

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 5 October 2016, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

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

- | | | |
|--|--|---|
| 1 <i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i>
Andy Nash
Bob Pullin
Richard Shaw | 10 <i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i>
Andy Bainbridge
Steve Wilson | 19 <i>Nether Edge & Sharrow Ward</i>
Nasima Akther
Mohammad Maroof
Alison Teal |
| 2 <i>Beighton Ward</i>
Chris Rosling-Josephs
Ian Saunders | 11 <i>Ecclesall Ward</i>
Roger Davison
Shaffaq Mohammed
Paul Scriven | 20 <i>Park & Arbourthorne</i>
Julie Dore
Ben Miskell
Jack Scott |
| 3 <i>Birley Ward</i>
Denise Fox
Bryan Lodge
Karen McGowan | 12 <i>Firth Park Ward</i>
Abdul Khayum
Alan Law
Abtisam Mohamed | 21 <i>Richmond Ward</i>
Dianne Hurst
Peter Rippon |
| 4 <i>Broomhill & Sharrow Vale Ward</i>
Michelle Cook
Kieran Harpham
Magid Magid | 13 <i>Fulwood Ward</i>
Sue Alston
Andrew Sangar
Cliff Woodcraft | 22 <i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i>
Dawn Dale
Peter Price
Garry Weatherall |
| 5 <i>Burngreave Ward</i>
Jackie Drayton
Talib Hussain
Mark Jones | 14 <i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i>
Lewis Dagnall
Cate McDonald
Chris Peace | 23 <i>Southey Ward</i>
Leigh Bramall
Tony Damms
Jayne Dunn |
| 6 <i>City Ward</i>
Douglas Johnson
Robert Murphy
Moya O'Rourke | 15 <i>Graves Park Ward</i>
Ian Auckland
Sue Auckland
Steve Ayris | 24 <i>Stannington Ward</i>
David Baker
Penny Baker
Vickie Priestley |
| 7 <i>Crookes & Crosspool Ward</i>
Craig Gamble Pugh
Adam Hanrahan
Anne Murphy | 16 <i>Hillsborough Ward</i>
George Lindars-Hammond
Josie Paszek | 25 <i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i>
Jack Clarkson
Richard Crowther
Keith Davis |
| 8 <i>Darnall Ward</i>
Mazher Iqbal
Mary Lea
Zahira Naz | 17 <i>Manor Castle Ward</i>
Lisa Banes
Terry Fox
Pat Midgley | 26 <i>Walkley Ward</i>
Olivia Blake
Ben Curran
Neale Gibson |
| 9 <i>Dore & Totley Ward</i>
Joe Otten
Colin Ross
Martin Smith | 18 <i>Mosborough Ward</i>
David Barker
Tony Downing
Gail Smith | 27 <i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i>
John Booker
Adam Hurst
Zoe Sykes |
| | | 28 <i>Woodhouse Ward</i>
Mick Rooney
Paul Wood |

1. CHAIR OF MEETING

- 1.1 The meeting commenced with the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) in the Chair, due to the absence of the Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) at the commencement of the meeting. The Lord Mayor chaired the meeting from item 6 (Director of Public Health Report for Sheffield – 2016) onwards.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Pauline Andrews, Mike Drabble, Bob Johnson, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris and Jackie Satur.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 3.1 Councillor Joe Otten declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 4(b) – Petition Regarding Road Safety on Hangingwater Road (See Minute 5 below) on the grounds that, in the near future, his daughter is likely to use that Road as her route to school. Councillor Otten indicated that he would not speak or vote on that item of business and he left the room for the duration of the item.
- 3.2 Councillor Paul Scriven declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 12 - Notice of Motion regarding Dementia (See Minute 13 below) due to his partner's mother having dementia.
- 3.3 Councillor Abdul Khayum declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 14 - Notice of Motion regarding Student Rents and Multinational Student Accommodation Companies (See Minute 15 below) as a landlord of property let to students.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

- 4.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 7th September 2016 be approved as a true and accurate record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

5.1 Ordinary Petitions

5.1.1 Petition Supporting the Flood Defence Plan in Oughtibridge

The Council received a petition containing 44 signatures supporting the Flood Defence Plan in Oughtibridge.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Terry Barrow who

referred to flooding of the River Don which had occurred in 2007 and to the dislocation of people from their homes, closure of the Park and loss of the pavilion. Some nine years after that event, a new pavilion had been built and people were back living in their homes. However, there was fear of the reoccurrence of flooding and potential effect on homes on Station Road and Waterside Gardens, where families lived whose homes had been so affected by flooding. The 44 people that had signed the petition included those people whose homes and businesses had been affected by the events in 2007.

The Council was asked to support the Flood Defence Plan in order to protect homes on Station Road and Waterside Gardens, the Oughtibridge War Memorial Sports Ground and pavilion from flooding in the future. Within the plan, which was subject to consultation, it was proposed that Coronation Park and the Sports Ground be designated as a flood storage area. The Plan would properly protect residents and businesses and provide benefits for areas of the City which were further downstream.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment. Councillor Lodge thanked the petitioners for bringing this matter to the Council. He said that the Flood Defence Plan was concerned with protecting people, property and business from flooding and utilising the natural flood plains and protecting some areas with defences. Consultation was being undertaken in relation to a scheme for the Sheaf and Upper Don and he would make sure that the views of petitioners were included as part of the responses to that consultation. He recalled the loss of life and devastation which had occurred in Sheffield during the floods of 2007.

Schemes and ideas were being considered and put in place to manage and regulate the flow of water from the moors, to slow the flow of water and rivers and this included the use of areas of parkland as flood storage areas. It was intended that facilities in these areas were improved and that the speed of recovery following their use as flood storage areas also be enhanced. Drainage and resilience would also be improved so as to protect people, their homes and property.

5.1.2 Petition Objecting to the Withdrawal of Grant Aid Funding to the Mental Health Action Group Sheffield

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 689 signatures objecting to the withdrawal of grant aid funding to the Mental Health Action Group Sheffield.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Tim Jones who said that the Mental Health Action Group Sheffield (MHAGS) represented and cared for the most vulnerable people in society with mental health issues. It was a user-led organisation which catered for those with no similar alternative provision. Mr Jones said that the Action Group had felt marginalised and unfairly treated by the Council in the past and had previously been moved to premises that were considered to be unsuitable and sub-standard.

The organisation had successfully campaigned for concessionary bus passes for people with mental health conditions. The support which it gave to people was also thought to have saved the Council considerable sums of money

Stephanie Milnes said that she had been close to suicide when she began accessing the support at the mental Health Action Group. She now helped to run it and said that it was devastating to think that the funding which the Council gave to it would cease.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries. Councillor Scott thanked the petitioners. He said that he agreed with some of the comments that had been made about the stigma sometimes attached to mental health issues. He said that the Mental Health Action Group had a huge positive impact on the people it helped. He also concurred that MHAGS saved the Council more money than the value of the grant that the Council made.

Councillor Scott confirmed that the financial grant which MHAGS received in 2016/17 was £10,500 and this would be in place until the end of March 2017. The grant had been made for one year and there certainly were no plans to withdraw it for 2016/17.

With regards to the grant for 2017/18, 22 organisations would have to apply for a grant in order that the process was fair. He said that he expected an excellent application from MHAGS as part of that process. However, each organisation making an application would have to go through the same process to make sure it was transparent and fair. There were issues which had to be looked at, such as that the grant awarded to organisations like MHAGS sometimes came back to the Council in the form of rent and discussions could be held in relation to the possibility of rent-free options for the organisation.

He said that it was important that mental health issues were raised and that MHAGS were effective in doing so. Councillor Scott said that he looked forward to meeting with members of MHAGS.

5.1.3 Petition Requesting Action in Connection with Anti-Social Behaviour in the Kirton Road Area

The Council received a petition containing 26 signatures requesting action in connection with anti-social behaviour in the Kirton Road area.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Anne Wyatt who explained that residents of Kirton Road and Scott Road, S4 and Pitsmoor were experiencing significant problems with anti-social behaviour and, in particular, the large number of children that gathered and played on the street, including many who were not resident on Kirton Road. This included noise nuisance at all times of the day and ball games played on the pavement directly outside and against houses and from off road bikes; damage to properties and cars; intimidation of pedestrians and passers-by; littering, including broken and abandoned toys, and fly-tipping.

At recent residents' meetings, solutions which had been discussed included the need for signs about ball games and dumping rubbish and litter in the area around the end of Kirton Road; and the need for more information about whether selective licensing was an option which could help improve the neighbourhood for everyone.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing. Councillor Dunn stated that the local ward Councillors (Councillors Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain and Mark Jones) had also brought this issue to her attention. She would arrange a meeting to look at all of the possible solutions to the problems which had been raised by the petition, including selective licensing and she would also ask the Police to consider enforcement measures.

