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 July 2017, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

**PRESENT**

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Anne Murphy)
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Magid Magid)

1 *Beauchief & Greenhill Ward*
Andy Nash
Bob Pullin
Richard Shaw

2 *Beighton Ward*
Ian Saunders

3 *Birley Ward*
Denise Fox
Bryan Lodge
Karen McGowan

4 *Broomhill & Sharrow Vale Ward*
Kieran Harpham
Magid Magid

5 *Burngreave Ward*
Jackie Drayton
Talib Hussain
Mark Jones

6 *City Ward*
Douglas Johnson
Robert Murphy
Moya O'Rourke

7 *Crookes & Crosspool Ward*
Craig Gamble Pugh
Adam Hanrahan
Anne Murphy

8 *Darnall Ward*
Mazher Iqbal
Mary Lea
Zahira Naz

9 *Dore & Totley Ward*
Joe Otten
Colin Ross

10 *East Ecclesfield Ward*
Pauline Andrews
Andy Bainbridge
Steve Wilson

11 *Ecclesall Ward*
Roger Davison
Shaffaq Mohammed

12 *Firth Park Ward*
Abdul Khayum
Alan Law
Abtisam Mohamed

13 *Fulwood Ward*
Sue Alston
Andrew Sangar
Cliff Woodcraft

14 *Gleadless Valley Ward*
Cate McDonald
Chris Peace

15 *Graves Park Ward*
Ian Auckland
Sue Auckland
Steve Ayris

16 *Hillsborough Ward*
Bob Johnson

17 *Manor Castle Ward*
Lisa Banes
Terry Fox
Pat Midgley

18 *Mosborough Ward*
David Barker
Tony Downing
Gail Smith

19 *Nether Edge & Sharrow Ward*
Mohammad Maroof
Jim Steinke
Alison Teal

20 *Park & Arbourthorne*
Julie Dore
Ben Miskell
Jack Scott

21 *Richmond Ward*
Mike Drabble
Dianne Hurst
Peter Rippon

22 *Shiregreen & Brightside Ward*
Dawn Dale
Peter Price
Garry Weatherall

23 *Southey Ward*
Mike Chaplin
Tony Damms
Jayne Dunn

24 *Stannington Ward*
David Baker
Penny Baker
Vickie Priestley

25 *Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward*
Jack Clarkson
Richard Crowther
Keith Davis

26 *Walkley Ward*
Olivia Blake
Ben Curran
Neale Gibson

27 *West Ecclesfield Ward*
John Booker
Adam Hurst
Zoe Sykes

28 *Woodhouse Ward*
Mick Rooney
Paul Wood

## 1. MINUTE'S SILENCE

1.1 Prior to the commencement of the business of the meeting, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) referred to the shocking events that had occurred recently; the Grenfell Tower fire, the Manchester Arena bombing, the Finsbury Park Mosque attack, the London Bridge and Borough Market attack, and the Westminster attack, and the Council meeting observed a minute's silence in memory of those who lost their lives in those events and to pay respects to members of their families and friends and also to those who suffered injury in the events.

## 2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Michelle Cook, Lewis Dagnall, George Lindars-Hammond, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Josie Paszek, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Jackie Satur, Paul Scriven and Martin Smith.

## 3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

## 4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS

4.1 It was moved by Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Dianne Hurst, that the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 5th April 2017 and the annual meeting of the Council held on 17th May 2017 be approved as true and accurate records.

4.2 Whereupon, Councillor Douglas Johnson requested that in section 5.4 of the minutes of 5th April (Petition Requiring Debate – Calling on the Council to "Save Ecclesall Road Trees"), in order to aid clarity, the note towards the top of page 17 of the minutes should be altered to read as follows –

(Note: A challenge was made under Council Procedure Rule 19 concerning comments made by Councillor Alison Teal during the debate and following advice by the Chief Executive the meeting was adjourned for a short period.)

