

Agenda Item 3

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH, on Wednesday 3 February 2016, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR ()
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Denise Fox)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Mike Drabble Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i> Julie Gledhill Roy Munn Richard Shaw	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Steve Wilson Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Nasima Akther Nikki Bond Mohammad Maroof
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> John Campbell Lynn Rooney Paul Wood
4	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	13	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Sheila Constance Alan Law Garry Weatherall	22	<i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Aodan Marken Brian Webster	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Leigh Bramall Tony Damms
6	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Ibrar Hussain	15	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Steve Jones Cate McDonald Chris Peace	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Lewis Dagnall Robert Murphy Sarah Jane Smalley	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Steve Ayris	25	<i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Keith Davis
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Anne Murphy Geoff Smith	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Dianne Hurst Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea	18	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Jenny Armstrong Terry Fox Pat Midgley	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> John Booker Adam Hurst Zoe Sykes
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Ray Satur

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from the Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Isobel Bowler, Rob Frost, Gill Furniss, Shaffaq Mohammed, Denise Reaney and Cliff Woodcraft.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Richard Crowther declared a personal interest in item number 9 on the Summons for this meeting (Notice of Motion Concerning the Steel Industry) as his father was employed by Forgemasters.

Councillor Jenny Armstrong declared a personal interest in item number 16 on the Summons for this meeting (Notice of Motion Concerning Student Maintenance Grants) as she was a student nurse.

Councillor Ray Satur declared a personal interest in relation to the subject of the Petition at item 4 (Petition calling on the Council to install crossing at the junction where Castle Street/Waingate and Haymarket join) on the grounds of his employment.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 6th January 2016 be approved as a true and accurate record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Petitions

4.1.1 Petition Objecting to Government Funding Cuts

The Council received a petition containing 931 signatures objecting to Government funding cuts.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Alistair Tice. Mr Tice stated that he would urge the Council to adopt a Sheffield People's budget, with no cuts in 2016. He commented that it had been reported that 400 Council job losses were likely and given this background, it was important that the Council took the petition seriously. The petition, he said, had trade union support and had attracted a high number of signatures.

The petitioners were not calling on the Council to set an illegal budget, although he stated that the Council would be acting illegally if it was not able to carry out its statutory duties. The Chair of the Local Government Association had also referred

to the plight of local authorities. He asked the Council to explore the use of reserves and borrowing powers. The reserves earmarked to pay contractors, including AMEY and Veolia could be used now to plug the gap and campaign to regain the funding which had been lost. He said that he understood that the Council could potentially take the waste contract from Veolia and save money by running services itself.

Mr Tice suggested that the City Council took a stand and said that the Council would win the support of trades unions and local communities for such action and the launch of a mass campaign by like-minded local authorities.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources. Councillor Curran stated that this matter had been discussed on previous occasions. He acknowledged that the Government austerity programme did hurt people. He assured the petitioners that, if the Council was able to set a budget which did not affect people it would do. However, the amount of funding which the Council received from the Government was decreasing. In 1992, the Government introduced legislation which required local authorities to set a balanced budget. It was very difficult to see how it was possible for the Council to set a no cuts budget, without it being illegal. Moreover, use of reserves and borrowing may also serve to store up problems for the future. No political party or local authority administration in the country had proposed a no cuts budget as it would be illegal and it was not proposed to do so in Sheffield.

4.1.2 Petition Requesting a Loading Bay near Watan Curry House, Page Hall Road

The Council received a petition containing nine signatures, requesting a loading bay near the Watan Curry House, Page Hall Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Mehboob Hussain, who stated that there was particular difficulty in loading to premises on Page Hall Road where there were double yellow lines in place and there was also a bus stop, with people susceptible to receiving parking fines when they were attempting to unload vehicles. It was requested that an loading bay was put in place at the site.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport. Councillor Fox said that he would make sure a meeting was arranged on site including with local councillors to look at the details of the situation as described by the petition.

4.2 Public Questions

4.2.1 Public Question Concerning Installation of Fire Doors

Richard Perks stated that he was a leaseholder and had been informed by the Council that he would have to have fire doors installed at his property. However, he said that no one had visited the property in relation to the matter. He stated that the cost to him of installing the door would be £1,500. In comparison, he had obtained an alternative quote to purchase the door himself and have it fitted,

which would cost only £500. He asserted that Kier would be making a profit of £1000 on this job. He also raised concerns about the overall profit which Kier made, and instances of overcharging by them.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing, responded and stated that she would look into the amount that Mr Perks was being charged for the installation of a fire door and respond to him. She said that the Council was bringing services provided by Kier back in house.

4.2.2 Public Question Concerning the Housing and Planning Bill and Welfare to Work Reform Bill

Mr A P Page asked whether the Cabinet Member for Housing or other Member of the Council would propose the following resolution:

- “
- a. Condemns the housing policies of the Tory Government in the Housing and Planning Bill and the Welfare to Work Reform Bill which will destroy council housing as we know it.
 - b. Resolves to:
Oppose and resist these policies and support the national campaign to get these stopped alongside tenants, trade unions, councillors and MPs.
 - c. Oppose the imposition of a 1% reduction in council rents which will drain the housing service of £27 million per year needed for proper maintenance of the housing stock UNLESS this sum is reimbursed into the Housing Revenue Account.
 - d. Oppose the demolition of viable estates which are communities not just bricks and mortar.
 - e. Issue a public statement clearly expressing their opposition to the Tory government/s housing plans which undermine council housing.
 - f. Resists the implementation of these plans alongside the tenants national campaign to defend their right to a decent, secure, affordable home to rent.”

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that the Council had condemned the housing policies of the Government, such as the Bedroom Tax and had also supported campaigns opposing such policies which were unfair and had an adverse social and economic impact on people and communities. The Council was also opposed to the 1% reduction in rents. However, it was legislation which the Council had to implement and was included in the Housing Revenue Account item referred to Council from Cabinet, which would be considered at this meeting of the Council.

The Fairness Commission Annual Review commented on issues regarding housing and supported housing. As regards the potential demolition of estates,

Councillor Dore stated that the Administration would not be proposing a scheme to abolish 'sink' estates. It had implemented programmes to regenerate housing through Housing Market Renewal and the Decent Homes programme. The Council wished to pursue regeneration rather than demolition of housing. She also noted that there was a motion on the Council Summons regarding the Housing and Planning Bill. Councillor Dore affirmed that she would be glad to support a campaign which opposed the Bill, which she said was pernicious and draconian.

(Note: The Council noted a question received from Jules Alexandra which referred to a Council officer by name and would not be considered under the public questions item.)

4.2.3 Public Question Concerning Closure of Government Offices

Kaltun Elmi asked if the opposition party would oppose the closure of government offices that are in Sheffield, to stop it moving to London.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council responded that by 'opposition' party she took that to mean the national opposition party in Westminster. She said that it was proposed that Department of Business, Innovation and Skills jobs would be moved to London. The Government would need to address the loss of employment in Sheffield and reconcile this with its stated commitment to the 'Northern Powerhouse' and associated investment, future economic growth, skills and relocation of businesses, which were needed in order to rebalance the economy. The first announcement of the closure of the Business, Innovation and Skills offices in Sheffield was made when the 90 day notice was served. She had written to the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills and had demanded a meeting with them and others including local MPs and unions, in order to understand the rationale behind the decision and to also make the case for the relocation of jobs from London to Sheffield.

Councillor Dore stated that she had not yet received a reply to her letter and if she did not hear from him, she would write to the Chancellor of the Exchequer. There was also an online petition which she would encourage people to sign. Louise Haigh MP had asked an urgent question in Parliament on this subject. A meeting with the PCS (Public and Commercial Services) Union had also been scheduled. The previous Coalition Government had also relocated Department for Work and Pensions jobs to Scotland and others had been relocated abroad. This latest decision was, she said, one which the Council would not accept.

4.2.4 Public Questions Concerning the Stubbin Estate

Sylvana Mansell asked the following questions:

Would the Council be willing to allow the community of the Stubbin Estate to create its own future by shaping its own policies on a bottom-up basis?

Will the Council support the community if it is revealed that the agencies or individuals behave inappropriately and is there any objection to the publication of details as to the unacceptable behaviour?

Will the Council respect the wishes of the local people and give them prime importance above any imposed agencies?

Councillor Sioned Mair Richards, the Acting Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods responded that the questions applied to her work on Neighbourhood issues relating to the Stubbin Estate. She suggested that she meet with the questioner regarding the issues she had raised.

4.2.5 Public Questions Concerning Trees

Robert McBride asked why the Council had not adhered to the Aarhus Convention, which he said was a legally binding agreement, and carried out a proper and correct consultation process in relation to the proposed felling of trees?

Alan Robshaw asked why questions asked since the July Council meeting had not been answered. With regard to the Streets Ahead contract with AMEY, he asked why the Council said the contract cannot be changed, when Clauses 5.2 to 5.5 allow for change in service; the law; in highway standards; and in Council policy.

Colette Cameon stated that research showed that mental and physical health was improved by the presence of trees. She asked how this could be monitored and the effect on health and wellbeing could be measured of reducing this natural resource.

Michele Lazenby asked whether consideration had been given to the effect on property values where trees had been removed and potential for financial compensation.

Jon Johnson asked who was collating the evidence for the Independent Tree Panel and how the public could view it and make comments.

James Mountain stated that people had been told that there was no budget to retain the Elm tree on Chelsea Road. He asked as there had been no cost/benefit analysis undertaken on the street trees, how were costs being accurately assessed and did the Council acknowledge that large mature trees offer most in ecosystem services and had monetary value?

Helen McIlroy stated that AMEY claimed that all staff were NJUG (National Joint Utilities Group) trained and the 5 year tree management plan also claimed that there was compliance with NJUG guidance. She asked why on 15 January, machinery was used right up to trees at Winn Gardens within the NJUG protection zone and said there were photographs of this taking place. She also asked for the location of over 140 trees that it was claimed were retained using flexible paving.

Dr Deepra Shetty stated that the AMEY Operations Manager said that AMEY had an alternative specification that had not been made public and asked, if these solutions had been used on Snaithing Lane and in other places, why could they not be used city-wide?

