De Hood might be accessed by people who did not use other commercial gyms. The Cabinet Member for Finance was urged to ring-fence the capital receipt from the proposed sale of the former school site for redevelopment to be invested in the project and, if the project was not to stay in the current building, either another building was found or a purpose built facility developed.

The regeneration of the area was important and in the current building in which De Hood was located, the heating was not working and there were some other safety concerns. However, it was important to get a deal which worked for everyone, including those who needed job opportunities which could be brought into the area and the Council would do all it could to help De Hood and was supportive of the team there and all of the work which it did.

The Council should consider the comparative benefits of potential investment and those of projects like De Hood to the area in such issues as reducing crime and fires in the locality.

Reference was made to the Brendan Ingle gym at Wincobank, which had also developed over time and which had produced champion boxers but most importantly had helped many young people and they learned self-discipline, looking after themselves and their own fitness and health and about community; all of which had been built on an ethos of looking after self, pride in an area and a community. De Hood had demonstrated qualities of pride and commitment and there was a determination to continue their work so that De Hood could continue to have such a positive effect on the Manor in a similar way to the experience in Wincobank.

The lead petitioner, Mr Wilkinson, exercised a right of reply and he said there had been much positive support to keep De Hood going and that to lose it would be an incredible shame. The people that worked at De Hood did so for free as volunteers. De Hood was a model which might be replicated elsewhere in Sheffield, provided there was support from enough people. He invited people to visit De Hood. He said that he looked forward to a further meeting so that matters could progress including the issue of where the organisation was to be located and funding. De Hood was attempting to attract funding and a lease was very important in that respect.

Councillor Olivia Blake, Cabinet Member for Finance and Deputy Leader,

responded to matters which were raised during the debate. She said that there was clearly support for the excellent work which De Hood carried out both in the Manor in other areas and it was important that everyone was kept up to date and informed through the process. The Council would continue to work with De Hood and meet with its board to discuss all the options with a two-way dialogue to understand what was needed and how to ensure that its services could continue.

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

Proposal 1

It was moved by Councillor Olivia Blake and seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that:

This Council notes the petition requesting the Council to grant a long lease of the former Prince Edward School building to De Hood Community Project, and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Finance to continue to work with the Project to identify an appropriate solution for ensuring its activities continue to be delivered in the area.

Proposal 2

It was moved by Councillor Adam Hanrahan and seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that:

This Council notes the petition requesting the Council to grant a long lease of the former Prince Edward School building to De Hood Community Project, and refers the petition to the Cabinet to determine the action to be taken to ensure the activities of the Project continue to be delivered in the area, with specific reference to De Hood being active participants in the decision making process, they being the arbiter on the suitability of any alternative accommodation provision suggested by the Council.

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 requesting the Council to grant a long lease of the former Prince Edward School building to De Hood Community Project, and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Finance to continue to work with the Project to identify an appropriate solution for ensuring its activities continue to be delivered in the area.
--

3.4 Petition requesting the resurfacing of footpaths and roads on College Close and College Court

The Council received a petition containing 13 signatures, requesting the resurfacing of footpaths and roads on College Close and College Court.

There was no speaker to this petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for the Environment and Streetscene.

4. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

4.1 Urgent Business

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

4.2 Questions

4.2.1 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.

4.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

4.3.1 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).

5. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "HOMES IN THE PRIVATE RENTED SECTOR" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEWIS DAGNALL AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR SOPHIE WILSON

5.1 It was moved by Councillor Lewis Dagnall, and seconded by Councillor Sophie Wilson, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the increasing public debate about private rented housing and notes the following regarding the growth of the private rented sector:-
 - (i) nationally the sector has grown significantly since the 1980s whilst the social rented sector has shrunk;
 - (ii) 'generation rent' is all too real: in the UK, 46% of people aged 25-34 and 29% of people aged 35-44 now rent privately, compared to 20% of the population as a whole, and a quarter of families with children now find their homes in the private rented sector;
 - (iii) austerity and the cost of living have made life harder for many private renters and have helped create a "rent trap" for many;
 - (iv) Sheffield's private rented sector has doubled in size during the

past decade to over 38,000 households, about 16% of all Sheffield's housing, and is further predicted to grow to reach 25% of all housing in 2025; and

- (v) Sheffield's private rented housing is diverse – ranging from purpose-built flats to former council housing sold under 'Right to Buy'; from student Houses of Multiple Occupation to families in terraced housing – with strong concentrations in some neighbourhoods;
- (b) believes these changes in the housing market have produced the following challenges:-
- (i) how to help people afford to enter and maintain a private tenancy;
 - (ii) how to change the sector to recognise that people are spending longer periods of their life privately renting than used to be typical;
 - (iii) how to help those who wish to move out of the private rented sector to do so;
 - (iv) how to help neighbourhoods with high numbers of privately-rented homes maintain a sense of community despite the turnover of neighbours; and
 - (v) how to fund council services to help private renters when the Government has imposed austerity, unfairly and unnecessarily slashing local government budgets;
- (c) believes that government policies since 2010 have spectacularly failed to address these growing challenges in the private rented sector, but the new measures finally being implemented - including 'banning orders' for landlords convicted of malpractice, an extension of licensing for Houses of Multiple Occupation, and an end to letting agencies' fees (all previously advocated by the Labour Party) - should be cautiously welcomed;
- (d) notes that a future Labour Government would introduce standard three-year tenancies; cap rent rises by inflation; introduce new legal minimum standards to ensure properties are "fit for human habitation"; and give renters new consumer rights (including tenants' rights to keep pets);
- (e) supports the following measures taken by this Administration to help people who are renting privately in Sheffield:-
- (i) building new homes, including the first new council homes in a generation, to create more alternatives for those who wish to move on from renting privately;
 - (ii) co-operating with landlords, the universities and students' unions

to run the SNUG accreditation scheme, which is achieving better standards for student renters;