5.2 Public Questions

5.2.1 Public Questions Concerning Kashmir

Mohammad Imran stated that hospitals in troubled areas within Kashmir had declared a state of emergency in response to the rising numbers of casualties and thousands of people had been injured. There were reports that there were no proper medical facilities because the hospitals were unable to cope with greater numbers of casualties and the authorities did not allow people to travel to other parts of India to seek medical assistance. He asked whether the Council agreed that these were barbaric actions by the Indian Government.

Nazim Mohammad asked whether the Council believed that a permanent resolution to the Kashmir dispute according to the aspirations of the people of Kashmir through referendum would bring considerable benefits to the people of Jammu and Kashmir, India and Pakistan. He referred to high expenditure on defence as opposed to education. Such a permanent resolution would enhance peace and security in the region and bring comfort to many people in Sheffield with family connections in the region. He asked what the Council had done and what it could do on behalf of its constituents in relation to this issue.

Rabnawaz Khan stated that during the recent uprising, a curfew was imposed in all ten districts of the Kashmir Valley and mobile services were suspended by the government. The curfew, which was lifted on 31 August, lasted for 53 consecutive days. It was imposed again the very next day in many parts of the Valley. Police and Indian paramilitary forces used pellet guns, tear gas shells and rubber bullets and assault rifles, resulting in the deaths of more than 75 civilians, over 7,000 civilians had been injured and over 700 women and children and young people blinded. He asked why politicians were silent on the violation of human rights.

Mohammad Riaz said that there had been 85 years of continual struggle for self-determination and during that time 100,000 people had been killed and many displaced and women had been raped. He expressed disappointment that no voices were raised by politicians to put pressure on both India and Pakistan to find a peaceful solution to the conflict. He asked if the Council

would send a message of solidarity to the victims and that it condemns the atrocities which had been committed in Kashmir.

Hameed Ur Rehman stated that there were human rights abuses in Indian occupied Jammu and Kashmir state, which ranged from mass killings, disappearances, torture, rape and sexual abuse to political repression and suppression of freedom of speech. He said that people of Sheffield from the Kashmiri Community had friends and families living in areas of conflict where tension was building between India and Pakistan and there was a risk of war between both countries. He asked whether the Council was concerned about the safety and welfare of the relatives and friends of people in Sheffield.

Javid Khan stated that Amnesty International had criticised Indian security forces for the use of arbitrary and excessive force to deal with the protests in Kashmir and it had also stated that the actions were a violation of international standards and were leading to a worsening of the human rights crisis there. Amnesty also criticised the use of pellet guns, stating that these had been used 100 times in Kashmir during the first week of September 2016 and it called for a ban on the use of pellet guns. He asked whether the Council would add its voice by writing to the Indian High Commission to protest and demand the ban of the use of pellet guns and an end to the violence.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded to the questions relating to Kashmir. She said that despite the availability of 24 hour news, it was not always known exactly what was happening in some parts of the world. Whereas, people in Sheffield with families and friends were well informed of events such as in Kashmir. What had been described was appalling and particularly as it was a situation affecting family and friends of a community in Sheffield. There was a large Kashmiri community in Sheffield and the people in that community brought so much to the City, as did other communities. Councillor Dore stated that she could not imagine what people were going through and she said that Members of the Council had the utmost sympathy for them.

The Council would do what it could locally and would speak to Government Ministers and to the MPs on the front benches of their respective parties in Westminster. Paul Blomfield MP had met with members of the Kashmiri community and there had also been meetings within her political group in Sheffield. It had been requested by some Councillors that a motion be submitted to the meeting of Council in November and that would be done. Councillor Dore confirmed that the Council would send a message to condemn the atrocities which had taken place in Kashmir.

5.2.2 Public Question Concerning the Mental Health Action Group (MHAGS)

Alistair Tice stated that the Mental Health Action Group Sheffield had been informed by Council Officers that it would not receive a grant for 2017/18, whilst a funding pot of £107k was available for organisations which contributed to tackling poverty. However, the fund was of a limited size and there were a high number of organisations that were likely to bid. He said that he believed that it

was possible for the Council to guarantee funding for the Action group.

Stuart stated that he was a member of the MHAGS Committee and in the time before he became a member of MHAGS, he stayed at home. His involvement with MHAGS helped him to be able to come to the Council meeting today. He asked how much it would cost if instead of receiving support from an organisation such as MHAGS, he was in hospital care.

M A Hill stated that he had been a member of MHAGS since 1992 and the organisation meant a lot to him. He said that without the support that it offered, life would be very difficult. Winter was a particularly hard time for people with mental health conditions and he asked where people would go to find support without MHAGS?

Julie Ingram stated that she had come from Barnsley to the Council meeting so as to support MHAGS. She asked the Council not to close it as it was needed by its members.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries, responded to the questions. He said that he understood the impact and importance of MHAGS and had heard powerful stories from people at this Council meeting. He commented that it was very brave of people to come the Council meeting and to speak about their personal circumstances. These were precisely the type of stories that the Council needed to hear about how MHAGS made a difference.

There were 22 groups which were funded at present and, in future, the Council wanted to provide funding for such groups for a period of three years. All of those groups did brilliant work and all of them saved the Council money and were of a high quality and did make a difference. It would not be fair to treat particular groups in a different way and it was right to ensure they were all treated equitably. The amount of grant aid which the Council had available was £1.6 million, which was much reduced compared with previous years. He said that he hoped that within any application that MHAGS submitted for grant funding, there was a clear reflection of the impact of the organisation on peoples' lives. He said he was pleased to see representatives of MHAGS and looked forward to receiving an application from the organisation and meeting with them.

5.2.3 Public Question Concerning Flood Risk

Helen McIlroy asked whether the Council could say which examples, both national and international, had been used to inform the flood risk strategy and why those examples had been chosen.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, stated that the Council was working with the Environment Agency and Arup Consultants in relation to flood defences and the work being done was recognised as most innovative by the Government. Examples of schemes both nationally and abroad were being considered to help draft the consultation on flood protection.

5.2.4 Public Questions Concerning Trees

Helen McIlroy stated that surveys of highways trees were conducted some time ago. She asked where a comprehensive list could be found of trees due to be felled and why information was only made available street by street and only to residents of that street. She referred to a figure which had been used of 143 trees which had been saved by the use of flexible paving. She asked for the location of those trees to be identified.

Dave Dilner stated that it was the aim of the Sheffield Trees Action Group that a comprehensive tree strategy be introduced which would help to save trees and this had been something which was promised nearly two years ago. The Chief Executive and Cabinet Member were asked separately about when a strategy would be produced and a press statement was made announcing that a draft tree strategy would be made available by the end of that week, although with no reference to a sub strategy for highway trees. Whereas, the Cabinet Member had said, when asked, that the strategy would be available by the end of the calendar year. Mr Dilner asked what was happening.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, responded that information concerning street trees was made available street by street and to residents as works were to commence. The information was also published on the Council website including the advice of the Tree Panel.

As regards the tree strategy, a consultation draft strategy was released for consultation on 30 September. In responding to the enquiry concerning when a strategy document would be published, he had been mindful of the context in which dates had previously been subject to slippage and was aware that the strategy would be available by the end of the year. In the event, the Trees and Woodlands Strategy Consultation was published at the end of that week (30 September). Councillor Lodge urged people to take part in the consultation.

5.2.5 Public Question Concerning Taxis

Nigel Slack stated that an issue which he had raised in 2014, that of non-Sheffield taxis plying their trade in Sheffield and related safety issues, had been taken up by The Star newspaper and former Councillor Ibrar Hussain. He said that, as a result, the Council had found a partial solution to the problem with the new regulations on Sheffield Taxi Companies only supplying radio services to Sheffield Licensed taxis. Mr Slack stated that despite having been told there was no way to prevent the externally licensed taxis operating in the City, he was pleased that a solution had been found. He asked the Council to take up the other half of his concerns and that is to work, through the City Region structures, to bring all Sheffield's partner Councils' procedures up to Sheffield's standards.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment, responded that the Council placed utmost importance on safety of users of taxis and the Licensing Committee had worked on a policy. The Head of Licensing had done a considerable amount of work in this regard and had written to the

Government Minister regarding the potential dangers of deregulation and would also meet with the Transport Minister in this regard. Councillor Lodge said that he had met with MPs and the Council would continue to lobby the Government to deal with elements of deregulation. It was important to have trust in the taxi trade and the Council was working with neighbouring local authorities and the Department of Transport. The Council's Chief Licensing Officer had also approached other local authorities and the Department of Transport in relation to the problems associated with deregulation. The Council recognised the need to ensure a safe service for people in Sheffield in order that people felt safe and comfortable.