Louise Wilcockson asked how people could submit evidence to the Independent Tree Panel as there were no contact details available. She stated that she had contacted the Director of Development Services in relation to this matter on 20 January. Louise Wilcockson also asked how people would know what would be put before the Panel and how many trees and streets will be considered at each Independent Tree Panel sitting. She said that more information was needed to allow this to be an open and democratic process.

The questions were referred to the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Councillor Terry Fox and responses would be given by Councillor Fox as part of his response to the petition concerning trees in Nether Edge which was presented later in the meeting.

4.2.6 Public Questions Concerning Complaints Process

Marc Ewan stated that he had recently tried to make a complaint to the Council and found the process very difficult. He asked if the Council would be prepared to form a working group to examine and to scrutinise the complaints process.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, responded and stated that she was aware of the complaint that Mr Ewan had made regarding a recent meeting. Complaints, questions and queries were usually acknowledged and referred to a Council officer for a response. Members were advised that the matter to which Mr Ewan referred had been received by email and was being considered through the complaints process and Mr Ewan would receive a response to the matters he had raised.

4.2.7 Public Questions Concerning Council Reserves and Budget

Roan James asked how much of the Council's reserves were to pay for Public Finance Initiative (PFI) contracts in Sheffield?

Carrie Hedderick stated that the scale of financial cuts to the Council was enormous and that the language which the Council used which termed these cuts as 'savings' was not the correct way of describing cuts which had been imposed by the Government. She asked whether Sheffield City Council had made moves to join with other local authorities to take the issue of financial cuts to local authority budgets up with the Government.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, responded that with regard to the Council's financial reserves, it was known that there was £28 million which the Council would have to pay for PFI contracts and the bulk of this was in Government PFI Credits which the Council was given.

Councillor Curran said that in terms of the scale of financial cuts, the Council had been clear about the level of financial cuts to its budget and that it was the Government's austerity agenda which was driving the cuts. It was not the Council's desire to make cuts, but it was the outcome of Government enforced austerity. No political group on the Council had proposed a no cuts budget and the

instruction from the national Leader of his political party was to set a balanced budget.

4.2.8 Public Question Concerning Elected Members

Martin Brighton stated that an elected member had shown that the needs of the citizens come first and said that when a crisis occurred, at a weekend, and out of hours, that Cabinet Member selflessly put all to one side, pulled out the stops, and by the Monday remedial action had been put in place. He said that the Cabinet Member was Councillor Jayne Dunn. Mr Brighton asked: "could this Full Council please take this exemplar of good practice and use it as a template for how all elected members should serve their citizens?"

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded by thanking Mr Brighton for his compliment to Councillor Jayne Dunn. She said there were many occasions when City councillors went the extra mile and it was nice to show appreciation to them.

4.2.9 Public Question Concerning Questions at Council

Martin Brighton asked the following questions:

What is the point, if: -

1. "When questions are asked in this chamber they are not properly answered, even when later asked to review the answers given?"
2. "When asked in this chamber to clarify the questions, the following emails are ignored?"
3. "Not one of the issues raised by the questions has ever been resolved?"
4. "Even when agreeing to meet with abused people, and making promises in a digitally recorded meeting, nothing followed?"
5. "Questions that should be answered by politicians, that do not come under [Freedom of Information Act] FoIA, are sent to the Fol department, who are unable to answer?"

Councillor Julie Dore stated that she believed that Members answered questions put to them as best they could. She said that if Mr Brighton was not satisfied, she believed that he would follow up the matter with Members or ask the question again.

With regards to requests under the Freedom of Information Act, a person bringing forward a question may distinguish whether or not the request was under the FOI Act and the recipient of the request may also determine that and pass the request to the appropriate department as a request under the Freedom of Information Act. In some cases, it was possible to gain more information by using the FOI process. Councillor Dore said that if a person felt that something should be treated as a FOI request but it had been answered as if it was a question instead, then they would need to say so.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that in relation to Mr Brighton's reference to abuse, it was clear that if he had any allegations of abuse, then he should contact her and provide details and she would request that officers investigate the matter.

4.2.10 Public Question Concerning Rutting

Martin Brighton stated that it was the annual rutting season and that it was city-wide, pernicious, showed disrespect for the community, was unsightly, and a safety issue. He asked that after all these years, could the Council adopt a policy and enforce a procedure to prevent rutting in public spaces?

Councillor Sioned Mair Richards stated that upon researching what was meant by the term "Rutting", she found that it was in fact a local reference to verges being driven over by vehicles, which resulted in the formation of ruts and cars getting bogged down on the verge surface. She stated that she, together with the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, Councillor Terry Fox, would look at the problem of rutting and how it might be stopped, through for example the use of wooden bollards and she would respond to Mr Brighton on this matter.

4.2.11 Public Question Concerning Declarations of Interest

Martin Brighton asked if the Council would consider reviewing its Constitution and expanding the rules for Declarations of Interest.

He said that that: "The reason for this is because, upon investigation, it was found that there were many indirect associations or arm's-length involvement of elected members or elite but influential cadres that were not declared. What is being revealed is an entire community of inextricably entangled politicians and their self-serving puppets that are to all extents and purposes invisible to the electorate. It is asked that this review be urgent."

Councillor Julie Dore responded that, if Mr Brighton could identify where somebody has an interest which had not been declared, then he should bring this to the attention of the Council.

4.3 Petitions Requiring Debate

4.3.1 Petition Requiring Debate Calling on the Council to Install a Crossing at the Junction where Castle Street/Waingate and Haymarket Join

The Council received an electronic petition containing 7,833 signatures calling on the Council to install a crossing at the junction where Castle Street/Waingate and Haymarket joined. The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at the Council meeting. The wording of the e-petition was as follows:-

"I am writing this petition to ask Sheffield Council to install traffic lights at the junctions in the Sheffield city centre. The same spot where Summer Lee Seymour lost her life in a collision with a bus along with her boyfriend, who is currently fighting for his life.

As a bus driver myself, this has been an accident waiting to happen for a long time. It really saddened me to hear of Summer's passing and I think that in respect of Summer, and for her boyfriend, Sheffield needs to do this to prevent any other lives at risk.

15 year old Summer Seymour had her whole life ahead of her. I didn't know her personally and neither do I know the family or her partner, but this beautiful girl lost her life and I think it could have been prevented had there been traffic lights and a pedestrian crossing installed. It is really bad driving round the city centre, especially in this area. I've come across lots of near misses myself and it won't be the last time if something isn't done about this soon.

So please do this in respect of Summer Seymour and her boyfriend. Please sign and share. We don't want anymore tragic accidents, please act now."

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Melissa Hewitt who stated that the petition was requesting a crossing in honour and respect of Summer Seymour and to prevent the occurrence of another tragic accident. She was aware of the dangers of the junction and a crossing at that location was badly needed.

The petition had the support of Summer's family and it could make things safer in the area for everyone's benefit to try and prevent a similar tragedy happening again. She acknowledged there was a safe crossing by the KFC restaurant nearby but the area concerned was on a blind corner and was close to a taxi rank and also used frequently by buses. The installation of a crossing would slow down traffic in the area especially on the corner. She therefore hoped that the Council would agree to the installation of the crossing in memory of Summer and for the safety of the public.

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

Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, thanked Ms. Hewitt and the petitioners for bringing the matter to Council and for raising the issue of the need for a crossing at the junction.

Councillor Fox commented that it was one of the hardest jobs for a Member and a Cabinet Member to be faced with such a horrific incident. He also wished Jake Ford well, who had also been seriously hurt in the incident. As a parent himself, Councillor Fox commented that he could not imagine what the family of Summer and Jake had been through.

As soon as was possible following the incident, Councillor Fox said he had been

to inspect the scene. Following the relocation of the market he would have expected footfall in the area to have decreased but that did not seem to be the case and there was still a high level of risk to people in the area.

Police investigations into the incident were still ongoing to which the Council was closely involved, noting that the speed limit in the area was 30mph and the condition and width of the carriageway had been inspected. Visibility had also been looked at and Councillor Tony Downing, Cabinet Adviser for Environment and Transport, had provided advice as a former bus driver.

The Council had a long list of traffic calming schemes which had been requested and affordability did have to be considered in the assessment of such schemes. Historical accident rates at that location were available and had shown that there had been 6 accidents in recent years.

Councillor Fox further commented that the Council had to take into consideration the police forensic investigation. The Coroner may put forward some recommendations which the Council would have to consider.

The Council was awaiting recommendations from different sources. When these had been received, they would be considered carefully and decisions would be made. There were some short term options available but the overall masterplan for the City needed to be kept in mind.

In conclusion, Councillor Fox thanked Ms. Hewitt and the petitioners for bringing the petition and sent his thoughts to the families of those involved.

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

The Council could look at changing the layout of the road and the safety issues in the area. Councillor Fox's comments that the evidence would be taken on board when reaching a decision were welcomed.

The junction concerned was a blind bend which was a blind bend by design. However, this style of junction created unnecessary danger and this should be looked at. The administration were supported in taking action that they thought was appropriate and it was hoped that progress could be made.

The death of a child or young person was especially sad and this incident could easily have resulted in two deaths and it was hoped that Jake Ford would make a speedy recovery. It was right that the petitioners were calling for something to be done. There had been many near misses in the area. Even when the market was there and there was a footbridge, this was often not used.

A change of priorities may improve safety in the area where vehicles could be made to give way at the end of Castle Street at the junction with Haymarket.

There was a need to do something both in the short term and the long term and

this area should not be forgotten and neglected. The problems were obvious but the solutions might not necessarily be so and it was accepted that officers needed to look at the area closely before a decision was made.

It was disappointing that a Police response had not been received prior to the Council meeting. The policy of prioritising road safety improvements based on accident statistics was supported and it was wrong to prioritise around schools and across the City, accident statistics should be the basis of such decisions.

Accident statistics showed that the issue was much improved compared to 20 years ago. The Council had limited resources and needed to ensure that it put money into areas where it would have the maximum impact.

It was important to see the Police report and it was agreed that the Police should be pressed to release that to establish what had caused the accident. The junction layout should be examined and it needed to be kept in mind that a lot of buses and taxis used the area.