- (iii) assisting tenants to assert their legal rights to the safe and quiet enjoyment of their rented home is making renting in Sheffield significantly safer;
 - (iv) successful prosecutions against unscrupulous landlords – whether resulting in a suspended jail sentence, community service or a heavy fine – send a strong message that this Administration will pursue the strongest possible action against any landlords who are badly letting their tenants down;
 - (v) stepping in to help those at risk of homelessness find a new home through Housing Solutions is an important preventative step;
 - (vi) establishing a Selective Licensing scheme in Page Hall has significantly improved the quality of private rented homes in the area, with landlords investing over £1m in improving property conditions; and
 - (vii) mandating that new student apartments are designed so they can be converted to alternative uses in the future makes sure there is flexibility for these developments as housing changes; and
- (f) notes this Administration's commitment to:-
- (i) publish a charter for people renting in the private sector, clearly explaining their rights and responsibilities;
 - (ii) act to limit the use of letting boards in neighbourhoods with a high density of privately-rented homes;
 - (iii) publish its response to the recent consultation on whether to introduce a Selective Licensing scheme for Abbeydale, Chesterfield and London Roads; and
 - (iv) continue taking the strongest possible action against rogue landlords through prosecution.

5.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Steve Ayris, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (c) to (f) and the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-

- (c) believes the adoption, nationally, of the following measures which are Liberal Democrat Party policy, can help people in Sheffield who privately rent:-
 - (i) help people who cannot afford a deposit by introducing a new

Rent to Own model where rent payments give tenants an increasing stake in the property, owning it outright after 30 years;

- (ii) capping up-front deposits, and increasing minimum standards in rented homes;
- (iii) help young people into the rental market by establishing a new Help to Rent scheme to provide government-backed tenancy deposit loans for all first-time renters under 30;
- (iv) give buyers a fair chance by stopping developers advertising homes abroad before they have been advertised in the UK;
- (v) give tenants first refusal to buy the home they are renting from a landlord who decides to sell during the tenancy at the market rate according to an independent valuation;
- (vi) promote longer tenancies of three years or more with an inflation-capped annual rent increase built in, to give tenants security and limit rent hikes; and
- (vii) end the scandal of rough sleeping by increasing support for homelessness prevention and adequately funding age-appropriate emergency accommodation and supported housing.

5.3 It was then moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (g) to (k) as follows:-

- (g) notes the huge rise in private rented accommodation in the city centre;
- (h) notes that this Council's planning policy (CS41) on mixed communities is often not adhered to when determining planning applications and that this Council has still not refreshed its local plan;
- (i) believes this Council must re-assess the number and type of single-person apartment blocks in the city, in order to review an out-of-date student accommodation strategy;
- (j) commends the work of officers prosecuting crimes of illegal eviction and harassment and asks officers to look at further ways to support this work; and
- (k) notes the new duty in the Homelessness Reduction Act 2017 requiring the Council to provide earlier, more individualised advice to prevent people becoming homeless in the first place, and looks forward to action by the Council to achieve this minimum duty.

5.4 After contributions from two other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the amendment moved by Councillor Penny Baker

was put to the vote and was negated.

5.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was then put to the vote and was also negated.

5.5.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker and Penny Baker voted for paragraphs (g), (h), (j) and (k) and abstained from voting on paragraph (i) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the increasing public debate about private rented housing and notes the following regarding the growth of the private rented sector:-
 - (i) nationally the sector has grown significantly since the 1980s whilst the social rented sector has shrunk;
 - (ii) 'generation rent' is all too real: in the UK, 46% of people aged 25-34 and 29% of people aged 35-44 now rent privately, compared to 20% of the population as a whole, and a quarter of families with children now find their homes in the private rented sector;
 - (iii) austerity and the cost of living have made life harder for many private renters and have helped create a "rent trap" for many;
 - (iv) Sheffield's private rented sector has doubled in size during the past decade to over 38,000 households, about 16% of all Sheffield's housing, and is further predicted to grow to reach 25% of all housing in 2025; and
 - (v) Sheffield's private rented housing is diverse – ranging from purpose-built flats to former council housing sold under 'Right to Buy'; from student Houses of Multiple Occupation to families in terraced housing – with strong concentrations in some neighbourhoods;
- (b) believes these changes in the housing market have produced the following challenges:-
 - (i) how to help people afford to enter and maintain a private tenancy;
 - (ii) how to change the sector to recognise that people are spending longer periods of their life privately renting than used to be typical;
 - (iii) how to help those who wish to move out of the private rented

