

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 20 July 2022, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

**PRESENT**

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards)

- |   |   |    |  |    |   |
|---|---|----|--|----|---|
| 1 | <i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i><br>Simon Clement-Jones<br>Richard Shaw<br>Sophie Thornton | 10 | <i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i><br>Vic Bowden<br>Craig Gamble Pugh<br>Alan Woodcock | 19 | <i>Nether Edge &amp; Sharrow Ward</i><br>Nighat Basharat<br>Maroof Raouf                    |
| 2 | <i>Beighton Ward</i><br>Kurtis Crossland<br>Bob McCann<br>Ann Woolhouse                         | 11 | <i>Ecclesall Ward</i><br>Roger Davison<br>Barbara Masters<br>Shaffaq Mohammed    | 20 | <i>Park &amp; Arbourthorne</i><br>Ben Miskell   |
| 3 | <i>Birley Ward</i><br>Denise Fox<br>Bryan Lodge<br>Karen McGowan                                | 12 | <i>Firth Park Ward</i><br>Fran Belbin<br>Abtisam Mohamed<br>Abdul Khayum         | 21 | <i>Richmond Ward</i><br>David Barker<br>Mike Drabble<br>Dianne Hurst                        |
| 4 | <i>Broomhill &amp; Sharrow Vale Ward</i><br>Angela Argenzio<br>Maleiki Haybe                    | 13 | <i>Fulwood Ward</i><br>Sue Alston<br>Andrew Sangar                               | 22 | <i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i><br>Dawn Dale<br>Peter Price<br>Garry Weatherall     |
| 5 | <i>Burngreave Ward</i><br>Talib Hussain<br>Mark Jones<br>Safiya Saeed                           | 14 | <i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i><br>Marieanne Elliot<br>Paul Turpin                  | 23 | <i>Southey Ward</i><br>Tony Damms<br>Jayne Dunn   |
| 6 | <i>City Ward</i><br>Ruth Mersereau<br>Martin Phipps<br>Douglas Johnson                          | 15 | <i>Graves Park Ward</i><br>Ian Auckland<br>Sue Auckland<br>Steve Ayris           | 24 | <i>Stannington Ward</i><br>Penny Baker<br>Vickie Priestley<br>Richard Williams              |
| 7 | <i>Crookes &amp; Crosspool Ward</i><br>Tim Huggan   | 16 | <i>Hillsborough Ward</i><br>Christine Gilligan<br>George Lindars-Hammond         | 25 | <i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i><br>Lewis Chinchin<br>Julie Grocutt<br>Janet Ridler |
| 8 | <i>Darnall Ward</i><br>Mazher Iqbal<br>Mary Lea<br>Zahira Naz                                   | 17 | <i>Manor Castle Ward</i><br>Terry Fox<br>Anne Murphy<br>Sioned-Mair Richards     | 26 | <i>Walkley Ward</i><br>Ben Curran<br>Tom Hunt<br>Bernard Little                             |
| 9 | <i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i><br>Joe Otten<br>Martin Smith                                      | 18 | <i>Mosborough Ward</i><br>Kevin Oxley<br>Gail Smith                              | 27 | <i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i><br>Alan Hooper<br>Mike Levery<br>Ann Whitaker                  |
|   |   |    |  | 28 | <i>Woodhouse Ward</i><br>Mick Rooney<br>Jackie Satur  |

## **1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mike Chaplin, Alexi Dimond, Tony Downing, Peter Garbutt, Brian Holmshaw, Ruth Milsom, Nabeela Mowlana, Henry Nottage, Minesh Parekh, Colin Ross, Sophie Wilson, Paul Wood and Cliff Woodcraft.
- 1.2 It was agreed that the congratulations and best wishes of the Council be conveyed to Councillor Sophie Wilson and her partner on the recent birth of their daughter.

## **2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 2.1 Councillor Jackie Satur declared a personal interest in agenda item 6 – Notice of Motion Regarding “Guaranteeing No More Bus Service Cuts And No More Fare Increases” – on the grounds that her husband was a director of First Buses.

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

### **3.1 Clive Stephenson, Licensing Strategy & Policy Officer**

- 3.1.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) reported that Clive Stephenson, Licensing Strategy & Policy Officer, had suddenly and unexpectedly died a couple of days ago. She expressed her sadness and shock at Clive’s death and invited Councillor David Barker, a Joint Chair of the Licensing Committee, to speak to pay tribute to Clive.
- 3.1.2 Councillor Barker paid tribute to Clive for his professionalism and dedication to the Council in his role within the taxi licensing service and commented on the high regard within which he was held by Councillors and the taxi trade. He stated that Clive’s death was a loss to the Council and to the city and he extended his sympathies to Clive’s family, friends and colleagues.
- 3.1.3 The Lord Mayor asked that the condolences of the Council be conveyed to Clive’s family.

### **3.2 Parish Nursing Project**

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) reported that a collection for the Parish Nursing Project, which had been held at the previous meeting of the Council, had raised the amount of £2,010, and those funds would be used to support the services provided by the Parish Nurses to marginalised people in the community.

### **3.3 UEFA European Women's Football Championship 2022**

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) expressed her thanks to the Council's Major Events Team, and other Council and partner organisation services, for their work in hosting UEFA European Women's Football Championship 2022 matches within the city over recent weeks.

### 3.4 Petitions and Public Questions

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) reported that four petitions and questions from twelve members of the public had been received prior to the published deadline for submission of petitions and questions for this meeting. Representations were to be made on behalf of the petitioners on one of the four petitions and the other three petitions would be received in the absence of a speaker. The Lord Mayor added that questions from another two members of the public had been received yesterday and immediately prior to the meeting and she proposed to use her discretion, as chair of the meeting, and permit the questions to be asked on this occasion.

### 3.5 Petitions

#### 3.5.1 Petition Requesting Action On Pension Divestment

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition containing 197 signatures requesting action on pension divestment.

At the request of the Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards), Martin Meyer and Sarah Johnson made representations on behalf of the petitioners and June Cattell, Sue Owen, Hilary Smith, Ayan Abdulkadir and Flis Callow were also invited to ask the questions that they had submitted on this matter.

Martin Meyer, on behalf of the petitioners, requested the Council to join the Palestinian call for international support for boycott divestment and sanctions in supporting justice for Palestine. Several authoritative organisations have declared that Israel operates as an apartheid state. Amnesty International's report details that fragmentation and segregation of occupied Palestinian land, denial of Palestinian's rights to equality, equal nationality and status, restriction of Palestinians' movement as a means of control of people, separation of families through discriminatory laws, forced dispossession of Palestinian land and property to support secular colonialism, administrative detention and torture, unlawful killings and serious injuries. Mr Meyer stated that Michael Link, former United Nations Special Rappateur for occupied Palestine argues that Israel's system of oppression, discrimination, control and abusive treatment meets the international definition of apartheid. The petitioners therefore call on the Council to accept Amnesty International's report and re-affirm its 1981 commitment to be an apartheid-free zone. The petitioners also call on the Council to campaign for the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority to commit to divestment in companies shown to be complicit in human rights abuse, including those involved in the ongoing oppression of the Palestinian people.

Sarah Johnson stated that the petitioners were calling on the Council to recommit to a position taken in 1981. She referred to Sheffield's long and proud

history of fighting injustice, and quoted the then Council Leader, Councillor David Blunkett – “we were the first local authority to pledge to end all links with apartheid”. Public pensions investments played a big role, and by 1985, 120 local councils had taken some form of anti-apartheid initiative. Ms Johnson referred to the steps taken by Professor Michael Link, in urging local pension schemes to divest from any holdings linked to Israeli settlements. Today, the Government aimed to control how public service pensions were invested, rather than allowing pensions authorities to decide. Whilst pensions authorities have a responsibility to maximise their returns, they must be free to decide how and where to invest and divest, particularly when considering human rights and the planet. Ms Johnson referred to Palestine’s call for a global citizen’s response of solidarity with their struggle for freedom, justice and equality. The petitioners therefore hoped that the Council could do this by committing to its proud and historic stance, and support this petition.

The Council also received five public questions relating to this issue, as follows:-

June Cattell

1. There are clear and irrefutable arguments that Israel is an apartheid state and Sheffield should not shy away from criticism of apartheid in Israel any more than it did with South Africa in the eighties because of concerns about being labelled antisemitic. My question is “When apartheid in Israel is demonstrated daily with ongoing daily killings of Palestinians, seizure of Palestinian lands, the ongoing use of military detention including minors, unequal land rights and many other injustices, what MORE will it take for Sheffield City Council to name the injustice in Israel for what it is - “Apartheid”, support boycott of Israel in goods, culture, academia and sport and ask its councillors who sit on South Yorkshire Pension Authority to pressurise the Authority to divest from Israeli companies especially those that have links with the Israeli illegal settlements.” I hope Sheffield Councillors today can show the courage they did in 1981.

Sue Owen

2. What steps are you as a council taking to oppose the Government's profoundly undemocratic attempts to restrict the freedom of local councils to make their own ethical decisions with regard to pension investment and other investment and procurement decisions. This is particularly important in relation to Palestine and investments in companies that support Israel's apartheid system and breaking of international law, which the Government is aiming to protect with its anti BDS legislation. What are you doing to try and retain the democratic right as a Local Authority to make your own ethical decisions for Sheffield people who are members of the Local Authority pension fund?

Hilary Smith

3. Having worked for South Yorkshire Councils for many years and contributed to the South Yorkshire Pension fund for over 20 years, I feel outraged that the Government is planning to curtail the influence that pension fund members can

have on where our money is invested. This Council rightly has high expectations of its staff in applying principles of justice and fairness and I feel this should extend to its expectations of the pension fund as well. I want to know how the Council is going to support me in opposing the iniquitous legislation that the Government is trying to introduce, which severely limits the influence members who have contributed to the scheme for many years can have.

Ayan Abdulkadir

4. Does the Council think it hypocritical that the international community has not boycotted the Israel government due to their 73-year-long apartheid, occupation and annexation against the Palestinian civilians when they boycotted the Russian government due to Putin's invasion of Ukraine after 7 days?

Flis Callow

5. As well as a verbal answer to our questions today we would like to receive written responses and an invitation to the relevant committees which will deal with the petition and with issues of procurement and investment. I would like to know how Sheffield City Council and its representatives on the Pensions Authority will ensure there is due diligence to ensure companies behave in line with the principles of the well-recognized international human rights standards and the UN Guiding Principles on Business and Human Rights.

The Council referred the petition and the questions to Councillor Terry Fox, Leader of the Council and Chair of the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee. Councillor Fox thanked the lead petitioners and the questioners and stated that he was aware of the implications of the subject matter, and referred to action taken by the Authority to date, in terms of discussions held with representatives of the Palestinian and Jewish communities in the city. Councillor Fox declared an interest in the issue, as a member of the South Yorkshire Pensions Scheme, and stated that he would arrange for a written response to be sent to the lead petitioner and the questioners. He added that he would seek legal advice in terms of what action, if any, could be taken by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee in this regard.

### 3.5.2 Petition Requesting Cameras On And Around Frecheville Pond

The Council received an electronic petition containing 54 signatures, requesting cameras on and around Frecheville Pond. There was no speaker for this petition.

The Council referred the petition to the Communities, Parks and Leisure Policy Committee.

### 3.5.3 Petition Requesting The Creation Of Residents Only Parking Permit Zones For The Roads Off Abbeydale Road

The Council received an electronic petition containing ten signatures, requesting the creation of residents only parking permit zones for the roads off

Abbeydale Road. There was no speaker for this petition.

The Council referred the petition to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee.

#### 3.5.4 Petition Requesting The Demolition Of Outhouses At Busk Meadows

The Council received an electronic petition containing ten signatures, requesting the demolition of outhouses at Busk Meadows. There was no speaker for this petition.

The Council referred the petition to the Housing Policy Committee.