5.2.6 Public Question Concerning Parliamentary Constituency Boundaries

Nigel Slack asked whether the Council would be responding formally to the Boundary Commission regarding the proposals for changes to Sheffield's constituency boundaries and the proposed loss of one Sheffield MP.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that the Council would be making a response to the proposals as would her own political Party.

5.2.7 Public Question Concerning Devolution

Nigel Slack referred to a new report from Middlesex and Sheffield Universities which had highlighted the concerns that the devolution deal may not be all it seemed and indeed may lead to further austerity. He said that the deal's £900 million of new money will not compensate for the £1.1 billion already lost by the City Region's Councils and will only be delivered over 30 years.

Most concerning, he said, was their assertion that rather than delivering powers that will regenerate the city economy: "*... in practice the powers being devolved are often the supervision and delivery of a narrow section of policy activity, rather than allowing city regions any influence over the design, nature and implementation of policy and practice...*"

Mr Slack asked whether the Council would consider this report most carefully before making the final commitment to the devolution deal and approving the draft order produced by the Secretary of State when it was presented to the City Region meeting later this month.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded to the question. She said that she was aware of the report about devolution and there had also been conferences and other reports on the subject. The financial resources available through the devolution deal did not replace those which had been available to Regional Development Agencies (RDAs). Whilst the RDAs were not perfect, the Coalition Government had put a stop to economic growth and had imposed a fifty percent reduction in real terms to local government funding, some of which had been used for economic development. There were other competing pressures on local government budgets, such as care for the elderly and the resources available for economic development had to be considered in this difficult budget context. The emphasis of the devolution deal for the City

Region was an economic one rather than a deal which included welfare. However, the City Region did bid to include the Work Programme in the deal and employment programmes were something that might be discussed in the next round of devolution.

There was a strong case for the Region to have a devolution deal which included skills for those aged 16-18 as well as other elements which were drivers of economic growth, including transport and connectivity. In summary, the £900 million in the devolution deal did not replace the resources which had already been lost. However, it did represent more than the Region had now. This would comprise capital, which could be drawn down; and revenue to enable investment in people through work and employment programmes, skills and targeting those people who found it difficult to access jobs.

Councillor Dore said that she agreed that powers being devolved could be seen as the supervision and delivery of nationally made policy decisions and direction. However, she said that local delivery was better even if it was within a nationally prescribed framework. The City Region would work with the Government on future devolution and investment in jobs and an inclusive economy.

5.3 Public Questions Concerning Road Safety Measures on Hangingwater Road

Jane Bollington asked if the Council was prepared to take responsibility for forcing children to take a longer route through a dark and secluded parkland, rather than crossing at Hangingwater Road.

Richard Bollington asked in reference to a Department for Education document, if the Council accepted that it had a legal obligation to deliver appropriate infrastructure to provide a safe walking route to school and did it consider the views of 6,500 people who had requested a crossing on Hangingwater Road.

Jo Mirza referred to information provided on the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport and City Council websites regarding routes to school. She asked whether the Council could say how children are supposed to get to High Storrs School from Fulwood and Nether Green safely, given that the crossing on Hangingwater Road was so dangerous.

Jane Robinson said that the police had concluded that the accident which had occurred at the junction on Hangingwater Road had been the fault of neither the driver nor the pedestrian. She asked how the Council would prevent a more serious accident from occurring at the Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road junction where 160 children crossed to access their local catchment school.

Dr Lindsey Jacobs told the Council that it was her daughter, Grace, who had been knocked over in the accident at the Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road junction. Grace had undergone a long period of rehabilitation following her injuries. She said that the costs quoted of £250K to install a crossing and footpath were five times more than a similar scheme in Trolley and

a similar schemes in Enfield and Reading had been implemented for between £25-50K. She asked for the costs to be explained.

A question was asked on behalf of Jason Thomson, as follows: On 13 June, Sheffield City Council encouraged children to walk to school. Councillor Drayton had said it was “healthier for children along with reducing traffic and pollution at peak times”. He asked, could the Council explain how the children could participate in this type of activity when there was no safe place to cross the road and how did the Council feel about the increase in traffic created by parents taking their children to High Storrs School.

Andrea Bramall asked a question on behalf of Anne Henshaw, as follows: Do the Council think it is acceptable to disregard 6,500 signatories who are united in their concern that the junction of Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road should have a footpath and crossing installed?

Sarah Bramall asked a question on behalf of Patricia Flowerdew, stating that she walked with her autistic son to Nether Green Junior School and was concerned that since the road improvements and tree felling, vehicles travelled faster. She asked if the path could be extended and a proper crossing installed.

Sarah Bramall stated that the Council acknowledged that the junction was dangerous and asked if the Council thought that this was acceptable, given that there was no safe alternative.

George Michael Bramall asked if the Council thought it was acceptable that school children had to cross at a point where there was a junction of two busy roads and no footpath and the Council had stated that it was unsafe to have a crossing patrol warden.

Steve Wilson referred to a Department of Transport report concerning the cost of people sustaining injuries where they had become casualties in road traffic accidents. He asked the Council to consider the costs of implementing a scheme to improve safety at the Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road junction in the light of the cost of a serious injury or even a loss of life.

The questions were referred to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport to be answered as part of the debate concerning the petition requesting road safety measures on Hangingwater Road.

5.4 Petition Requiring Debate

5.4.1 Petition Requesting Road Safety Measures on Hangingwater Road

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition containing 6,610 signatures, calling on the Council to implement road safety measures on Hangingwater Road, including a footpath and crossing at the junction of Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road. 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 on this issue on the Council's website was as follows:-

"We the undersigned petition the Council to 1. Implement road safety measures on Hangingwater Road including a footpath and crossing at the junction of Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road and 2. Provide school bus transport from Fulwood / Nether Green to High Storrs School.

High Storrs is the closest catchment school for Nether Green and Fulwood. However the walking route has no footpath in places and no crossings. There is concern amongst parents about the safety of this route, which is likely to lead to increased traffic congestion in the area if parents decide to drive their children to school."

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Martin Jacobs who introduced the petition and showed photographs of the location of Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road. A document had also been circulated to Members of the Council containing further information.

The unique layout of the junction and footpath at Whiteley Wood Road and Hangingwater Road meant that pedestrians had to cross the junction diagonally across two roads. This was a walking route for children to get to and from School. Each day, 160 children from Fulwood and Nether Green travelled to High Storrs School using the route, requiring them to walk to the middle of the road in order to obtain a clearer view to be able to cross the road. The footpath ended at the T-Junction. The concerns about the safety of the crossing point at the junction came from parents, teachers, children, people who wished to access the Porter Valley for leisure, runners and cyclists. He said that people were frustrated with the situation.

Children and parents had to cross the road at this junction every week day to attend High Storrs School. The only alternative walking route to school was through secluded and unlit parkland. The City Council had told the petitioners that they could not advocate this as a safe access route to High Storrs School.

Mr Jacobs explained that his daughter, Grace, had been involved in an accident at the junction of Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road on her way to High Storrs School and she had gone through a lot of trauma and upset as a result. He said that in December 2015, his wife had taken a telephone call informing her that Grace had been bit by a car. He had arrived at the scene at the same time as the ambulance to find that Grace had suffered serious injuries, which included multiple fractures. She had sustained these injuries despite the fact that the car involved had been travelling at a speed of less than 20 mph. The driver of the car had slowed down and Grace had been hit by the car's wing mirror. Car drivers were equally concerned about safety at the junction.

Mr Jacobs appealed to the Council to decide to take action in relation to safety at the junction of Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road. Some parents did have the option to drive their children to High Storrs School but that would

only increase traffic and pollution.

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

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, thanked Mr Jacobs and the petitioners for attending the Council meeting and submitting the petition. He also thanked Mr and Mrs Jacobs for inviting him to meet with them. He explained that he would outline the Council's policy in relation to requests for highways schemes. He had met with the three local Councillors about this matter. A request for a pedestrian crossing had been made in 2011 and this was added to the list of requests for highways schemes. A further request was made by local Councillors in 2013, which was assessed and scored accordingly. There were no recorded accidents in the previous 5 years. Following the accident involving Grace in December 2015, a further assessment was carried out.

Councillor Iqbal explained the scoring criteria relating to highways schemes and the way the Council policy sought to address accident hotspots in the City. The Core Investment period of the Streets Ahead programme would reach its final year in 2017. Where it was possible, improvements to highways would be made as part of the programme.