- sector to do so;
- (iv) how to help neighbourhoods with high numbers of privately-rented homes maintain a sense of community despite the turnover of neighbours; and
 - (v) how to fund council services to help private renters when the Government has imposed austerity, unfairly and unnecessarily slashing local government budgets;
- (c) believes that government policies since 2010 have spectacularly failed to address these growing challenges in the private rented sector, but the new measures finally being implemented - including 'banning orders' for landlords convicted of malpractice, an extension of licensing for Houses of Multiple Occupation, and an end to letting agencies' fees (all previously advocated by the Labour Party) - should be cautiously welcomed;
- (d) notes that a future Labour Government would introduce standard three-year tenancies; cap rent rises by inflation; introduce new legal minimum standards to ensure properties are "fit for human habitation"; and give renters new consumer rights (including tenants' rights to keep pets);
- (e) supports the following measures taken by this Administration to help people who are renting privately in Sheffield:-
- (i) building new homes, including the first new council homes in a generation, to create more alternatives for those who wish to move on from renting privately;
 - (ii) co-operating with landlords, the universities and students' unions to run the SNUG accreditation scheme, which is achieving better standards for student renters;
 - (iii) assisting tenants to assert their legal rights to the safe and quiet enjoyment of their rented home is making renting in Sheffield significantly safer;
 - (iv) successful prosecutions against unscrupulous landlords – whether resulting in a suspended jail sentence, community service or a heavy fine – send a strong message that this Administration will pursue the strongest possible action against any landlords who are badly letting their tenants down;
 - (v) stepping in to help those at risk of homelessness find a new home through Housing Solutions is an important preventative step;
 - (vi) establishing a Selective Licensing scheme in Page Hall has significantly improved the quality of private rented homes in the area, with landlords investing over £1m in improving property

- conditions; and
- (vii) mandating that new student apartments are designed so they can be converted to alternative uses in the future makes sure there is flexibility for these developments as housing changes; and
- (f) notes this Administration's commitment to:-
- (i) publish a charter for people renting in the private sector, clearly explaining their rights and responsibilities;
 - (ii) act to limit the use of letting boards in neighbourhoods with a high density of privately-rented homes;
 - (iii) publish its response to the recent consultation on whether to introduce a Selective Licensing scheme for Abbeydale, Chesterfield and London Roads; and
 - (iv) continue taking the strongest possible action against rogue landlords through prosecution.

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

For paragraphs (a) and (b) of the Substantive Motion (68) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy), The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Andy Nash, Richard Shaw, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Adam Hanrahan, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Abdul Khayum, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Gail Smith, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Jim Steinke, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Jayne Dunn, David Baker, Penny Baker, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against paragraphs (a) and (b) of the - Nil

Substantive Motion
(0)

Abstained from voting on paragraphs (a) and (b) of the Substantive Motion (2) - Councillors Jack Clarkson and John Booker.

For paragraphs (c) to (f) of the Substantive Motion (53) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy), The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Abdul Khayum, 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, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against paragraphs (c) to (f) of the Substantive Motion (0) - Nil

Abstained from voting on paragraphs (c) to (f) of the Substantive Motion (17) - Councillors Andy Nash, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker, Jack Clarkson and John Booker.

6. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "DEMOCRACY UNDER ATTACK" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR CHRIS ROSLING-JOSEPHS AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR ZAHIRA NAZ

6.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs, and formally seconded by Councillor Lisa Banes, that this Council:-

(a) notes that the Government wants voters to present identification (ID) before being given a ballot paper in an attempt to combat "voter

personation”, with five local authorities trialling this for the upcoming council elections in May;

- (b) notes with concern this development and highlights that a coalition of charities and academics has warned the Government that plans to enforce voter ID at the upcoming local elections could ‘damage turnout and undermine engagement’;
- (c) contends that Electoral Fraud is a serious crime and should of course be combated, however, it is this Administration’s belief that there is simply not enough evidence of voter fraud in the UK to justify these potentially damaging pilots, which threaten to disenfranchise members of some of the most vulnerable groups of society;
- (d) notes that in 2016 there were 44 allegations of impersonation out of nearly 64 million votes, reflecting just one case for every 1.5 million votes cast, and that last year there were only 28 allegations of impersonation out of nearly 45 million votes - one case for every 1.6 million votes cast – with only one of these allegations resulting in a conviction;
- (e) contends that whilst the Government has stated that anyone can apply for a Certificate of Identity, if without an identification document, this is still disadvantageous to many and those less likely to possess approved photo ID for a variety of socio-economic and accessibility reasons, and that international studies confirm this assertion;
- (f) argues, therefore, that voter ID reforms could affect young people, older people, disabled people, transgender and gender non-conforming people, BAME communities and the homeless and there is a great risk that these reforms would exclude far more people than the tiny few attempting to undermine the result;
- (g) notes that the Chief Executive of the Electoral Reform Society has stated that “electoral reform is a serious issue – but mandatory voter ID is a sledgehammer to crack a nut”;
- (j) supports the sentiments of Slough MP, Tan Dhesi, that 'the Tories are trying to introduce this not to tackle election fraud, but basically just to knock out not hundreds, but millions, of voters and disenfranchise them';
- (k) notes that there are only a handful of cases of voter fraud but, as the Association of Electoral Administrators have pointed out, the new set-up will require extra training for the staff at polling stations to make sure that genuine voters are not being turned away;
- (l) believes that even if the pilots go smoothly, it will remain debatable whether voter ID in its proposed form will even be effective in tackling fraud;
- (m) notes that in Britain we have electoral officers and a highly-respected

judicial system to prevent abuses, and contend that these should be strengthened to tackle electoral fraud rather than potentially disenfranchising millions, as the Government is proposing; and

- (n) believes that, ultimately, the biggest threat for our democracy does not come from a tiny few electoral fraudsters but a Conservative government determined to make things difficult for an electoral base unlikely to vote for them – it is, in effect, gerrymandering at its most dangerous and callous and a real threat to the democratic process in this country.