### 3.6 Public Questions

#### 3.6.1 Public Question Regarding Pension Disinvestment in Fossil Fuel Companies

Kate Stott asked the following question:

Sheffield City Council declared a climate emergency in 2019. A commissioned analysis by the Tyndall Centre states that the city needs to reach zero or near zero carbon no later than 2038 for Sheffield to make its fair contribution to the Paris Climate Change Agreement.

However, one of the largest investors in South Yorkshire, the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority (SYPA), still invests directly in fossil fuel companies to the tune of £230 million. With five Sheffield Councillors on the Pensions committee broadly supportive of the need to reduce the carbon exposure of the fund, and similar support from other committee members, the fund still refuses to disinvest from fossil fuels. Money that could be reinvested in the local economy in one of the many exciting opportunities such as the Ultimate Battery Company based at the AMRC.

To add insult to injury, the pension fund provides pensions for Council employees and Councillors across the region, and continued investment in fossil fuels puts those pensions at risk.

The excuse, or stalling tactic, given by the pension fund, is that the Border to Coast Pension Pool (BCPP) don't offer a carbon-free investment vehicle for equities and that SYPA don't want to invest outside the pool.

I call on Sheffield City Council to deliver on their climate emergency declaration by applying pressure on SYPA to disinvest their holdings in fossil fuel companies, either via a fossil-free equity fund within the BCPP or if this is not forthcoming, outside the pool.

In response, Councillor Julie Grocutt (Co-Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) thanked Ms Stott for raising the question, and stated that the Pensions Authority had agreed a Net Zero goal which aligns with the City Council's. This is amongst the most ambitious such goals set, not just within the Local Government Pension Scheme, but within the wider Pensions

Industry, and the Authority's officers are working to try to deliver this. However, the role of the Pensions Authority is not to be an instrument of policy, but to pay pensions and while risks such as climate change rightly form part of the decision-making process, it is this overriding duty that must be the Authority's priority.

This year, being the year in which the actuarial valuation of the Fund is being undertaken, also provides the opportunity for the periodic review of the investment strategy. This review will incorporate consideration of changes to the allocation of asset to individual products that will support both the achievement of required returns and the achievement of the Net Zero goal. However, it is worth emphasising that emissions related to the Fund's equity portfolios, which are the focus of this question, have reduced by 49% compared to the 2019 starting point. The Strategy Review will need to consider the type of products that the Fund invests in, but simply changing the product you invest in does not remove one tonne of emissions from the atmosphere and also needs to be considered within the context of the partnership with 10 other funds within which the Authority operates to make investments. The Strategy must, however, generate at least a 70% probability of achieving the required investment return in order to ensure that the Fund's liabilities can be met without seeking significant additional employer contributions which would impact directly on the Council's budget.

The Authority has a long standing policy of investing in climate solutions, and already has more money invested in renewable energy than in fossil fuel companies. Beyond this, a three-year commitment of £240m has been made to a specific Climate Opportunities product. This, together with ongoing commitments to infrastructure investment and other private market products, will continue to increase exposure to climate solutions. However, the Authority is not equipped to make individual direct investments into local businesses and private equity investments of this sort would need to be made through fund managers who have the necessary expertise and whose involvement avoids potential conflicts of interest.

### 3.6.2 Public Questions Regarding Support to Vulnerable People in the Stradbroke Area

Helen Eadon asked the following questions:

1: At present what is being done, and who is doing it, to help and support those being impacted by the cost of living crisis in the Stradbroke area? What are the future plans to support people in need in this area who will be impacted when we have further price increases in gas, electricity and the cost of living during cold Winter months?

2: When did the review of Sheffield City Council's Community buildings start? What is the review for? What is the end date for the review? Why can't community buildings be used by the community whilst the review is taking place? Why has previous requests for the community to use the community buildings in the Stradbroke not been acted on?

In response, Councillor Terry Fox (the Leader of the Council and Chair of the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee) thanked Ms Eadon for raising the questions, and for the excellent work she and other residents were undertaking to help people through this cost of living crisis. The Council had taken decisive action in an attempt to mitigate the effects of the inflation and the huge increase in energy costs on families and local communities. The Strategy and Resources Policy Committee, at its meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> July, 2022, had identified a number of key areas to address, and had identified £200,000 towards supporting local food banks. There was also £5.2m crisis support funding for tenants, under the Housing Support Fund, together with food vouchers for families with children receiving free school meals, during the summer holidays. In addition, there was a cross-party, strategic response to the crisis, which included input from partners across the public, private and voluntary sectors. The Local Area Committees (LACs), comprising local Ward Councillors, were also engaged in terms of identifying those areas of greatest need, such as Stradbroke. The Council would be continuing, as a matter of urgency, with its review of community buildings, and would be working closely with voluntary organisations and the LACs. Councillor Fox concluded by placing on record his sympathy for those individuals and families who were suffering, on a day-to-day basis, due to the cost of living crisis.

### 3.6.3 Public Questions Regarding the Council's Disposal of Unused Land at Walshaw Road, Worrall

Robin Hughes asked the following questions:-

Members may recall my previous questions to Council on 2nd February 2022 and the Co-operative Executive on 20th April regarding a proposed housing development in the village of Worrall. This would entail the demolition of a historic 18th century farmhouse and barn and impact to the setting of listed buildings, unless the Council agree to sell a small piece of land on Walshaw Road as alternative access, which is the Council's preferred alternative. I was assured that the urgency was understood, an extension of time would be sought, and the sale of the land would be negotiated.

Regrettably, this remains unresolved. The extension expired on 29th April, and there has been no visible progress. Having originally tried to push the developer towards a planning appeal, at a time when this was no longer legally possible, the Council now appears to be dragging its feet, despite Members repeatedly promising action. The pointless and avoidable loss of historic buildings becomes increasingly likely.

Will this Council:-

- (1) Urgently instruct its officers to conclude the sale of this land without further delay?;
- (2) Make public the reasons for its failure to do so before now?; and



(3) Update its Property Strategy so that it states clearly that where Council property is important to the preservation and public enjoyment of designated heritage assets or their settings, this will be given priority?.

In response, Councillor Julie Grocutt (Co-Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) thanked Mr Hughes for raising the questions, and stated that, with regard to Question 1, officers have held several discussions with the owners and their representatives regarding the sale of the land. This is a commercial negotiation and the buyer is clearly trying other angles before they reach an agreement with the Council. The Council is willing to sell its land and is happy to continue negotiations with the agent.

In response to Question 2, Councillor Grocutt stated that any sale requires a willing buyer and a willing seller, and until both parties reach a financial agreement which reflects the value of the land in question and achieves best consideration for the Council, the Council is unable to move the sale forward. Clearly the owners are reluctant to purchase additional land and are still trying to make the development work within the existing site boundaries, without the additional expense. Officers have engaged with the owners and shown willingness to progress a sale. However, the Council cannot force the owners to purchase the land.

In response to Question 3, Councillor Grocutt stated that this is already a consideration in the use of Council assets, but this does not mean the Council gives its assets away. Legally, it must achieve best consideration when considering sale of its land.

#### 3.6.4 Public Questions Regarding the Proposed Creation of Bus Lanes on Ecclesall and Abbeydale Road

Nasar Raof asked the following questions:-

There are 3 questions the businesses have. I am here in front of the councillors today on behalf of the Say No to Red Lines group.

1. Why have the results of an economic assessment not been published and done with the businesses on the impact of red lines?
2. Are the Council going to compensate heavily any losses that are forthcoming for local businesses upon the implementation of the red lines?
3. With the declining bus services and learning earlier in the month that 1/3 buses will be cut going forward, why are more bus lanes being created ? This doesn't make sense at all.

In response, Councillor Julie Grocutt (Co-Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) thanked Mr Raof for raising the questions, and stated that Members were well aware of the concerns raised, as well as the general concerns regarding the current cost of living crisis. She stressed that no decision had been made in terms of the red lines, and that the issue would

be discussed at a future meeting of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee. In response to Question 1, Councillor Grocutt stated that as part of the outline business case to be submitted to the Mayoral Combined Authority, an economic assessment had been undertaken to determine the wider costs and benefits of the scheme. However, an economic assessment had not yet been undertaken on the impact of the proposed red lines on the businesses on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, as the red lines would increase existing restrictions on the corridors, and would still allow for parking and loading and unloading outside the red line hours of operation. Businesses would not be able to load and unload on the double-red lines as they currently could on the double-yellow lines, but the Council would look to introduce more loading bays for use by businesses if the scheme was progressed. The red lines were being proposed to allow for enhanced enforcement of the loading and waiting restrictions on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, with the cameras. The Council would be required to advertise a Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) before any proposed changes were made, and no decision had yet been made as to what those changes would be. The public would have an opportunity to comment following the advertisement of the TRO.

In response to Question 2, Councillor Grocutt stated that red lines would allow for enhanced enforcement of existing restrictions on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall road, with the cameras. These lines would not increase existing parking restrictions along the two corridors, although loading and unloading was prohibited on red lines for most drivers. Therefore, as part of the investigations into whether or not the red lines were to be introduced, additional parking bays to serve businesses would be considered.

In response to Question 3, Councillor Grocutt stated that it was not proposed to increase the length of the bus lanes on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, although bus priority measures were proposed on both corridors to enhance the reliability and consistency of bus services, and to improve access on the corridors, and into the city centre.

### 3.6.5 Public Questions Regarding Climate Change

Sam Wakelin asked the following questions:-

1. This meeting marks three years since this Council gave a full meeting to receiving and approving the climate science report from the renowned Tyndall Centre. It showed that to limit global heating to 1.7C, Sheffield needed dramatic and immediate changes. We are now three years on and none of these changes can be seen. In addition, holding to 1.5C needs around double the speed of change. Councillor Fox said this year that "The sky isn't going to fall in tomorrow because of climate change." and "we want a more calculated pace." Does this show that he doesn't understand that this is a life and death crisis for all of us? Or that he does not care?
2. How does Councillor Fox reflect on his record of delivery on the climate crisis while serving as Leader, and what does he say to those who have lost loved ones this week due to unprecedented extreme heat? Or to the estimated

more than 1,500 Sheffields killed by fossil fuel air pollution in the time since he voted to declare a climate emergency?

In response, Councillor Terry Fox (the Leader of the Council and Chair of the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee) commented that when holding politicians to account, people should think through the language they use and what they say. He added that he understood why people may say the things they do, but it should be considered that Councillors were elected by the community, that they too were human beings, not machines, and know how to use empathy, and he asked that people realise that the language they use does count, that Councillors live, eat and breathe within communities.

One of his aims since becoming Leader was to soften the rhetoric but he has asked people to hold him to account. Councillor Fox believed that we were in the midst of a climate emergency, and that the Council must take strong action and lead from the front to tackle this issue. The point he was trying to make during the interview referred to by Mr. Wakelin was that a climate emergency was also a climate injustice, and the Council must lead from the front to tackle this emergency and take the community with it, not make their lives worse and it was no good enacting measures that some people would be totally against. The public needed to work with us all, with Councillors, Local Area Committees and Policy Committees. Some of the rhetoric coming back was hostile and aggressive and, especially following the problems faced during the pandemic, he felt that we all should be able to talk our problems through. Councillor Fox said that as a city, there was a need to tackle the climate emergency together in a fair way and see it not only as a necessity but as a positive to enact in people's lives. The Labour Administration rolled out the clean air zone (CAZ) proposal and had worked hard with the Government and obtained £24m funding to enforce it in ensuring that it targeted the most polluting buses, taxis, coaches and lorries. The transition into the CAZ must be done fairly with less polluting private cars and the right financial support package for that transition. Councillor Fox said that, along with Councillor Douglas Johnson, he had attended conferences held with taxi drivers and listened to the difficulties those drivers faced and would have to overcome. Councillor Fox had also listened to the issues that business owners along Ecclesall Road were facing coming out of the crisis. There was a need to allow people to drive their cars and encourage them to drive clean cars.

