

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 3 July 2019, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

**PRESENT**

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Tony Downing)  
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Gail Smith)

1	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Bob Pullin Richard Shaw	10	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Andy Bainbridge Vic Bowden Moya O'Rourke	19	<i>Nether Edge &amp; Sharrow Ward</i> Peter Garbutt Jim Steinke Alison Teal
2	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Bob McCann Sophie Wilson	11	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Roger Davison Barbara Masters	20	<i>Park &amp; Arbourthorne</i> Julie Dore Ben Miskell
3	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	12	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Abdul Khayum Alan Law Abtisam Mohamed	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> Mike Drabble Dianne Hurst Peter Rippon
4	<i>Broomhill &amp; Sharrow Vale Ward</i> Angela Argenzio Kaltum Rivers	13	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i> Dawn Dale Peter Price Garry Weatherall
5	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Talib Hussain Mark Jones	14	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Lewis Dagnall Cate McDonald Paul Turpin	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Mike Chaplin Tony Damms Jayne Dunn
6	<i>City Ward</i> Douglas Johnson Ruth Mersereau Martin Phipps	15	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Sue Auckland Steve Ayris	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Penny Baker Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Crookes &amp; Crosspool Ward</i> Tim Huggan Mohammed Mahroof Anne Murphy	16	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Julie Grocutt Francyne Johnson
8	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea Zahira Naz	17	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Terry Fox Pat Midgley Sioned-Mair Richards	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i> Colin Ross Martin Smith	18	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> Tony Downing Kevin Oxley Gail Smith	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> Alan Hooper Adam Hurst Mike Levery
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Paul Wood

## **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Michelle Cook, Shaffaq Mohammed, Joe Otten, Chris Rosling-Josephs and Jack Scott.

## **2. WESTFIELD HEALTH**

- 2.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) reported that exactly one hundred years ago this day the organisation now known as Westfield Health was founded.
- 2.2 He briefly outlined the history and evolution of the Organisation through the period prior to the introduction of the NHS and the period since, and stated that Westfield Health has had a hugely positive legacy in the city in terms of making a healthy difference to the quality of life of Sheffield residents since 1919.
- 2.3 The Lord Mayor concluded by stating that, in recognition of its centenary and positive contribution to the local community, a special token of appreciation will be presented from the city to Westfield Health, and this will be presented in due course.
- 2.4 Mr. Graham Moore, Chairman of Westfield Health, responded by expressing his thanks and gratitude to the Council for its support and encouragement of Westfield Health over the years, and for its plans to recognise Westfield's centenary.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 3.1 There were no declarations of interest made by Members of the Council.

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

### **4 Petitions**

- 4.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Support the Labour Party in Recognising Palestine as a Sovereign State, as part of the United Nations, and to Pass a Motion to this Effect

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition containing 1692 signatures, requesting the Council to support the Labour Party in recognising Palestine as a sovereign state, as part of the United Nations, and to pass a motion to this effect.

Representations of behalf of the petitioners were made by Julie Pearn who

stated that the UK Parliament had made a decision in 2014 to recognise Palestine as an independent sovereign state and the petition called upon the Council to immediately implement that decision. She said that 138 nations recognised the state of Palestine and then commented on actions of Israel allegedly in contravention of international law.

It was believed that such public recognition would be a powerful statement which others might emulate. She made reference to the tradition of humanitarianism and internationalism in Sheffield and the role that the Council had played in relation to issues, such as in the ending of apartheid in South Africa recognition of Somaliland. The Council was requested to immediately recognise an independent Palestinian state; to make that recognition public both nationally and internationally and to undertake appropriate communications; to carry out an urgent review (in line with policies relating to ethical procurement and investment) of any business dealings with companies involved in enabling the mistreatment of Palestinians; and to undertake an information campaign to explain its decision and to educate the public in relation to this issue.

#### 4.2 Public Questions Concerning Palestine

A number of questions were asked by members of the public on the subject of Palestine, as follows:

Peter Jones referred to the Council's ethical investment principles and asked if it was agreed that the Council would seek to ensure that South Yorkshire Pensions should divest from companies which profited from military and other action against civilian populations such as in Yemen and in Palestine.

Kaltun Elmi asked firstly whether the Council would condemn the demolition of Palestinian schools. Secondly, she asked whether the Council would agree that the Israeli government should be condemned for the arrest and imprisonment of children in Palestine.

John Morgan asked whether the Council believed that the Palestinian dancers performing at Tramlines should be acknowledged as enhancing an already strong brand which represented Sheffield's inclusive outward looking reputation.

Sarah Johnson asked whether the Council would support Labour Party policy in recognising a sovereign state of Palestine and encourage other core cities to follow Sheffield's lead.

Angela Martin asked whether the Council agreed that supporting a two state solution, without recognising Palestine as a sovereign state was tantamount to allowing Israel to annex land that was internationally and legally recognised as being Palestinian.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Olivia Blake (Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance). Public questions relating to this

topic were also referred to Councillor Blake.