The Council would consider submitted petitions fairly, regardless of the number of signatories. A number of people had said that the only walking route would include the Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road junction. However, there was an alternative route, which was safer but also longer.

A number of actions had taken place since the accident had occurred in December 2015. A number of warning triangle signs had been erected, speed indicator devices installed and, earlier in the summer, it had been decided to extend the 20mph zone, so as to include Hangingwater Road.

Councillor Iqbal explained the financial constraints which limited the amount which could be allocated to highways and road safety schemes. Priority was given to providing resources for schemes in hotspots where accidents had occurred. The request for improvements to the crossing point at the Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road Junction had been assessed and had scored seven out of a maximum of nine. Councillor Iqbal outlined the number of requests which had been assessed and had resulted in scores ranging from six to nine. There were not enough resources available to progress highways schemes in relation to all of the requests which had been made.

However, as the Cabinet Member, he would review the transport programme and priorities to see if these were fit for purpose and try to identify if any resources could be made available. It was important to have a policy in place which enabled requests to be assessed against criteria and assisted evidence based and informed decision making.

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

It was suggested that other resources might be available, which could be used to fund highways schemes of the type proposed on Hangingwater Road, including Better Bus funding and capital resources, which had been underspent in the past. It was put forward that local elected Members could be given influence over the programme for highways schemes.

The road layout at the Hangingwater Road and Whiteley Wood Road junction was the main concern. There was not a viable alternative route for children to use to walk to High Storrs School. Whilst an extension to the 20mph zone was welcome, the cause of the accident which had occurred in December 2015 was not due to speed. It was the Council's responsibility to provide safe walking routes to schools.

The Council would look at the advice and information available to parents, including on websites, concerning safe walking routes to school. In practice, it was likely that people would wish to take the shortest journey possible to reach their destination. There were not adequate resources to deliver all highways schemes but the Council had committed to examine this case and to respond to the petitioners.

It was not acceptable to expect children to use the alternative route which had been suggested and they would be likely to take the shortest route. Local Councillors wished to work with the Cabinet Member to help find a solution so that the risk of another accident was much reduced.

Members acknowledged how hard it will have been for her parents to talk about what had happened to Grace. The Council did wish for children to walk to school wherever possible and it was also important that the route was safe. The Council had criteria by which to assess proposed highways and road safety schemes in a way that was fair. The Cabinet Member had undertaken to look at the matter again and it was agreed that everyone should work together to find a solution within the financial resources which were available.

Members were urged to walk the route to see for themselves what the issues were for pedestrians and motorists. Alternative options should be explored to slow vehicles and make them come to a stop.

It was important that the Council listened to people on this issue. It was considered that, if it was too dangerous to assign a school crossing patrol warden to the location on Hangingwater Road then it was also too dangerous for children to use as a route to school.

The route which school children used was established and they were unlikely to use an alternative longer route. Preventive measures should be examined to increase safety and priorities within the Streets Ahead programme should also be questioned.

The estimated costs of a highways scheme for a crossing and footpath should be challenged in the light of similar schemes which had been developed by other local authorities and to see whether there was a better and less expensive option.

The assessment criteria for highways schemes had been developed so as to ensure there was an objective method of considering potential schemes. The Council also needed to carefully consider other locations where there was a record of injuries or fatalities resulting from road traffic accidents. It was right that the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport looked at this matter again.

It was right that people had a safe place to cross the road and children and young people did not necessarily have a sense of danger so there was the potential for another accident to occur at this location.

The alternative walking route put by the Council was not adequate as it was secluded and dark, particularly in the winter. Reference was made to the Council's responsibility under the Education Act to provide safe routes to school. It was considered that the Council could reprioritise in order to implement a crossing.

The Council might consider examining the criteria if it was thought to be wrong and to see if resources were available through the Local Transport Plan and Sustainable Transport Fund.

The lead petitioner, Mr Jacobs, exercised a right of reply. He stated that the route incorporating Hangingwater Road was the only route which children used to walk to High Storrs School. He said that people with a disability could not use that route.

Mr Jacobs referred to another scheme for a crossing at Furniss Avenue in Dore which had also received a score of seven when assessed and this had been implemented. The cost of that scheme, which included a zebra crossing, was £57K. He said that he believed that the Council could reprioritise spending and implement a crossing on Hangingwater Road. There was a real risk that someone else could be seriously hurt or killed if another accident occurred at that location.

Mr Jacobs said that he had requested the details of an alternative route on 12 January and was therefore disappointed that details of that route had only been made available today, before the Council meeting. The alternative route which the Council had provided was 3.1 miles in contrast to the current route, which was shorter at 1.3 miles. The guidelines relating to safe routes to school indicated that a reasonable walking distance for a journey to school was three miles or less.

Mr Jacobs referred to the Director of Public Health's Annual Report, which encouraged physical activity. Mr Jacobs stated that in comparison to costs estimated by Sheffield City Council, Wiltshire County Council had implemented

a zebra crossing for £16K.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. He said that it was important that decisions were based on the agreed criteria. There were many requests for highways schemes and therefore it was the Council's responsibility to make sure that an open and transparent process was followed which took the relevant factors into consideration.

He acknowledged that such decisions were difficult to make and as Cabinet Member, he would take advice from officers. The junction of Whiteley Wood Road and Hangingwater Road was not normal and in a sense this was reflected in the amount (£250K to £300K) quoted to undertake the necessary works, based on the assessment which had been carried out.

In relation to other sources of funding, there were strict criteria relating to better bus funding, which was for improvements including bus punctuality. The funding had to be used for the intended purpose. As regards Capital underspends, projects were sometimes subject to delays and end dates might be extended.

The Council had considered alternative routes and extended the proposed 20 mph zone and used speed indicator devices. Street lighting stayed on for a longer time and came on earlier. Councillor Iqbal said that he needed time to look at the schemes in the programme and to consider whether there were any other options.

It was his responsibility to consider this request together with the 66 current requests for highways schemes. He would examine whether there was a resource and if, within the core investment programme of the Streets Ahead project, there was the opportunity of any available resource.

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

Proposal 1

It was moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that this Council notes the petition calling on the Council to implement road safety measures on Hangingwater Road, and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport to consider what can be done to add to the road safety measures in and around Hangingwater Road.

On being put to the vote, proposal 1 was carried.

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

For proposal 1 (49) - Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Moya O'Rourke, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve

Wilson, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney and Paul Wood

- Against proposal 1 (22) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker.
- Abstained from voting on proposal 1 (5) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) and Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal.

Proposal 2

It was moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, that Council notes the petition calling on the Council to implement road safety measures on Hangingwater Road, and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, requesting the Cabinet Member to submit a report to the Council's Cabinet by the end of this calendar year with proposals to implement road safety measures on Hangingwater Road.

On being put to the vote, proposal 2 was not carried.

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

- For proposal 2 (22) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker.
- Against proposal 2 (49) - Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Moya O'Rourke, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve

Wilson, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Leigh Bramall, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney and Paul Wood.

Abstained from
voting on proposal 2
(5)

The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) and Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal.

As a result of the votes on the two proposals, the motion approved was as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council notes the petition calling on the Council to implement road safety measures on Hangingwater Road, and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport to consider what can be done to add to the road safety measures in and around Hangingwater Road.

(NOTE: Councillor Joe Otten, having earlier declared an interest in the above item, was not present for the duration of the item.)

6. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT FOR SHEFFIELD (2016)

- 6.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of the Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) and seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.1, the order of business as published on the Council Summons be altered and Agenda Item 9 – Director of Public Health Report for Sheffield (2016) be taken as the next item of business.
- 6.2 The Council received a presentation by Greg Fell, the Director of Public Health, concerning the Director of Public Health Annual Report 2016: *A Matter of Life and Healthy Life*. The Annual Report examined how improvements in health and wellbeing and reductions in health inequalities could be maximised by capturing the impact of work across the whole Council and its partners.
- 6.3 In his presentation, Greg Fell outlined trends relating to population, health and causes of illness and mortality and the factors contributing to health. The presentation also covered prevention and the importance of the best start for children in their early years. He outlined factors which would create the environment to enable people to live well, including active travel, self-care, employment and planning and development of neighbourhoods. He also considered ageing and chronic conditions and presented some challenges to

change the way people thought about health and wellbeing.