Councillor Fox added that another example was the housing strategy, and this Administration was committed to getting its housing stock to net zero, but this had to be done whilst delivering affordability as its tenants were facing the highest inflation rates in 40 years.

Councillor Fox said he might have been careless with words by saying that the sky won't fall in tomorrow because of climate change, but it didn't mean that it should be tackled on the backs of the poor and the vulnerable. The Council was the first local authority to ban fracking, it introduced the clean air zone, smoke free zones and ensured that brownfield sites would be used effectively. The Council purchased 100% renewable energy and had invested millions of pounds in providing insulation and new roofs to its housing stock and was now

working with anchor organisations to clean up their buildings, their vehicles and seek their commitment to support renewable energy in their estates.

Councillor Fox said that this Council under Labour leadership had spent millions on sustainable transport initiatives such as Active Travel, cycle lanes, bus lanes etc. but now the Council was at another crossroads because, whilst there was a focus on public transport, the city was now facing the possibility that a third of bus routes were to be cut. He stated that Government funding cuts had to stop. The Council was now working cross party and was working together in all its Committees and he asked that the people of Sheffield come and join the debate and come with the Council along its journey. Whilst that journey would be hard, it was the right thing to do.

### 3.6.6 Public Question Regarding Housing Repairs

Val Wilson said that she was severely disabled and has had adaptations carried out to her bungalow in both the kitchen and bathroom and was now waiting for safety flooring to be fitted to the bathroom floor. Mrs. Wilson outlined all her falls and ailments and felt that the Council was not keeping to their promises to attend to the everyday living needs of its Council tenants and that repairs were being pushed aside.

In response, Councillor Douglas Johnson (Chair of the Housing Policy Committee) said that he was sorry to hear about Mrs. Wilson's falls and asked if she could leave her details with the officers in attendance about what was needed, and he would ask someone from housing services to contact her.

### 3.6.7 Public Question Regarding Mental Health Services

Jonathan Marsden said that he used to be a manager within the Derbyshire County Council Mental Health Service and has also carried out mental health work around Sheffield and has noticed the severe cutbacks within the Service. He said that the triage system isn't working and referred to a situation whereby three women that have SEN children were not being seen in the same way as someone on their own. These concerns have been raised with relevant officials, including the Director of Public Health, to make them aware that there needs to be a system shift.

In response, Councillor Angela Argenzio (Co-Chair of the Adult Health and Social Care Policy Committee) said that although she didn't have a full answer to hand, she totally takes on board the points raised by Mr. Marsden and stated that she would ask officers to provide her with details of how the service currently operated and she would then provide Mr. Marsden with a written answer. She added that she would be happy to meet with Mr. Marsden, at his request, to discuss this matter further.

### 3.6.8 (NOTE: Questions which had been submitted by Bridget Ingle and Loveday Herridge, but which were not asked at the meeting, would receive a written response from the Chair of the relevant Policy Committee).

#### **4. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

##### **4.1 Urgent Business**

With the permission of the Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards), Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed asked the following question relating to urgent business, under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6(ii):-

What steps does the Leader of the Council intend to take to help secure the future of Doncaster Sheffield Airport?

In response, Councillor Terry Fox (the Leader of the Council) stated that since the recent announcement regarding the future of the Airport, which took the Council by surprise, an emergency meeting was called with the South Yorkshire Leaders and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority. Councillor Fox had also met with the other South Yorkshire Leaders, the Mayor of South Yorkshire, local Members of Parliament, including Louise Haigh (Shadow Secretary of State for Transport), to discuss the implications of the Airport closing down. All the South Yorkshire Authorities were working hard to seek answers following the announcement as it was not clear what the exact position was. There was currently a six-week consultation period, and a request had been made for this to be extended. Councillor Fox referred to other planned meetings with interested parties, including meetings to discuss the potential job losses if the Airport was to close. The Council was continuing to work with the other South Yorkshire Authorities and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority to see if they could offer any assistance. Councillor Fox expressed sympathy and concern regarding the adverse effects of a possible closure, which included inconvenience to people who had booked flights there, damage to the regeneration of the region and the potential loss of around 800 jobs. He stated that he would ensure that Members and local residents were kept fully informed of any progress made following the various meetings.

##### **4.2 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities**

4.2.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) referred to the unprecedented heat wave being experienced in the country and to the fact that a state of emergency had been operating within South Yorkshire's emergency services in recent days, and she invited Councillor Tony Damms, the Chair of the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority, to comment on the response of the local fire and rescue services.

Councillor Damms commended the work undertaken by firefighters in such exceptionally demanding circumstances over the past few days, and also acknowledged the assistance provided by support staff of the Fire and Rescue Service and he proposed that a letter of thanks, from the Lord Mayor, on behalf of the Council, be sent to the Chief Fire Officer expressing thanks and appreciation for the work of the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service over the past few days. Councillor Paul Turpin seconded that proposal.

The Lord Mayor suggested that the thanks of this Council should also be extended to the South Yorkshire Police and Ambulance services, and to Council services who had been involved in the emergency responses in recent days. This suggestion was supported by the Council.

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

#### 4.3 Written Questions

A schedule of questions to Chairs of Policy Committees, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated. Supplementary questions, under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4, were asked and were answered by the appropriate Policy Committee Chairs until the expiry of the time limit for Members' Questions (in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.7).

(NOTE: During the proceedings of item 4.3, Councillor Douglas Johnson drew the attention of the meeting to an administrative error on page 3 of the schedule of questions and answers, which contained answers purporting to be from himself. He stated that the questions concerned were also repeated on page 27 of the document and his answers to those questions were correctly stated on page 27, not on page 3. The Members' Q&As document, as published on the Council website, has been corrected accordingly.)

At this point in the proceedings, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) left the meeting, and it was RESOLVED: That, in the absence of both the Lord Mayor and Deputy Lord Mayor, Councillor Anne Murphy be appointed as chair for the remainder of the meeting.

### 5. **NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "GUARANTEEING NO MORE BUS SERVICE CUTS AND NO MORE FARE INCREASES" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ANDREW SANGAR AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR KURTIS CROSSLAND**

- 5.1 It was moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, and seconded by Councillor Kurtis Crossland, that this Council:-
- (a) is hugely disappointed at the cancellation of a number of bus services in Sheffield coming at the end of this month;
  - (b) believes that the further cuts to come in the Autumn will devastate Sheffield's public transport system, making many people's lives much

harder as they will struggle to get around our city;

- (c) believes that the Sheffield Bus Partnership has failed the citizens of Sheffield by not improving services and keeping fares low, which has led to:-
  - (i) cuts to services available to the general public;
  - (ii) extortionate fare increases, forcing people to use their cars over public transport as a cheaper and more accessible option; and
  - (iii) a lack of public confidence in the reliability of the bus service, which is also contributing to decreasing passenger numbers; noting that punctuality of bus services has reduced, down to 83% from 87% over the past five years, whilst reliability is at its lowest rate in years;
- (d) is concerned that increased car use will add to air pollution in the city centre if fewer people are using more energy efficient bus services and that cuts to bus services are preventing people from getting to work, school, running errands and attending medical appointments;
- (e) further notes that London, which was not subject to bus deregulation in 1986, has seen decade upon decade increases in bus patronage and mileage;
- (f) notes that, under the Bus Services Act 2017, the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority has the power to enact bus franchising and that this was agreed in the original 2015 Sheffield devolution deal;
- (g) believes that bus franchising will be a long-term solution to these problems, allowing bus operators and local authorities to work collaboratively to improve bus services and realise untapped growth potentials in regional and rural areas;
- (h) resolves to:-
  - (i) call on the Council's and Regional Authority's leaderships to protect passengers from further fare increases, cuts to routes and unreliable services by using any available means, which could include, but not necessarily be limited to:-
    - (A) giving notice to immediately terminate any Bus Partnership Agreement;
    - (B) enlisting the full support of South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority;
    - (C) an active media campaign; and

- (D) a review of existing bus priority measures in order to deliver a more reliable, greener and efficient bus service;
  - (ii) support the introduction of a statutory bus quality contract in Sheffield; and
  - (iii) send copies of this motion to all the other parties to the Bus Partnership Agreement; and
- (i) believes that alongside the strategic long-term problems with buses in our city there are a number of smaller, simpler issues that need to be resolved in order to give Sheffield the best possible bus and mass transit services, and these include:-
- (i) improving the accuracy of real time information signage at bus stops;
  - (ii) making sure every bus stop accurately identifies the buses that stop there, and has accurate timetables physically displayed; and
  - (iii) linking trams to buses at terminals as part of making sure that all of Sheffield's mass transit services link together to provide a properly integrated service.
- 5.1.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the Motion (Councillor Andrew Sangar), the Motion as published on the agenda was altered by the substitution of the word "any" for the word "the" in subparagraph (h)(i)(A) of the Motion.)
- 5.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Tom Hunt, and seconded by Councillor Fran Belbin, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (j) to (m) as follows:-
- (j) notes that the Sheffield Bus Partnership was, effectively, the only option at the Council's disposal at the time to bring bus operators and transport authorities together, and that, for all of this Partnership's failings, it did deliver reduced fares and more local control over input into the routes and delivery of the bus operations than would have been achieved by simply doing nothing;
  - (k) recalls comments by former Liberal Democrat Transport Minister, Norman Baker, "The Sheffield Bus Agreement is good news for the city and shows what can be achieved when local councils, bus operators and transport authorities work together for the benefit of passengers. This partnership will transform passengers' experience by making bus travel easier and cheaper" and recalls that the Liberal Democrats in government favoured pursuing the Bus Partnership Agreement, rather than providing local authorities with the means and finances to run their own services;



- (l) notes that the Bus Partnership Agreement is no longer in existence, having been replaced by the South Yorkshire Enhanced Partnership – which unlike the previous voluntary agreement has more statutory influence - and that this was only agreed in March 2022 and launched under the new Mayor in June 2022, bringing together the new South Yorkshire Mayor, all South Yorkshire Local Authority Leaders, and representatives from bus operators; and
- (m) notes that the process to begin franchising is underway, something councillors from across the chamber have called for, but that the process will take approximately 18 months and believes that at present the enhanced partnership is currently the best course of action available to influence bus operators, and that it would be a terrible decision for Sheffield to be the only local authority without a voice and influence within this partnership.

5.3 It was then moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and seconded by Councillor Bernard Little, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (j) to (o) as follows:-

- (j) believes that politicians across South Yorkshire have undermined public transport for many years by promoting individual car use, through providing free or low-cost car parking in town / city centres, ineffective and insufficient parking enforcement and active opposition to improvement measures like bus lanes or residents' parking schemes;
- (k) regrets the lack of ambition set out in the Bus Service Improvement Plan submitted to the Government by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority and in particular that “success” would have meant fewer people using buses in the future;
- (l) notes that bus operators are commercial companies and are not primarily there to provide a public service; and therefore believes in a need for public ownership and control of buses;
- (m) believes that public transport is an equality issue, as only 35% of the population in the bottom 10% of wealth own a car, whereas 93% of the top 10% own at least one;
- (n) notes that Yorkshire and Humberside already gets only £500 per head of population spent on transport compared with £1,476 for London (in 2020/21) and believes that the Government cannot be serious about “levelling up” until it guarantees equal funding; and
- (o) however, recognises that this Council must do what it can to support as many buses on as many routes as it can and therefore requests the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to consider using all the levers at its disposal to make public transport more attractive than private cars, including:-

- (i) advertising to promote public transport usage, in particular aimed at those who do not routinely use buses and including through the universities;
- (ii) lower fares, multi-operator tickets and tap-on technology as standard;
- (iii) measures for multi-modal travel, including bikes on trams;
- (iv) higher parking fees for private car ownership;
- (v) more priority routes for buses and trams;
- (vi) higher quality bus or tram shelters, and staffed bus/tram interchanges;
- (vii) more effective enforcement of illegal, selfish and dangerous parking that often goes unchecked;
- (viii) schemes such as an employer's workplace parking levy to reduce the perks of free parking and raise substantial sums to provide improved bus services, tram services and better walking and cycling infrastructure;
- (ix) allowing a reasonable increase in regulated taxi fares; and
- (x) encouraging innovative neighbourhood community hub bus services that serve local shopping areas.