Councillor Blake thanked the petitioners and stated that she believed that it was right to recognise the rights of Palestinian people to their own sovereign state and which was recognised by 137 nations and the United Nations General Assembly had also sought to do so in 2012 but this was blocked through the Security Council. She referred to Labour Party policy in relation to this issue. It was also acknowledged that such recognition would be a step toward a genuine two state solution and a process towards peace for Palestine and Israel. She also referred to the need to support self-determination for people in their own sovereign states.

Councillor Blake said that the Council's Administration would present a notice of motion at the first opportunity in relation to the recognition of Palestine as a sovereign state and that all councillors should have an opportunity to speak and to vote on the matter and have input to the debate. Whilst Sheffield was just one city, it could make a symbolic gesture in this regard and seek to put pressure on the Government to also recognise Palestine. Councillor Blake said that whilst she had responded on behalf of the Leader of the Council, she would also request that the Leader respond to some of the questions in writing.

In regard to South Yorkshire Pensions Authority, Councillor Blake stated that she would be pleased to write to the Pensions Authority and to outline concerns and questions put by Mr Jones. She also made reference to notices of motion previously considered by the Council with regards the sale of arms to Saudi Arabia in connection with the conflict in Yemen.

She said that she condemned the demolition of schools and that education was a right and not a privilege and it should be protected. It was also horrifying that children were being kept from their families and released without charge.

As regards Palestinian dancers performing at Tramlines, Councillor Blake stated that this would be recognised as enhancing Sheffield's strong brand relating to Sheffield's inclusive and outward looking reputation.

Councillor Blake said that she believed the Council should take a stand with regard to the issues raised and that Palestine should be recognised as a sovereign state. She said that a written response would be made to the question regarding the potential for Israel to annex land in Palestine.

#### 4.3 Public Questions

##### 4.3.1 Public Question Concerning School Streets

E Jones Marriott asked a question concerning whether the Council would consider plans for school streets or living streets in Sheffield.

Councillor Bob Johnson, the Cabinet Member for Transport and

Development, stated that the Council was looking at launching a number of pilot schemes for school streets, play streets and living streets and he would encourage people to come forward so they might be included in any future plan. This was an initiative that was to be done in conjunction with clean air zones and the Council was determined to take an action in areas around schools as one of its priorities.

#### 4.3.2 Public Question Concerning Injunction

Justin Buxton asked whether the decision to pursue the renewal and extension of the injunction was signed off by elected members or had it been made by officers. He asked whether the Leader of the Council was still happy with the decision and the financial and reputational cost to the Council. He also made reference to an investigation by the Forestry Commission into the street tree felling programme in Sheffield.

#### 4.3.3 Public Question Concerning Trade Union Law

Justin Buxton made reference to a response to a question by the Leader of the Council in November 2016 concerning the use of Trade Union Law to arrest protesters. He referred to emails from the Council requesting the police to arrest protesters using Trade Union Law and he asked whether the Leader of the Council was in charge of the Council.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change, responded that the matters raised had been considered exhaustively and answers had been provided to the issues on several occasions and he referred the questioner to the record of questions and answers in the minutes of previous meetings of Council to clarify matters. He said that he was pleased about the progress which had been made in bringing the community together to find a more sustainable way forward in relation to the managing street trees.

#### 4.3.4 Public Questions Concerning Works to Street Trees

Dave Dillner made reference to a comment made by the Cabinet Member concerning the Council upholding to rule of law. He commented that making false accusations to the Police was a criminal offence and he asked, firstly whether the Cabinet Member would join with him in condemning those responsible for falsely accusing citizens of pulling on ropes of workmen in trees; studding trees with broken glass, nails and chains and oiling tree trunks. He said that no evidence had been produced to substantiate the accusations. Secondly, he asked if the Council would be prepared to work with him to find the source of the accusations.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change, stated that allegations of a criminal offence should be reported to the police.

#### 4.3.5 Public Questions Concerning Injunction

Russell Johnson made reference to the movement towards an urban tree management policy for the City and stated that in that context, an extension of the High Court Injunction was unnecessary and inflammatory. He asked for confirmation that the Council intended to express faith in the new arrangements and to save public money by stating that no such extension would be sought. He also referred to a response previously made on this subject concerning a decision relating to any injunction and as to whether it was a legal or political decision.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change, stated that the first issue relating to a legal decision had been discussed before and he made reference to previous responses given. The second issue was substantially the same as a question recently asked at a meeting of Cabinet. He said that the Council was seeking to create the conditions which would make an injunction unnecessary and to build a consensus in relation to an approach with regards street trees and he was glad that progress was being made in that regard.

#### 4.3.6 Public Questions Concerning Carbon Reduction and Climate Change

Richard Souter stated that transport accounted for an increasing proportion of the City's emissions. He asked what measures the Council was putting in place to reduce transport emissions to meet a net zero target by 2030.

Celia Mather stated that following the declaration of a 'climate emergency', it had been suggested by the Sheffield Climate Alliance that there were immediate steps the Council could take, including renewable electricity, training, policy reports to include environmental implications and ensuring that the Pensions Authority would divest from fossil fuels. She asked which of those steps had begun to be taken.

