

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 8 January 2020, 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 & Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Bob Pullin Richard Shaw	10	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Vic Bowden Moya O'Rourke	19	<i>Nether Edge & Sharrow Ward</i> Peter Garbutt Alison Teal
2	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Bob McCann Sophie Wilson	11	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Roger Davison Barbara Masters	20	<i>Park & 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 & Sharrow Vale Ward</i> Angela Argenzio Kaltum Rivers	13	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	22	<i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i> Dawn Dale Peter Price Garry Weatherall
5	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Talib Hussain Mark Jones	14	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Lewis Dagnall Cate McDonald 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> Penny Baker
7	<i>Crookes & Crosspool Ward</i> Tim Huggan Mohammed Mahroof Anne Murphy	16	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	25	<i>Stocksbridge & 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> Ben Curran
9	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten 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. FORMER COUNCILLOR CHRIS TOSSEANO

- 1.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) reported with sadness, the death, on 26th December 2019, of former Councillor Chris Tosseano, who had served as a Member of the Council from 1994 to 2001. Members of the Council observed a minute's silence in her memory, and later in the meeting, Members paid tribute to her.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andy Bainbridge, David Baker, Olivia Blake, Neale Gibson, Shaffaq Mohammed, Vickie Priestley, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Jack Scott and Jim Steinke.

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

4.1 Petitions

4.1.1 Petition Objecting to the Proposed Road Changes in Oughtibridge and to the Lack of Consultation with Residents

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition, containing 676 signatures, objecting to the proposed road changes in Oughtibridge and to the lack of consultation with residents.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Gary Chamberlain. Mr Chamberlain explained that he was the chair of the Oughtibridge Road Safety Group. He said that consultation had taken place and that residents had made objections to the proposals. He said that he had handed in 12 such objections from people unable to attend a consultation meeting and had asked for responses, but no such responses had been forthcoming. The Road Safety Group had also consulted people using a leaflet drop and which showed that the majority of people who responded were against the proposal.

He said that he had spoken with the Council in April 2019 and it had been indicated that the Council was keen to make sure that there would be communication between the residents and the Council throughout the process. However, that had not happened and he felt there had been a lack of engagement, apart from a meeting having been arranged and help having been received from a Bradfield Parish Councillor, with parts of the proposal having been changed as a result.

There were concerns with regards to the proposal. There was a large amount of traffic going through Oughtibridge and this was continuing to increase and there was also new housing being built. The proposal now had an exit and entrance to Bridge Hill. Therefore, traffic would come in and out of Bridge Hill.

Mr Chamberlain said that there were concerns as to the amount of traffic coming from Station Lane straight on to Bridge Hill. There was also a public house on Bridge Hill which had regular deliveries and it had been suggested that in order to get in and out of Bridge Hill, vehicles would have to reverse from Station Lane up onto Bridge Hill. It was understood that the legal team for the public house was involved in the process.

It was felt that the Council should communicate with residents and the Road Safety Group in order to try and come up with a sensible solution and before any other action was considered.

He referred to a newspaper article in the Star in which the Cabinet Member, Councillor Bob Johnson, was quoted as saying that he would not sign off a Traffic Regulation Order against the wishes of residents. Mr Chamberlain said that he believed that the number of signatories on the petition made it clear that people in Oughtibridge were not in favour of the proposals or at least they would like a say in the process.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Bob Johnson, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development. Councillor Johnson thanked Mr Chamberlain for bringing the petition to Council. He said that he had responded to Mr Chamberlain's e-mail correspondence when he came into post as Cabinet Member in May 2019 and had provided his personal mobile number to him, although this offer had not been taken up.

He said that the aim of the safety scheme was to reduce road traffic collisions and, in particular, those involving bicycles and motorcycles at the junction of Bridge Hill, Lower Road and Orchard Street. Consultation letters, a plan and a list of frequently asked questions were delivered to 1,500 households in Oughtibridge on 7 March 2019, informing residents of the proposed scheme and inviting them to a public information session held in Oughtibridge. A public drop in session was held on 14 March and which was well attended. All of the comments received, together with the Traffic Regulation Order which had been advertised from the 14 November to 12 December 2019 and which gave a formal opportunity to object as residents and as a group, would then be considered before a decision was made.

4.1.2 Petition Requesting a Pedestrian Crossing Facility or a School Crossing Patrol at Angram Bank School

The Council received an electronic petition containing 19 signatures, requesting a pedestrian crossing facility or a school crossing patrol at Angram Bank School.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Bob Johnson, Cabinet Member for Transport and Development.