5.4 After contributions from six other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Andrew Sangar, the amendment moved by Councillor Tom Hunt was put to the vote and was carried.

5.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 43 Members; AGAINST - 25 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Councillor Lewis Chinchon voted for, but abstained on paragraph (k) of the amendment.)

5.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was then put to the vote and was carried in part. Paragraphs (j), (k) & (o) of the amendment were lost and paragraphs (l), (m) & (n) of the amendment were carried.

5.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 39 Members; AGAINST - 26 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. The Labour Group members voted for, but against paragraphs (j) & (k) and abstained from voting on paragraph (o) of the amendment.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) is hugely disappointed at the cancellation of a number of bus services in Sheffield coming at the end of this month;
- (b) believes that the further cuts to come in the Autumn will devastate Sheffield's public transport system, making many people's lives much harder as they will struggle to get around our city;
- (c) believes that the Sheffield Bus Partnership has failed the citizens of Sheffield by not improving services and keeping fares low, which has led to:-
  - (i) cuts to services available to the general public;
  - (ii) extortionate fare increases, forcing people to use their cars over public transport as a cheaper and more accessible option; and
  - (iii) a lack of public confidence in the reliability of the bus service, which is also contributing to decreasing passenger numbers; noting that punctuality of bus services has reduced, down to 83% from 87% over the past five years, whilst reliability is at its lowest rate in years;
- (d) is concerned that increased car use will add to air pollution in the city centre if fewer people are using more energy efficient bus services and that cuts to bus services are preventing people from getting to work, school, running errands and attending medical appointments;
- (e) further notes that London, which was not subject to bus deregulation in 1986, has seen decade upon decade increases in bus patronage and mileage;
- (f) notes that, under the Bus Services Act 2017, the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority has the power to enact bus franchising and that this was agreed in the original 2015 Sheffield devolution deal;
- (g) believes that bus franchising will be a long-term solution to these problems, allowing bus operators and local authorities to work collaboratively to improve bus services and realise untapped growth potentials in regional and rural areas;
- (h) resolves to:-
  - (i) call on the Council's and Regional Authority's leaderships to protect passengers from further fare increases, cuts to routes and unreliable services by using any available means, which could include, but not necessarily be limited to:-
    - (A) giving notice to immediately terminate any Bus Partnership Agreement;

- (B) enlisting the full support of South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority;
  - (C) an active media campaign; and
  - (D) a review of existing bus priority measures in order to deliver a more reliable, greener and efficient bus service;
- (ii) support the introduction of a statutory bus quality contract in Sheffield;
- (iii) send copies of this motion to all the other parties to the Bus Partnership Agreement;
- (i) believes that alongside the strategic long-term problems with buses in our city there are a number of smaller, simpler issues that need to be resolved in order to give Sheffield the best possible bus and mass transit services, and these include:-
  - (i) improving the accuracy of real time information signage at bus stops;
  - (ii) making sure every bus stop accurately identifies the buses that stop there, and has accurate timetables physically displayed; and
  - (iii) linking trams to buses at terminals as part of making sure that all of Sheffield's mass transit services link together to provide a properly integrated service;
- (j) notes that the Sheffield Bus Partnership was, effectively, the only option at the Council's disposal at the time to bring bus operators and transport authorities together, and that, for all of this Partnership's failings, it did deliver reduced fares and more local control over input into the routes and delivery of the bus operations than would have been achieved by simply doing nothing;
- (k) recalls comments by former Liberal Democrat Transport Minister, Norman Baker, "The Sheffield Bus Agreement is good news for the city and shows what can be achieved when local councils, bus operators and transport authorities work together for the benefit of passengers. This partnership will transform passengers' experience by making bus travel easier and cheaper" and recalls that the Liberal Democrats in government favoured pursuing the Bus Partnership Agreement, rather than providing local authorities with the means and finances to run their own services;
- (l) notes that the Bus Partnership Agreement is no longer in existence, having been replaced by the South Yorkshire Enhanced Partnership – which unlike the previous voluntary agreement has more statutory

influence - and that this was only agreed in March 2022 and launched under the new Mayor in June 2022, bringing together the new South Yorkshire Mayor, all South Yorkshire Local Authority Leaders, and representatives from bus operators;

- (m) notes that the process to begin franchising is underway, something councillors from across the chamber have called for, but that the process will take approximately 18 months and believes that at present the enhanced partnership is currently the best course of action available to influence bus operators, and that it would be a terrible decision for Sheffield to be the only local authority without a voice and influence within this partnership;
- (n) notes that bus operators are commercial companies and are not primarily there to provide a public service; and therefore believes in a need for public ownership and control of buses;
- (o) believes that public transport is an equality issue, as only 35% of the population in the bottom 10% of wealth own a car, whereas 93% of the top 10% own at least one; and
- (p) notes that Yorkshire and Humberside already gets only £500 per head of population spent on transport compared with £1,476 for London (in 2020/21) and believes that the Government cannot be serious about “levelling up” until it guarantees equal funding.

5.6.1 On being put to the vote, the Substantive Motion was carried, except for paragraph (h)(i)(A) which was lost.

5.6.2 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 66 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. The Labour Group members voted for, but against paragraphs (c)(i), (ii) & (iii) and (h)(i)(A) of the Substantive Motion. The Liberal Democrat Group members voted for, but against paragraphs (j) to (o) of the Substantive Motion. The Green Group members voted for, but against paragraph (h)(i)(A) of the Substantive Motion. Councillor Lewis Chinchen voted for, but against paragraph (n) and abstained from voting on paragraphs (k) and (p) of the Substantive Motion.)

5.7 Accordingly, the resolution passed by the Council was as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) is hugely disappointed at the cancellation of a number of bus services in Sheffield coming at the end of this month;
- (b) believes that the further cuts to come in the Autumn will devastate Sheffield’s public transport system, making many people’s lives much harder as they will struggle to get around our city;

- (c) believes that the Sheffield Bus Partnership has failed the citizens of Sheffield by not improving services and keeping fares low, which has led to:-
  - (i) cuts to services available to the general public;
  - (ii) extortionate fare increases, forcing people to use their cars over public transport as a cheaper and more accessible option; and
  - (iii) a lack of public confidence in the reliability of the bus service, which is also contributing to decreasing passenger numbers; noting that punctuality of bus services has reduced, down to 83% from 87% over the past five years, whilst reliability is at its lowest rate in years;
- (d) is concerned that increased car use will add to air pollution in the city centre if fewer people are using more energy efficient bus services and that cuts to bus services are preventing people from getting to work, school, running errands and attending medical appointments;
- (e) further notes that London, which was not subject to bus deregulation in 1986, has seen decade upon decade increases in bus patronage and mileage;
- (f) notes that, under the Bus Services Act 2017, the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority has the power to enact bus franchising and that this was agreed in the original 2015 Sheffield devolution deal;
- (g) believes that bus franchising will be a long-term solution to these problems, allowing bus operators and local authorities to work collaboratively to improve bus services and realise untapped growth potentials in regional and rural areas;
- (h) resolves to:-
  - (i) call on the Council's and Regional Authority's leaderships to protect passengers from further fare increases, cuts to routes and unreliable services by using any available means, which could include, but not necessarily be limited to:-
    - (A) enlisting the full support of South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority;
    - (B) an active media campaign; and
    - (C) a review of existing bus priority measures in order to deliver a more reliable, greener and efficient bus service;
  - (ii) support the introduction of a statutory bus quality contract in Sheffield; and

- (iii) send copies of this motion to all the other parties to the Bus Partnership Agreement;
- (i) believes that alongside the strategic long-term problems with buses in our city there are a number of smaller, simpler issues that need to be resolved in order to give Sheffield the best possible bus and mass transit services, and these include:-
  - (i) improving the accuracy of real time information signage at bus stops;
  - (ii) making sure every bus stop accurately identifies the buses that stop there, and has accurate timetables physically displayed; and
  - (iii) linking trams to buses at terminals as part of making sure that all of Sheffield's mass transit services link together to provide a properly integrated service;
- (j) notes that the Sheffield Bus Partnership was, effectively, the only option at the Council's disposal at the time to bring bus operators and transport authorities together, and that, for all of this Partnership's failings, it did deliver reduced fares and more local control over input into the routes and delivery of the bus operations than would have been achieved by simply doing nothing;
- (k) recalls comments by former Liberal Democrat Transport Minister, Norman Baker, "The Sheffield Bus Agreement is good news for the city and shows what can be achieved when local councils, bus operators and transport authorities work together for the benefit of passengers. This partnership will transform passengers' experience by making bus travel easier and cheaper" and recalls that the Liberal Democrats in government favoured pursuing the Bus Partnership Agreement, rather than providing local authorities with the means and finances to run their own services;
- (l) notes that the Bus Partnership Agreement is no longer in existence, having been replaced by the South Yorkshire Enhanced Partnership – which unlike the previous voluntary agreement has more statutory influence - and that this was only agreed in March 2022 and launched under the new Mayor in June 2022, bringing together the new South Yorkshire Mayor, all South Yorkshire Local Authority Leaders, and representatives from bus operators;
- (m) notes that the process to begin franchising is underway, something councillors from across the chamber have called for, but that the process will take approximately 18 months and believes that at present the enhanced partnership is currently the best course of action available to influence bus operators, and that it would be a terrible decision for Sheffield to be the only local authority without a voice and influence

within this partnership;

- (n) notes that bus operators are commercial companies and are not primarily there to provide a public service; and therefore believes in a need for public ownership and control of buses;
- (o) believes that public transport is an equality issue, as only 35% of the population in the bottom 10% of wealth own a car, whereas 93% of the top 10% own at least one; and
- (p) notes that Yorkshire and Humberside already gets only £500 per head of population spent on transport compared with £1,476 for London (in 2020/21) and believes that the Government cannot be serious about “levelling up” until it guarantees equal funding.

**6. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "SECURE, CONNECTED, RESPECTED NEIGHBOURHOODS" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MAZHER IQBAL AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR ABDUL KHAYUM**

6.1 It was moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, and seconded by Councillor Abdul Khayum, that this Council:-

- (a) notes, with shock and anger, that Sheffield’s bus networks are beginning to be slashed this month, culminating in a third of services being decimated by October as the Government cuts funding and commercial operators withdraw;
- (b) believes our communities deserve a public transport system as good as in London, and yet despite the Government promising to deliver this (in their Levelling Up White Paper) they are now refusing to give our region the money or the powers to make this happen;
- (c) notes that South Yorkshire was given nothing in the latest round of bus funding from the Government, and believes it is simply not good enough to continue to under-fund our buses and limit people’s opportunities to get to work, education, health services and for business growth, as well as failing to help us to tackle the climate emergency;
- (d) notes that Labour councillors have long called for bus franchising to be explored, and enacted the local bus partnership as this was the only option available to the Council at the time to help provide greater local control, but believes that this partnership, whilst helpful at the time, is no longer fit for purpose;
- (e) believes that one of the main issues all councillors and candidates encountered on the doorsteps during the local election was residents’ concerns on the poor state of public transport, and we need to work



cross-party to demand to the Government that South Yorkshire gets significantly improved funding and greater local control over the bus network, and commends the actions of recently elected South Yorkshire Mayor, Oliver Coppard, for his commitment to working alongside our region's councils, and doing everything he can to save as many services as possible;

- (f) believes that in order for Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and bus prioritisation lanes to be adopted successfully, and with public support, there needs to be a public transport offer that is fit for purpose;
- (g) believes that our communities deserve better and notes that there is a general sense within the country of a government failing to get to grips with the major issues that affect neighbourhoods – crime, connectivity, lack of opportunities, and the cost-of-living crisis;
- (h) notes with dismay the recent violent crime and serious incidents in the city and that, whilst the levers to fully address this reside with the Government, the Council must be steadfast in its prioritisation of community safety and doing everything we can locally;
- (i) notes that despite the challenging year-on-year budget position the Council is investing more in community safety measures such as community wardens, increased CCTV cameras, increased outreach work (including expanded youth services) and greater information sharing and ability to respond quickly to local issues via the Local Area Committees;
- (j) believes that the Council must do everything it can to help our partners respond to serious incidents, and that we need a city-wide protocol – bringing together our partners (such as the police, Police and Crime Commissioner, social services and the Voluntary and Community Sector), Council staff and councillors, so that information is shared and acted on more quickly, and to ensure that there is better communication with the affected neighbourhoods and communities; and
- (k) resolves, therefore, to request that the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee should consider developing a clearly defined Community Safety Incident Protocol, within the next three months, and review the current community safety support structures.