6.4 Mr Fell outlined four key recommendations, made in the Annual Report, as follows:-

1. The Health and Wellbeing Board should take forward a series of learning events / appreciative enquiry on different approaches to health and wellbeing to explore what optimising “health and wellbeing” could look like in a number of key policy areas.
2. The Council and other stakeholders, as part of Public Sector Reform, should consider a healthy population and minimising health inequalities as a core infrastructure investment for a prosperous economy.
3. The Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group (CCG) should explore the development of a ‘Heart of Sheffield’ structural model to coordinate and shape a policy approach to improving living well options (such as increasing physical activity and reducing smoking) in the City.
4. The Council and the CCG should develop a joint neighbourhood delivery system with a broad model of primary care as the main delivery mechanism for services.

6.5 Members of the Council asked questions and commented upon issues raised by the Director of Public Health’s Annual Report and presentation and these, together with the responses to them, are summarised below:

In relation to the continuing problem of health inequalities, Members were informed that Sheffield was not unique in that health inequalities were a persistent issue and the situation was not improving. This was clearly not acceptable, and the Sheffield Health and Wellbeing Board was taking a new approach to health inequalities.

Responding to a comment about the availability of public health data, there was a considerable amount of such data available on the Council’s website and this could also be presented for a particular ward or neighbourhood.

In connection with a question about the engagement with the City’s Walking Forum, Greg Fell said that he would like to discuss further the involvement of public health and the Council.

A question was asked about the contribution of mental ill health and premature death and Mr Fell responded that there was a well established evidence base concerning the positive effect of prevention in relation to health. With regard to austerity, mental health and suicide rates, the numbers relating to suicide were relatively small and the main reasons for premature death were cardiovascular diseases and cancer. However, there was a link between mental health and life expectancy and often, the physical health of people with mental health conditions was neglected.

In relation to a question about the debate concerning the impact of migration on health and health services, people that came to the UK tended to be younger and healthier, although that was not always the case.

In response to a question concerning the use of data and individual case studies, Mr Fell stated that both the use of data and case study material were important and data alone could not explain why something was occurring. In connection with a further question relating to knowledge and education regarding life choices in helping to improve health and quality of life, it was considered that, in school, children and young people were quite well informed about health. Children and adults had choices in the environment in which they lived and that environment might also affect those choices. There was a focus on children in early years and helping children to make the best start in life.

A comment was made about the importance of personal confidence and the impact of better engagement and of neighbourhoods working collectively to help bring about improvement and change. Responding to this point, Greg Fell said that there was a vibrant voluntary sector in Sheffield. There was also a question of how best to access social capital to bring about change and this was something which required further consideration.

It was stated that Sheffield had a significant potential because of its physical assets including proximity to the Peak District and work in relation to the Outdoor City. A question was put as to how effective criteria might be established which allowed an assessment of creative investment and likely health outcomes. Mr Fell stated that as regards creative investment in health and the effect of physical assets such as parks and woodlands and the potential return on investment for the population's health, one might look, for example, at issues including air quality and the potential for physical activity including walking. It was not immediately clear how this could be incorporated into routine use and decision making.

A question was asked concerning the relationship between an ageing population and increasing care costs and preventive approaches, including children walking to school. In response to the latter, Members were informed that the Council funded a range of activity relating to children walking to school. As regards the issue of an ageing population, it was clear that increasing costs of health and social care related to proximity to death and particularly the final 18 months of a person's life. That was true whether somebody was 55 or 95 years of age. It was about how poorly that person was and not how old they were and some health conditions were preventable.

In relation to obesity and the prevalence of diabetes, obesity in children had levelled off, but it had not improved. Diabetes was an important health condition to consider in connection with future costs. Much was due to lifestyle choices, some of which were within people's control and others were not.

There was potential with the development of the Housing Plus service, to collect data relating to the health of the population and it was most important to consider what was happening in a community and which might impact on the

population's health. There were things that could be done locally to encourage people to use their local park, for example, and voluntary groups had a significant potential role in encouraging involvement and participation and in supporting people.

Responding to a number of points, Mr Fell stated the private sector was not generally well engaged in the health debate at this point in time and this needed to be looked at. In relation to social capital and community resilience, it was clearly important, but it was not known how exactly it might be measured.

In responding to a question concerning the determining factors relating to the gap in life expectancy between different areas of the City, Mr Fell explained that when people became more affluent, then tended to move to a more affluent area of the City. In the long term, the factors which would address the gap in life expectancy were housing, primary education and primary care, by which he included community services and General Practice. More immediately and in the short term, actions might include GPs identifying diseases such as cancer at an early stage.

In relation to the consideration of public health in decision making, evidence was important and the implications for public health could be taken into account in connection with matters which were both big and small. There were times when the Council had to consider budget cuts which led to difficult decisions. However, this could include or lead to a decision to invest in something which improved health. Public health had to be considered as part of the totality of available resources and expenditure, be that in primary schools, parks or cycle lanes.

- 6.6

RESOLVED: That this Council notes the information contained in the Director of Public Health's report, expresses support for the four recommendations outlined in the report for improving the health of the local population, and thanks him for his presentation.

7. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

7.1 Urgent Business

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

7.2 Questions

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

7.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

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

8. ALLOCATION OF SEATS ON COUNCIL COMMITTEES IN 2016-17 - UPDATE

8.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor David Baker, that this Council:-

- | | |
|-----|--|
| (a) | notes the impact on the allocation of seats on Council Committees of the new political composition of the Council, following the result of the Mosborough Ward By-election held on 8th September 2016, as set out in the report of the Acting Executive Director, Resources circulated with the agenda for this meeting; and |
| (b) | agrees that, in order to ensure that each political group has the required number of seats overall in comparison to the total number of seats available on all Committees to reflect their composition on the Council as a whole, the final adjustment of one seat, where the Labour Group is required to give up one seat to be allocated to the Liberal Democrat Group, be from the Appeals and Collective Disputes Committee, and accordingly, appoints Councillor Andy Nash to serve on that Committee, filling a vacancy. |

9. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

9.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that (a) approval be given to the following changes to the memberships of Boards, etc.

- | | |
|---|--|
| Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee | - Councillor Gail Smith to fill a vacancy; and Councillor Peter Rippon to replace Councillor Anne Murphy |
| Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee | - Councillor Anne Murphy to replace Councillor Peter Rippon |
| Licensing Committee | - Councillor Gail Smith to replace Councillor Andy Nash |

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

- | | |
|---|--|
| Sheffield City Region
Combined Authority
Transport Committee | - Councillors Adam Hurst and Abtislam Mohamed to fill vacancies |
| Norton Educational
Foundation and Non-
Educational Trusts | - Mr. Roy Munn to fill a vacancy |
| Sheffield Galleries and
Museums Trust | - Councillor Peter Rippon to fill a vacancy |
| Sheffield Safer and
Sustainable Communities
Partnership Board | - Remove Councillor Jack Scott; Councillor Steve Ayris to fill a vacancy |

10. ANNUAL SCRUTINY REPORT 2015-16

- 10.1 The Council received an Annual Report, which provided an overview of scrutiny activity undertaken by each of the Scrutiny and Policy Development Committees during the 2015/16 Municipal Year, and proposed activity for 2016/17.
- 10.2 RESOLVED: That the Annual Report of the Scrutiny and Policy Development Committees 2015-16 be noted.

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ROBERT MURPHY

Bus Services

- 11.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, and formally seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, that this Council:-
- (a) believes Sheffield's once famous bus service is a shadow of its former self following 30 years of declining patronage under different council administrations and national governments;
 - (b) notes the recent rise in child fares on Sheffield's bus network which has resulted in a 100% increase since 2011;
 - (c) believes the rise hits hardest a group that has no independent income and the fewest alternative travel options, a group that it is critical to educate and encourage to use public transport as a long-term way of sustaining services;
 - (d) notes that the Sheffield Bus Partnership has abandoned its original target of increasing bus patronage in favour of a policy of managing

decline, and believes it has therefore failed on its own terms;

- (e) believes with sufficient funding and the right approach, Sheffield's buses could once again become a very positive and well-used public service, and this should improve public health, reduce traffic congestion and air pollution, and improve access for everyone to key facilities and services such as schools, colleges, shops, employment locations, hospitals and other health services; and
- (f) calls on the City Region to make full use of forthcoming devolved powers included in the Bus Services Bill, including franchising of bus services.