The area concerned was a point at which buses gathered and was well used by pedestrians, including mothers with prams. If there was a proposal for a 20mph zone this needed to be supported by additional traffic calming measures and consideration should be given to the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTe) also looking into the matter.

The reduction in accidents in recent years was heartening but one tragedy was one tragedy too many and the whole area needed examining by highway engineers.

Everyone was aware of the junction concerned and the safety issues associated with it. Despite the market moving location, the area still had places and shops to visit. The family could never recover from the loss of their daughter but if the conclusion was that the accident could have been avoided they would want to ensure that it never happened again.

The debate had highlighted the possible options available and it was important for the Cabinet Member to look at the short term options and also long term to consider who would continue to use the junction and think about what the best options were for all users.

The lead petitioner, Ms Hewitt, exercised a right of reply. She thanked all Members for listening and looked forward to seeing the outcome and the options presented for improving safety at the junction.

Councillor Terry Fox the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. He further requested that Ms. Hewitt pass the thoughts of all Members of the Council onto the family of Summer Seymour at this difficult time. During the debate a response had been received from the Police who were in the last stages of drafting the report which would be sent to the Coroner. It was important that the Council did not pre-judge the outcome and they would keep the challenge up to ensure a scheme was

developed to improve safety in the area.

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

<p>RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, that this Council:-</p> <p>(a) was deeply saddened to hear of the tragic fatal accident on Haymarket on 11 December;</p> <p>(b) requests officers to:-</p> <p>(i) review the lines and road markings in this area to see if there is any way to amend these to control speed; and</p> <p>(ii) follow the Early Action Team's recommendations and investigate whether effective improvements to this junction, such as road-narrowing, can be incorporated into the Grey to Green Scheme, which is being extended to the junction of Castle Street and Haymarket from next year; and</p> <p>(c) asks that the Cabinet Highways Committee consider the viability of the options available to improve the junction, taking into account the findings of the police report when it is published.</p>

4.3.2 Petition Requiring Debate Requesting the Council (acting as Trustees of Graves Park) to Protect the Park and Not Sell Cobnar Cottage

The Council received an electronic petition containing 12,942 supporters calling on the Council (acting as Trustees of Graves Park) to protect the Park and not sell Cobnar Cottage. The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at the Council meeting. The wording of the e-petition was as follows:-

"Cobnar Cottage in Graves Park is up for auction at the end of this month. If the Council (acting as trustees of the park) succeed in selling the cottage, it will break the covenants on Graves Park. This will put any of the rest of the park at risk of sale. It also puts at risk all the other covenants on property given to the people of Sheffield by J G Graves.

Graves Park does not belong to the Council, it belongs to the citizens of Sheffield.

In 2009 Sheffield City Council put all of the Graves Park covenants into one scheme, to protect all of the park and to stop any future disputes. By selling the cottage they are breaking their own agreements of just 6 years ago.

The latest proposed solution is that a stonemason has volunteered to live in the cottage and restore it to its former glory, using his skills. The Friends of Graves

Park have agreed to fund his work (he would give his labour for free and would only need funding for raw materials). The stonemason would also like to run training for young people and workshops for the public. The cottage would remain within the Graves Park trust and in public ownership. This is the perfect solution to the fate of the cottage. The Council, however, see no value in a stonemason working in Graves Park and have rejected this proposal. They are determined to sell the cottage.

The Council says the people of Sheffield do not care about Cobnar Cottage and support its sale.

Act now! Sign this petition! Write to your local Councillors! Write to the leader of the Council! Write to your MP! Help us to protect the covenants before it is too late!

Support us in protecting Graves Park!"

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Caroline Dewar who stated that 12,942 signatures to the petition had been received strongly objecting to the sale of Cobnar Cottage. It was protected by a Covenant and if the sale went ahead the Covenant would be broken and the Council would be held legally responsible.

Ms. Dewar further commented that the Charity Commission had stated that the decision to sell the Cottage was the responsibility of the Trustees. The debate presented the final opportunity for the Trustees to reverse the decision to sell the Cottage. There was, she said, a clear conflict of interest for the Trustees and the decision to sell the cottage was not acting in the best interests of the Graves Park Charity or the people of Sheffield. Trustees could not and should not pass on the responsibility for the decision to Council Officers and should not follow their misguided advice.

Ms. Dewar said that the Covenant stated that land in Part 1 of the Scheme must be maintained and this included Cobnar Cottage. The Cottage was very important to local people and the decision to sell was a clear message from the Trustees to the people of Sheffield. The sale must be reversed and should this not be the case, it was a clear example of democracy not working in Sheffield as the Trustees were not acting in the best interests of the people of Sheffield.

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

Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, the Acting Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, thanked Ms. Dewar and the petitioners for bringing the matter to Council and for raising the issue of the sale of Cobnar Cottage.

Councillor Richards further commented that she felt equally as passionately as the petitioners about Graves Park and she believed the sale of Cobnar Cottage at Auction in the previous week for a price of £152k was in the best interests of the

people of Sheffield.

The funds received from the sale would be invested entirely in Graves Park for the benefit of users of the Park. There were plans to improve toilet provision, play facilities, paths and running trails, which were all things that were needed.

There was no funding available to the Council at present to maintain the Park and maintenance works were funded through the taxpayer. As funding was reduced due to Government cuts, the resources available for maintenance were reduced.

Discussions on the proposals concerning Cobnar Cottage had taken place with the Friends of Graves Park for around 2 years and the Covenant allowed the Trustees to demolish the Cottage. The Friends had said they would agree to that. However, demolition was not felt to be in the best interests of the Park.

As previously stated, the sale allowed for improvements to the Park for the benefit of all users. The Trustees intended to continue to proceed with the sale of the Cottage. The matter had been to Scrutiny 3 times and Cabinet 3 times. Trustees had listened to the views of petitioners and the Friends of Graves Park and had explained the reason for the decision a number of times which was that the funds from the sale could be spent on much needed Capital projects for the benefit of the people of Sheffield.

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

The land concerned had been gifted in 1925 to be retained as parkland. The City Council purchased another 1/3 of the land in the 1960's and in the 1990's sold off part of the park. It had been confirmed that the area referred to in the petition was Charitable Land.

The Council had brought everything together under one scheme to protect the park for ever so it was difficult to understand why the Cottage was now being sold off. It was proposed that local Councillors should be involved as Trustees as they had the local knowledge to ensure that the original intention of J.G Graves to protect the park was retained forever.

Graves Park had been gifted to the people of Sheffield and it was important that the Trustees acted in the people's best interests. The Cottage was run down and in need of repair. The issue of the sale had been scrutinised many times and the Charity Commission had not raised an objection.

There were no plans to dispose of parkland across the City. There would now be money available to spend on Graves Park with which the upgrading of the tennis courts should also be explored.

Local people were of the opinion that this was a first step and further sales were planned and other areas of the park were now at risk. The Council may realise £152k from the sale but a proper relationship with the Friends of Graves Park

would have presented an opportunity to transform Graves Park and would far outweigh the money gained from the sale.

The Cottage had been part of the park for centuries and should be maintained. The issue of how the park was governed as a Charity should be examined as it should be a local trusteeship with a role for backbench councillors and Cabinet acting as Trustees should then be freed from day to day responsibility for the park.

The wording of the petition suggested that all parks in the City were under threat which misrepresented the issue and may have caused people to sign when they were not aware of the true facts. An independent survey undertaken by Sheffield Hallam University had shown that people across the City thought that the sale of the Cottage and investment in the Park was a good idea.

The Friends of Graves Park had put forward a proposal to demolish the Cottage whereas the sale would preserve the overall setting. It was hoped that the Council and the Friends of Graves Park would work together for the future of Graves Park.

There was a perception that the Trustees had refused to listen to the people of Sheffield and had not looked at alternative options other than the sale of the Cottage. The Cottage had not been gifted to the Council but to the people of Sheffield and it did not lie outside of the park.

The disregard shown to petitioners by the administration was reprehensible and a matter of regret. The sale of the Cottage should have been postponed until the petition had been heard.

The issue of Cobnar Cottage was discussed at Cabinet in July 2013 following the submission of a report outlining potential options. Since that time the Council had continually maintained that if the Friends of Graves Park wished to present an affordable option this would be given consideration. The only option presented was demolition of the Cottage and this was not one that the Trustees felt was appropriate. The sale of the Cottage was therefore the only viable option and this allowed someone to live in the Cottage and money could be spent on improvements to the Park. Friends groups in the City were thanked and the City depended on their contribution to its parks.

The money raised from the sale was welcome, although it was also suggested that the Trustees were not entitled to sell the land. It was proposed that the issue be referred to scrutiny.

The City valued its parks and green spaces and it was recognised that people were passionate about them. With the Government cuts, the Council needed to find additional funding to invest in parks and money was needed to protect parks across the City and for the benefit of people in the City.

The lead petitioner, Ms. Dewar, exercised a right of reply. She stated that it was not true to say Graves Park was short of money. It was not a political issue and the Friends of Graves Park had met with Louise Haigh M.P. who had been sympathetic to their arguments. The Friends had spoken to a Stonemason who

was prepared to work for free in return for being able to live in the Cottage. This option was presented to the Council in October and November 2015.

Ms. Dewar further commented that the Cottage was protected by a Covenant. The Charity Commission and Covenants were also clear that money earned from any sale could not be spent on maintenance of the park and needed to be spent on Capital projects.

There needed to be a change in the Trustees of the Park to better represent local people. The Council did not own Graves Park, it belonged to the people of Sheffield. Selling Cobnar Cottage had broken a Covenant and should not have taken place.

Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards the Acting Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. She commented that it had been raised during the debate that Graves Park should be kept the same. She did not want the Park to be kept the same but instead she wished to see it improve which was why the decision had been taken.

The Cottage had never been a public amenity. It was private and would remain as such. Being sold and undergoing maintenance improvement work would allow residential ownership including the possibility of a family living there. The sale would not present a fundamental change to the Park for Park users.

Councillor Richards had received requests from local Ward Councillors to improve the tennis courts at the Park. This could now be a possibility with money received from the sale whereas previously there was no funding for this. Councillor Richards had listened carefully to what the Friends of Graves Park had proposed and believed that their proposals would not benefit the people of Sheffield.