6.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Mike Levery, and seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (d) to (k) and the addition of new paragraphs (d) to (n) as follows:-

- (d) believes that removing Covid-related bus support funding entirely while passenger numbers have still not recovered to pre-pandemic levels will inevitably lead to severe reductions in service levels across the whole country, and the Government needs to rethink if people are not going to go back to using cars, and if we are to meet climate change targets;

- (e) believes that the Sheffield Bus Partnership has failed the citizens of Sheffield by not improving services and keeping fares low which has led to:-
  - (i) cuts to services available to the general public;
  - (ii) extortionate fare increases, forcing people to use their cars over public transport as a cheaper and more accessible option; and
  - (iii) a lack of public confidence in the reliability of the bus service, which is also contributing to decreasing passenger numbers; noting that punctuality of bus services has reduced, down to 83% from 87% over the past five years, whilst reliability is at its lowest rate in years;
- (f) is concerned that increased car use will add to air pollution in the city centre if fewer people are using more energy efficient bus services and that cuts to bus services are preventing people from getting to work, school, running errands and attending medical appointments;
- (g) further notes that London, which was not subject to bus deregulation in 1986, has seen decade upon decade increases in bus patronage and mileage;
- (h) notes that, under the Bus Services Act 2017, the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority has the power to enact bus franchising and that this was agreed in the original 2015 Sheffield devolution deal;
- (i) believes that bus franchising will be a long-term solution to these problems, allowing bus operators and local authorities to work collaboratively to improve bus services and realise untapped growth potentials in regional and rural areas;
- (j) resolves to:-
  - (i) call on the Council's and Regional Authority's leaderships to protect passengers from further fare increases, cuts to routes and unreliable services by using any available means, which could include, but not necessarily be limited to:-
    - (A) giving notice to immediately terminate the Bus Partnership Agreement;
    - (B) enlisting the full support of South Yorkshire Mayoral Authority;
    - (C) an active media campaign; and
    - (D) a review of existing bus priority measures in order to deliver

a more reliable, greener and efficient bus service;

- (ii) support the introduction of a statutory bus quality contract in Sheffield;
  - (iii) send copies of this motion to all the other parties to the Bus Partnership Agreement;
- (k) believes that alongside the strategic long term problems with buses in our city there are a number of smaller, simpler issues that need to be resolved in order to give Sheffield the best possible bus and mass transit services, and these include:-
- (i) improving the accuracy of real time information signage at bus stops;
  - (ii) making sure every bus stop accurately identifies the buses that stop there, and has accurate timetables physically displayed; and
  - (iii) linking trams to buses at terminals as part of making sure that all of Sheffield's mass transit services link together to provide a properly integrated service;
- (l) notes with dismay the recent violent crime and serious incidents, on public transport, and around the city as a whole;
- (m) notes the on-going work the Council is undertaking to develop a robust city-wide protocol and process to ensure all relevant partners (such as the police, Police and Crime Commissioner, social services and the voluntary and community sector), Council staff and Councillors, are aware of serious incidents in a timely manner; and
- (n) notes the work being undertaken by the Safer Sheffield Partnership Board to develop a clearly defined Community Safety Incident Protocol as quickly as possible.

6.3 It was then moved by Councillor Christine Gilligan, and seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (l) to (q) as follows:-

- (l) believes that politicians across South Yorkshire have undermined public transport for many years by promoting individual car use, through providing free or low-cost car parking in town / city centres, ineffective and insufficient parking enforcement and active opposition to improvement measures like bus lanes or residents' parking schemes;
- (m) regrets the lack of ambition set out in the Bus Service Improvement Plan submitted to the Government by the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority and in particular that "success" would have meant fewer people using buses in the future;

- (n) notes that bus operators are commercial companies and are not primarily there to provide a public service; and therefore believes in a need for public ownership and control of buses;
- (o) believes that public transport is an equality issue, as only 35% of the population in the bottom 10% of wealth own a car, whereas 93% of the top 10% own at least one;
- (p) notes that Yorkshire and Humberside already gets only £500 per head of population spent on transport compared with £1,476 for London (in 2020/21) and believes that the Government cannot be serious about “levelling up” until it guarantees equal funding; and
- (q) however, recognises that this Council must do what it can to support as many buses on as many routes as it can and therefore requests the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to consider using all the levers at its disposal to make public transport more attractive than private cars, including:-
  - (i) advertising to promote public transport usage, in particular aimed at those who do not routinely use buses and including through the universities;
  - (ii) lower fares, multi-operator tickets and tap-on technology as standard;
  - (iii) measures for multi-modal travel, including bikes on trams;
  - (iv) higher parking fees for private car ownership;
  - (v) more priority routes for buses and trams;
  - (vi) higher quality bus or tram shelters, and staffed bus/tram interchanges;
  - (vii) more effective enforcement of illegal, selfish and dangerous parking that often goes unchecked;
  - (viii) schemes such as an employer’s workplace parking levy to reduce the perks of free parking and raise substantial sums to provide improved bus services, tram services and better walking and cycling infrastructure;
  - (ix) allowing a reasonable increase in regulated taxi fares; and
  - (x) encouraging innovative neighbourhood community hub bus services that serve local shopping areas.

6.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Mike Levery was put to the vote and was

lost.

- 6.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 28 Members; AGAINST - 36 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member. Councillor Lewis Chinchon voted for, but against paragraph (j) and abstained from voting on paragraph (d) of the amendment.)
- 6.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Christine Gilligan was then put to the vote and was carried in part. Paragraphs (l), (m) & (q) of the amendment were lost and paragraphs (n), (o) & (p) of the amendment were carried.
- 6.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 39 Members; AGAINST - 26 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. The Labour Group members voted for, but against paragraphs (l) & (m) and abstained from voting on paragraph (q) of the amendment.)
- 6.6 The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes, with shock and anger, that Sheffield's bus networks are beginning to be slashed this month, culminating in a third of services being decimated by October as the Government cuts funding and commercial operators withdraw;
- (b) believes our communities deserve a public transport system as good as in London, and yet despite the Government promising to deliver this (in their Levelling Up White Paper) they are now refusing to give our region the money or the powers to make this happen;
- (c) notes that South Yorkshire was given nothing in the latest round of bus funding from the Government, and believes it is simply not good enough to continue to under-fund our buses and limit people's opportunities to get to work, education, health services and for business growth, as well as failing to help us to tackle the climate emergency;
- (d) notes that Labour councillors have long called for bus franchising to be explored, and enacted the local bus partnership as this was the only option available to the Council at the time to help provide greater local control, but believes that this partnership, whilst helpful at the time, is no longer fit for purpose;
- (e) believes that one of the main issues all councillors and candidates encountered on the doorsteps during the local election was residents' concerns on the poor state of public transport, and we need to work cross-party to demand to the Government that South Yorkshire gets significantly improved funding and greater local control over the bus network, and commends the actions of recently elected South Yorkshire

Mayor, Oliver Coppard, for his commitment to working alongside our region's councils, and doing everything he can to save as many services as possible;

- (f) believes that in order for Low Traffic Neighbourhoods and bus prioritisation lanes to be adopted successfully, and with public support, there needs to be a public transport offer that is fit for purpose;
- (g) believes that our communities deserve better and notes that there is a general sense within the country of a government failing to get to grips with the major issues that affect neighbourhoods – crime, connectivity, lack of opportunities, and the cost-of-living crisis;
- (h) notes with dismay the recent violent crime and serious incidents in the city and that, whilst the levers to fully address this reside with the Government, the Council must be steadfast in its prioritisation of community safety and doing everything we can locally;
- (i) notes that despite the challenging year-on-year budget position the Council is investing more in community safety measures such as community wardens, increased CCTV cameras, increased outreach work (including expanded youth services) and greater information sharing and ability to respond quickly to local issues via the Local Area Committees;
- (j) believes that the Council must do everything it can to help our partners respond to serious incidents, and that we need a city-wide protocol – bringing together our partners (such as the police, Police and Crime Commissioner, social services and the Voluntary and Community Sector), Council staff and councillors, so that information is shared and acted on more quickly, and to ensure that there is better communication with the affected neighbourhoods and communities;
- (k) resolves, therefore, to request that the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee should consider developing a clearly defined Community Safety Incident Protocol, within the next three months, and review the current community safety support structures;
- (l) notes that bus operators are commercial companies and are not primarily there to provide a public service; and therefore believes in a need for public ownership and control of buses;
- (m) believes that public transport is an equality issue, as only 35% of the population in the bottom 10% of wealth own a car, whereas 93% of the top 10% own at least one; and
- (n) notes that Yorkshire and Humberside already gets only £500 per head of population spent on transport compared with £1,476 for London (in 2020/21) and believes that the Government cannot be serious about “levelling up” until it guarantees equal funding.

- 6.6.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 64 Members; AGAINST - 1 Member; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. The Liberal Democrat Group members voted for, but against paragraphs (d), (e), (l) & (m) of the Substantive Motion. Councillor Lewis Chinchon voted against, but for paragraphs (j), (k) & (m) and abstained on paragraphs (e) & (n) of the Substantive Motion.)

**7. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "PRIDE IN SHEFFIELD" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SOPHIE THORNTON AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR SIMON CLEMENT-JONES**

- 7.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Sophie Thornton, and formally seconded by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, that this Council:-

- (a) wishes to thank the charitable and voluntary sector for the support they already provide to the LGBTQ+ community throughout the year;
- (b) reaffirms its commitment to keep all people safe in our City, no matter their gender or sexual identity, secularity, skin colour or disability;
- (c) notes the need to improve the safety of our LGBTQ+ community, noting that homophobic and transphobic violence is increasing and trans or non-binary Sheffielders are especially at risk of violence, depression, self-harm, and suicide;
- (d) acknowledges the greater risk to LGBTQ+ people of colour, especially transgender women of colour;
- (e) believes that this Council's support for Sheffield's LGBTQ+ community should go well beyond painted rainbow crossings, and as such -
- (f) supports LGBTQ+ cultural events in Sheffield through:-
  - (i) Sheffield holding an annual Pride event going forward from 2022, as at present no such event is organised to take place, celebrating Sheffield's LGBTQ+ community, in a similar vein to Pinknic and Barnsley Pride;
  - (ii) acknowledging the importance of holding Pride events due to the heritage of Pride as a protest, and that there is still work to be done towards equality; and
  - (iii) supporting community groups involved in and facilitate spaces for dates across the LGBTQ+ calendar, including but not limited to Pride Month, LGBTQ+ History Month, Trans Day of Remembrance (TDOR), and International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia and Transphobia (IDAHOBIT);