4.2 Public Questions

4.2.1 Public Questions Concerning Footpath Surface and Protocols in the Streets Ahead Contract

Nigel Slack said that walking along Sharrow Lane and Washington Road to get to the General Cemetery, it was noticeable that some form of mechanical street sweeper had been used to clean the pavements. However, whatever had been used had effectively stripped the surface from the footpath and exposed not only a softer layer of tarmac but had, in some places, scraped all of the new resurfacing back to the original surface. He provided photographs of the pavement.

He commented in relation to this calling into question the quality of the resurfacing and the ability of the contractor to carry out what he said should be simple operations. Mr Slack asked the following questions: When was this area of pavements cleaned? What was used? Was this within the expectations of the contract? When will the damage be repaired? Who will pay for the repairs, the Council or Amey?

Nigel Slack said that in March 2017, he had asked a question at Cabinet about protocols in place under the Streets Ahead contract to protect vulnerable people in the case of issues caused by the contractors. The response from the Cabinet Member at that time was that lessons would be learned from the incident and that the particular case would be investigated further. He said that, despite further questions at Cabinet in April and July, he had not received a response, either in writing or verbally.

Mr Slack outlined the incident which had taken place relating to the resurfacing of Bocking Lane and the cutting of the phone line to his Mother's property. He said that Amey had failed to report this to the service provider and, after the phone line had been out of action for a number of days, he had taken the matter in hand himself. He spoke of his mother's health during that time and said that she became virtually housebound and that her health never recovered. Mr Slack informed Members of the Council that his mother had died in December 2019.

Mr Slack said that throughout all this, there was never a response from the Cabinet Member, as promised, and no information about what, if any, protocols were in place to prevent this happening to other vulnerable people. He asked what, if any, protocols to protect the vulnerable were in place with the Streets Ahead contract?

Councillor Mark Jones, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene

and Climate Change, began by thanking Mr Slack for his questions and he extended the sympathies of Members of the Council to Mr Slack for the loss in December, of his mother. He said that he would provide detailed written answers in relation to the question concerning the Sharrow Lane and Washington Road footpath.

Councillor Jones apologised for the incident relating to Mr Slack's mother's telephone line and said that he had been assured that protocols had been put into place in that regard. However, he said that he would also look at those protocols himself to make sure that they were as rigid and robust as they could be and to ensure that nothing of this nature happened again. He said that, once he was satisfied with the answers that he had received, he would contact Mr Slack and discuss them with him. He said that he was very sorry to hear about Mr Slack's loss and said that his thoughts were with him.

4.2.2 Public Question Concerning Access Officers

James Martin, Chair of the Access Liaison Group, made reference to the restructure of the Council's Planning department and asked whether the dispute had yet reached a conclusion. He said that disabled groups were concerned at the risk of losing disability access officers and the implications that might have. He commented that the sooner such discussions could be had with the Cabinet Member, the better that would be and so it was clear that the concerns of the disabled community were understood and so as to ensure that there could be confidence that the good things that had been done over the years in the city could continue and with dedicated officers.

Councillor Bob Johnson, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, thanked Mr Martin for the question and stated that matters relating to the dispute were progressing and he would hope to be able to make an announcement shortly. He said that he would then immediately write to Mr Martin and offer to meet with him so that the matter could be discussed at the earliest opportunity.

4.2.3 Public Question Concerning Litter and Fly-tipping

Brian Holmshaw said that there were volunteer litter pickers in Sheffield who helped to clean neighbourhoods and pick up litter in the city and they also reported incidents of fly-tipping, which he said was increasing. He said that Sheffield had been reported in the press as being in the top five worst local authorities in England in relation to fly-tipping. He also said there had been a reduction in standards relating to litter and that fly-tipping would be picked up less often and he referred to a Scrutiny Committee meeting in July 2017 which had considered this issue. He commented that no one from the Sheffield Litter Group had been invited to attend that meeting. He said that rubbish was now being removed from streets due to the efforts of volunteer litter pickers. He asked whether the Council would realise the error in reducing previous service standards in 2017 relating to litter and fly-tipping and whether these standards could be reinstated.

Councillor Mark Jones, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change, responded that the Council had had to make considerable savings since 2010.

He acknowledged that, having also participated in litter-picks himself, it could be frustrating for people that having cleaned the streets, someone else then dropped litter. He said that more did need to be done in relation to education and raising awareness and for people to simply stop dropping rubbish. He said that if people were more considerate towards the environment and to others, they would not drop litter on the street.