6.1.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the Motion (Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs), the Motion as published on the agenda was altered by the deletion of paragraphs (h) and (i).)

6.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, and formally seconded by Councillor Adam Hanrahan, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of new paragraphs (g) and (h) as follows:-

- (g) notes that Liberal Democrat MP, Tom Brake, called the change “a completely unnecessary move that risks undermining our democracy by preventing millions of people from voting”;

- (h) notes that the Lib Dems have consistently campaigned against ID cards, a scheme introduced by the previous Labour Government, and successfully abolished the scheme in 2010 and with that the deletion of the National Identity Register, the database which contained the biographic and biometric fingerprint data of card holders;

2. the deletion of original paragraphs (h), (i), (j) and (n), and the re-lettering of original paragraph (g) as a new paragraph (i) and original paragraphs (k) to (m) as new paragraphs (j) to (l); and

3. the addition of new paragraphs (m) and (n) as follows:-

- (m) welcomes Sheffield Young Labour’s requests for the Council to review its strong leader model and “embrace a model which encourages debate and dialogue”, for example the proposed committee system in the Liberal Democrat Group’s budget proposal; and

(n) believes that voter participation would increase and that local democracy would be enhanced by adopting the following measures:-

- (i) giving the vote to everyone sixteen years and older; and
- (ii) introducing a proportional representational voting system to council elections, such as Single Transferable Vote (STV); a voting system already used in Scottish council elections.

- 6.2.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the amendment (Councillor Andrew Sangar), paragraph (n)(ii) of the amendment as circulated at the meeting was altered by the substitution of the word “council” for the word “parliamentary”.)
- 6.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and formally seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (n) and the addition of a new paragraph (n) as follows:-
- (n) believes, however, that having millions of voters living in safe seats is, in effect, the greatest disenfranchisement, and therefore calls for an end to the first-past-the-post voting system.
- 6.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar was put to the vote and was negated, with the exception of the proposed new paragraph (n)(i) in Part 3 of the amendment, which was carried.
- 6.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was then put to the vote and was negated.
- 6.6 The original Motion, as altered and amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that the Government wants voters to present identification (ID) before being given a ballot paper in an attempt to combat “voter personation”, with five local authorities trialling this for the upcoming council elections in May;
- (b) notes with concern this development and highlights that a coalition of charities and academics has warned the Government that plans to enforce voter ID at the upcoming local elections could ‘damage turnout and undermine engagement’;
- (c) contends that Electoral Fraud is a serious crime and should of course be combated, however, it is this Administration’s belief that there is simply not enough evidence of voter fraud in the UK to justify these potentially damaging pilots, which threaten to disenfranchise members of some of the most vulnerable groups of society;
- (d) notes that in 2016 there were 44 allegations of impersonation out of nearly 64 million votes, reflecting just one case for every 1.5 million votes cast, and that last year there were only 28 allegations of impersonation out of nearly 45 million votes — one case for every 1.6 million votes cast – with only one of these allegations resulting in a conviction;
- (e) contends that whilst the Government has stated that anyone can apply for a Certificate of Identity, if without an identification document, this is

still disadvantageous to many and those less likely to possess approved photo ID for a variety of socio-economic and accessibility reasons, and that international studies confirm this assertion;

- (f) argues, therefore, that voter ID reforms could affect young people, older people, disabled people, transgender and gender non-conforming people, BAME communities and the homeless and there is a great risk that these reforms would exclude far more people than the tiny few attempting to undermine the result;
- (g) notes that the Chief Executive of the Electoral Reform Society has stated that “electoral reform is a serious issue – but mandatory voter ID is a sledgehammer to crack a nut”;
- (h) supports the sentiments of Slough MP, Tan Dhesi, that 'the Tories are trying to introduce this not to tackle election fraud, but basically just to knock out not hundreds, but millions, of voters and disenfranchise them';
- (i) notes that there are only a handful of cases of voter fraud but, as the Association of Electoral Administrators have pointed out, the new set-up will require extra training for the staff at polling stations to make sure that genuine voters are not being turned away;
- (j) believes that even if the pilots go smoothly, it will remain debatable whether voter ID in its proposed form will even be effective in tackling fraud;
- (k) notes that in Britain we have electoral officers and a highly-respected judicial system to prevent abuses, and contend that these should be strengthened to tackle electoral fraud rather than potentially disenfranchising millions, as the Government is proposing;
- (l) believes that, ultimately, the biggest threat for our democracy does not come from a tiny few electoral fraudsters but a Conservative government determined to make things difficult for an electoral base unlikely to vote for them – it is, in effect, gerrymandering at its most dangerous and callous and a real threat to the democratic process in this country; and
- (m) believes that voter participation would increase and that local democracy would be enhanced by giving the vote to everyone sixteen years and older.