- (g) believes in the importance of how this Council's economic development work can support the LGBTQ+ community and support diverse business owners by asking the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee to consider looking at starting consultation work with the LGBTQ+ community to develop an LGBTQ+ 'quarter' in Sheffield with the spaces LGBTQ+ people in Sheffield both want and need; and this should include:-
- (i) supporting LGBTQ+ owned business, charities, nightlife and safe spaces in the same way other cities have done, including Manchester (Canal Street area), Birmingham (Hurst Street area) and Leeds (Freedom Quarter);
  - (ii) taking into account the importance of non-alcoholic (dry spaces) and child friendly spaces in an LGBTQ+ quarter – with a desire for any such area to be fully inclusive, including for disabled people, and safe, with good street lighting among other considerations;
  - (iii) agreeing to the principle that any LGBTQ+ quarter shouldn't just be bars and clubs, noting the real problems of drug abuse and alcoholism in the community, for which this Council must support schemes that focus on harm reduction with these issues; and
  - (iv) looking at places such as Common Press in London and the Queer Emporium in Cardiff as examples of good practice of inclusive, diverse spaces;
- (h) expresses its disappointment that Sheffield's Gender Identity Clinic is only now starting to see appointments for those referred to them in 2018 and calls on the Government to do more to support these crucially important services for trans and non-binary people;
- (i) supports the health and wellbeing of LGBTQ+ Sheffielders by asking the Policy Committees, in considering Public Health functions, to have regard to:-
- (i) supporting existing and new spaces, clinics, and pop-up clinics that support LGBTQ+ Sheffielders' physical, mental, and sexual health;
  - (ii) providing information about sexual health, housing, and support for LGBTQ+ people, with specific information about support available for LGBTQ+ people of colour and those who are HIV+;
  - (iii) including information and support for those who have been sexually assaulted or experienced domestic violence as a result of their sexual or gender identity;
  - (iv) existing established health services needing to ensure staff are trained in supporting LGBTQ+ Sheffielders who have sadly gone



through sexual assault or domestic violence as a result of their sexual and/or gender identity;

- (v) investigating ways this Council can help the HIV+ community access support and the support around the wide variety of other issues faced by the LGBTQ+ community and raised within this motion; and
- (vi) our belief that good services supporting young LGBTQ+ people, such as SAYiT, that provide them with a safe space and the ability to make lifelong friends in the community, are critical;
- (j) believes in supporting inclusive housing and LGBTQ+ Sheffielders who face homelessness, and that no one in Sheffield should be made homeless as a result of coming out or being rejected by their families by virtue of who they are, and asks the Housing Policy Committee to consider investigating ways this Council can:-
  - (i) help reduce homelessness in young LGBTQ+ people by supporting LGBTQ+ youth services, as well as providing information and support;
  - (ii) give considerations for LGBTQ+ supported housing for older LGBTQ+ people in Sheffield, dependent on need, as has been done by councils such as Lambeth, as we look to expand our social housing stock; and
  - (iii) continue supporting projects that help people that are homeless and/or rough sleeping in any way we can; and
- (k) believes that Sheffield Council, as an inclusive organisation:-
  - (i) should include a gender neutral toilet facility whenever possible in Council buildings, separate to disabled toilets so as to not impact or restrict on disabled toilet access for disabled people, with private and safe locking cubicles for all, and therefore asks the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee to consider this as and when they consider any policy or capital decisions on our corporate estate or future capital works;
  - (ii) needs to advertise information on support that is already available to the LGBTQ+ community more, highlighting support services wherever they are available; and
  - (iii) stands firmly against conversion therapy in all forms and is dismayed to see the Government excluding trans people from the ban on conversion therapy for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual people, as well as using trans people as part of a culture war.

7.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Ben Miskell, and formally

seconded by Councillor Jayne Dunn, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (l) to (o) as follows:-

- (l) (i) notes that the current climate for LGBT+ people in the UK means that nearly half - including 64 per cent of trans pupils - are bullied for being LGBT+ in Britain's schools;
- (ii) further notes that the repeal of Section 28 was a pivotal moment for LGBT+ rights, and believes that the UK must never move backwards on LGBT+ rights by stopping LGBT+ inclusive education in schools;
- (iii) notes that people of all faiths and none are LGBT+ and it is vital that all children receive age-appropriate inclusive relationships and sex education, regardless of their parents' beliefs;
- (iv) welcomes the introduction of statutory Relationships Education and Relationships and Sex Education (RSE), which all primary and secondary schools in England are now required to teach; and
- (v) affirms unequivocally its support for compulsory LGBT+ inclusive Relationships Education and Relationships and Sex Education in all state funded primary and secondary schools, and commits to ensuring that schools are delivering RSE in line with new Government guidance, supported by teaching material already produced by Learn Sheffield;
- (m) (i) calls on all employers in Sheffield to create workplaces free from LGBT+ harassment;
- (ii) further notes that the TUC's report on sexual harassment of LGBT people in the workplace reports that nearly 7 in 10 (68%) LGBT+ people have been sexually harassed at work;
- (iii) welcomes the vital work carried out by trade unions to organise LGBT+ workers in the workplace to campaign for their rights; and
- (iv) affirms that workplaces that are trade unionised are more likely to support the human rights of workers;
- (n) (i) notes that 2022 marks 40 years since the first cases of HIV were reported globally;
- (ii) further notes the progress that had been made through the tireless and tenacious efforts of people affected by HIV, HIV activists, allies, and people living with HIV, which has taken us to the point where it is now scientifically possible to end new HIV transmissions in the UK;
- (iii) affirms that this Council wants to see an end to new HIV transmissions in Sheffield;
- (iv) notes that the UK Government has pledged to make this a reality by

2030 and achieve an 80% reduction in new HIV transmissions by 2025;  
and

(v) calls on the Government to make good on this promise; and

(o) (i) is disappointed by the divisive rhetoric used by candidates for the leadership of the Conservative Party and future Prime Minister when discussing transgender and non-binary people;

(ii) believes that this rhetoric fuels transphobia and prejudice against LGBT+ people; and

(iii) affirms that this Council unequivocally supports transgender and non-binary people.

7.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Angela Argenzio, and formally seconded by Councillor Martin Phipps, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the replacement throughout the Motion of all the references to LGBTQ+ by LGBTIQA+;

2. the addition of a new paragraph (a) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (a) to (k) as new paragraphs (b) to (l):-

(a) requests the Chief Executive to consider adopting the term LGBTIQA+ within the Council and replacing all existing references in other forms;

3. the addition, in the new paragraph (j) [original paragraph (i)], of new sub-paragraphs (vii) and (viii) as follows:-

(vii) community learning being about building community and confidence and voluntary and community organisations are often the best placed to offer the safe spaces that are so important; and

(viii) the commissioning of community-based learning to support LGBTIQA+ people when coming out and at all points along their journey;

7.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Ben Miskell was put to the vote and was carried.

7.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 66 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Councillor Lewis Chinchon voted for, but against sub-paragraphs (o)(i) & (ii) of the amendment.)

7.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Angela Argenzio was then put to the vote and was lost.

7.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 10 Members; AGAINST - 26 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 30 Members.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) wishes to thank the charitable and voluntary sector for the support they already provide to the LGBTQ+ community throughout the year;
- (b) reaffirms its commitment to keep all people safe in our City, no matter their gender or sexual identity, secularity, skin colour or disability;
- (c) notes the need to improve the safety of our LGBTQ+ community, noting that homophobic and transphobic violence is increasing and trans or non-binary Sheffields are especially at risk of violence, depression, self-harm, and suicide;
- (d) acknowledges the greater risk to LGBTQ+ people of colour, especially transgender women of colour;
- (e) believes that this Council's support for Sheffield's LGBTQ+ community should go well beyond painted rainbow crossings, and as such -
- (f) supports LGBTQ+ cultural events in Sheffield through:-
  - (i) Sheffield holding an annual Pride event going forward from 2022, as at present no such event is organised to take place, celebrating Sheffield's LGBTQ+ community, in a similar vein to Pinknic and Barnsley Pride;
  - (ii) acknowledging the importance of holding Pride events due to the heritage of Pride as a protest, and that there is still work to be done towards equality; and
  - (iii) supporting community groups involved in and facilitate spaces for dates across the LGBTQ+ calendar, including but not limited to Pride Month, LGBTQ+ History Month, Trans Day of Remembrance (TDOR), and International Day Against Homophobia, Biphobia and Transphobia (IDAHOBIT);
- (g) believes in the importance of how this Council's economic development work can support the LGBTQ+ community and support diverse business owners by asking the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee to consider looking at starting consultation work with the LGBTQ+ community to develop an LGBTQ+ 'quarter' in Sheffield with the spaces LGBTQ+ people in Sheffield both want and need; and this should include:-

- (i) supporting LGBTQ+ owned business, charities, nightlife and safe spaces in the same way other cities have done, including Manchester (Canal Street area), Birmingham (Hurst Street area) and Leeds (Freedom Quarter);
  - (ii) taking into account the importance of non-alcoholic (dry spaces) and child friendly spaces in an LGBTQ+ quarter – with a desire for any such area to be fully inclusive, including for disabled people, and safe, with good street lighting among other considerations;
  - (iii) agreeing to the principle that any LGBTQ+ quarter shouldn't just be bars and clubs, noting the real problems of drug abuse and alcoholism in the community, for which this Council must support schemes that focus on harm reduction with these issues; and
  - (iv) looking at places such as Common Press in London and the Queer Emporium in Cardiff as examples of good practice of inclusive, diverse spaces;
- (h) expresses its disappointment that Sheffield's Gender Identity Clinic is only now starting to see appointments for those referred to them in 2018 and calls on the Government to do more to support these crucially important services for trans and non-binary people;
- (i) supports the health and wellbeing of LGBTQ+ Sheffielders by asking the Policy Committees, in considering Public Health functions, to have regard to:-
- (i) supporting existing and new spaces, clinics, and pop-up clinics that support LGBTQ+ Sheffielders' physical, mental, and sexual health;
  - (ii) providing information about sexual health, housing, and support for LGBTQ+ people, with specific information about support available for LGBTQ+ people of colour and those who are HIV+;
  - (iii) including information and support for those who have been sexually assaulted or experienced domestic violence as a result of their sexual or gender identity;
  - (iv) existing established health services needing to ensure staff are trained in supporting LGBTQ+ Sheffielders who have sadly gone through sexual assault or domestic violence as a result of their sexual and/or gender identity;
  - (v) investigating ways this Council can help the HIV+ community access support and the support around the wide variety of other issues faced by the LGBTQ+ community and raised within this motion; and

- (vi) our belief that good services supporting young LGBTQ+ people, such as SAYiT, that provide them with a safe space and the ability to make lifelong friends in the community, are critical;
- (j) believes in supporting inclusive housing and LGBTQ+ Sheffielders who face homelessness, and that no one in Sheffield should be made homeless as a result of coming out or being rejected by their families by virtue of who they are, and asks the Housing Policy Committee to consider investigating ways this Council can:-
  - (i) help reduce homelessness in young LGBTQ+ people by supporting LGBTQ+ youth services, as well as providing information and support;
  - (ii) give considerations for LGBTQ+ supported housing for older LGBTQ+ people in Sheffield, dependent on need, as has been done by councils such as Lambeth, as we look to expand our social housing stock; and
  - (iii) continue supporting projects that help people that are homeless and/or rough sleeping in any way we can;
- (k) believes that Sheffield Council, as an inclusive organisation:-
  - (i) should include a gender-neutral toilet facility whenever possible in Council buildings, separate to disabled toilets so as to not impact or restrict on disabled toilet access for disabled people, with private and safe locking cubicles for all, and therefore asks the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee to consider this as and when they consider any policy or capital decisions on our corporate estate or future capital works;
  - (ii) needs to advertise information on support that is already available to the LGBTQ+ community more, highlighting support services wherever they are available; and
  - (iii) stands firmly against conversion therapy in all forms and is dismayed to see the Government excluding trans people from the ban on conversion therapy for Lesbian, Gay and Bisexual people, as well as using trans people as part of a culture war;
- (l)
  - (i) notes that the current climate for LGBT+ people in the UK means that nearly half - including 64 per cent of trans pupils - are bullied for being LGBT+ in Britain's schools;
  - (ii) further notes that the repeal of Section 28 was a pivotal moment for LGBT+ rights, and believes that the UK must never move backwards on LGBT+ rights by stopping LGBT+ inclusive education in schools;