He said that in the city centre, the streets were cleaned several times of the day and litter still occurred and this was probably regardless of whether cleaning took place at increased cycles or with more regular frequency.

Councillor Jones said that it was not acceptable to drop litter and that people should take responsibility for their own rubbish and for their actions. The Council had issued many fines to people for dropping litter and he believed that fines would not be necessary if people did not drop litter.

He said that, in the past, the Council did provide for more regular collections of litter, such as in the area in his Ward around the Northern General Hospital, but whilst this might be something he would like to have, it was also something that the Council could not afford to do at this time, which was regrettable. The Council needed to focus on enforcement and education as regards litter and it was also an issue which the Council was looking to bring forward over the coming months.

He said that with regards to working with the litter pickers, it was regrettable that they were not included in the previous discussions and he said that the Council would try to work with them as much as possible in future. He said that he had regular contact with Sheffield litter pickers and had sought to listen to their views. He would provide a written answer on this matter and said that if Mr Holmshaw wished to have a meeting regarding this issue, he would be pleased to do so.

4.2.4 Public Question Concerning Hanover Tower

Brian Holmshaw referred to the report concerning the Hanover Tower, which he said had been further delayed and that residents were increasingly concerned. He asked why the report was subject to further delay and commented as to whether the further delay was due to the contractor, Lovell. He asked why the Council was seemingly so risk averse in publishing the report.

Councillor Paul Wood, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, thanked Mr Holmshaw for his question and he expressed sympathy with the points made in relation to delay to the publication of the report relating to Hanover Tower. He said that he had

been attempting to get the report into the public realm since becoming Cabinet Member. He had received legal advice that the report would have to be provided to anyone named in the report in order to give them opportunity to respond.

He explained that the contractor, Lovell had questioned the report and had requested that they be given until 31 January to make any representations in response to the report. That was why the report could not yet be issued, as legal clearance had not yet been given to do so. He said that he had met with the Council's solicitor and had said that he personally believed that the Council should issue the report once the date of 31 January had been met and he had asked for the report to be issued as soon as that date had passed. This would be the case unless it was legally not possible to do so for reasons which prevented publication of the report. He apologised for the delay in being able to issue the report.

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

5.1 Urgent Business

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

5.2 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

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

6. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

6.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Dianne Hurst, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 4th December 2019, be approved as a true and accurate record.

7. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

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

(a) Mr. David Baldwin (former Health Service Executive) be re-appointed to serve as a public sector representative on the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel for a three year term ending 6th February 2023; and

(b) Councillor Olivia Blake be removed from the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee,

creating a vacancy.

8. PRINCIPLES FOR GOVERNANCE AT SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

- 8.1 The Council received a presentation concerning decision making and governance and outlining the main findings of the work undertaken by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee. It included interim feedback from the Big City Conversation. The presentation was given by James Henderson, the Director of Policy, Performance and Communications. Gillian Duckworth, the Director of Legal and Governance and Emily Standbrook-Shaw, Policy and Improvement Officer both attended the meeting and also answered Members' questions arising from the presentation.
- 8.2 A report had been previously circulated which was produced by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and which set out ambitions for the Council relating to governance, principles for governance and ways of working.
- 8.3 James Henderson set out the timeline of activity following the request by full Council for the Deputy Leader of the Council to work with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to review decision making in the Council.
- 8.4 He outlined the work on the Big City Conversation which sought to talk to people in every part of the city about the issues that mattered to them, how they wanted to get involved in their local community and local issues; and how they wanted to influence decision making. He set out the approach taken which included a city wide survey, 'pop-up' conversations and organised discussions.
- 8.5 James Henderson summarised the interim responses made during the Big City Conversation. People had given their views in relation to a range of issues, including what they liked best about where they lived and what needed improving; how well informed they felt and their involvement in local issues; finding out about services; and influencing decisions affecting a local area.
- 8.6 He set out the findings of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and the ambitions, principles and ways of working as detailed in the report by the Committee.
- 8.7 Members of the Council asked questions and made comments in relation to the presentation and the report by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and responses were given. These are summarised below.
- 8.8 The Big City Conversation informed the debate concerning governance, including how people felt informed and involved. It also had a wider

remit to give insight to help shape the broader direction of the Council and its engagement with people. The work of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee was to develop a set of principles upon which proposals for a decision making model could be based.