Chris Broome commented that government policy to prioritise economic growth made adequate action to improve the environment and reduce emissions virtually impossible. He asked whether councillors understood that if they had courage to condemn the system within which they were supposed to cooperate, then many campaigners would welcome and support such a stance.

Logan Robin referred to the report by the Tyndall Centre and commented that it did not include particular actions or breakdown by sector in relation to emission reductions. He asked for timescales relating to decisions regarding reductions in emissions and as to the process by which decisions would be made.

Jenny Patient stated that, to reach net-zero carbon, the insulation of homes would be essential. Ten years ago, the Council had reported that 52 percent of homes in Sheffield were 'hard to treat' in that these homes could not be adequately insulated through loft and cavity wall insulation. She asked what

the strategy would be for the Council to insulate all homes and what the cost and timescale would be to bring all homes up to at least a SAP B rating.

Zoe Roberts asked how the Council planned to develop measures and policy to ensure that Sheffield remained within the carbon budget as outlined in the Tyndall Report and whether there was, or it was planned to establish, a cross party working group on the matter.

Responses were given to the questions relating to carbon reduction and climate change as part of item 5 on the agenda: *Responding to the Climate Emergency – Developing a Carbon Budget for Sheffield*.

#### 4.4 Petition Requiring Debate

##### Petition Seeking a Referendum on Whether the Council Should be Run in a Different Way by One or More Committees made up of Elected Councillors

The Council received an electronic petition containing 7754 signatures, seeking a referendum on whether the Council should be run in a different way by one or more Committees made up of elected Councillors.

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:-

"We, the undersigned, being local government electors for the area of Sheffield City Council, to whom this petition is addressed, seek a referendum on whether the Council should be run in a different way by one or more committees made up of elected councillors".

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Ruth Hubbard. She stated that the petition sought a change in the model of governance to a modern committee system rather than the strong leader model which was currently operated by the Council.

She said that the aspiration for local governance which reflected the way people wished to live and work together and care for each other. This was not a peripheral issue and it was something that did matter to people in the city.

Ruth Hubbard said that the people's petition was launched on 24 August 2018 and once a valid petition representing five percent of the electorate was submitted, the Council would have to hold a referendum on a change of governance to a committee system and it would also have to remain neutral. A first batch of signatures had been submitted to the Council. At this time, a total of over nineteen thousand signatures had been received and it was intended that the final number of signatures would be greater than the required verification number. This would be the biggest petition on such a matter in the country.

There had been many conversations with a wide range of people throughout the city in relation to this issue and Ruth Hubbard made reference to some of the people to whom campaigners had spoken.

She stated that a change in governance would require examination of a number of issues, including what made a good decision, collaboration, ensuring better representation and scrutiny. It was not intended to recreate the previous committee based model of local authority governance. This matter concerned having governance arrangements which worked for Sheffield and all of its large and diverse communities. There was no 'off-the-shelf' solution but, where local authorities had changed to a committee system, the design of those systems had reflected particular priorities. For example, a desire to create better cross party working and better working with communities, stakeholders, business and other partners. It was recognised that there was no perfect system. Local Councils which had changed had done so for better local democracy and had reported improvement. Cheshire East and Scarborough had recently changed governance arrangements.

Ruth Hubbard commented that she had been pleased to have had an open discussion recently with the Deputy Leader of the Council. However, she said that she was disappointed with the Council's response during the year and this matter had been consistently raised at Council. She commented on the potential costs of a referendum on the matter. She said that people were signing the petition because they wanted change and to end the strong leader model of governance. She called upon the Council to take the opportunity presented by the petition to grasp the issue and to make a decision to move to a committee system. If a decision was not made at this point, and when a completed petition was submitted, there would not be the opportunity for the Council to make a decision to change and a statutory referendum would be required. She said that this was a change which people wanted and called upon the Council to change to a modern committee system. The petition also presented an opportunity to claim Sheffield as a city of democracy and to make that meaningful.

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

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance, thanked the petitioners for bringing the issue to Council. She stated that becoming a councillor was a chance to serve the community and it was something of which she was proud and could not be taken for granted.

There was a wish for every councillor to have a role whereby they could make most difference to people and the present system did present opportunities to do so. Councillors were champions in their communities and were appointed to committees which regulated functions including licensing



and planning; and councillors represented the Council on outside bodies. The administration was formed by the largest political party and the opposition held them to account and cross party scrutiny committees considered decisions that were made. The Cabinet and Scrutiny system was introduced by the government to improve accountability, not to stifle it.

Councillor Blake made reference to the 2012 referendum concerning a change to a mayoral model of governance and in which sixty five percent of people backed the current system. However, it was clear from the petition that the Council should take the opportunity to consider how to improve public engagement and the Council was committed to doing everything it could in that regard. This included consideration of the best model for the future. There was a need to look at the full range of issues relating to engagement as it would not be right to put in place a new system without knowing how it might address those issues as raised by the petition.