The views expressed by the Friends of Graves Park had not persuaded the Trustees that they were taking the wrong course of action by selling the Cottage and the Charity Commission had confirmed that the Trustees had the right to sell.

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

It was moved by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, seconded by Councillor Neale Gibson, that this Council notes the petition calling on the Council not to sell Cobnar Cottage, but resolves not to depart from the current course of action to complete the sale of the Cottage and reinvest the proceeds in Graves Park

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor David Baker, as an amendment, that the issue be referred to the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee as it was considered that the decision to sell the Cottage was taken based on flawed information.

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

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

- For the amendment (20) - Councillors Richard Shaw, Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, David Baker, Katie Condliffe, Vickie Priestley Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker.
- Against the amendment (53) - Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Dianne Hurst, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Garry Weatherall, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.
- Abstained on the amendment (1) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

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

RESOLVED: That this Council notes the petition calling on the Council not to sell Cobnar Cottage, but resolves not to depart from the current course of action to complete the sale of the Cottage and reinvest the proceeds in Graves Park.

4.3.3 Petition Objecting to the Felling of Trees in Nether Edge

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 6,500 signatures, objecting to the felling of trees in Nether Edge and requesting that, as an alternative to felling, sensitive engineering solutions be implemented in order to enable the long-term retention of trees in the Nether Edge area. The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at the Council meeting. The wording of the petition was as follows:-

“We, the undersigned, refute the assertion that the felling of trees in Netheredge, Sheffield, is necessary. Instead, we demand, and believe it imperative, that sensitive engineering solutions be adopted and implemented to enable the long-term retention of these trees.

Evidence indicates that such large trees contribute significantly to local climate regulation, filtration of atmospheric pollutants, sustainable urban drainage, biodiversity, ecology: health and wellbeing and amenity; through their beauty and our pleasure of its enjoyment, which enriches our lives.

So far between August 2012 and July 2015 2,019 trees have been felled across the city. The SCC argue that the trees are damaging the pavements and roads and are therefore are "dangerous and/or discriminatory to disabled people and those using pushchairs". We believe the damage is minor and does not significantly impair accessibility for disabled people, or the use of prams and pushchairs. It is our opinion that sensitive engineering solutions, such as pavement restructuring and localized remediation near trees, with kerb stones sculpted to accommodate root morphology, would represent a sustainable solution to perceived problems.

Loss of these trees would represent a significant loss of a valuable foraging resource for bees, bats, owls and many other insects and birds. Not to mention the emotional wellbeing of Sheffield's residents. Lines could be painted on the road to prevent parking under trees, thereby minimizing the risk of damage to vehicles, to a level firmly within the "broadly acceptable region" of tolerability.

SCC and Amey have pledged to plant small ornamental trees to "replace" the mature trees. These are not a replacement. Sapling trees cannot provide the same that mature trees can its impossible. Some of these trees are over 100 years old. It is ignorant to suggest that it is possible to just "replace" them.

Sub-veteran, mature trees represent our cultural heritage and are irreplaceable. We demand that alternative, sensitive engineering solutions be implemented as an alternative to felling.

Much of Netheredge is deemed a conservation area, these trees are an invaluable part of Sheffield heritage and cannot be allowed to be destroyed.”

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Carly Mountain who stated that the petitioners wished for the matter to be considered by a Council Scrutiny Committee. Nether Edge was an area which was rich in trees and it was also a Conservation Area. The Council's website made reference to the importance of trees in policy making. Mature large canopy trees had the most significant impact on air quality and trees had an effect on ecosystem services. Reference was also made to the call for investment in flood defences for Sheffield and to the contribution that trees might make to reducing flood risk. She said that a cost benefit analysis of highways trees was required and which should form part of the strategy regarding trees, which was awaited.

The contract with AMEY should have incorporated the issue of engineering solutions and trees might be maintained where alternative solutions and kerb specifications were used. She referred to the availability of financial resources, which she stated could be made available if the Council wished. The loss of up to fifty percent of street trees would she said change the face of the City and she asked whether the Streets Ahead project was sustainable. Saplings could still be planted, without felling existing trees. It was felt that the Aarhus Convention had not been applied with regard to the preparation of plans for the environment, and errors had been made with regard to tree surveys.

It was not known how the Independent Tree Panel could be contacted and there were concerns with regard to consultation relating to the potential felling of trees. The petitioners requested an Environmental Impact Assessment of the cumulative effect of felling high trees under the Streets Ahead project.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.1 (b), the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport responded to the petition.

Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, thanked the petitioners and campaigners. He stated that the Streets Ahead project was something which had the support of the silent majority of people who asked the Council to rid Sheffield of pot holes, improve street lighting and pavements and undertake management of highways trees. In an independent report during 2007, 75 percent of street trees were assessed as being mature or over-mature with potentially catastrophic decline in the health and safety of street trees if a programme of replacement was not undertaken. The Streets Ahead contract was informed by this survey. AMEY had a five year tree strategy within the contract. Information which had been part of a confidential document had now been released as public information. Councillor Fox said that the policy and procedures which were in place were up for people to challenge if they wished. Removing trees was ,he said, a last resort.

With regard to the Independent Tree Panel, Councillor Fox said that he was waiting to be informed about the detail of how people could contribute to it. Guidance was awaited as to how the Panel would receive evidence. He said that all sides in the issue had their own opinions. The Council was surveying every household on streets which were affected by the potential felling of a tree, which was considered to be above and beyond action required in other disciplines, such as planning applications. There was currently a process of carrying out surveys of 80 streets. There were approximately 100 trees that could not be worked on, 200 trees requiring significant engineering solutions and 1000 affecting kerbs. The cost to carry out the solutions required to retain those street trees would be £14.7 million and this would require an increase in Council Tax of 8.2 percent. 5,136 households had been sent surveys and 13 percent of those households had responded. The Independent Tree Panel had called-in the streets that they wished to examine and 37 streets had been released back to AMEY.

Councillor Fox stated that people wished for the Streets Ahead programme to move forward for the benefit of their communities.

The Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport then spoke on the matter and Members of the City Council then debated the matters raised by the petition, as summarised below:

The Council was not listening and although credit was given for establishing the Tree Forum and an Independent Tree Panel, it was yet to be seen what this would achieve. The consultation in respect of highway trees was flawed and the felling of healthy highway trees was indefensible. A strategy would enable the weighing up of costs and benefits. Greater flexibility was needed concerning standards relating to pavement construction.

The Council said had that it would listen with regard to the issue of highway trees and Tree Forum meetings had taken place and meetings had been held with individual groups. 80 streets had been surveyed and to date, 2613 trees had been retained. 42 streets had been referred to the Independent Tree Panel and consultation was being undertaken as to the replacement of 231 trees. It was apparent that there was a silent majority of people saying that they wanted to City's roads to be upgraded and, without the Streets Ahead programme the Council would not be able to protect trees. Replacement of trees at this point in time would mean that the problem was not passed on to future generations. Many of the existing street trees were not suitable for the highway and some action was required. There were financial implications of delay to the programme and the Streets Ahead programme was something which had cross party support of the Council.

People were waiting for a strategy for highway trees, which had been promised in July 2015. The Independent Panel would not meet in public and surveys were not sent to households when trees were categorised as dead, diseased or dying. The recommendations of the Independent Panel would need to have some weight, although any solutions proposed would need to be examined to see whether these were affordable and there was no funding earmarked for the Panel. Comment was made regarding the potential to renegotiate the Streets Ahead contract.

There were differences of opinion regarding street trees. Some people wished for trees to be replaced and there was also a fear of people tripping and falling on uneven pavements. Falls affected the lives of older people in particular and uneven pavements may contribute to the occurrence of falls. It was important to have pavements with even surfaces and in considering alternative solutions to retain trees, some level of proportionality need to be applied. The Council would have to decide the extent to which it should fund particular items. The Streets Ahead programme was popular and it was helpful that the Forum and Independent Panel had been established.

The issues were concerning the operation of the PFI contract, rather than its aims. The Council had the final say concerning which trees were retained and which were felled. With sympathetic solutions, a number of trees could be saved. The Streets Ahead programme had the potential of improving the City's roads and pavements. The Independent Tree Panel needed to be open and it was understood that the Panel would visit sites on which trees were located, rather than undertaking only a paper based exercise.

Sheffield had the largest number of trees per head of population and trees had been protected. The Air Quality Action Plan also recognised the importance of trees. It was part of the Streets Ahead contract that every tree that was removed would be replaced and historical gaps in trees would be filled under the contract. The planting season was from October to March and trees needed to be replaced within a timescale. The Council was not an organisation which did not care about trees, but it need to make sure that healthy trees would be there in the future.

The petitioners were thanked for bringing deficiencies in the Council policy to its attention. The evidence presented by the petitioners could be used to inform the Council strategy regarding highways trees. There should be scrutiny of the issues raised and of the Streets Ahead contract.

A document produced in 2009 relating to the highways contract also referred to the replacement of highways trees. The City had some four million trees and 36,000 highways trees.

Where a community was saying that it wished to retain trees, then this matter should be looked at more closely. There was also cost associated with felling and replacing trees.

The lead petitioner, Carly Mountain exercised a right of reply. She stated that mature and over mature trees was a way of classifying trees and not an indication of a rate of decline. She said there was capacity to change the Highways contract and asked for the Council to be as open to retaining as many trees as possible and take into account sound evidence and not vested interest. Alternative solutions were required, such as those which had been used to retain trees in some places, including Snaithing Lane, and these solutions should also be employed elsewhere, for other trees.

She stated that saplings had a high rate of failure and requested that an Environmental Impact Assessment was carried out and that the Council ceased the felling of highways trees until consultation had taken place. The public was not able to contribute to the Independent Tree Panel but City Council officers and representatives of AMEY were present at the first meeting of the Panel. The Council was requested to vote on a moratorium.

Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. He stated in relation to the Elm Tree on Chelsea Road that the Council was working closely with the Butterfly Association. When the Council obtained information, it would be made available in the public domain. On the matter of putting in place a moratorium on further work to highways trees, it was not only the Council and AMEY that had to be considered. The Department for Transport, banks and the Government were also part of the picture. There was cost associated with not meeting milestones within the contract and of standing down AMEY employees. The Council could potentially begin negotiations to get out of the contract with AMEY but there would be a cost and other matters to consider, including Government credits.