11.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, and formally seconded by Councillor George Lindars-Hammond, 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) supports the re-regulation of bus services and believes it is important that the Buses Bill brings forward the radical measures needed to give Sheffield City Region the necessary tools to deliver a successful franchised bus service;
- (b) notes that as set out by the Government, under the Buses Bill, the only way Sheffield City Region is able to franchise bus services is through its devolution agreement with the Government and the franchised bus services will only be available to areas with devolution agreements;
- (c) confirms that if the Council had taken the advice of Councillor Robert Murphy and rejected the Sheffield City Region Devolution Agreement in March 2016, there would not be an option on the table of refranchising bus services in Sheffield when the Buses Bill comes into force;
- (d) regrets that Councillor Murphy voted against the devolution deal that included giving the City Region the ability to franchise bus services, and his actions would have, in effect, blocked Sheffield from doing something he is now calling for;
- (e) notes that, under the current national framework, no local area has been able to successfully franchise bus services outside London and recalls last year's Government ruling blocking Tyne and Wear from taking control of local services;
- (f) believes that the motion fails to highlight the true cause of cuts to bus services and increases in child fares, which is the government's failed austerity programme of enforcing draconian cuts to local government in addition to cuts to specific bus grants over the past six years, and notes that cuts to bus services have hit areas across the country; and
- (g) believes that key to making franchising successful going forward is the Government putting the necessary powers in the Buses Bill and

reinstating the funding that has been lost through local authority subsidies which have caused a loss of subsidised routes and fares.

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

11.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, and formally seconded by Councillor Andy Nash, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraphs (a) to (c) and the addition of new paragraphs (a) and (b) as follows:-
 - (a) recalls the previous Administration's attempt to pursue a franchising model for delivering bus services in Sheffield, which had cross party support until the current Administration dropped the plans in favour of the current voluntary agreement;
 - (b) believes that a 'Quality Contract' franchised model would have brought greater value for taxpayers and delivered a more consistent service;
2. the insertion, in paragraph (e), of the words ", more passenger rights" after the words " sufficient funding"; and
3. the relettering of paragraphs (d) to (f) as new paragraphs (c) to (e).

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

11.6 It was then formally moved by Councillor Magid Magid, seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a paragraph (g) as follows:-

- (g) requests that all alternative sources of revenue for public transport be investigated and that the relevant Cabinet Member brings a report on this matter to a meeting of the Full Council within 3 months.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) supports the re-regulation of bus services and believes it is important that the Buses Bill brings forward the radical measures needed to give Sheffield City Region the necessary tools to deliver a successful franchised bus service;
- (b) notes that as set out by the Government, under the Buses Bill, the only way Sheffield City Region is able to franchise bus services is through its

- devolution agreement with the Government and the franchised bus services will only be available to areas with devolution agreements;
- (c) confirms that if the Council had taken the advice of Councillor Robert Murphy and rejected the Sheffield City Region Devolution Agreement in March 2016, there would not be an option on the table of refranchising bus services in Sheffield when the Buses Bill comes into force;
 - (d) regrets that Councillor Murphy voted against the devolution deal that included giving the City Region the ability to franchise bus services, and his actions would have, in effect, blocked Sheffield from doing something he is now calling for;
 - (e) notes that, under the current national framework, no local area has been able to successfully franchise bus services outside London and recalls last year's Government ruling blocking Tyne and Wear from taking control of local services;
 - (f) believes that the motion fails to highlight the true cause of cuts to bus services and increases in child fares, which is the government's failed austerity programme of enforcing draconian cuts to local government in addition to cuts to specific bus grants over the past six years, and notes that cuts to bus services have hit areas across the country; and
 - (g) believes that key to making franchising successful going forward is the Government putting the necessary powers in the Buses Bill and reinstating the funding that has been lost through local authority subsidies which have caused a loss of subsidised routes and fares.

11.8.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) to (e) and (g), and voted against paragraph (f) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded;

2. Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a) and (e), voted against paragraphs (c) and (d), and abstained from voting on paragraphs (b), (f) and (g) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BEN MISKELL

Fixed Odds Betting Terminals

12.1 At the request of Councillor Ben Miskell and with the consent of the Council, the Notice of Motion Numbered 11 on the Summons for this meeting was withdrawn in accordance with Council Procedure Rules 11(x) and 17.10.

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR OLIVIA BLAKE

Dementia

13.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Olivia Blake, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that:
 - (i) in Sheffield it is estimated that 6,099 people over the age of 65 are living with dementia; 80.3% of those living with dementia have received a formal diagnosis; and diagnosis can often be the key to accessing appropriate support services;
 - (ii) two thirds of those living with dementia are living in the community, and nearly 70% of people with dementia feel lonely and trapped in their own homes, with limited or no social networks;
 - (iii) a healthy diet, regular physical exercise, and avoiding smoking and drinking may reduce the risk of developing Alzheimer's Disease and vascular dementia, but 64% of people are not aware of this; and
 - (iv) the societal cost of dementia in the UK is estimated at an average cost per person of £32,250; and of the total estimated cost of dementia in the UK, it is estimated that £11.6 billion is contributed through the work of unpaid carers;
- (b) welcomes the long standing commitment of the present Administration to making Sheffield a Dementia Friendly City, driven by the work of the Sheffield Dementia Action Alliance;
- (c) commits to appointing an Elected Member to the position of 'Dementia Champion' for the Authority; and
- (d) supports this Administration's commitment to:-
 - (i) work towards making Council practices more dementia friendly, encouraging staff and Members to become a 'Dementia Friend' through the Dementia Friends Programme and committing to making Council buildings dementia friendly;
 - (ii) run local risk reduction campaigns, including clear messaging in ongoing campaigns regarding exercise, alcohol, smoking or diet that 'what's good for your heart is good for your head'; and
 - (iii) make information about local dementia services as accessible as possible, embedding the free Dementia Connect database on the local authority website.

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ADAM HANRAHAN

Safety of Students

- 14.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Adam Hanrahan, and formally seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council:-
- (a) welcomes the many students at both Sheffield University and Sheffield Hallam University who have recently come to Sheffield for the new academic year;
 - (b) recognises the massive economic, social and cultural contribution Sheffield's student population makes to our city;
 - (c) notes Sheffield's reputation as a safe city and recognises that this reputation is a factor in many students' decisions to come and study here;
 - (d) expresses concern that in our city, students may be at a particular risk of crime, as burglary is on the increase in areas such as Broomhill, Crookesmoor and Broomhall, and there have been a number of recent high profile sexual assaults in student areas and the city centre;
 - (e) believes that this poses a threat to the safety of our student population, a threat to the vitality of Sheffield's night-time economy and may potentially lead to a fall in student numbers; and
 - (f) calls on the Administration and the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner to set up a task force with students and staff from both Universities to ensure that all of our institutions are sharing best practice and are doing everything we can to keep students safe within the city.
- 14.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Neale Gibson, and formally seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-
- 1. the replacement, in paragraph (d), of the words "as burglary is on the increase in areas such as Broomhill, Crookesmoor and Broomhall and there have been a number of recent high profile sexual assaults in student areas and the city centre", by the words "however welcomes recent crime figures reported in the Sheffield Star newspaper that burglary is down in student areas such as Broomhill with a 38.75% reduction from 80 to 49 and notes comments on the Sheffield Hallam Student Union website that "cases of student burglary have actually been reduced in recent years in Sheffield."; and
 - 2. the deletion of paragraphs (e) and (f) and the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows:-

- (e) notes that whilst Sheffield is recognised as one of the country's safest cities, it is important not to be complacent and welcomes the existing strong partnership working between the Council, Students' Unions, Universities and the police to promote student safety and recognises that any specific issues can be raised through these channels.

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

14.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and formally seconded by Councillor Magid Magid, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a paragraph (f) as follows:-

- (f) commends the many agencies that are working hard to tackle complex issues of begging, alcohol and drug problems, street homelessness and mental health; and recognises that education of students about these matters is an important part of addressing these issues and promoting safety in the city.

14.4.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the amendment (Councillor Douglas Johnson), the amendment as circulated at the meeting was altered so as to propose the new paragraph as an additional paragraph (f) to the substantive motion, and also by the insertion between the words "education of" and "students" of the words "the general public, and in particular".)

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the many students at both Sheffield University and Sheffield Hallam University who have recently come to Sheffield for the new academic year;
- (b) recognises the massive economic, social and cultural contribution Sheffield's student population makes to our city;
- (c) notes Sheffield's reputation as a safe city and recognises that this reputation is a factor in many students' decisions to come and study here;
- (d) expresses concern that in our city, students may be at a particular risk of crime, however welcomes recent crime figures reported in the Sheffield Star newspaper that burglary is down in student areas such as Broomhill with a 38.75% reduction from 80 to 49 and notes comments on the Sheffield Hallam Student Union website that "cases of student burglary have actually been reduced in recent years in Sheffield";

- (e) notes that whilst Sheffield is recognised as one of the country's safest cities, it is important not to be complacent and welcomes the existing strong partnership working between the Council, Students' Unions, Universities and the police to promote student safety and recognises that any specific issues can be raised through these channels; and
- (f) commends the many agencies that are working hard to tackle complex issues of begging, alcohol and drug problems, street homelessness and mental health; and recognises that education of the general public, and in particular students, about these matters is an important part of addressing these issues and promoting safety in the city.