She said that she would also welcome an opportunity to work with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to look at how this might be done and the matter would also be debated at a political group level. She looked forward to working with campaigners to consider issues and to make sure there was the best system for democracy in which every councillor was able to play a part, representing the community and to ensure that the public could engage and have input into the work of the Council.

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

Comment was made about the style of governance in the Council and concern expressed as to people becoming distanced from it. Remarks were also made about the changes made to Council meetings and as to the level of scrutiny in the Council. It was felt that, whilst local councillors could get involved, such opportunities had reduced over time.

It was thought that the petition and debate concerning governance was about opening up democracy and councillors being part of the decision making process. Whilst a change in governance model might not provide a solution to all the issues, it did provide an opportunity including for more cross party working.

The debate was welcomed and was considered to show the strength of democracy in the City and in contrast to other countries, the UK was a democratic country which enabled people to organise and develop a case and to debate. The scale of challenges for the City also meant that there needed to be experiments in deliberative and participative democracy, such as a Citizens Assembly. This was about the democratic processes in place in addition to the Council's formal model of governance.

People in the City were saying that that they would wish for the Council to work with them and the Council had tried to do that with Community

Assemblies and something such as that might be developed further in order to engage with people. Councillors worked hard in their communities and were aware of issues and problems and that some people need more help and support than others, including the extent to which they might feel able to engage in debate. The Council needed to work with people, find out what they wanted and how power might be devolved

The committee model of governance was fair and representative. It would bring greater transparency and better decision making and cross party collaboration and was more inclusive and democratic. Backbench councillors would have a role on committees which were established proportionate to the political composition of the Council and a committee model would also lend itself to a multi-party council.

Comment was made that the previous committee system was not a good way of working and the new model of executive arrangements was intended to give transparency so people knew who made decisions and could hold them to account. Those in a scrutiny role would be active in their role and, when it was well done, scrutiny properly engaged councillors to undertake different ways of working. There were examples of good practice in relation to scrutiny, such as pre-decision scrutiny and the use of task and finish working groups. It should be a critical friend to ensuring the voice of the public was heard and carried out by independent minded councillors to drive improvement.

The proposals for a committee model of governance would not necessarily mean returning to the model previously used by local authorities but a different model which allowed the public to engage. Some councils had chosen to adopt a committee structure and some had established a model of governance which included overview and scrutiny.

Many people had signed the petition and the petition organisers had spoken with many people. The Council could accept that people wanted a change in the system and put in place a system of governance which was open and transparent. A committee system was considered to allow more debate and accountability than a cabinet model.

Other local authorities with a committee model of governance gave delegated powers to chairs of committees to make decisions. Scrutiny could hold people to account and there were examples of it doing so. Sometimes decisions had to be made quickly including in conjunction with partner organisations such as the police and some delegated authority would be needed to do that. It was also thought that there was currently significant opportunity for public involvement at meetings of Council and at other meetings and it was also important to listen to public concerns.

The Cabinet model was considered to be the least-worst option when changes were made in 2000, when compared to alternative options of an elected mayor or city manager. At that time, Cabinet, Scrutiny and devolution were key component. It was commented that the Cabinet

component had become stronger and a better decentralised system and scrutiny system was needed. A modern committee system was needed which was the right one for this time and one which reached out to people.

Comment was made that regardless of the committee or cabinet model, the party with the most number of seats would take decisions. Whilst a committee system would be different to a cabinet model, it would not necessarily more or less democratic, although more members would be involved.

Comment was made that the role of scrutiny chairs had previously been given to opposition councillors, which had been an important element. A new system was required and Community Assemblies had involved local councillors in decision making for their respective communities.

Scrutiny Committees had been conducted in a democratic way and members were regarded as equals and had their say with the work of those committees being a collective effort. Task and finish groups in scrutiny was also used to enable work to be done.

Within the cabinet and scrutiny model, there was opportunity for decisions to be called in. Scrutiny also enabled councillors to work differently and reduced the party political dimension which had been a feature of the previous committee system.

The lead petitioner, Ruth Hubbard, exercised a right of reply and stated that a valid petition would be submitted and that would trigger a referendum on this matter. Over eighty percent of people to whom campaigners had spoken with wanted to sign the petition. She commented that there had been many good point of discussion during the debate by Council and said that she was disappointed that the debate had not occurred during the year.

Ruth Hubbard said that, with regards to scrutiny and the views expressed about whether scrutiny worked or not and with regard to good practice in scrutiny, reports from government and from think tanks and research studies had expressed the view that scrutiny could not work well in a rigid whipping environment as in Sheffield. There were decisions to be made about what scrutiny arrangements might be implemented in a modern committee system and that might incorporate an integrated scrutiny function or the inclusion of one or two scrutiny boards.

She referred to Select Committees in Parliament and to the appointment of members of the opposition to chair them and said that, under the Localism Act, it was local communities who were the check and balance for local authorities. She said that she did not believe in scrutiny in which the Council inspected itself and also said that the party divisions were apparent in the minutes of scrutiny committee meetings and that she was not aware of one decision which had been significantly modified or overturned by scrutiny in the Council.