- (i) notes that people of all faiths and none are LGBT+ and it is vital that all children receive age-appropriate inclusive relationships and sex education, regardless of their parents' beliefs;
  - (ii) welcomes the introduction of statutory Relationships Education and Relationships and Sex Education (RSE), which all primary and secondary schools in England are now required to teach; and
  - (iii) affirms unequivocally its support for compulsory LGBT+ inclusive Relationships Education and Relationships and Sex Education in all state funded primary and secondary schools, and commits to ensuring that schools are delivering RSE in line with new Government guidance, supported by teaching material already produced by Learn Sheffield;
- (m)
- (i) calls on all employers in Sheffield to create workplaces free from LGBT+ harassment;
  - (ii) further notes that the TUC's report on sexual harassment of LGBT people in the workplace reports that nearly 7 in 10 (68%) LGBT+ people have been sexually harassed at work;
  - (iii) welcomes the vital work carried out by trade unions to organise LGBT+ workers in the workplace to campaign for their rights; and
  - (iv) affirms that workplaces that are trade unionised are more likely to support the human rights of workers;
- (n)
- (i) notes that 2022 marks 40 years since the first cases of HIV were reported globally;
  - (ii) further notes the progress that had been made through the tireless and tenacious efforts of people affected by HIV, HIV activists, allies, and people living with HIV, which has taken us to the point where it is now scientifically possible to end new HIV transmissions in the UK;
  - (iii) affirms that this Council wants to see an end to new HIV transmissions in Sheffield;
  - (iv) notes that the UK Government has pledged to make this a reality by 2030 and achieve an 80% reduction in new HIV transmissions by 2025; and
  - (iv) calls on the Government to make good on this promise; and
- (o)
- (i) is disappointed by the divisive rhetoric used by candidates for the leadership of the Conservative Party and future Prime Minister when discussing transgender and non-binary people;

- (ii) believes that this rhetoric fuels transphobia and prejudice against LGBT+ people; and
- (iii) affirms that this Council unequivocally supports transgender and non-binary people.

7.6.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 65 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Councillor Lewis Chinchon voted for, but against sub-paragraphs (k)(iii) and (o)(i) & (ii) of the Substantive Motion.)

**8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "EXPANDING ON-STREET ELECTRIC VEHICLE CHARGING INFRASTRUCTURE" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEWIS CHINCHEN AND TO BE SECONDED BY THE LORD MAYOR (COUNCILLOR SIONED-MAIR RICHARDS)**

8.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Lewis Chinchon, and formally seconded by the chair of the meeting (Councillor Anne Murphy), that this Council:-

- (a) believes that the mass uptake of Electric Vehicles (EVs) will depend on convenient and affordable charging infrastructure;
- (b) notes that EV ownership is skewed towards those with off-street parking (80% of EV owners have access to a driveway);
- (c) believes that we need to ensure that the 40% of households in this country that do not have access to off-street parking have ways to conveniently charge an EV;
- (d) notes that Sheffield currently does not have any on-street residential EV charging infrastructure;
- (e) believes that without proper investment in on-street EV charging technology, we will continue to see inequality in EV ownership between those with off-street parking and those without;
- (f) recognises that there is a chicken and egg situation where it is often not initially financially viable for the private sector to invest in new infrastructure due to the limited EV ownership in areas that need this infrastructure;
- (g) believes that a partnership between Government, this Council and innovative private sector enterprise is the best way to develop our on-street EV charging network;
- (h) notes the work of other local authorities such as the London Borough of Lambeth in expanding on-street EV charging infrastructure across 11



council estates through a partnership with a private company; and

- (i) requests the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to consider:-
  - (i) developing an EV charging strategy that outlines a vision for every household in Sheffield to be within walking distance of a public EV charging point;
  - (ii) inviting businesses to Sheffield to explore innovative infrastructure solutions such as retractable chargers, as well as successful commercial models that maximise private sector investment;
  - (iii) applying to the Government's On-Street Residential Chargepoint Scheme and/or the Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (LEVI) fund once this becomes fully available following national pilots; and
  - (iv) working collaboratively and collectively with neighbouring local authorities and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) where appropriate to take advantage of economies of scale, share knowledge and ensure our strategies are aligned, whilst recognising the differences between our respective areas.

8.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Julie Grocutt, and formally seconded by Councillor Bryan Lodge, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (j) to (m) as follows:-

- (j) notes that the UK has only 15% of the charging points it needs to meet net zero – and believes that government inaction is creating a two-tier transport Britain;
- (k) notes that in June 2021 Parliament's Select Committee on Climate Change, found that there needs to be over 150,000 public charging points operating in our country by 2025, and yet the Government is currently trailing way behind at around 42,000 public charging points overall, itself an increase of less than 20,000 in the last 12 months, therefore way off the target required;
- (l) notes that, unlike this Government, the Labour Party has a plan to support people across the country to make the switch to electric, aiding the country's transition to net zero, by:-
  - (i) making electric vehicle ownership affordable by offering long-term interest-free loans for new and used electric vehicles to those on low to middle incomes to remove the upfront cost barrier; and trialling a national scrappage scheme;
  - (ii) making it easier for people to drive an electric vehicle, wherever they live, by accelerating the roll-out of charging points on streets

and targeting areas left out, such as Yorkshire; and

- (iii) committing to charging points being treated as a national infrastructure project, led by central government through a National Infrastructure Bank and by working with local authorities; and
- (m) notes that the Council's Leader and Co-Chairs of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee are meeting with the Mayor and SYMCA to develop increased EV charging infrastructure, and the Council is currently developing an Electric Vehicle Strategy, which will be submitted to the Committee shortly, and will be bidding for the Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (LEVI) Fund for pilot status, with the scheme delivering additional public EV charging infrastructure.

8.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Tim Huggan, and formally seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraph (e) and the addition of new paragraphs (e) and (f) as follows:-
  - (e) further notes that with only 23.4 charging points in total per 100,000 people according to Department for Transport figures, Sheffield lags behind the national average of 45.8;
  - (f) believes that in order to give confidence to more people without the ability to install a domestic charger that they will be able to conveniently fuel and run an EV, there is a need for substantial provision of publicly accessible charging at reasonable prices in residential areas, at workplaces and in the city centre and district centres;
2. the re-lettering of original paragraphs (f) and (g) as new paragraphs (g) and (h).
3. the addition of a new paragraph (i) as follows:-
  - (i) regrets the lack of government leadership so far in co-ordinating a national roll out of on-street charging, and believes there has been a lack of Council ambition hitherto in providing sufficient public charging to drive take up;
4. the re-lettering of original paragraphs (h) and (i) as new paragraphs (j) and (k).
5. the re-lettering of sub-paragraphs (iii) and (iv) in the new paragraph (k) [original paragraph (i)] as new sub-paragraphs (iv) and (v), and the addition of new sub-paragraphs (iii) and (vi) as follows:-

- (iii) learning from best practise in other places and finding innovative ways to overcome some of the practical and regulatory obstacles to on-street charging, recognising that different areas face different challenges, so that residents of all areas of Sheffield are able to run an electric vehicle (levelling up);
- (vi) ensuring that energy available through such charging infrastructure whether developed and managed publicly or privately is made available at reasonable prices, covering the cost of energy and infrastructure investment, and where applicable a reasonable profit margin, ensuring that EVs remain generally considerably cheaper to fuel than internal combustion engine vehicles.

8.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Ruth Mersereau, and formally seconded by Councillor Paul Turpin, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (j) to (n) as follows:-

- (j) notes that whilst electric vehicles do address some issues of air quality, they do nothing to address congestion, road danger from vehicles, harmful emissions from tyres and brakes, and on-street vehicle storage;
- (k) notes that ownership of any type of vehicle is skewed towards wealthier households, and believes that the Council should be prioritising its subsidies to those who can't afford to own a vehicle, and that, for greater transport equity, we must ensure that our EV policy fits within a wider transport objective of maximising active travel and public transport usage, whilst minimising private vehicle usage, especially for routine and regular trips;
- (l) notes that EV ownership is even further skewed towards those with higher incomes who can afford electric vehicles;
- (m) believes that Sheffield streets already have issues with lack of space for car parking, limited footway space, illegal parking and congestion; and
- (n) therefore requests the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to give consideration to the following measures:-
  - (i) resisting any scheme that effectively reserves parking spaces outside people's homes, and instead supporting publicly available, high speed charging infrastructure;
  - (ii) proposing that policy should be to develop reliable public charge points in public car-parks, supermarkets, neighbourhood hubs and other publicly available spaces;
  - (iii) proposing that current Sheffield City Council EV charging points be made accessible to the public as well as to taxis, to increase usage and revenue generation;

- (iv) proposing that the usual Pay & Display fees associated with Sheffield City Council car parks should apply to EV charging bays where appropriate, so that drivers pay for charging and parking concurrently, as is the case in other core cities; and
- (v) proposing that the Council look to learn from other local authorities, e.g. York City Council, who are further down the road with the development of their EV policy.

8.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Julie Grocutt was put to the vote and was carried in part. Paragraph (l) of the amendment was lost and paragraphs (j), (k) and (m) of the amendment were carried.

8.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 54 Members; AGAINST - 11 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. The Liberal Democrat Group members voted for, but against paragraph (l) of the amendment.)

8.6 The amendment moved by Councillor Tim Huggan was then put to the vote and was carried.

8.6.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 36 Members; AGAINST - 29 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Councillor Lewis Chinchon voted for, but against Part 3 of the amendment.)

8.7 The amendment moved by Councillor Ruth Mersereau was then put to the vote and was also carried.

8.7.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 38 Members; AGAINST - 26 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. The Labour Group members voted for, but against sub-paragraph (n)(i) of the amendment. The Liberal Democrat Group members voted against, but for paragraphs (m) & (n) of the amendment.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that the mass uptake of Electric Vehicles (EVs) will depend on convenient and affordable charging infrastructure;
- (b) notes that EV ownership is skewed towards those with off-street parking (80% of EV owners have access to a driveway);
- (c) believes that we need to ensure that the 40% of households in this country that do not have access to off-street parking have ways to conveniently charge an EV;
- (d) notes that Sheffield currently does not have any on-street residential EV

charging infrastructure;

- (e) further notes that with only 23.4 charging points in total per 100,000 people according to Department for Transport figures, Sheffield lags behind the national average of 45.8;
- (f) believes that in order to give confidence to more people without the ability to install a domestic charger that they will be able to conveniently fuel and run an EV, there is a need for substantial provision of publicly accessible charging at reasonable prices in residential areas, at workplaces and in the city centre and district centres;
- (g) recognises that there is a chicken and egg situation where it is often not initially financially viable for the private sector to invest in new infrastructure due to the limited EV ownership in areas that need this infrastructure;
- (h) believes that a partnership between Government, this Council and innovative private sector enterprise is the best way to develop our on-street EV charging network;
- (i) regrets the lack of government leadership so far in co-ordinating a national roll out of on-street charging, and believes there has been a lack of Council ambition hitherto in providing sufficient public charging to drive take up;
- (j) notes the work of other local authorities such as the London Borough of Lambeth in expanding on-street EV charging infrastructure across 11 council estates through a partnership with a private company;
- (k) requests the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to consider:-
  - (i) developing an EV charging strategy that outlines a vision for every household in Sheffield to be within walking distance of a public EV charging point;
  - (ii) inviting businesses to Sheffield to explore innovative infrastructure solutions such as retractable chargers, as well as successful commercial models that maximise private sector investment;
  - (iii) learning from best practise in other places and finding innovative ways to overcome some of the practical and regulatory obstacles to on-street charging, recognising that different areas face different challenges, so that residents of all areas of Sheffield are able to run an electric vehicle (levelling up);
  - (iv) applying to the Government's On-Street Residential Chargepoint Scheme and/or the Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (LEVI) fund once this becomes fully available following national pilots;