It was considered that the Council had gone beyond what might be expected as regards consultation in writing to each household in roads potentially affected by the proposed felling of a tree. The Independent Panel was independent and would tell the Council what they wanted and would reach a balanced decision. Page 12 of the Streets Ahead Five Year Tree Management Strategy stated that other engineering solutions were outside of the scope of the Streets Ahead contract. It was the right approach to continue with the Streets Ahead programme.

At the conclusion of the debate it was moved by Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that this Council:-

- (a) is working towards a strategy to maintain and replace the city's street tree stock to maintain our green status;
- (b) notes that the trees that are now being replaced have been subject to consultation surveys with local residents and trees are only being replaced where the majority of local residents have indicated support for the proposals;
- (c) notes that where residents have objected to the proposals they have been referred to the independent tree panel which will provide advice to the Council;
- (d) commits to being open and transparent with the Sheffield public ensuring all relevant information is available in the public domain; and
- (e) is committed to delivering the Streets Ahead programme which is improving Sheffield's highway network for future generations.

It was then moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an alternative proposal to that set out above that this Council refers the petition objecting to the felling of trees in Nether Edge to the appropriate Scrutiny Committee with particular regard to the operation of the Independent Tree Panel and consultation in this case.

On being put to the vote, the alternative proposal was negatived.

The original proposal was then put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) is working towards a strategy to maintain and replace the city's street tree stock to maintain our green status;
- (b) notes that the trees that are now being replaced have been subject to consultation surveys with local residents and trees are only being replaced where the majority of local residents have indicated support for the proposals;
- (c) notes that where residents have objected to the proposals they have been

- referred to the independent tree panel which will provide advice to the Council;
- (d) commits to being open and transparent with the Sheffield public ensuring all relevant information is available in the public domain; and
 - (e) is committed to delivering the Streets Ahead programme which is improving Sheffield's highway network for future generations.

4.4 Petitions

Petition Requesting Improvements to Pedestrian and Cycling Routes between Chesterfield Road and Abbeydale Road

The Council received an electronic petition containing 75 signatures, requesting improvements to pedestrian and cycling routes between Chesterfield Road and Abbeydale Road.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport and Councillor Fox stated that he would make contact with the lead petitioner.

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

5.1 Urgent Business

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

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) reported that Councillor Colin Ross would receive written responses to questions which he had submitted concerning the Department of Business Innovation and Skills and Council Information Technology but which would not be permitted to be asked as urgent business.)

5.2 Questions

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

5.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

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

6. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

RESOLVED: on the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that approval be given to the following changes in the membership of Committees, etc:

1. the removal of Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to create a vacancy on the Admissions Committee; and
2. that Councillor Mick Rooney replaces Councillor Anne Murphy on the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee.

7. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN, HRA BUDGET AND RENT INCREASE 2016/17

It was moved by Councillor Jayne Dunn, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that the following recommendations of the Cabinet made at its meeting on 13th January 2016 in relation to a joint report of the Executive Directors, Communities and Place and Interim Executive Director, Resources and concerning the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan, HRA Budget and Rent increase 2016/17 be approved:-

“RESOLVED: That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 3rd February, 2016 that :-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix A of the report is approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix B of the report is approved;
- (c) rents for Council dwellings, including Temporary Accommodation, are reduced by 1% from April 2016 in line with the requirements of the anticipated Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016;
- (d) rents for garages and garage sites remain frozen at 2015/16 levels and not increased from April 2016;
- (e) community heating charges are not increased from April 2016;
- (f) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods to amend the burglar alarm charge in 2016/17 in line with the costs

incurred under the new contract, and that, until the contract is in place and the charges are known, the burglar alarm charge remains unchanged;

- (g) the Sheltered Housing service charge which was amended in November 2015 is not increased from April 2016;
- (h) charges for furnished accommodation are not increased from April 2016;
- (i) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Director of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, to authorise prudential borrowing as allowed under current Government guidelines; and
- (j) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Director of Finance, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and the Cabinet Member for Housing, to amend rent levels for 2016/17 in the event that the statutory requirements at the relevant time are different to those anticipated.”

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Steve Ayris, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker as an amendment that the recommendations made by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 13th January, 2016, concerning the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan, HRA Budget and Rent Increase 2016/17, be approved with the addition of a new paragraph (k) as follows:-

- (k) calls on the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Director of Finance to report back to Council with details of any variations made to rent and any other charges contained within this report.

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

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

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 13th January, 2016:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix A to the report now submitted be approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget for 2016/17 as set out in Appendix B of the report be approved;
- (c) rents for Council dwellings, including Temporary Accommodation, be reduced by 1% from April 2016 in line with the requirements of the

- anticipated Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016;
- (d) rents for garages and garage sites remain frozen at 2015/16 levels and be not increased from April 2016;
 - (e) community heating charges be not increased from April 2016;
 - (f) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods to amend the burglar alarm charge in 2016/17 in line with the costs incurred under the new contract, and that, until the contract is in place and the charges are known, the burglar alarm charge remains unchanged;
 - (g) the Sheltered Housing service charge which was amended in November 2015 be not increased from April 2016;
 - (h) charges for furnished accommodation be not increased from April 2016;
 - (i) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Director of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Housing, to authorise prudential borrowing as allowed under current Government guidelines; and
 - (j) authority be delegated to the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods and Director of Finance, in consultation with the Director of Legal and Governance and the Cabinet Member for Housing, to amend rent levels for 2016/17 in the event that the statutory requirements at the relevant time are different to those anticipated.

8. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PAUL WOOD

Housing

It was moved by Councillor Paul Wood, seconded by Councillor Karen McGowan, that this Council:-

- (a) believes the Government's Housing and Planning Bill will lead to a reduction in the number of homes available at genuinely affordable rents at a time when Sheffield needs more;
- (b) deplores the decisions of the current Government and the previous Coalition Government to cut grant funding for new social housing;
- (c) opposes:-
 - (i) the Government's decision to allow private consultants to process and potentially determine planning applications, and believes locally elected representatives are the most suitable people to deal with

this; and

- (ii) the watering down of Section 106 and the broadening of the definition of 'affordable homes' to include Starter Homes, and is concerned that these changes are likely to produce fewer new homes at genuinely affordable rents in Sheffield;
- (d) believes:-
- (i) children of tenants have rights and that the ending of home security for people upon the death of a parent is both ethically and morally unfair;
 - (ii) limiting councils to giving tenancies of between 2 and 5 years maximum is unfair on tenants and detrimental to developing strong, safe and cohesive communities and a stable schooling environment for young people;
 - (iii) believes the Right to Buy discounts for housing association tenants funded by the sale of high-value council housing is effectively a levy on the Housing Revenue Account and is detrimental to the housing needs of the City; and
 - (iv) a couple earning £15,000 each should not be the target of re-assessment for higher market rents; and
- (e) welcomes:-
- (i) the current Administration's commitment to increase Sheffield's council housing stock by 1,000 units; and
 - (ii) the news that more than 100 new homes are to be built in the Manor area on brownfield land owned by Sheffield City Council and that more than 150 jobs will be created during construction.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Steve Ayris, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:

1. the deletion of the words "and the previous Coalition Government" from paragraph (b); and
2. the addition at the end of paragraph (e)(ii) of the words "thanks to the establishment of the Sheffield Housing Company by the previous Administration".

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

It was then moved by Councillor Aodan Marken, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:

1. the addition of a new paragraph (d)(v) as follows:-
 - (v) that introducing a 1% enforced reduction to social housing rent this year will serve to reduce the Government's benefits bill at the cost of money for new housing stock and repairs, and believes that this is fuelled by an ideological commitment to austerity that means the poorest continue to suffer for the benefit of the wealthiest;
2. the addition at the end of paragraph (e)(i) of the words "notes that this will still be a net loss of stock since 2010/11".

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

Following a Right of Reply by Councillor Paul Wood, the original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes the Government's Housing and Planning Bill will lead to a reduction in the number of homes available at genuinely affordable rents at a time when Sheffield needs more;
- (b) deplores the decisions of the current Government and the previous Coalition Government to cut grant funding for new social housing;
- (c) opposes:-
 - (i) the Government's decision to allow private consultants to process and potentially determine planning applications, and believes locally elected representatives are the most suitable people to deal with this; and
 - (ii) the watering down of Section 106 and the broadening of the definition of 'affordable homes' to include Starter Homes, and is concerned that these changes are likely to produce fewer new homes at genuinely affordable rents in Sheffield;
- (d) believes:-
 - (i) children of tenants have rights and that the ending of home security for people upon the death of a parent is both ethically and morally unfair;
 - (ii) limiting councils to giving tenancies of between 2 and 5 years maximum is unfair on tenants and detrimental to developing strong, safe and cohesive communities and a stable schooling environment for young people;
 - (iii) believes the Right to Buy discounts for housing association tenants funded by the sale of high-value council housing is effectively a levy

- on the Housing Revenue Account and is detrimental to the housing needs of the City;
- (iv) a couple earning £15,000 each should not be the target of re-assessment for higher market rents; and
 - (v) that introducing a 1% enforced reduction to social housing rent this year will serve to reduce the Government's benefits bill at the cost of money for new housing stock and repairs, and believes that this is fuelled by an ideological commitment to austerity that means the poorest continue to suffer for the benefit of the wealthiest; and
- (e) welcomes:-
- (i) the current Administration's commitment to increase Sheffield's council housing stock by 1,000 units, but notes that this will still be a net loss of stock since 2010/11; and
 - (ii) the news that more than 100 new homes are to be built in the Manor area on brownfield land owned by Sheffield City Council and that more than 150 jobs will be created during construction.