Almost all of the local authorities which had changed to the committee system had sought to make sure that it was cost neutral and that would involve less bureaucracy and there were also so evaluations of what those councils had done. She also emphasised that councils were not moving back to the old committee system previously operating in local authorities. Such a change was something that was possible at a local level.

She commented that she would agree in relation to citizens' assemblies and other ways of thinking and which indicated the strength of democracy in the city.

Ruth Hubbard stated that if the Council did not make a decision on this matter, a petition would be submitted at the end of August. The task for Council to pass a motion to change its model of governance or a referendum would happen, which she said would result in a vote to change to a committee system.

Councillor Olivia Blake responded to issues raised during the debate. She acknowledged the range of issues discussed during the debate and stated that a large part of the petition was about cross party working. She said that the Council was not authoritarian and that there was good democracy in Sheffield and the presence of a good civil society in the City and that should be respected and acknowledged by Members. Scrutiny was very important and it had also brought about change such as with regards to the closure of the walk in centre, which had shown cross party working at its best.

Councillor Blake acknowledged that there were lots of challenges and issues in relation to the matters raised by the petition and debate and which needed to be considered. The Council wished to increase transparency and engagement and to continue to have the debate and take the work forward and to make sure that what was in place worked for the people of Sheffield and that councillors, as representatives of the people, were able to do their job to the best of their ability.

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

#### Proposal 1

It was moved by Councillor Olivia Blake and seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that:-

The matter be referred to the Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance to work cross party and with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, to bring a report back, following that engagement, to full Council within a period no later than 6 months' time.

#### Proposal 2

It was moved by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones and seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that:-

The action requested by the petitioners be supported and a report be brought forward to a future meeting of full Council, which may, by reason of timing, be an extraordinary meeting, to take a decision on a change of governance arrangements.

On being put to the vote, the above motion was not carried.

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

For Proposal 2 (33) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Gail Smith) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Angela Argenzio, Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Tim Huggan, Mohammed Mahroof, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Paul Turpin, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Kevin Oxley, Peter Garbutt, Alison Teal, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Alan Hooper and Mike Levery.

Against Proposal 2 (42) - Councillors Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Anne Murphy, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, Sioned-Mair Richards, Ben Miskell, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Julie Grocutt, Francyne Johnson, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Abstained from voting on Proposal 2 (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing).

### Proposal 3

It was moved by Councillor Martin Phipps and seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, that:-

The matter be referred to an emergency meeting of the full Council for a motion on adopting a modern committee system.

On being put to the vote, the above motion was not carried.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the Sheffield People's Petition; and
- (b) refers the matter to the Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance to work cross party and with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, to bring a report back, following that engagement, to full Council within a period no later than 6 months' time.

The votes on proposal 1 were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

- For Proposal 1 (43) - Councillors Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Anne Murphy, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Moya O'Rourke, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, Sioned-Mair Richards, Ben Miskell, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Julie Grocutt, Francyne Johnson, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.
- Against Proposal 1 (25) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Gail Smith) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Tim Huggan, Mohammed Mahroof, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Kevin Oxley, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Alan Hooper and Mike Levery.
- Abstained from voting on Proposal 1 (9) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) and Councillors Angela Argenzio, Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Paul Turpin, Peter Garbutt and Alison Teal.

**5. RESPONDING TO THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY - DEVELOPING A CARBON BUDGET FOR SHEFFIELD**

- 5.1 The Council received a presentation from Dr Jaise Kuriakose, from the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change and Research and Mark Whitworth, interim Head of Sustainability, Sheffield City Council. Dr Kuriakose outlined that to respond to climate change, action was required to hold the increase in global average temperature to well below 2 degrees Celsius and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Carbon budgets set policy for restricting Co2 emissions from energy use in electricity, heating, transport and industry.

The report of the Tyndall Centre had been circulated to Members, together with a report of the Executive Director, Place. It set out climate change targets for Sheffield and provided advisory budgets for carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions, from the energy system for 2020 to 2100. Those targets were derived from the commitments enshrined in the 2015 Paris Agreement.

The Tyndall Centre's approach took international carbon budgets and then split them down to national (UK) and sub-national levels (city or city-region). The resultant 'Carbon budget' was the maximum carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) associated with energy use in Sheffield that could be emitted to meet this commitment. This commitment was then translated into: a long-term carbon budget for Sheffield; a sequence of recommended five-year carbon budgets; and a date of 'near zero'/zero carbon for the city.

Based on that analysis, for Sheffield to make its 'fair' contribution towards the Paris Climate Change Agreement, the report made recommendations, which Dr Kuriakose outlined in his presentation.

- 5.2 Responses were made to questions from members of the public, as follows:

Regarding measures being put in place to reduce emissions to meet the net zero target and the increasing proportion of emissions being from transport, it was understood that the proportion of emissions from Transport had increased to 28 percent. In relation to electricity, through national grid decarbonisation and an increase in renewables, there had been decrease in the amount of carbon produced from energy generation.