6.6.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Andy Nash, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker and Penny Baker voted for paragraphs (a) to (k) and (m), and against paragraph (l) of the Substantive 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 (g) and (i)

to (m), and against paragraph (h) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

7. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "TRUST, TRUTH AND TRANSPARENCY" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MARTIN SMITH AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED

7.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Martin Smith, and formally seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that trust, truth and transparency are the bedrock of good governance;
- (b) believes that a lack of openness erodes confidence and trust in local government and agrees with the Leader of Rotherham Council that “you can’t be accountable without being transparent”;
- (c) agrees with the Chair of the Housing, Communities and Local Government (Commons Select) Committee and former leader of Sheffield City Council, Clive Betts MP, that a council’s organisational culture is the most significant factor in whether scrutiny is effective, and that commercial confidentiality should not be used as an excuse to inhibit scrutiny;
- (d) notes that, at the present time, Sheffield City Council does not broadcast or record public meetings, unlike other core city councils, for example Leeds and Manchester;
- (e) notes the recommendation of the Housing, Communities and Local Government Committee that all contracts should be available to be reviewed by councillors in overview and scrutiny committees;
- (f) notes that over the last three years, the refusal rate (including partial refusals) for FOI requests to Sheffield City Council has increased from 21% to 32%;
- (g) notes that it took more than two years for opposition Councillors to be given sight of the agreements made with Sichuan Guodong Construction;
- (h) notes that more than five years after the PFI contract was signed with Amey, opposition Councillors have still not been given sight of an un-redacted copy of the contract;
- (i) believes this demonstrates a worrying trend towards secrecy and a lack of transparency in Sheffield City Council, which restricts the ability of Councillors and members of the public to scrutinise the activities of the Council; and

- (j) resolves to undertake a wholesale review into the Council's lack of transparency with recommendations from that review to be brought back to full Council within a year, and requests the Chief Executive to commission that review.

7.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Chris Peace, and formally seconded by Councillor Dawn Dale, 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) fully agrees that transparency and openness are important in accountability and believes it is important that the Council does everything to be as open and transparent as possible;
- (b) notes that Sheffield City Council welcomed the report from the Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee and the recognition of the important role scrutiny plays in local government - both in holding decision makers to account and in developing policy;
- (c) further notes that Sheffield Council submitted evidence to the aforementioned Committee during the Inquiry and is looking in detail at the findings and recommendations in the report and plans to bring a report to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee;
- (d) notes, in addition, that many of the recommendations in the Select Committee's report call on the Government to issue revised guidance to local authorities and that we have already identified and are working on some of these areas, such as how we can better engage and involve the public in Scrutiny's work alongside helping scrutiny members to develop their skills and knowledge through training;
- (e) acknowledges that the Select Committee report does refer to examples whereby information has needed to be withheld, often on the grounds of commercial sensitivity, however Sheffield councillors, including those sitting on Scrutiny Committees, have rights of access to information and the Council complies with these requirements;
- (f) highlights that the Council is unaware of any situation where commercial sensitivity has been used to inhibit formal Scrutiny, with Scrutiny Committee Members provided with confidential documentation that is not publicly available in order to ensure they have all of the information available to them to enable proper scrutiny of the matter before them;
- (g) notes that a scrutiny committee looking at a particular issue can ask to see relevant information and request clarification of a matter from officers, and that this may include appropriate access to an un-redacted version of a contract if it would help the Scrutiny Committee Councillors understand the position;
- (h) regrets the trend from the main opposition group to mislead local people

and that this is continued in this notice of motion itself; with the main opposition group attempting to mislead on the following matters, which can be clarified as follows:-

- (i) the Council is considering options to broadcast and record Council meetings as part of the cross party working group reviewing Full Council meetings, and the main opposition group are a member of this cross party working group;
 - (ii) decisions around access to contracts and commercial sensitivity is rightly not taken by councillors but by politically independent Council officers;
 - (iii) the agreement with Sichuan Guodong, which opposition councillors have asked questions about, was signed in July 2016, less than two years ago; and
 - (iv) senior officers have offered to allow the main opposition group the opportunity to access the Streets Ahead contract, which has not been taken up by the main opposition group;
- (i) supports the principle that as much information should be published and be as easily accessible for the public to access as possible, however, recognises that all public bodies have to redact elements of contracts due to commercial sensitivity and this is because of legal obligations to do so, and where information is redacted this is based on the legal opinion of politically independent Council officers;
 - (j) recalls that when the previous Administration, of which the current Leader of the Main Opposition Group was a member of the Cabinet, released the Sheffield Highway Maintenance PFI Project Descriptive Document in April 2009, there was a section of the document entitled 'Commercial Confidentiality' which included the following passage -

"The Authority is very conscious of Bidders' concerns in relation to commercial confidentiality and believes that the Competitive Dialogue process may potentially be undermined by the sharing of Bidders' Solutions. In order to address Bidders' concerns, a Bid Process Agreement has been developed which relates to the Bidders' use of confidential Authority information and the confidentiality of Bidders' Solutions during dialogue and evaluation, together with freedom of information protocols

Protocols have been developed to ensure that Bidder queries are responded to with commercial confidentiality in mind, with sharing of information with other Bidders only permitted if queries are not Bidder specific, have first been made anonymous and where the sharing of the information is not materially detrimental to the Bidder raising the initial query or to the competitive process." ; and

- (k) regrets that the main opposition group have failed to put forward positive proposals to improve transparency and this is in contrast to the establishment of the cross party full council working group to make improvements to full council meetings, and the Administration will continue to consider ways in which the Council can improve engagement with local people, including through consultation, scrutiny and other public forums.