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR NEALE GIBSON

Student Rents and Multinational Student accommodation Companies

15.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Neale Gibson, and formally seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the importance of Sheffield's two universities to the city and welcomes all new students arriving in Sheffield in the past month;
- (b) further notes a number of national campaigns have been launched against the high level of student rents which risks making the accommodation unaffordable for many students;
- (c) believes that many students are charged high rents by multinational student accommodation companies who provide residential units of purpose built student accommodation and supports students in fighting for fair rents, and notes many of these companies have been well documented to make huge profits;
- (d) notes that these companies are exempt from paying business rates, which is also taking money away from local councils to fund vital public services and believes, like all businesses, student accommodation companies should be required to pay business rates to contribute to the funding of local services in cities like Sheffield where they make huge profits; and
- (e) directs that a copy of this motion is sent to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Shadow Chancellor for consideration.

15.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Adam Hanrahan, and formally seconded by Councillor Sue Alston, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (d) and the addition of a new paragraph (d) as follows:-

- (d) notes that residential property is not liable for business rates, and recognises that if business rates were levied on student accommodation this would push student rents even higher;

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

15.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Magid Magid, and formally seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (d) and the addition of a new paragraph (d) as follows:-

- (d) notes that these companies do pay business rates on the offices of their businesses, but believes that the system of both non-domestic rates and council tax needs comprehensive reform in favour of a land value tax.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the importance of Sheffield's two universities to the city and welcomes all new students arriving in Sheffield in the past month;
- (b) further notes a number of national campaigns have been launched against the high level of student rents which risks making the accommodation unaffordable for many students;
- (c) believes that many students are charged high rents by multinational student accommodation companies who provide residential units of purpose built student accommodation and supports students in fighting for fair rents, and notes many of these companies have been well documented to make huge profits;
- (d) notes that these companies are exempt from paying business rates, which is also taking money away from local councils to fund vital public services and believes, like all businesses, student accommodation companies should be required to pay business rates to contribute to the funding of local services in cities like Sheffield where they make huge profits; and
- (e) directs that a copy of this motion is sent to the Chancellor of the Exchequer and Shadow Chancellor for consideration.

15.6.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) to (c) and (e) and voted against paragraph

(d) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded;

2. Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a) to (c) and (e) and abstained from voting on paragraph (d) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR RICHARD CROWTHER

Stocksbridge Library

16.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Richard Crowther, seconded by Councillor Alan Law, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the recent installation of new lift facilities at Stocksbridge Library, which will improve access to the facility by providing help to wheelchair users, people with walking difficulties and people with pushchairs;
- (b) thanks the approximately 500 people who attended the open day at Stocksbridge Library on Saturday 17 September 2016, which was held to promote new groups being held in the Library and show people its new facilities, including lifts to all floors;
- (c) notes these new developments were completed three weeks ahead of schedule and underneath the planned budget;
- (d) commends the use of the Library for community purposes such as the weekly babytime group and the sporting memories group for older people;
- (e) believes that Stocksbridge Library is an important community facility for residents and hopes local people will use the service; and
- (f) directs that a copy of this motion be sent to the Library and to Stocksbridge Town Council.

17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR COLIN ROSS

Academic Selection and Grammar Schools

17.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Colin Ross, and formally seconded by Councillor Steve Ayris, that this Council:-

- (a) notes with great concern that the current government is considering bringing back grammar schools and allowing Free Schools to introduce academic selection;

- (b) believes that there is no such thing as an 'inclusive grammar school' and this policy is an unwelcome step backwards to a more unequal, divided society;
- (c) notes that the re-introduction of grammar schools necessitates the re-introduction of secondary moderns;
- (d) believes that the Government's plan to lift restrictions on faith schools, allowing schools to select 100% of their pupils based on faith, will lead to further division within communities;
- (e) notes that increasing academic selection in schools was not in the 2015 Conservative Party manifesto and believes the unelected Prime Minister has no mandate to put this policy into force;
- (f) notes the comments of the former Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. David Cameron, "*I think it is delusional to think that a policy of expanding a number of grammar schools is either a good idea, a sellable idea or even the right idea.*";
- (g) notes the efforts of the previous Government to close the gap in inequality in education through targeted investment towards poorer pupils, such as the pupil premium, free early years education and free school dinners;
- (h) regrets that since 2015, schools have seen a real term cut in their budgets, undermining efforts of the previous Government;
- (i) believes that young people have varied and complex aptitudes and abilities and believes that our young people's potential can be best achieved in good comprehensive schools where they are allowed to flourish at their own pace and mix with peers from all walks of life; and
- (j) therefore calls on the Administration to write to the Secretary of State for Education calling for the Government to abandon these plans.

17.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Jackie Drayton, and formally seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (g) to (j) and the addition of new paragraphs (g) to (j) as follows:-

- (g) believes that bringing back grammar schools is a backward step, that there are good reasons why the grammar school system was abolished around 50 years ago, and that at a time when we have been making progress with our results in Sheffield, this is the last thing we want to see;
- (h) believes that the grammar school system doesn't promote social mobility, it keeps people down, and over its five years the coalition government systematically downgraded the value of vocational study, downgrading vocational qualifications and work experience, making our system even

more elitist, which flies in the face of the needs of our local economy, where employers need young people with both vocational and academic qualifications;

- (i) wants a society that gives every child and young person the opportunity to succeed, whatever route they choose to go down, and believes these Government proposals will be bad for our education system, bad for our children and bad for society; and
- (j) welcomes the cross party opposition to grammar schools and notes that the move has been overwhelmingly opposed in the teaching profession and therefore sends a united message that new grammar schools are not wanted in Sheffield and believes the Government should listen to this clear local view.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes with great concern that the current government is considering bringing back grammar schools and allowing Free Schools to introduce academic selection;
- (b) believes that there is no such thing as an 'inclusive grammar school' and this policy is an unwelcome step backwards to a more unequal, divided society;
- (c) notes that the re-introduction of grammar schools necessitates the re-introduction of secondary moderns;
- (d) believes that the Government's plan to lift restrictions on faith schools, allowing schools to select 100% of their pupils based on faith, will lead to further division within communities;
- (e) notes that increasing academic selection in schools was not in the 2015 Conservative Party manifesto and believes the unelected Prime Minister has no mandate to put this policy into force;
- (f) notes the comments of the former Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. David Cameron, "*I think it is delusional to think that a policy of expanding a number of grammar schools is either a good idea, a sellable idea or even the right idea.*";
- (g) believes that bringing back grammar schools is a backward step, that there are good reasons why the grammar school system was abolished around 50 years ago, and that at a time when we have been making progress with our results in Sheffield, this is the last thing we want to see;

- (h) believes that the grammar school system doesn't promote social mobility, it keeps people down, and over its five years the coalition government systematically downgraded the value of vocational study, downgrading vocational qualifications and work experience, making our system even more elitist, which flies in the face of the needs of our local economy, where employers need young people with both vocational and academic qualifications;
- (i) wants a society that gives every child and young person the opportunity to succeed, whatever route they choose to go down, and believes these Government proposals will be bad for our education system, bad for our children and bad for society; and
- (j) welcomes the cross party opposition to grammar schools and notes that the move has been overwhelmingly opposed in the teaching profession and therefore sends a united message that new grammar schools are not wanted in Sheffield and believes the Government should listen to this clear local view.

17.4.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) to (g), (i) and (j), and voted against paragraph (h), of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER

Railways, Skills Investment and Workers' Rights

18.1 It was formally moved by Councillor John Booker, and formally seconded by Councillor Jack Clarkson, that this Council:-

- (a) supports Mick Cash, General Secretary of the National Union of Rail, Maritime and Transport Workers (RMT), in his argument that there is no basis for cost cutting on the North's railways, and notes that, according to Rail North's own estimates, passenger demand for the North's railways will soar by 50% over the next fifteen years, and despite this, and the clear need for investment, the Government has stated that annual subsidy will be cut by £160m, or 53% by the final year of the franchise;
- (b) believes there must be strong opposition to the cuts programme, attacks on supervisory and clerical jobs, the introduction of driver-only operation and increased casualization, arising from the re-franchising processes;
- (c) further, supports a publicly owned "People's Railway for the North";

- (d) believes that, for too long, British workers involved in the traditional industries have been ignored and not treated with the respect they deserve;
- (e) further believes we must invest in more training of our youth to meet future needs, especially in STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering and mathematics), increase places for medical training so we can be less reliant on foreign nurses and doctors, and provide more meaningful apprenticeships to support future growth; and
- (f) pays tribute to the men and women that drive forward British industry and undertakes to do all within its power to protect workers' rights from this Government's cuts.