The Council was in consultation and working in conjunction with City region in preparing a bid for the Department of Transport which was for the transforming cities fund to support buses, walking and cycling infrastructure investment and which would support the reduction of carbon emissions in the city. As identified in the recent transport strategy, more work needed to be undertaken in the light of the declaration of a climate emergency regarding how the Transport Strategy would respond to the findings from the Tyndall Centre and subsequent work.

With regard to the Tyndall report and details of the actions in terms of reductions and how they will be decided, at this stage, the report had only just been received so the actions in terms of how those savings might be delivered had yet to be worked through. That would be part of the process

around developing a plan and working through the citizens' assembly and with stakeholders to develop those proposals.

In connection with the initial steps that the Council could take immediately, as outlined by the Sheffield Climate Alliance, and as to whether any steps had been taken regarding those suggestions, the support of the Sheffield Climate Alliance was acknowledged and dialogue could also be made at regular meetings including the Climate Alliance or in writing. As regards energy, the Council had switched its electricity supply to a fully renewable tariff.

In relation to developing a carbon literacy programme, the Government was looking to nationally roll out a programme that had been successfully developed in Manchester. The Council was having conversations as to how Sheffield might be involved in that, including as a pilot and also the opportunities to use that approach in Sheffield.

Further in relation to sustainable transport there had been other cycle investment infrastructure investment in areas such as Portobello and also with the new heart of the city in Tudor Square along with other infrastructure as part of those developments.

Proposals that had been put forward relating to a Citizens' Assembly would be part of the solution in making sure that there was engagement across the city from wide range of people as well as taking a fully inclusive approach to developing the plan.

In respect of the question regarding net zero carbon insulation and as to what would be the cost and timescales and the partners for an insulation programme to bring buildings up to SAP B, that information was not to hand. However, given the scale of the challenge and some of the opportunities to de-carbonise, this was something that needed to be explored.

For the Council's housing stock, 40 thousand homes in the city have been insulated in a programme to bring those homes up to some equivalent of SAP Part C.

- 5.3 Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change, responded to the question concerning a cross party working group and said there need to be different forms of democracy, including the deliberative form of the citizen's assembly, an ongoing dialogue between elected representatives and the people they represent, different parties setting out different visions and putting these to people and the Council's cross party Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee which could keep track of the work being done.

He said that the questions from the public also helped to set out the debate as to how the City could be set on a trajectory where it would not spend its carbon budget within the next six years and would instead become carbon neutral. It was thought that the approach should include having a Citizens



Assembly and identifying the different sectors in the City and the reductions they would need to make.

- 5.4 Questions were asked and comments made by Members of the Council in relation to the report and presentation, and responses were given, as summarised below:

Questions were asked in relation to the approach to the carbon emissions budget and targets, emissions from shipping and aviation; reducing single use plastic and school initiatives; the extent to which there was a plan of action and proposals, such as in respect of transport, solar energy and insulation.

Responses were made that shipping and aviation within carbon budgets was dealt with at a national level and any increase in carbon use would have an impact on local carbon budget. It was important to have discussions with the government regarding plans concerning emissions from aviation and shipping. Collaboration and engagement would be required with stakeholders due to the scale of shipping and aviation.

It was very important to move away from the use of single-use plastic and there were a range of benefits and opportunities. Looking at such problems collectively and working across the city was fundamental as was engagement of every sector to help contribute and initiatives such as with single use plastics working through schools were part of that picture.

Avoiding single use plastics meant fewer emissions from industry which manufactured plastics, transporting plastic to the end users and in waste and recycling. More understanding was needed as to the different types of plastics, which were essential and as to the manufacturing process.

There would be a process to work through when the carbon budget had been identified in understanding where opportunities were within the city and which might vary from one location to another. In terms of actions, some of the approaches which are outlined in the question would be explored together with what the opportunities were and if there were pressing issues that needed to be addressed. Local knowledge was vital in achieving the maximum reduction in emissions and that that should be open to commercial partners, NGOs, Third Sector, academia and policymakers all of which had to be engaged and included and all would have their own action to deliver.

Questions were asked regarding energy efficient buses and a public transport system, integrated with other modes of transport; obtaining a picture of what the future might look like and relating issues to the public; the Tyndall Centre speaking with businesses and an explanation of the concept of 'grandfathering' and why it was seen as a good idea.

With regards what the zero carbon city looks like, work by other cities included transition to both electric vehicles including electric buses, electricity from renewable sources and a reduction in the number of vehicle

movements in the city and other roads, such as motorways, so it was a local issue and also something to discuss with national government and other agencies. Part of the work to be done was to understand the impact and changes. The Tyndall Centre had been supporting organisations in relation to Greater Manchester to develop understanding.

That understanding needed to be put in a form that people understood including what they might do to contribute towards reducing the carbon footprint. The City was starting from a good base and there were good examples from a range of organisations that were already delivering and supporting activities. Working with businesses was an important part of the city's approach.