7.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Adam Hanrahan, and formally seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (k) to (q) as follows:-

- (k) welcomes the fact that a Sheffield branch of the People's Audit has been established;
- (l) notes that the People's Audit is based on the legal right of local residents to inspect, question and challenge items in their council's accounts, established in the Local Audit and Accountability Act 2014;
- (m) notes that the People's Audit has been proven to bring transparency, empowerment to local people, and improvement in other local authorities;
- (n) believes that this will create an opportunity for the people of Sheffield to play an active role in decision-making at Sheffield City Council;
- (o) recommends that this Council meet with the People's Audit representatives to discuss how they can carry out an audit on the Streets Ahead contract;
- (p) resolves to empower and support the citizens of Sheffield to have full access as possible to transparently scrutinise spending of Council money and resources; and
- (q) thereby requests the Director of Legal and Governance to produce a clear guide for citizens outlining how they can access this information, with openness being at the forefront of thought when producing this guide.

7.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Rob Murphy, and formally seconded by Councillor Magid Magid, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (k) to (r) as follows:-

- (k) believes that the process of decision making in the Council is not transparent, as demonstrated by the Chinese Investment Deal regarding the Central Library, the Highways PFI with Amey and the recent Call-In on the Mount Pleasant development;
- (l) believes that a lack of transparency has contributed to continued reputational damage to the City and the Council, which has already

suffered from the Hillsborough Disaster cover up and a failure to bring Roger Dodds to justice at the time;

- (m) notes, despite promises, that recordings of meetings of the Full Council remain unpublished;
- (n) notes the rejection of Budget amendments from two of the opposition parties that provided for the recording and public viewing of public meetings of the Council;
- (o) notes a huge amount of Officer time and resources is spent on dealing with Freedom of Information requests;
- (p) believes all public Council meetings should be recorded and made publicly available via the Council website;
- (q) believes all Council contracts over £500 should be disclosed on the grounds of public interest; and
- (r) believes all meetings between planning officers and developers, and procurement officers and commercial interests, should be registered.

7.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Chris Peace was put to the vote and was carried.

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

7.6.1 The votes on the amendment were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For the amendment (19) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Andy Nash, Richard Shaw, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, Alison Teal, David Baker and Penny Baker.

Against the amendment (49) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) and Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, 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, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Abstained from voting on the amendment (3) - Councillors Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker.

7.7 The amendment moved by Councillor Rob Murphy was then put to the vote and was negated.

7.7.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker and Penny Baker voted for paragraphs (k) to (p) and (r) and abstained from voting on paragraph (q) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) fully agrees that transparency and openness are important in accountability and believes it is important that the Council does everything to be as open and transparent as possible;
- (b) notes that Sheffield City Council welcomed the report from the Housing, Communities and Local Government Select Committee and the recognition of the important role scrutiny plays in local government - both in holding decision makers to account and in developing policy;
- (c) further notes that Sheffield Council submitted evidence to the aforementioned Committee during the Inquiry and is looking in detail at the findings and recommendations in the report and plans to bring a report to the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee;
- (d) notes, in addition, that many of the recommendations in the Select Committee's report call on the Government to issue revised guidance to local authorities and that we have already identified and are working on some of these areas, such as how we can better engage and involve the public in Scrutiny's work alongside helping scrutiny members to develop their skills and knowledge through training;
- (e) acknowledges that the Select Committee report does refer to examples whereby information has needed to be withheld, often on the grounds of commercial sensitivity, however Sheffield councillors, including those sitting on Scrutiny Committees, have rights of access to information and the Council complies with these requirements;

- (f) highlights that the Council is unaware of any situation where commercial sensitivity has been used to inhibit formal Scrutiny, with Scrutiny Committee Members provided with confidential documentation that is not publicly available in order to ensure they have all of the information available to them to enable proper scrutiny of the matter before them;
- (g) notes that a scrutiny committee looking at a particular issue can ask to see relevant information and request clarification of a matter from officers, and that this may include appropriate access to an un-redacted version of a contract if it would help the Scrutiny Committee Councillors understand the position;
- (h) regrets the trend from the main opposition group to mislead local people and that this is continued in this notice of motion itself; with the main opposition group attempting to mislead on the following matters, which can be clarified as follows:-
 - (i) the Council is considering options to broadcast and record Council meetings as part of the cross party working group reviewing Full Council meetings, and the main opposition group are a member of this cross party working group;
 - (ii) decisions around access to contracts and commercial sensitivity is rightly not taken by councillors but by politically independent Council officers;
 - (iii) the agreement with Sichuan Guodong, which opposition councillors have asked questions about, was signed in July 2016, less than two years ago; and
 - (iv) senior officers have offered to allow the main opposition group the opportunity to access the Streets Ahead contract, which has not been taken up by the main opposition group;
- (i) supports the principle that as much information should be published and be as easily accessible for the public to access as possible, however, recognises that all public bodies have to redact elements of contracts due to commercial sensitivity and this is because of legal obligations to do so, and where information is redacted this is based on the legal opinion of politically independent Council officers;
- (j) recalls that when the previous Administration, of which the current Leader of the Main Opposition Group was a member of the Cabinet, released the Sheffield Highway Maintenance PFI Project Descriptive Document in April 2009, there was a section of the document entitled 'Commercial Confidentiality' which included the following passage -

"The Authority is very conscious of Bidders' concerns in relation to commercial confidentiality and believes that the Competitive Dialogue

process may potentially be undermined by the sharing of Bidders' Solutions. In order to address Bidders' concerns, a Bid Process Agreement has been developed which relates to the Bidders' use of confidential Authority information and the confidentiality of Bidders' Solutions during dialogue and evaluation, together with freedom of information protocols

Protocols have been developed to ensure that Bidder queries are responded to with commercial confidentiality in mind, with sharing of information with other Bidders only permitted if queries are not Bidder specific, have first been made anonymous and where the sharing of the information is not materially detrimental to the Bidder raising the initial query or to the competitive process.”; and

- (k) regrets that the main opposition group have failed to put forward positive proposals to improve transparency and this is in contrast to the establishment of the cross party full council working group to make improvements to full council meetings, and the Administration will continue to consider ways in which the Council can improve engagement with local people, including through consultation, scrutiny and other public forums.