- 8.9 In relation to local areas, there had been ward based conversations and discussions with community groups in different parts of the city to get a richer picture. Issues that were important to people were likely to be different in one area to another and that was something which would need to be reflected upon and form part of the thinking in relation to how engagement with local communities took place.
- 8.10 The other local authorities that were included in the Scrutiny Committee's work on governance included Reading, which already had a committee system in place, Cheshire East, which was at present changing to a committee system, Rotherham, which included pre-decision scrutiny in its model; and Melton, which was changing from a committee to a Cabinet model. Other local authorities were approached as well. It was considered that the Scrutiny Committee had heard a range of views from places with a variety of different experiences.
- 8.11 A question had not been asked as part of the Big City Conversation survey as to whether those people had also signed the governance petition requesting a referendum on whether the Council should adopt a committee system. The Big City Conversation was engaging a range of people in different places to obtain a rich and representative picture of people's views.
- 8.12 With regard to events as part of the Big City Conversation, a variety of locations had been selected and it had been decided to take a consultation and engagement approach based upon going to places where people already were, such as shopping areas, rather than expecting them to come to council meetings. In that way, it was hoped that a broad range of conversations could take place, including with individuals who might not feel confident in putting their points across in another type of forum. Whilst it might be difficult to say with certainty that this approach would engage a fully representative range of people, it was hoped that it would help in that regard. There was also a commitment to continue with the idea of a big city conversation and a recognition that this needed to be turned into broader conversations about the issues that were important to people, such as crime and public transport.
- 8.13 People had been asked about governance through the Big City Conversation, including their involvement in decision making and about how they feel they can get involved and how informed they feel about public services. The analysis would help to inform proposals relating to governance. In principle, the data from the Big City Conversation could be made available. However, advice would be sought as to any related data protection issues.

- 8.14 It was felt that the number of responses received so far was relatively good for a consultation of this type and there was more work yet to be done. It did represent a fairly substantial number of people in the city. There had been detailed and high quality conversations with people, which represented a strength in the approach that had been adopted. There had also been other forms of contact, including e-mails, which illustrated the level of interest and involvement.
- 8.15 Further analysis would be done such as to see the proportion of young people that had engaged with the process. There had been engagement with young people through the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee exercise. Some work was also being done with students from the University of Sheffield.
- 8.16 There was not an awareness of any evidence, including that submitted as part of the scrutiny exercise, that pointed to a correlation between the particular system of governance that is adopted by a council and voter turnout. From the evidence which the Committee heard, it was considered that there was no one perfect system.
- 8.17 The Council had sought to engage with as wide a range of the public as possible. It would also endeavour to make sure there was engagement with groups that may be under represented. The demographic profile was being looked at of those who had already responded, so as to understand any gaps in particular communities, age groups or other characteristics. Proactive steps would need to be taken during the remainder of the Big City Conversation to address any such gaps to obtain a representative range of views.
- 8.18 In relation to people feeling informed about decisions, the interim results were not out of line with other places as far as was known. The Council did take a number of steps to publicise what it was doing. However, the Scrutiny Committee was very clear that there was more that could be done and the Council would be seeking to do so. The Big City Conversation also gave a platform to build on some of the work that had been done and an opportunity to look at some of the issues that people said were most important to them.
- 8.19 The Scrutiny Committee had also said that, as part of a new governance system, it should be made very clear how decision making processes work and how people could get involved in those decision making processes and to make it as understandable as possible for people. The Council would need to be creative and imaginative about how that could be done as part of the next phase of work.
- 8.20 In the results seen so far, it was clear that people did want to get involved but they might want to use different mechanisms to those which the Council traditionally used. Public meetings would still be a good way of getting involved for some of the population. In addition, many more

people wanted to use e-mail and online mechanisms and the Council would have to find ways of ensuring that those were just as easy for people to use.