- (v) working collaboratively and collectively with neighbouring local authorities and the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) where appropriate to take advantage of economies of scale, share knowledge and ensure our strategies are aligned, whilst recognising the differences between our respective areas; and
- (vi) ensuring that energy available through such charging infrastructure whether developed and managed publicly or privately is made available at reasonable prices, covering the cost of energy and infrastructure investment, and where applicable a reasonable profit margin, ensuring that EVs remain generally considerably cheaper to fuel than internal combustion engine vehicles;
- (l) notes that the UK has only 15% of the charging points it needs to meet net zero – and believes that government inaction is creating a two-tier transport Britain;
- (m) notes that in June 2021 Parliament’s Select Committee on Climate Change, found that there needs to be over 150,000 public charging points operating in our country by 2025, and yet the Government is currently trailing way behind at around 42,000 public charging points overall, itself an increase of less than 20,000 in the last 12 months, therefore way off the target required;
- (n) notes that the Council’s Leader and Co-Chairs of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee are meeting with the Mayor and SYMCA to develop increased EV charging infrastructure, and the Council is currently developing an Electric Vehicle Strategy, which will be submitted to the Committee shortly, and will be bidding for the Local Electric Vehicle Infrastructure (LEVI) Fund for pilot status, with the scheme delivering additional public EV charging infrastructure;
- (o) notes that whilst electric vehicles do address some issues of air quality, they do nothing to address congestion, road danger from vehicles, harmful emissions from tyres and brakes, and on-street vehicle storage;
- (p) notes that ownership of any type of vehicle is skewed towards wealthier households, and believes that the Council should be prioritising its subsidies to those who can’t afford to own a vehicle, and that, for greater transport equity, we must ensure that our EV policy fits within a wider transport objective of maximising active travel and public transport usage, whilst minimising private vehicle usage, especially for routine and regular trips;
- (q) notes that EV ownership is even further skewed towards those with higher incomes who can afford electric vehicles;

- (r) believes that Sheffield streets already have issues with lack of space for car parking, limited footway space, illegal parking and congestion; and
- (s) therefore requests the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to give consideration to the following measures:-
  - (i) resisting any scheme that effectively reserves parking spaces outside people's homes, and instead supporting publicly available, high speed charging infrastructure;
  - (ii) proposing that policy should be to develop reliable public charge points in public car-parks, supermarkets, neighbourhood hubs and other publicly available spaces;
  - (iii) proposing that current Sheffield City Council EV charging points be made accessible to the public as well as to taxis, to increase usage and revenue generation;
  - (iv) proposing that the usual Pay & Display fees associated with Sheffield City Council car parks should apply to EV charging bays where appropriate, so that drivers pay for charging and parking concurrently, as is the case in other core cities; and
  - (v) proposing that the Council look to learn from other local authorities, e.g. York City Council, who are further down the road with the development of their EV policy.

8.8.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 64 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. The Labour Group members voted for, but against paragraphs (e), (f), (i), (k)(iii) and (vi) & sub-paragraph (s)(i) of the Substantive Motion. The Liberal Democrat Group members voted for, but against paragraphs (o), (p) & (q) of the Substantive Motion. Councillor Lewis Chinchen voted for, but against paragraphs (i), (l), (m), (o) to (s)(ii) and (s)(iv) & (v) of the Substantive Motion.)

## **9. UPDATES TO THE COUNCIL'S CONSTITUTION**

9.1 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: On the motion formally moved by Councillor Julie Grocutt and formally seconded by Councillor Sue Alston, that this Council:-

- (a) approves the changes to the various Parts of the Constitution, as outlined in sections 3.1 and 3.2 of the report of the Director of Legal and Governance and as set out in appendices A to H; and
- (b) notes the minor and consequential changes to Part 3.3 of the Constitution that had been made by the Director of Legal and Governance, as outlined in section 3.3 of the report and as set out in

appendices I and J.

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

- 10.1 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: On the motion formally moved by Councillor Dianne Hurst and formally seconded by Councillor Garry Weatherall, that the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 2<sup>nd</sup> February, the special meeting of the Council held on 2<sup>nd</sup> March and the extraordinary meeting of the Council held on 23<sup>rd</sup> March 2022, be approved as true and accurate records.

## **11. MEMBERSHIPS OF COUNCIL BODIES AND REPRESENTATIVES TO SERVE ON OTHER BODIES**

- 11.1 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: On the motion formally moved by Councillor Dianne Hurst and formally seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, that:-
- (a) it be noted that Councillor Ben Curran replaced Councillor Paul Wood as the Labour Group Spokesperson on the Housing Policy Committee with effect from 7<sup>th</sup> June 2022;
  - (b) it be noted that, at its meeting held on 22<sup>nd</sup> June 2022, the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee appointed Councillor Mike Chaplin as Deputy Chair of the Committee;
  - (c) Councillor Steve Ayriss be appointed as Deputy Chair of the Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee;
  - (d) Councillor Richard Williams be appointed as Deputy Chair of the Charitable Trusts Sub-Committee;
  - (e) it be confirmed that the Regulatory Committees are to operate with two chairs in 2022/23, (namely Councillors Dianne Hurst and Alan Woodcock on Planning and Highways Committee, and Councillors David Barker and Jayne Dunn on the Licensing Committee), continuing the arrangements operated in recent years, and not operate with a Chair and Deputy Chair which had been the designations approved in error at the annual meeting of the Council on 18<sup>th</sup> May 2022;
  - (f) it be noted that, in order to reflect the practice in operation, the "Committee Chair Job Share Protocol" in Part 5 of the Council's Constitution will be updated to reflect that the Chairs of the Regulatory Committees, each with equal full responsibility for the role, are designated as "Joint Chairs", and the job-share chairs, i.e. two Members jointly to share the position of Committee Chair, that have been



appointed to the Policy Committees, are designated as “Co-Chairs”;

- (g) it be noted that, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its annual meeting held on 18th May 2022, the Monitoring Officer had authorised the following appointments, with effect from the dates shown:-

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee   | - | (1) Councillors Abtisam Mohammed, Anne Murphy and Garry Weatherall appointed to serve on the Sub-Committee, with effect from 1 <sup>st</sup> June 2022; (2) Councillor Martin Phipps appointed to serve on the Sub-Committee in place of Councillor Angela Argenzio, with effect from 8 <sup>th</sup> June 2022, noting that he will also serve as Group Spokesperson on the Sub-Committee; and (3) Councillor Angela Argenzio appointed to serve as a substitute member of the Sub-Committee, in place of Councillor Martin Phipps, also with effect from 8 <sup>th</sup> June 2022 |
| Housing Policy Committee  | - | (1) Councillor Fran Belbin appointed to serve on the Committee in place of Councillor Safiya Saeed, with effect from 12th July 2022; and (2) Councillors Minesh Parekh and Safiya Saeed appointed to serve as substitute members on the Committee, with effect from 12th July 2022   |
| Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee   | - | (1) Councillor Mike Chaplin appointed to serve on the Committee, with effect from 1 <sup>st</sup> June 2022; and (2) Councillor David Barker appointed to serve as a substitute member on the Committee, with effect from 12 <sup>th</sup> July, 2022  |
| Corporate Joint Committee with Trade Unions   | - | Councillors Joe Otten, Martin Smith and Richard Williams appointed to serve on the Committee, with effect from 16 <sup>th</sup> June 2022  |
| Mayoral Combined Authority Audit, Standards and Risk Committee<br><i>(NB the Mayoral Combined Authority have reduced the membership of this Committee to one member per Authority, with Sheffield City Council required to nominate one Liberal</i> | - | (1) Councillor Ian Auckland appointed to serve on the Committee, with effect from 7 <sup>th</sup> June 2022; (2) Councillor Mike Levery appointed to serve as a substitute member of the Committee, with effect from 7 <sup>th</sup> June 2022; (3) Councillors Ben Curran and Talib Hussain be removed as members of the Committee, with effect from 7 <sup>th</sup> June 2022; and (4) Councillors Simon Clement-Jones and Joe Otten be removed as substitute members of the Committee, with effect from 7 <sup>th</sup> June 2022   |

*Democrat member with  
a substitute member)*

- Sheffield Museums Trust - Directors and Members - Ms Cate McDonald appointed to serve on the Trust, with effect from 31<sup>st</sup> May 2022
- Sheffield Football Trust - Councillor Anne Murphy to replace Councillor Colin Ross on the Trust, with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> June 2022
- Sheffield Safer and Sustainable Communities Partnership - (1) Councillor Tony Downing to replace Councillor Tony Damms on the Committee, with effect from 13<sup>th</sup> June 2022; and (2) Councillor Richard Williams to replace Councillor Alan Hooper on the Committee, with effect from 15<sup>th</sup> June 2022
- Sheffield Theatres Trust – Directors and Members - (1) Councillors Roger Davison and Joe Otten to be removed from the Trust, with effect from 13<sup>th</sup> June 2022; and (2) Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to be appointed to serve on the Trust, with effect from 13<sup>th</sup> June 2022

(h) approval be given to the following changes to the memberships of Committees, Boards, etc:-

- Finance Sub-Committee - Councillor Mary Lea to fill a vacancy and Councillor Tom Hunt to fill a vacancy as a substitute member
- Finance Sub-Committee Urgency Sub-Committee - Councillor Maroof Raouf to fill a vacancy
- Charitable Trusts Sub-Committee - Councillor Mike Levery to fill a vacancy
- Adult Health and Social Care Policy Committee - (1) Councillor Ruth Milsom to be removed as a member; (2) Councillor Safiya Saeed to fill a vacancy; (3) Councillor Garry Weatherall to be removed as a substitute member; and (4) Councillors Peter Garbutt, Maleiki Haybe and Bernard Little to fill vacancies as substitute members
- Health Scrutiny Sub-Committee - Councillor Abtisam Mohamed to be removed as a member

- Education, Children and Families Policy Committee - Councillors Marieanne Elliot, Abtisam Mohamed, Maroof Raouf, Safiya Saeed and Paul Turpin to fill vacancies as substitute members
- Housing Policy Committee - Councillors Alexi Dimond, Marieanne Elliot and Christine Gilligan to fill vacancies as substitute members
- Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee - Councillors Mike Chaplin and Bryan Lodge to fill vacancies as substitute members
- Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee - Councillors Mike Drabble, Peter Garbutt, Bernard Little and Martin Phipps to fill vacancies as substitute members
- Economic Development and Skills Urgency Sub-Committee - Councillor Minesh Parekh to fill a vacancy
- Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee - Councillor Ruth Mersereau to fill a vacancy as a substitute member
- Waste and Street Scene Urgency Sub-Committee - Councillor Mark Jones to fill a vacancy
- Communities, Parks and Leisure Policy Committee - Councillors Fran Belbin, Brian Holmshaw, Christine Gilligan, Mary Lea and Ruth Mersereau to fill vacancies as substitute members
- Communities, Parks and Leisure Urgency Sub-Committee - Councillor Peter Price to fill a vacancy
- Planning and Highways Committee - Councillor Ian Auckland to fill a vacancy as a substitute member
- Corporate Joint Committee with Trade Unions - (1) Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed to replace Councillor Martin Smith; and (2) Councillors Dawn Dale, Mazher Iqbal and Zahira Naz to serve as substitute members for their Co-Chairs

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

- Joint Advisory Committee for the - Councillor Janet Ridler to fill a vacancy

South Yorkshire  
Archaeology Service

Mayoral Combined Authority Overview and Scrutiny Committee - Councillor David Barker to fill a vacancy as a substitute member

Poors Land (Ecclesall Bierlow Charity) - Mr Mike Waters to fill a vacancy

(j) it be noted that appointment of Members to the Local Panel for Together Housing (a stock transfer management board) and to Sheffield Compact, are no longer required to be made as those bodies no longer exist.