7.8.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Andy Nash, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker and Penny Baker voted for paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (e) and against paragraphs (d) and (f) to (k) of the Substantive 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 (d) and against paragraphs (e) to (k) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "REQUIREMENTS OF THE HIGHWAYS PFI CONTRACT" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS JOHNSON AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR ALISON TEAL

8.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and formally seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that this Administration has repeatedly refused to disclose specific details of the Highways PFI contract signed in 2012;
- (b) notes that this Administration has repeatedly put out statements that:-
- (i) trees are only felled as a last resort;
 - (ii) trees are only felled in accordance with the 6 Ds criteria: i.e. if they are dead, dying, diseased, dangerous, damaging footpaths, private property or roads, or 'discriminatory'; and

- (iii) there are no targets to fell trees;
- (c) notes that the Council's refusal to release part of the contract was found to be unlawful by the Information Commissioner, who ordered that these parts of the contract be released;
- (d) notes that the newly-released extracts from the contract show that there was a contractual requirement for Amey to replace highway trees "at a rate of not less than 200 per year";
- (e) further notes that it is a contractual requirement for Amey to replace 17,500 highway trees by the end of the 25-year contract;
- (f) believes that the Administration's statements set out above are incompatible with these contractual requirements;
- (g) therefore asks the Administration to admit that those statements were untrue; and
- (h) resolves that this Council has no confidence in the present Administration to tell the truth.

8.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Peter Price, and formally seconded by Councillor Bryan Lodge, 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 this Administration has repeatedly confirmed the intention to publically disclose of non-commercially sensitive parts of the Streets Ahead contract, despite the fact this involved considerable Council resources and, due to the length of the contract, took a considerable time to do so;
- (b) notes that within the recently released performance standards in the Streets-Ahead contract, there was reference to Sheffield City Council having the right to ask Amey to replace up to 17,500 street trees over the duration of the 25 year contract;
- (c) notes that, whilst this figure may initially appear alarming, this figure is in no way a fixed target that Amey must replace but, in fact, gives the Council the option to replace this number within the agreed contract price without any extra cost to the Council or taxpayers;
- (d) believes that this Administration has been clear on this point and that opposition parties have seized on this figure and misrepresented the facts and spread fear into certain Sheffield neighbourhoods that thousands more trees are going to be felled unnecessarily in order to fulfil a contract arrangement, and regrets, with anger, the opportunism by which these opposition groups have circulated this untruth;

- (e) notes that the Council will have sanctioned the replacement of around 6,000 trees during the first five years of the contract (known as the Core Investment Period) and this period has now ended, though difficulties have remained in removing the last 200 trees earmarked for felling;
- (f) notes that, beyond the initial Core Investment Period, it is very difficult to estimate the total number of trees that need replacing over the remaining twenty years of the contract as, for example, a disease outbreak amongst a specific species could vary the numbers significantly, however, this Administration has consistently stated that the best estimate of the number of trees to be replaced over the full life of the contract will be the 6000 as already replaced during the Core Investment Period followed by an estimated 200 trees a year;
- (g) reaffirms, again, that the Council is not removing healthy trees because there is a set quota to be adhered to, and a tree is only marked for replacement if it is dead, dying, diseased, dangerous, damaging (footpaths, private property or roads) or discriminatory (meaning the tree creates difficulty for elderly, disabled and partially-sighted people when using the footpath);
- (h) notes that the Council's explanation has been vindicated by the High Court on both occasions and that the legality of the works, and the contract, is not under legal contention despite being consistently called into question erroneously by opposition members;
- (i) contends that before the Streets Ahead work commenced, street trees were being felled every year and often with no replacement, whereas now, because of the Streets Ahead contract, this Administration is guaranteeing a sustainable street tree stock for the city and, ultimately, there will be more street trees in Sheffield at the end of the contract than when it began;
- (j) notes that this Administration remains consistent in the estimate that 6,000 trees would be felled in the first five years, as has been the case, and that over the next 20 years the best estimate is that another 200 trees a year will need replacing, and that the Council has made no secret of this fact – issuing numerous press releases and statements stating this previously;
- (k) notes the many successes of the Streets Ahead programme, often overlooked, such as:-
 - (i) we have ensured that Sheffield is the only city in the country to replace every single street light with LED lighting (64,000 lamps), saving energy and a massive contribution to our environment;
 - (ii) we have re-laid over 1,450 miles of pavements, making it so much better for our elderly, disabled, partially sighted and pram pushers;