(Note: Councillors Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (a), (c), (d) and (e) and against Paragraph (b) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE

Steel Industry

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Chris Peace, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that Sheffield has an international reputation for steel making, and that steel remains a crucial part of the City's economy;
- (b) reiterates the motion passed in November calling on the Government to take action to support the steel industry;
- (c) believes that the Government's response to the job losses around the country have been completely inadequate and believes that the Secretary of State must urgently reconsider his approach;
- (d) deeply regrets the news announced earlier this month that Sheffield Forgemasters is to cut up to 100 jobs and extends full sympathy to everyone affected;

- (e) welcomes action taken by the present Administration to work at a city region level to try to extend the support packages that have been put together for Tata steel workers to anyone affected by job losses at Forgemasters and to do everything it can to put in place support to get people who are facing redundancy back to work;
- (f) reaffirms that Forgemasters is a world class company but needs urgent support and a level playing field with its international competitors; and
- (g) supports the Save Our Steel Campaign and calls on the Government to:-
 - (i) provide support for a business rate cut for the steel industry;
 - (ii) give the steel industry a break from green taxes and high energy bills;
 - (iii) take urgent action to stop the dumping of cheap Chinese steel;
 - (iv) make a commitment to use British steel for all major infrastructure and construction projects; and
 - (v) look to use British-made steel in all Government backed contracts.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy and Sarah Jane Smalley voted for Paragraphs (a) to (f) and abstained on Paragraph (g) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PENNY BAKER

Tinsley Recreational Ground

It was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that building has begun of the new Tinsley School on Tinsley Recreational Ground;
- (b) notes that this was the only publicly accessible green space in the Tinsley area and was a part of our city's heritage as the park that Gordon Banks, England's 1966 World Cup winning team goalkeeper played on as a child;
- (c) notes that there were alternative sites and options which could have been considered but believes the Administration refused to listen to public opinion;
- (d) believes that our city's green reputation and treasured open spaces are not safe in the hands of our current Administration;

- (e) notes that last January, Ochre Dike Playing Fields, Waterthorpe was designated as a 'Fields in Trust' protected site to allow it to be further protected and managed as a public park and playing field in perpetuity; and
- (f) therefore calls on the Administration to:-
 - (i) award the remainder of Tinsley Recreational Ground 'Fields in Trust' status to protect this community asset from this current Administration and in perpetuity; and
 - (ii) resolve that not one blade of grass of designated public open space or park land in Sheffield will be sold off or developed further.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Mary Lea, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) recalls that the decision to amalgamate Tinsley Nursery Infant and Junior schools to create Tinsley Meadows Primary School was agreed by Cabinet on 16th April 2014 and planning permission was granted in July 2015, and is surprised that if the main opposition group have genuine concerns they have not raised them until now;
- (b) believes that it is imperative that the school is moved away from the motorway in order to alleviate noise and air pollution issues and the overwhelming evidence concerning air quality and children's health development;
- (c) recalls that none of the other options to relocate the school were viable and the decision facing the Administration was to leave the school where it was with the danger that presented to the health of local children or relocate it to the chosen site, and believes that the main opposition group should check their facts before making misleading assertions;
- (d) recognises the importance of protecting the local green space and notes that all efforts were made to keep the development to a quarter of the green space and commits to protecting the rest of the site from development;
- (e) notes that the school will continue to work with the community and offer community activity and support on the site, alongside providing a great inclusive education for children in Tinsley, in line with our corporate mission to make every school a great school;
- (f) commits to work with local young people to ensure they get best use of the pavilion, noting that the Administration has given Tinsley Forum a grant for the provision of activities for young people; and

- (g) recalls that Ochre Dike Playing Fields, Waterthorpe was protected due to plans to develop whilst the previous Administration was in control and is therefore astounded at the hypocrisy of the main opposition group.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) recalls that the decision to amalgamate Tinsley Nursery Infant and Junior schools to create Tinsley Meadows Primary School was agreed by Cabinet on 16th April 2014 and planning permission was granted in July 2015, and is surprised that if the main opposition group have genuine concerns they have not raised them until now;
- (b) believes that it is imperative that the school is moved away from the motorway in order to alleviate noise and air pollution issues and the overwhelming evidence concerning air quality and children's health development;
- (c) recalls that none of the other options to relocate the school were viable and the decision facing the Administration was to leave the school where it was with the danger that presented to the health of local children or relocate it to the chosen site, and believes that the main opposition group should check their facts before making misleading assertions;
- (d) recognises the importance of protecting the local green space and notes that all efforts were made to keep the development to a quarter of the green space and commits to protecting the rest of the site from development;
- (e) notes that the school will continue to work with the community and offer community activity and support on the site, alongside providing a great inclusive education for children in Tinsley, in line with our corporate mission to make every school a great school;
- (f) commits to work with local young people to ensure they get best use of the pavilion, noting that the Administration has given Tinsley Forum a grant for the provision of activities for young people; and
- (g) recalls that Ochre Dike Playing Fields, Waterthorpe was protected due to plans to develop whilst the previous Administration was in control and is therefore astounded at the hypocrisy of the main opposition group.

(Notes 1. Councillors Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (b), (e) and (f) and against Paragraphs (a), (c), (d) and (g) of the Substantive Motion and

asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy and Sarah Jane Smalley voted against Paragraph (c) and abstained on all of the remaining Paragraphs of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded).

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE GLEDHILL

Flood Defences

It was moved by Councillor Julie Gledhill, seconded by Councillor Lewis Dagnall, that this Council:-

- (a) extends its sympathy and support for the people across the country affected by severe flooding over Christmas and the New Year;
- (b) notes that flooding is becoming the new norm in Britain, and recalls the flooding of Sheffield in June 2007 in which two people tragically died and millions of pounds worth of damage and disruption was caused;
- (c) understands that Sheffield's geography makes it vulnerable to flooding, and recognises that the city is in need of extra flood defences to better protect homes and businesses;
- (d) therefore welcomes the current Administration's plans, developed in partnership with the Environment Agency, to develop a comprehensive flood management capital programme involving five new major schemes which will provide protection for 6,000 homes and more than 1,700 businesses;
- (e) is, however, concerned that the Government has so far earmarked only £23 million of the £43 million required to build the defences;
- (f) notes figures from the National Audit Office which show that investment in flood defences delivers £9.50 in benefits per £1 spent;
- (g) notes that the Leader of the Council has recently written to the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer calling on the Government to meet the £20 million shortfall in funding so Sheffield can get the flood defences it urgently needs; and
- (h) notes that the current Administration has developed one of the largest flood protection programmes in the country and is committed to protecting Sheffield from flooding.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Aodan Marken, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of a new paragraph (b) as follows and the relettering of original paragraphs (b) to (h) as new paragraphs (c) to (i):-
 - (b) believes that climate change makes extreme weather events,

including severe flooding, significantly more likely and agrees with the officer report establishing the Green Commission that “climate change is the biggest challenge facing our civilisation”;

2. the addition of new paragraphs (j) and (k) as follows:-

(j) further notes that the report from the Green Commission is still awaited; and

(k) calls on the Administration to set a date for the release of the report.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negatived.

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

<p>RESOLVED: That this Council:-</p> <p>(a) extends its sympathy and support for the people across the country affected by severe flooding over Christmas and the New Year;</p> <p>(b) notes that flooding is becoming the new norm in Britain, and recalls the flooding of Sheffield in June 2007 in which two people tragically died and millions of pounds worth of damage and disruption was caused;</p> <p>(c) understands that Sheffield’s geography makes it vulnerable to flooding, and recognises that the city is in need of extra flood defences to better protect homes and businesses;</p> <p>(d) therefore welcomes the current Administration’s plans, developed in partnership with the Environment Agency, to develop a comprehensive flood management capital programme involving five new major schemes which will provide protection for 6,000 homes and more than 1,700 businesses;</p> <p>(e) is, however, concerned that the Government has so far earmarked only £23 million of the £43 million required to build the defences;</p> <p>(f) notes figures from the National Audit Office which show that investment in flood defences delivers £9.50 in benefits per £1 spent;</p> <p>(g) notes that the Leader of the Council has recently written to the Prime Minister and the Chancellor of the Exchequer calling on the Government to meet the £20 million shortfall in funding so Sheffield can get the flood defences it urgently needs; and</p> <p>(h) notes that the current Administration has developed one of the largest flood protection programmes in the country and is committed to protecting Sheffield from flooding.</p>

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE

State Pension Age Equalisation

It was moved by Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Nasima Akther,

that this Council:-

- (a) recalls that:-
 - (i) the State Pension Age (SPA), created in the 1995 Pensions Act, set out incremental women's SPA rises from 60 to 65 to equalise with men's SPA; and
 - (ii) this was accelerated by the 2011 Pensions Act, so that women's SPA would increase to 65 by 2018;
- (b) welcomes the equalisation of the State Pension Age but is concerned that the acceleration of that equalisation, implemented by the Coalition Government and overseen by former Liberal Democrat Pensions Minister, the Rt. Hon. Steve Webb, discriminates against women born in the early 1950s, leaving them with inadequate time to make alternative arrangements and adversely affecting their retirement plans;
- (c) notes Steve Webb's admission to the Institute for Government in December that he made a "bad decision" on raising the State Pension Age; and
- (d) calls on the current Minister of State for Pensions to immediately introduce transitional arrangements to provide protection for women affected by equalisation of the State Pension Age

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

- (b) welcomes the equalisation of the State Pension Age but is concerned that, due to the failure of previous Governments to properly communicate the changes to the State Pension Age for women born in the 1950's, many women only discovered the changes in 2009, or when they were contacted about the further, necessary, changes that were made in 2011, leaving them inadequate time to make alternative arrangements and adversely affecting their plans for retirement;
- (c) notes that, whilst in Government, Liberal Democrats worked hard to alleviate the impact of the equalisation by introducing £2bn worth of changes that meant for most women no more than 12 months was added to their State Pension Age (SPA), with an absolute maximum of 18 months, from the position they inherited from the previous Government; and
- (d) believes that more can be done to help those women affected and therefore calls on the current Minister of State for Pensions to immediately introduce transitional arrangements to provide protection for women affected by equalisation of the State Pension Age.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negatived.

(Note: Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker voted for Paragraphs (b) and (d) and abstained on Paragraph (c) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) recalls that:-
 - (i) the State Pension Age (SPA), created in the 1995 Pensions Act, set out incremental women's SPA rises from 60 to 65 to equalise with men's SPA; and
 - (ii) this was accelerated by the 2011 Pensions Act, so that women's SPA would increase to 65 by 2018;
- (b) welcomes the equalisation of the State Pension Age but is concerned that the acceleration of that equalisation, implemented by the Coalition Government and overseen by former Liberal Democrat Pensions Minister, the Rt. Hon. Steve Webb, discriminates against women born in the early 1950s, leaving them with inadequate time to make alternative arrangements and adversely affecting their retirement plans;
- (c) notes Steve Webb's admission to the Institute for Government in December that he made a "bad decision" on raising the State Pension Age; and
- (d) calls on the current Minister of State for Pensions to immediately introduce transitional arrangements to provide protection for women affected by equalisation of the State Pension Age.