18.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Lisa Banes, and formally seconded by Councillor Mohammad Maroof, 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) supports bringing railways back under public ownership to run them in the interests of passengers and taxpayers;
- (b) believes that privatisation has led to unfair ticket price hikes and an inefficient system subsidising the profits of private rail operators;
- (c) regrets that privatisation was a policy developed across numerous industries in the 1980s under the government of Margaret Thatcher, with rail eventually being privatised in 1994, and therefore condemns Diane James, MEP, for describing Margaret Thatcher as a political hero;
- (d) believes that rail services and transport infrastructure has not been given the investment it needs and improving connectivity will be essential in driving economic growth in the north of England, and supports all sentiments opposing the cuts that have been made to railways in the north and unnecessary attacks on rail workers;
- (e) believes that, for too long, British workers have been ignored and that this has been realised through undermining their right to organise, through attacks on trade unions under successive Conservative governments;
- (f) opposes the Trade Union Act 2016 which this Council believes is an attack on the civil liberties of workers;
- (g) believes that more investment is needed in skills, particularly STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) and recognises the importance of devolution of skills budgets so local areas can match the training available to the needs of local businesses and the economy;

- (h) welcomes Sheffield's strong record as holding the best record for apprenticeships of all the Core Cities and believes the devolution of 16-18 skills budgets is essential in strengthening this record; and
- (i) pays tribute to all British workers that drive forward British industry and undertakes to do all within its power to protect workers' rights from this Government's cuts, and fears that Brexit could lead to the undermining of many workers' rights under this Government and calls on these rights to be protected.

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

18.3.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (d) to (i), voted against paragraphs (a) and (b), and abstained from voting on paragraph (c) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) supports bringing railways back under public ownership to run them in the interests of passengers and taxpayers;
- (b) believes that privatisation has led to unfair ticket price hikes and an inefficient system subsidising the profits of private rail operators;
- (c) regrets that privatisation was a policy developed across numerous industries in the 1980s under the government of Margaret Thatcher, with rail eventually being privatised in 1994, and therefore condemns Diane James, MEP, for describing Margaret Thatcher as a political hero;
- (d) believes that rail services and transport infrastructure has not been given the investment it needs and improving connectivity will be essential in driving economic growth in the north of England, and supports all sentiments opposing the cuts that have been made to railways in the north and unnecessary attacks on rail workers;
- (e) believes that, for too long, British workers have been ignored and that this has been realised through undermining their right to organise, through attacks on trade unions under successive Conservative governments;
- (f) opposes the Trade Union Act 2016 which this Council believes is an attack on the civil liberties of workers;

- (g) believes that more investment is needed in skills, particularly STEM subjects (science, technology, engineering and mathematics) and recognises the importance of devolution of skills budgets so local areas can match the training available to the needs of local businesses and the economy;
- (h) welcomes Sheffield's strong record as holding the best record for apprenticeships of all the Core Cities and believes the devolution of 16-18 skills budgets is essential in strengthening this record; and
- (i) pays tribute to all British workers that drive forward British industry and undertakes to do all within its power to protect workers' rights from this Government's cuts, and fears that Brexit could lead to the undermining of many workers' rights under this Government and calls on these rights to be protected.

18.4.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (d) to (i), voted against paragraphs (a) and (b), and abstained from voting on paragraph (c), of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

19. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ROBERT MURPHY

HS2 Project

19.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, and formally seconded by Councillor Magid Magid, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the HS2 Route Change announced on 7th July 2016 would result in the loss of hundreds of homes in the city region and a likely reduction in services stopping in Sheffield City Region compared to the original proposal;
- (b) is concerned that the proposal will not provide the benefits of 'substantially reduced journey times' or 'release space on the conventional rail network for new commuter, regional and freight services,' the statements used as justification for Sheffield City Council supporting the concept of High Speed Rail;
- (c) believes that the proposed HS2 spur to Sheffield Midland Station will not provide the economic benefits, capacity and connectivity improvements that a Sheffield Victoria option claimed;

- (d) believes that the huge amount of infrastructure investment tied up in HS2 is not good value for money for Sheffield City Region and the money would be better spent on improvements to the local and regional train network, in particular the overcrowded cross-Pennine routes;
- (e) believes that, for the North to be more successful, it is more important to improve connections between northern cities than those between these cities and London; and
- (f) calls on the Administration, for the reasons above, to withdraw this Council's support for the HS2 project, and resolves to send a copy of this motion to the Department of Transport and HS2 Ltd.

19.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, and formally 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) notes that the campaign for a Sheffield city centre HS2 station has been supported in the city by the Council, the local business community, the universities and the Sheffield Star newspaper, due to the overwhelming economic evidence of thousands of additional jobs and billions of additional economic growth created from a city centre, as opposed to a Meadowhall, option;
- (b) believes that changing Sheffield's HS2 station location to Midland provides a better option for the city than the previous Meadowhall option which would have failed to deliver thousands of much needed additional jobs whilst potentially weakening Sheffield city centre;
- (c) however, recognises that the Government and HS2 Ltd. still need to make commitments for the onward connection from Sheffield to Leeds;
- (d) believes HS2 Ltd. must work with the areas that are most affected by the route change to address the concerns they are raising about the impact that the new route will have on their communities;
- (e) fully agrees that improving connections between northern cities is imperative and welcomes the leadership of the present Administration in working with other northern cities to establish Transport for the North to realise the vision of strongly connected cities across the north of England;
- (f) believes that fundamental to this is securing 30 minute city centre to city centre connectivity between both Sheffield and Leeds, and Sheffield and Manchester, and believes that these key conditional outputs must be met and the Government should provide the resources to achieve this as a top priority;

- (g) notes the evidence detailing the disparity in transport spending between the north of England and London and the south east, and believes these transport infrastructure projects are a crucial element in transforming connectivity, productivity and the economy of the north, and further believes that investment in local and regional services alongside national projects such as HS2 are not mutually exclusive; and
- (h) therefore believes that investment in both Transport for the North and HS2 are important in providing the transport infrastructure needed, and will continue to support them.

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

19.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, and formally seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, 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) welcomes the recent announcement by the Government to provide a spur line to the HS2 route directly into Sheffield Midland Station;
- (b) believes that HS2 and improving connectivity for Northern cities need not be a case of either/or, and both can and should be welcomed;
- (c) believes that improving connections between northern cities is vitally important to improving prosperity in the North, and HS2 coming to Sheffield city centre, rather than an out-of-town parkway station, is a step in the right direction;
- (d) believes that Sheffield Victoria should still be re-opened and redeveloped to improve capacity and connectivity, particularly to Stockbridge and the North of Sheffield; and
- (e) resolves to send a copy of this motion to Sheffield City Region and the Department of Transport.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that the campaign for a Sheffield city centre HS2 station has been supported in the city by the Council, the local business community, the universities and the Sheffield Star newspaper, due to the overwhelming economic evidence of thousands of additional jobs and billions of additional economic growth created from a city centre, as opposed to a Meadowhall, option;

- (b) believes that changing Sheffield's HS2 station location to Midland provides a better option for the city than the previous Meadowhall option which would have failed to deliver thousands of much needed additional jobs whilst potentially weakening Sheffield city centre;
- (c) however, recognises that the Government and HS2 Ltd. still need to make commitments for the onward connection from Sheffield to Leeds;
- (d) believes HS2 Ltd. must work with the areas that are most affected by the route change to address the concerns they are raising about the impact that the new route will have on their communities;
- (e) fully agrees that improving connections between northern cities is imperative and welcomes the leadership of the present Administration in working with other northern cities to establish Transport for the North to realise the vision of strongly connected cities across the north of England;
- (f) believes that fundamental to this is securing 30 minute city centre to city centre connectivity between both Sheffield and Leeds, and Sheffield and Manchester, and believes that these key conditional outputs must be met and the Government should provide the resources to achieve this as a top priority;
- (g) notes the evidence detailing the disparity in transport spending between the north of England and London and the south east, and believes these transport infrastructure projects are a crucial element in transforming connectivity, productivity and the economy of the north, and further believes that investment in local and regional services alongside national projects such as HS2 are not mutually exclusive; and
- (h) therefore believes that investment in both Transport for the North and HS2 are important in providing the transport infrastructure needed, and will continue to support them.

19.6.1 (NOTE: Councillors Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (e) and (f), and abstained from voting on paragraphs (a) to (d), (g) and (h) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

This page is intentionally left blank