An explanation was provided of the concept of Grandfathering, which referred to past or recent emissions. The average of the annual emissions from 2011 to 2016 was used and compared to the UK emissions. Using more recent figures would make the approach not applicable but it did work broadly in the UK and within that timeframe. This approach was also tested by looking at a range of other local authorities with different characteristics, relating to population, income distribution, economic activity etc.

Questions were asked concerning climate change and the local plan for housing, including infrastructure such as water, energy and transport on potential brownfield or greenfield development sites; whether information for Sheffield's emissions by sector were based on actual data; the actions which the Council could take which would have maximum impact; provision of parking spaces and the need for immediate action.

The work to develop the evidence base and in relation to opportunities would need to take into account some of the issues raised relating to new housing development. For example, the Council was already engaged in work to look at opportunities for use of hydrogen and options for new developments if natural gas was phased out; and similarly for opportunities to de-carbonise.

Action was needed on all different levels in relation to transport and to think differently about the mobility of passengers and goods, how we deliver goods and engage with business to bring about innovative models and solutions.

The data regarding Sheffield's emission by sector came from the government Department of Business, Energy and Industry Strategy and was publically available.

In terms of what Sheffield could do to reduce the emissions, there might be activity such as installing solar panels or wind turbines, although it was the National Grid emissions that dictated the emissions from the electricity sector. There might also be engagement with the distribution network operators and National Grid along with renewable energy installations. The Council had some control in relation to fuels burned within the city boundary and discussions could be held with business and industry about action to reduce emissions. Collaborating with others was probably the best way

forward.

In relation to how we make decisions now and actions that need to start immediately, there was engagement with the University of Sheffield in relation to using the United Nations sustainable development goals and how they might be applied in appraising decisions or looking at strategies and how they contribute to those international goals and translating those to a local level to understand what they mean for the city and its citizens. There was also a need for a conversation internally about developing some of that thinking and the sort of measures which needed to be put in place to enable decisions now to be cognisant of the climate emergency as well as developing a plan that starts to mobilise some of the additional actions that were needed.

Questions were asked concerning air quality and related measures and monitoring; whether the rise in Co2 might as much be a result of global warming; and with regard to prioritising steps to reduce carbon emissions over economic growth.

In relation to clean air and alongside the current consultation on the clean air zone, there was work being done with the University on a wider deployment of sensors around the City to build up a better picture and understanding and give a better position from which to respond. There was also a project with community volunteers building and installing sensors and further work was being done to check data from that project with the University's data.

Proposals relating to the clean air zone were expected to have wider impacts and benefits. There was also infrastructure change required to be delivered through programmes such as the transforming cities fund, for which a bid had been submitted. There was also work on issues including wider resilience and adapting to change as well as mitigating impact on the environment.

The earth had witnessed climate change before but it was a question of the extent and the magnitude of the change that was happening. The increase in the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and the change in temperature that was being seen now was unprecedented. The effects of that change were still being evaluated but there was a cascading effect where one failure would lead to a further failure and the impact was severe in terms of the effect on biodiversity, life, health and the economy etc. and was set in the context of a large human population and civilisation.

There was a release of carbon dioxide because of the ice melting and the increase of concentration of carbon dioxide was actually contributing to warming and that melted some of the ice and released permafrost and methane. So, there was a cascade effect which accelerated the warming and was considered to be quite severe, if all of the different effects were considered.

In relation to the prioritisation of reducing carbon emissions over economic

growth, such a question might be addressed and debated in a wider forum such as the citizens' assembly. Understanding the potential wider effects as outlined and also having a bigger picture around what the city could do and the related implications was part of that debate.

Questions were asked concerning cycling and the contribution of journeys made by cycling to the city becoming carbon neutral; and the percentage of carbon emissions for which the Council was responsible.

Further questions were asked regarding whether the quickening of change would affect the carbon budget; the significance of limiting temperature growth to 1.5 degrees Celsius; and if there should also be a focus on other pollutants; and local procurement.

Additional questions were put concerning whether other greenhouse gases such as methane should also be considered; and if there should be initiatives to grow the local food economy, including new business start-ups in the agricultural sector in rural areas and action in relation to overgrown allotments.

Questions were asked as to how we might measure success in the way progress was measured; and it was important to recognise other environmental crises, such as species depletion and soil depletion and other events which might happen such as floods, droughts, food shortages and health issues and how this might be built into decision making.

Responses were made to the above questions, as follows:

It was explained that information relating to the Transport Strategy was based upon the Department for Transport propensity to cycle tool. The aspiration was to increase the share of journeys made by cycle to the city centre from approximately 3 percent to 15 percent. For the city as a whole, the aspiration was from approximately 2 percent to 12 percent.

The estimated reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> of that shift, as portion of the road transport share was estimated at between 1 and 3 percent of road transport. This presented part of the challenge in relation to transport as there was unlikely to be a neat solution based on modal shift to any mode. The issue was probably not about facilitating more transport by any mode but how the city could be planned so people could travel less by any mode.