- (iii) we have re-laid over 693 miles of road; and
 - (iv) we have replaced 3,200 gullies and drains and improved 300 bridges and structures; and
 - (l) notes that outside of the Streets Ahead programme, Sheffield City Council has planted another 50,000 trees across the City, and we now have around 4 million trees within Sheffield, making us the greenest, most tree covered city in the UK.
- 8.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Colin Ross, and formally seconded by Councillor Steve Ayris, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (a) to (e) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (a) to (h) as new paragraphs (f) to (m):-
- (a) believes that trust, truth and transparency are the bedrock of good governance;
 - (b) believes that a lack of openness erodes confidence and trust in local government and agrees with the Leader of Rotherham Council that “you can’t be accountable without being transparent”;
 - (c) agrees with the Chair of the Housing, Communities and Local Government (Commons Select) Committee and former leader of Sheffield City Council, Clive Betts MP, that a council’s organisational culture is the most significant factor in whether scrutiny is effective, and that commercial confidentiality should not be used as an excuse to inhibit scrutiny;
 - (d) notes that Sheffield was known as ‘pothole city’ and roads were in desperate need of repair and resurfacing and welcomed the central government grant to resolve this;
 - (e) however, believes that the PFI contract with Amey has been mismanaged, leading to unacceptable delays in works and poor quality of repairs;
- 8.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Peter Price was put to the vote and was carried.
- 8.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Colin Ross was then put to the vote and was negatived, with the exception of the proposed new paragraphs (a) and (b), which were carried.
- 8.5.1 (NOTE: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (e) and abstained from voting on paragraph (d) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)
- 8.6 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 trust, truth and transparency are the bedrock of good governance;
- (b) believes that a lack of openness erodes confidence and trust in local government and agrees with the Leader of Rotherham Council that “you can’t be accountable without being transparent”;
- (c) notes that this Administration has repeatedly confirmed the intention to publically disclose of non-commercially sensitive parts of the Streets Ahead contract, despite the fact this involved considerable Council resources and, due to the length of the contract, took a considerable time to do so;
- (d) notes that within the recently released performance standards in the Streets-Ahead contract, there was reference to Sheffield City Council having the right to ask Amey to replace up to 17,500 street trees over the duration of the 25 year contract;
- (e) notes that, whilst this figure may initially appear alarming, this figure is in no way a fixed target that Amey must replace but, in fact, gives the Council the option to replace this number within the agreed contract price without any extra cost to the Council or taxpayers;
- (f) believes that this Administration has been clear on this point and that opposition parties have seized on this figure and misrepresented the facts and spread fear into certain Sheffield neighbourhoods that thousands more trees are going to be felled unnecessarily in order to fulfil a contract arrangement, and regrets, with anger, the opportunism by which these opposition groups have circulated this untruth;
- (g) notes that the Council will have sanctioned the replacement of around 6,000 trees during the first five years of the contract (known as the Core Investment Period) and this period has now ended, though difficulties have remained in removing the last 200 trees earmarked for felling;
- (h) notes that, beyond the initial Core Investment Period, it is very difficult to estimate the total number of trees that need replacing over the remaining twenty years of the contract as, for example, a disease outbreak amongst a specific species could vary the numbers significantly, however, this Administration has consistently stated that the best estimate of the number of trees to be replaced over the full life of the contract will be the 6000 as already replaced during the Core Investment Period followed by an estimated 200 trees a year;
- (i) reaffirms, again, that the Council is not removing healthy trees because there is a set quota to be adhered to, and a tree is only marked for

replacement if it is dead, dying, diseased, dangerous, damaging (footpaths, private property or roads) or discriminatory (meaning the tree creates difficulty for elderly, disabled and partially-sighted people when using the footpath);

- (j) notes that the Council's explanation has been vindicated by the High Court on both occasions and that the legality of the works, and the contract, is not under legal contention despite being consistently called into question erroneously by opposition members;
- (k) contends that before the Streets Ahead work commenced, street trees were being felled every year and often with no replacement, whereas now, because of the Streets Ahead contract, this Administration is guaranteeing a sustainable street tree stock for the city and, ultimately, there will be more street trees in Sheffield at the end of the contract than when it began;
- (l) notes that this Administration remains consistent in the estimate that 6,000 trees would be felled in the first five years, as has been the case, and that over the next 20 years the best estimate is that another 200 trees a year will need replacing, and that the Council has made no secret of this fact – issuing numerous press releases and statements stating this previously;
- (m) notes the many successes of the Streets Ahead programme, often overlooked, such as:-
 - (i) we have ensured that Sheffield is the only city in the country to replace every single street light with LED lighting (64,000 lamps), saving energy and a massive contribution to our environment;
 - (ii) we have re-laid over 1,450 miles of pavements, making it so much better for our elderly, disabled, partially sighted and pram pushers;
 - (iii) we have re-laid over 693 miles of road; and
 - (iv) we have replaced 3,200 gullies and drains and improved 300 bridges and structures; and
- (n) notes that outside of the Streets Ahead programme, Sheffield City Council has planted another 50,000 trees across the City, and we now have around 4 million trees within Sheffield, making us the greenest, most tree covered city in the UK.

8.6.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker and Penny Baker voted for paragraphs (a) and (b) and against paragraphs (c) to (n) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

9. STANDARDS REPORT 2015-17

- 9.1 The Council received the Audit and Standards Committee's Standards Annual Report, highlighting the activities of the Committee and providing details of the outcome of the Standards complaints received from June 2015 through to December 2017.
- 9.2 RESOLVED: That the Standards Annual Report be noted.

10. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS

- 10.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 7th February 2018 and the special meeting of the Council held on 7th March 2018, be approved as true and accurate records.

11. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

- 11.1 RESOLVED: That it be noted that the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 31st January 2018, appointed Dawn Walton (Interim Director of Inclusion and Learning Services and Children's Commissioner) to the post of Children's and Schools Commissioner, and that Ms. Walton commenced in post on 1st March 2018.