(Note 1. Councillors Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (a) and (d) and against Paragraphs (b) and (c) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) and (d) and abstained on Paragraphs (b) and (c) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR COLIN ROSS

New Retail Quarter

It was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, that

this Council:-

- (a) notes that work has begun on Sheffield's new Chinatown development;
- (b) welcomes this development and believes that this is great news for Sheffield, which will bring £65 million of private foreign investment to regenerate part of the city and create 400 jobs;
- (c) believes that this is a great complement to the re-development of The Moor which was secured by the previous Administration and which is progressing at pace and on course for completion by the end of next year;
- (d) expresses disappointment at the rate at which the New Retail Quarter has progressed;
- (e) believes that the people of Sheffield have waited long enough for progress on the New Retail Quarter to be made; and
- (f) hopes that with the planning application submitted and a new developer soon to be announced there will be no further delays in the development.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (c) to (f) and the addition of new paragraphs (c) to (g) as follows:-

- (c) welcomes the proactive measures taken by the present Administration to allow the development to be brought forward;
- (d) welcomes the redevelopment of the Moor under the present Administration;
- (e) further welcomes the series of actions taken by the present Administration to drive forward the city's New Retail Quarter, a crucial project for Sheffield, including:-
 - (i) securing the New Development Deal to inject funds into the retail quarter to bridge the financial gap facing the scheme;
 - (ii) parting company with Hammerson when they would not commit to start construction;
 - (iii) taking control of the scheme as a Council, working to redesign a new scheme that is viable and fit for purpose in the long term, and taking real action to make the scheme happen; and
 - (iv) securing the land and property needed to develop the scheme;
- (f) welcomes the interest from developers in the retail quarter and believes this is positive news which demonstrates viability and confidence in the new scheme; and

- (g) contrasts this action to the record of the previous Administration with three wasted years.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that work has begun on Sheffield's new Chinatown development;
- (b) welcomes this development and believes that this is great news for Sheffield, which will bring £65 million of private foreign investment to regenerate part of the city and create 400 jobs;
- (c) welcomes the proactive measures taken by the present Administration to allow the development to be brought forward;
- (d) welcomes the redevelopment of the Moor under the present Administration;
- (e) further welcomes the series of actions taken by the present Administration to drive forward the city's New Retail Quarter, a crucial project for Sheffield, including:-
 - (i) securing the New Development Deal to inject funds into the retail quarter to bridge the financial gap facing the scheme;
 - (ii) parting company with Hammerson when they would not commit to start construction;
 - (iii) taking control of the scheme as a Council, working to redesign a new scheme that is viable and fit for purpose in the long term, and taking real action to make the scheme happen; and
 - (iv) securing the land and property needed to develop the scheme;
- (f) welcomes the interest from developers in the retail quarter and believes this is positive news which demonstrates viability and confidence in the new scheme; and
- (g) contrasts this action to the record of the previous Administration with three wasted years.

(Note: Councillors Richard Shaw, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) and against Paragraphs (c) and (e) to (g) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BRIAN WEBSTER

Sheffield City Region Devolution Proposals

It was moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Aodan Marken, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that the recent consultation on proposals for devolution of powers to the Sheffield City Region closed on January 15th;
- (b) notes that the consultation was only open for a period of roughly six weeks, that it was only late in this period that the consultation was publicised on the front page of the Council website, and does not believe this was sufficient to ensure a robust consultation providing the widest possible range of views from the people of the Sheffield City Region;
- (c) recalls that in a 2012 referendum the people of Sheffield voted decisively against the creation of the post of executive mayor for Sheffield City Council, and believes this shows strong strength of feeling across the city against centralising executive power in the hands of a single individual;
- (d) believes that while genuine devolution of powers to local authorities and cross-authority areas is an important objective in principle, the deal as proposed appears more concerned with seeking economic growth than with the genuine enhancement of local democracy;
- (e) therefore, calls upon the Administration to:-
 - (i) return to negotiations with the Chancellor of the Exchequer to make clear Sheffield City Council's opposition to the imposition of a mayor;
 - (ii) oppose, on behalf of the people of Sheffield, any devolution deal that includes as a prerequisite the creation of the post of Sheffield City Region Mayor; and
 - (iii) work with local authority leaders from across the Sheffield City Region and across the North of England to secure a better deal for the people of Sheffield; and
- (f) directs that copies of this motion be forwarded to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, and to the leaders of each local authority in the Sheffield City Region.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (e) and (f) and the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows:-

- (e) believes that this Administration, by signing the proposed devolution deal

which contains the condition of a mayor, has weakened any powers of negotiation over the Sheffield City Region devolution deal that we may have held.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Geoff Smith, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) notes that following the launch of the official consultation on the devolution proposals, the Leader of the Council stated that for Sheffield to support the proposal the following issues must be addressed:-
 - (i) Mayoral Model - we cannot have a situation where half of the combined authority are not involved in electing a mayor; and
 - (ii) Mayoral Veto – we cannot have a situation where the mayor would have a veto over every decision;
- (b) believes that Sheffield should not agree to bring forward the proposal until these issues are addressed;
- (c) notes that the Council hosted a scrutiny meeting involving external stakeholders where the proposals were given consideration;
- (d) further notes that the consultation has now closed and believes it is important to listen to the consultation responses of the people of Sheffield City Region before coming to any decision;
- (e) supports concerns that were raised at the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority Scrutiny Committee about the consultation process; and
- (f) notes that any proposal must be agreed by Full Council, however, notes that there is no current specified date to bring the proposal to a Council meeting until the necessary changes have been made.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that following the launch of the official consultation on the devolution

proposals, the Leader of the Council stated that for Sheffield to support the proposal the following issues must be addressed:-

- (i) Mayoral Model - we cannot have a situation where half of the combined authority are not involved in electing a mayor; and
- (ii) Mayoral Veto – we cannot have a situation where the mayor would have a veto over every decision;
- (b) believes that Sheffield should not agree to bring forward the proposal until these issues are addressed;
- (c) notes that the Council hosted a scrutiny meeting involving external stakeholders where the proposals were given consideration;
- (d) further notes that the consultation has now closed and believes it is important to listen to the consultation responses of the people of Sheffield City Region before coming to any decision;
- (e) supports concerns that were raised at the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority Scrutiny Committee about the consultation process; and
- (f) notes that any proposal must be agreed by Full Council, however, notes that there is no current specified date to bring the proposal to a Council meeting until the necessary changes have been made.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraph (e) and against all of the remaining Paragraphs of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER

Coal Industry

It was moved by Councillor John Booker, seconded by Councillor Keith Davis, that this Council:-

- (a) believes a relentless attack on Great Britain's coal and heavy industry continues unabated, and that the few remaining miners of this country, the salt of the earth, were brought to tears by the closure of Kellingley Colliery a week before Christmas 2015;
- (b) notes that Kellingley Colliery was the last deep coal mine operating in Great Britain, and is situated at Beal in North Yorkshire, three and a half miles east of Ferrybridge power station;
- (c) further believes “the powers that be” have now conspired to destroy our country's last remaining underground kingdom of coal;

- (d) also believes that, in effect, the badges and slogans that proclaim "Coal Not Dole" around Sheffield and in this Council Chamber have been washed away, like tears in the rain;
- (e) regrets that the island of Great Britain, which stands with enough coal under its ground sufficient for 500 years' use, now imports coal from all over the world;
- (f) believes that if Great Britain is to have energy security and cheap, plentiful, reliable sources of power, coal must be a part of the solution, and that it is a crying shame that more of the coal we use will now be mined from under some other nation's footprint instead of our own;
- (g) places on record its conclusion that politics is too important to be left in the hands of our current crop of national politicians; and
- (h) suggests that a copy of this motion should not be sent to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change, for fear it would cause bewilderment and confusion.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) was saddened to hear news of the closure of Kellingley Colliery, Britain's last deep coal mine, and the loss of 450 jobs;
- (b) further regrets that the Government refused to extend a loan facility to Hatfield Colliery last summer, leading to its closure;
- (c) believes that the decimation of the mining industry was led by the Government of Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s and is appalled that during this period she was being cheered on by UKIP Leader Nigel Farage, who was a member of the Conservative Party whilst Mrs Thatcher was Prime Minister;
- (d) recalls UKIP Leader Nigel Farage declaring in 2013 that he was the only politician "keeping the flame of Thatcherism alive";
- (e) further notes the comments by Nigel Farage that UKIP are "the true inheritors of Thatcher" and talking about Mrs. Thatcher said "I think she would get involved in UKIP";
- (f) believes UKIPs claims to be a champion of the mining industry hypocrisy at its worst when they continue to back a leader who idolised the Prime Minister who embarked upon a personal crusade to destroy miners, their families and communities for political reasons;

- (g) notes that in a few years' time there will be a new market for coal with a clean coal power station at Drax, but that market will be supplied by imported coal, with all the environmental costs of shipping coal to Britain; and
- (h) recognises the labour of all the miners who have worked in Britain's coal industry over the last century and regrets that their jobs have been lost for generations.