The model recommended reviewing the carbon budget on a five yearly basis to take changes into account, including if the situation was worsening or to understand the effect of national or international action, such as for aviation or shipping. The current budget was between 1.5 and 1.7 degrees and it was probably not realistic to achieve 1.5. It was important to keep up to date the relevant science and climate modelling and changing policies according to the science at the time.

As to whether this should be limited to CO<sub>2</sub> or include all greenhouse gases,

whilst this idea had been considered, one reservation was that the six greenhouse gases had different physical and chemical properties and so it would not be recommended to combine them. National government had a greenhouse gas target. How the gases interact in the atmosphere and affected the temperature was different for different gases and gases had a different lifetime and the rate of emission could vary between the different gases. It was therefore considered important to look at CO<sub>2</sub>, which was the majority of all greenhouse gases, and to tackle CO<sub>2</sub> and the related energy system. However, other greenhouse gases, such as nitrous oxide, also needed to be taken into consideration and reduced as much as possible.

National Government was signed up to the Kyoto Agreement and reported within a framework and on a production basis and the carbon budget for Sheffield was also on a production basis. There was not a clear methodology developed yet on a consumption basis but that needed to be developed as well. The model used was an energy carbon emissions model and whilst it did not include land use and land use changes and the emissions from storage and capture from trees or from other vegetation, there was a need to look at that.

With respect to other issues, such as changes including species depletion and some of the other impacts that were already being experienced, conversations should be had as part of the citizen's assembly and to have the evidence to understand the risks and clarity in relation to the science, together with the opportunities for Sheffield and to act so as to take the City's share of the global commitment.

On behalf of the Council, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) thanked Dr Jaise Kuriakose and Mark Whitworth for their presentation and for responding to Members' questions.

- 5.5 (NOTE: During the discussion on the above item of business, it was - RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Mark Jones and seconded by Councillor Mike Drabble, that the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 5.5 be suspended and the termination of the meeting be extended by a period of up to 30 minutes, to 6.00 p.m. maximum.)

## **6. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING**

- 6.1 RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2019 be approved as a true and accurate record, subject to the following alterations:-
- (a) the addition to the recorded votes set out in paragraph 6.4.1, of the names of Councillors Mohammed Mahroof and Barbara Masters to the two lists of Members voting for the amendment, and the correction of the votes of Councillor Simon Clement-Jones to show that he voted for the amendment;

- (b) the addition to the recorded votes set out in paragraph 6.6.1, of (i) the names of Councillors Denise Fox and Francyne Johnson to the two lists of Members voting for the Motion, (ii) the name of Councillor Ian Auckland to the list of Members voting for paragraphs (b), (c)(ii) to (iv) and (vi) of the Motion and to the list of Members voting against paragraphs (a) and (c)(i) and (v) of the Motion and (iii) the names of Councillors Angela Argenzio and Kaltum Rivers to the two lists of Members abstaining from voting on the Motion;
- (c) the addition to the recorded vote set out in paragraph 7.6.1, of the names of Councillors Abdul Khayum and Josie Paszek to the list of Members voting against the amendment;
- (d) the addition to the recorded vote set out in paragraph 8.6.1, of the names of Councillors Olivia Blake and Adam Hurst to the list of Members voting against the amendment; and
- (e) the addition to the recorded votes set out in paragraph 8.8.1, of the name of Councillor Ian Auckland to the two lists of Members voting against the Substantive Motion, and the correction of the votes of Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed to show that he voted against the Substantive Motion.

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

7.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Dianne Hurst, that:-

- (a) it be noted that, with effect from 2<sup>nd</sup> July, 2019 (i) Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed stood down as Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group on the Council and (ii) Councillor Penny Baker became Interim Leader of the Group, and Councillor Simon Clement-Jones became Interim Deputy Leader of the Group, until further notice;
- (b) approval be given to the following changes to the memberships of Committees, Boards, etc.:-

Overview & Scrutiny Management Committee	- Councillors Julie Grocutt and Sioned-Mair Richards to fill vacancies
Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee	- Councillor Mike Chaplin to replace Councillor Bryan Lodge, and remove Councillor Roger Davison and create a vacancy
Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee	- Councillor Bryan Lodge to replace Councillor Mike Chaplin

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee | - Councillor Peter Price to fill a vacancy         |
| Licensing Committee  | - Councillor Roger Davison to fill a vacancy       |
| Senior Officer Employment Committee                                      | - Councillor Simon Clement-Jones to fill a vacancy |
| Appeals and Collective Disputes Committee                                | - Councillor Simon Clement-Jones to fill a vacancy |

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

- |                 |  |
|-----------------|--|
| Transport 4 All | - Councillor Douglas Johnson be appointed to serve on the Body |
|-----------------|--|

## **8. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

- 8.1 A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated.
- 8.2 Supplementary questions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4), questions relating to urgent business (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6ii) and questions relating to the discharge of the functions of the South Yorkshire Joint Authorities for Fire and Rescue and Pensions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6i), were not able to be asked before the meeting terminated (as agreed earlier at the meeting, when suspending the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 5.5) at 6.00 p.m..