- 8.21 It was also important to speak with people who were harder to hear, such as people with caring responsibilities. The Council had engaged with the voluntary sector to try to utilise things that were already in place. If there were groups already engaged with people with particular characteristics, the Council had tried to speak with them. As outlined above, further analysis would be done as to any such gaps in the people or groups who had responded to the Big City Conversation.
- 8.22 As part of the Big City Conversation, information was collected about the wards that people lived in by postcode. People had been asked for information about where they lived, their age and other aspects of their background. That information would now be analysed to identify and address any gaps in different characteristics. Analysis had not yet been done to be able to say what the specific things were that different groups of people had said.
- 8.23 It was also critical that the Council was able to show that it was responding to the issues people had raised. There was a need to understand what those issues were and how they differed between different groups.
- 8.24 The proposal for a committee system would need to be published by 11 March. The decision on the proposal itself was one for the Executive but there would be opportunities for Members to comment on the proposal.
- 8.25 In response to a question concerning devolving decision making to a local level, it was felt that an answer on that issue would be a political one, although it was clarified that decisions could be devolved in either a Leader and Cabinet or a committee system.
- 8.26 Committees had to be politically proportionate to the overall political makeup of the Council as a whole.
- 8.27 The legislation said that, once there had been a governance referendum, it would be ten years before a further referendum relating to a council's governance arrangements could take place.
- 8.28 It was expected that performance measures would be developed to help to look at the governance model in the context of the governance principles proposed by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and that oversight could be provided by the Committee.
- 8.29 It had been made clear through the Big City Conversation that, if there were specific issues that people raised, such as complaints or concerns about individual cases, these would be dealt with as and when they arose.

- 8.30 One of the main messages from the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee listening to young people from the Youth Cabinet and the Young Advisors was about communication and putting information in places where people already accessed it and making it easily available. They talked about getting out to harder to reach groups of young people and about voting age.
- 8.31 A question was asked about participation by other political groups in the development of the governance proposals and this was considered to be an issue which should be subject of a response by a Cabinet Member.
- 8.32 The Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee had been provided with information concerning the estimated cost of Democratic Services support to meetings. It was possible to then estimate the costs, depending on the model of decision making to be adopted and numbers of committees. There had not been any direct conversations with the other local authorities about how much systems of governance cost to run.
- 8.33 One of the principles that the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee outlined concerned the importance of people understanding the decision making process and decisions that were due to be taken and that information was provided to people about that. That was something which needed further thought, including imaginative ways in which it might be described.
- 8.34 In relation to accountability, reference was made to the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, which recognised accountability as another key theme to emerge. The Big City Conversation survey had not included specific questions concerning accountability, although some such issues may have been explored in some of the discussions.
- 8.35 That councillors were elected to perform a function and make decisions came through quite clearly in some of the evidence heard by the Scrutiny Committee. A key finding of the scrutiny report was that there was not a perfect governance structure and there were advantages and disadvantages to different models. It was the behaviours and the ways of operating within that system that ultimately determined how successful they were.
- 8.36 It was right to say that digital communication was increasingly popular and to recognise that there was a large number of people in the city for whom that was not an option, perhaps because of affordability or having the skills to be able to engage with it. Therefore, the Council had to ensure that there were other mechanisms to communicate with people as individuals.
- 8.37 Both the business community and voluntary sector had been involved in

the process through the work of the Scrutiny Committee and in the Big City Conversation. The Council would seek to continue to involve partners in those two sectors and partners in the public sector as well.

- 8.38 Whichever model was adopted, the responsibility for taking decisions was with councillors and they were elected by the public. Decisions could also be delegated to Council officers. Involvement of the community before the Council made decisions was something which the Council could further consider and develop.
- 8.39 No follow up action from the Big City Conversation had been taken at this point because the process was ongoing. When it was completed, the results would be analysed and thought could be given to what needed to be done and to understand in more depth what was behind some of the issues.
- 8.40 The Scrutiny Committee report was clear that it was important that people were well informed about the decisions that the Council was taking.
- 8.41 The information from the Big City Conversation was also reflected nationally in that people generally wanted to get involved in the issues that matter to them and there were different mechanisms by which they might do so. It was also clear from the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee report that Members were elected with a mandate to implement a manifesto and they had a mandate to govern and to make the decisions. The findings of the Committee were that people wanted to have a say on those things but they expected elected Members to implement them.
- 8.42 Members of the Council then made comments relating to the issue of the Council's governance and the report of the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee.
- 8.43 **RESOLVED:** That this Council approves the recommendations made by the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, that:-
- (a) the Council endorses the ambitions, governance principles and ways of working, as set out in its report, to shape future governance options;
- (b) work commences as soon as possible to implement the following:-
- Strengthening Sheffield City Council's approach to Scrutiny
 - A commitment to the highest ethical standards and ensuring that the Code of Conduct reflects this
 - Improving Sheffield City Council's approach to

communicating about how decision making works

- Ensuring that a commitment to meaningful community engagement, involvement and consultation runs through the organisation
- Improving the information that we provide about how decision making happens across the city as a whole, and how partnerships and boards interconnect; and

- (c) following the referendum, the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee provides cross party oversight of the development of the new governance arrangements prior to their implementation.