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

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraph (a) and abstained on Paragraphs (b) to (h) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) was saddened to hear news of the closure of Kellingley Colliery, Britain's last deep coal mine, and the loss of 450 jobs;
- (b) further regrets that the Government refused to extend a loan facility to Hatfield Colliery last summer, leading to its closure;
- (c) believes that the decimation of the mining industry was led by the Government of Margaret Thatcher in the 1980s and is appalled that during this period she was being cheered on by UKIP Leader Nigel Farage, who was a member of the Conservative Party whilst Mrs Thatcher was Prime Minister;
- (d) recalls UKIP Leader Nigel Farage declaring in 2013 that he was the only politician "keeping the *flame of Thatcherism* alive";
- (e) further notes the comments by Nigel Farage that UKIP are "the true inheritors of Thatcher" and talking about Mrs. Thatcher said "I think she would get involved in UKIP";
- (f) believes UKIPs claims to be a champion of the mining industry hypocrisy at its worst when they continue to back a leader who idolised the Prime Minister who embarked upon a personal crusade to destroy miners, their families and communities for political reasons;
- (g) notes that in a few years' time there will be a new market for coal with a clean coal power station at Drax, but that market will be supplied by imported coal, with all the environmental costs of shipping coal to Britain; and
- (h) recognises the labour of all the miners who have worked in Britain's coal

industry over the last century and regrets that their jobs have been lost for generations.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraph (a) and abstained on Paragraphs (b) to (h) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MAZHER IQBAL

Student Maintenance Grants

It was moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Mick Rooney, that this Council:-

- (a) condemns the Government's decision to abolish maintenance grants for lower income students and replace them with a loans system from September 2016;
- (b) notes that around 40% of students at Sheffield Hallam University are reliant on maintenance grants to help fund their studies;
- (c) is concerned that:-
 - (i) abolishing maintenance grants will make life harder for students from low income backgrounds, and could deter some from entering higher education; and
 - (ii) the Government's own Equality Impact Assessment reveals a risk to the participation of students from poorer backgrounds, women, BME students, mature students and disabled students;
- (d) recalls comments from the Rt. Hon. Lord David Willetts, former Universities Minister, in 2010: "Our proposals [tuition fee rise] are progressive because they help to encourage people from poorer backgrounds to go to university because of the higher education maintenance grant...";
- (e) agrees with Dapo Adaramewa, Sheffield Hallam Students' Union President, that turning the grants into loans "flies in the face of the poorer students who are being saddled with even more debt";
- (f) notes research from the Institute for Fiscal Studies which found that scrapping maintenance grants will mean the poorest 40 per cent of university students in England will graduate with debts of up to £53,000, rather than £40,500 at present;
- (g) believes that higher education should be accessible to all, including those from low income backgrounds; and
- (h) calls on the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills and the Education Secretary to reverse this decision.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (e) and (f) as follows and the relettering of the original paragraphs (e) to (h) as new paragraphs (g) to (j):-

- (e) notes that increased maintenance grants were a key protection brought in by the Liberal Democrats when tuition fees were raised and have meant that in recent years more students from poorer background have gone to university than ever before;
- (f) regrets the removal of NHS bursaries for student nurses;

On being put to the vote, Paragraph (f) of the amendment was carried and Paragraph (e) was negated.

(Note 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Dianne Hurst, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Garry Weatherall, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Mohammad Maroof, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur voted for Paragraph (f) and against Paragraph (e) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraph (f) and abstained on Paragraph (e) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) condemns the Government's decision to abolish maintenance grants for lower income students and replace them with a loans system from September 2016;
- (b) notes that around 40% of students at Sheffield Hallam University are reliant on maintenance grants to help fund their studies;
- (c) is concerned that:-
 - (i) abolishing maintenance grants will make life harder for students from low income backgrounds, and could deter some from entering

- higher education; and
- (ii) the Government's own Equality Impact Assessment reveals a risk to the participation of students from poorer backgrounds, women, BME students, mature students and disabled students;
 - (d) recalls comments from the Rt. Hon. Lord David Willetts, former Universities Minister, in 2010: "Our proposals [tuition fee rise] are progressive because they help to encourage people from poorer backgrounds to go to university because of the higher education maintenance grant...";
 - (e) regrets the removal of NHS bursaries for student nurses;
 - (f) agrees with Dapo Adaramewa, Sheffield Hallam Students' Union President, that turning the grants into loans "flies in the face of the poorer students who are being saddled with even more debt";
 - (g) notes research from the Institute for Fiscal Studies which found that scrapping maintenance grants will mean the poorest 40 per cent of university students in England will graduate with debts of up to £53,000, rather than £40,500 at present;
 - (h) believes that higher education should be accessible to all, including those from low income backgrounds; and
 - (i) calls on the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills and the Education Secretary to reverse this decision.

17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR COLIN ROSS

Community Pubs

It was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Richard Shaw, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that Sheffield is world famous for its pubs and real ale, and last year was named by the New York Times as the beer capital of Britain;
- (b) recognises the important role local pubs play in the life of our city by providing a community hub for residents to meet, relax, debate and do business;
- (c) notes the recent study by Oxford University for Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) which found that people who have a "local" pub are "significantly" happier, have more friends, better life satisfaction, and drink in moderation compared to those who haven't;
- (d) regrets the decline of community pubs in recent years and notes that last year, figures revealed 46 pubs had shut across Sheffield since 2010;

- (e) notes the recent rejection by this Administration of 9 applications to give some of our city's best known pubs Asset of Community Value status on the ground that they have no community;
- (f) believes that the Administration is being too stringent in its definition of 'community' and that a community can be defined other than by geography; and
- (g) calls on the Administration to support Sheffield's pubs by:-
 - (i) reassessing the definition of community that it uses for Asset of Community Value applications;
 - (ii) supporting community groups who wish to register their local pubs as assets of community value; and
 - (iii) amending local planning policies to stipulate that no pub will be allowed to change use unless it is demonstrated that continued trading is not economically viable and that the premises has been marketed as a pub unsuccessfully for a stipulated minimum period.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Peter Price, seconded by Councillor Sioned Mair-Richards, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (d) to (g) and the addition of new paragraphs (d) to (f) as follows:-

- (d) regrets the decline in the number of pubs in the city, and understands that this is part of a national trend which can be explained by a range of factors including higher taxes on alcohol, competition from supermarkets selling cheap alcohol and changing demographics; and
- (e) understands that:-
 - (i) the Council assess all nominations for Assets of Community Value status impartially and on a case by case basis, according to the Localism Act 2011 and guidance issued in 2012 by the Coalition Government, of which the main opposition group was a part; and
 - (ii) when assessing nominations, the decision maker acts only on the information provided in each application and makes no presumptions regarding what is and isn't a community for the purposes of that nomination; and
- (f) notes that there is a review of the assessment process underway, with a view to simplifying the process, which will be developed bearing in mind the comments of all interested parties.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that Sheffield is world famous for its pubs and real ale, and last year was named by the New York Times as the beer capital of Britain;
- (b) recognises the important role local pubs play in the life of our city by providing a community hub for residents to meet, relax, debate and do business;
- (c) notes the recent study by Oxford University for Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) which found that people who have a "local" pub are "significantly" happier, have more friends, better life satisfaction, and drink in moderation compared to those who haven't;
- (d) regrets the decline in the number of pubs in the city, and understands that this is part of a national trend which can be explained by a range of factors including higher taxes on alcohol, competition from supermarkets selling cheap alcohol and changing demographics;
- (e) understands that:-
 - (i) the Council assess all nominations for Assets of Community Value status impartially and on a case by case basis, according to the Localism Act 2011 and guidance issued in 2012 by the Coalition Government, of which the main opposition group was a part; and
 - (ii) when assessing nominations, the decision maker acts only on the information provided in each application and makes no presumptions regarding what is and isn't a community for the purposes of that nomination; and
- (f) notes that there is a review of the assessment process underway, with a view to simplifying the process, which will be developed bearing in mind the comments of all interested parties.

18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACK CLARKSON

Court Martial of Sergeant Blackman

It was moved by Councillor Jack Clarkson, seconded by Councillor Keith Davis, that this Council:-

- (a) asks what other country in the world would pay lawyers to persecute its own soldiers, our very own war heroes;
- (b) believes that the current practice of pursuing soldiers who have fought for

this country in Iraq, Afghanistan and Ulster, whereby many soldiers have had investigators turn up at their home addresses asking questions on their door steps regarding their military actions, of men and women who were simply carrying out orders, is deplorable and is nothing more than a “witch hunt”;

- (c) believes that this is beyond comprehension, and unless an individual has served on a battlefield/front, you cannot imagine what it must have been like to fight for your life, or to have lost a fellow comrade, shot or blown to pieces by an improvised explosive device (IED);
- (d) is concerned that Sergeant Alexander Blackman (Marine 'A') was sent to prison not by a British jury but by a military Court, and believes that if Sergeant Blackman had been judged by the ordinary public (i.e. a Jury) the result would have been somewhat different; Sergeant Blackman was prepared to die for his country, a man who signed up to be a soldier, who we expected to fight, and believes that the Government let Sergeant Blackman down, didn't support him as a soldier and has hung him out to dry; and
- (e) supports the release of Sergeant Blackman and will not rest until the “witch hunt” against our soldiers in the British Army comes to an end

(Note: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the Motion, Councillor Jack Clarkson, Paragraph (b) of the Motion was altered by the addition of the words “and women” after the words “of men”.)

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words “That this Council” and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) wishes to place on record its respect and appreciation for members of the armed forces and the work they do to keep our country safe;
- (b) notes the action the current Administration has taken to support the armed forces, including the community covenant - a pledge to commit to improving the transition from service life into civilian life for local residents and their families;
- (c) sympathises with the case of Sergeant Blackman, and notes that new and potentially significant information came to light following the publication of a military report into the incident in September which contained several issues which were never put to the court martial panel and could have significantly helped Sergeant Blackman's case, including the finding that commanders had missed signs that Sergeant Blackman and his men were showing evidence of "moral regression, psychological strain and fatigue"; and
- (d) notes the fact that MPs from various political parties have expressed similar

sympathies.

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

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) and (b) and abstained on Paragraphs (c) and (d) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) wishes to place on record its respect and appreciation for members of the armed forces and the work they do to keep our country safe;
- (b) notes the action the current Administration has taken to support the armed forces, including the community covenant - a pledge to commit to improving the transition from service life into civilian life for local residents and their families;
- (c) sympathises with the case of Sergeant Blackman, and notes that new and potentially significant information came to light following the publication of a military report into the incident in September which contained several issues which were never put to the court martial panel and could have significantly helped Sergeant Blackman's case, including the finding that commanders had missed signs that Sergeant Blackman and his men were showing evidence of "moral regression, psychological strain and fatigue"; and
- (d) notes the fact that MPs from various political parties have expressed similar sympathies.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) and (b) and abstained on Paragraphs (c) and (d) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

This page is intentionally left blank