4.3 Following advice by the Monitoring Officer, it was:-

RESOLVED: That the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 5th April 2017 and the annual meeting of the Council held on 17th May 2017 be approved as true and accurate records, subject to the alteration in section 5.4 of the minutes of 5th April (Petition Requiring Debate – Calling on the Council to "Save Ecclesall Road Trees") of the note towards the top of page 17 of the minutes to read as follows –

(Note: A challenge was made under Council Procedure Rule 19 concerning comments made by Councillor Alison Teal during the debate and following advice by the Chief Executive the meeting was adjourned for a short period.)

(NOTE: Subsequent to the meeting, a correction was made to item 6 of the minutes of the annual meeting of the Council held on 17th May 2017 to incorporate details of the Shadow Cabinet Member appointments that had been reported to and approved at the annual meeting of the Council, but which had mistakenly been omitted from the minutes published within the agenda for the meeting on 5th July 2017.)

## 5. ORDER OF BUSINESS

5.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Peter Rippon and seconded by Councillor Dianne Hurst, that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.1, the order of business as published on the Council Summons be altered by taking item 9 (Notice of Motion regarding Fire Safety on Tower Blocks) immediately after the next item of business (Tower Block Review – item 4 on the agenda).

## 6. TOWER BLOCK REVIEW

6.1 The Council received a presentation from the Chief Executive of the Council, John Mothersole and the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods, Janet Sharpe on the work undertaken to review the safety of tower blocks in the city, following the tragic fire at Grenfell Tower in Kensington and Chelsea. The presentation was followed by an opportunity for Members of the Council to ask questions.

6.2 There were matters that were known in relation to the fire at the Grenfell Tower, including that it was a 24 storey building, with a single central staircase and that a composite aluminium material rain-screen cladding with thermal insulation had been installed in 2015/16. It was also confirmed that gas was installed in the tower block.

6.3 There were also things which were not known at this time, particularly in relation to how the fire had taken hold and had spread so quickly, the management of the building, any outstanding actions from the London Fire service in relation to its safety and the exact details of the scope of the Inquiry into the tragedy.

6.4 In Sheffield, there were 24 Tower Blocks, all of which were externally clad, 14 of these were completed over 15 years ago. Three were clad in brick at Stannington and 21 with a rain-screen cladding system. 20 Tower Blocks had solid Aluminium metal cladding with a mineral type insulation, one block had an aluminium composite material (ACM) on its outer leaf that was sent down to the Government for testing. The other 20 tower blocks were clad in solid aluminium. It was confirmed that a testing programme was underway to finally confirm this. All 24 tower blocks had benefited from extensive fire stopping and compartmental works which commenced in 2010 and were now completed as part of the Council's 5 year Fire Safety Programme which included the provision of compartmentation works, external fire breaks and

fire retardant insulation. One tower block, which was sheltered housing, had a sprinkler system installed. There was a 'Stay Put' Policy in place for all blocks, which had been agreed with South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service. All blocks had annual Fire Risk Assessments in place and benefited from regular checking every 6 weeks. A commitment had been made by the Council to consult with tenants and residents to install sprinklers in all Tower Blocks as further re-assurance to tenants.

6.5 One Tower Block in Sheffield, the Hanover Tower, had failed the new Government test on one element of the cladding. The block, comprising 126 flats and a single staircase had been refurbished in 2012 and a three-part cladding system was installed. There were fire stopping measures in the block which had also been subject to an independent fire safety quality check in 2010 and through annual Fire Risk Assessments. The design and build had been contractor led and the Council was clarifying why composite material was chosen to install to the outer leaf. However, this complied with Building Regulations.

6.6 Meetings had been held with Tenants and Leaseholders and the cladding was to be removed, during which time there would be 24 hour security in place. People would be offered temporary rehousing and consultation would take place to choose new cladding for the block. All tenants and their safety regardless of tenure was a priority for the City.

6.7 Other buildings, including those used by other institutions and the private sector were also being looked at and it was known that the Stephenson wing of the Children's Hospital had failed the new test on cladding and it would be removed. Other types of building which were being looked at in conjunction with the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service included schools, private sector rented accommodation, university student accommodation, housing association, office and hotel buildings.

6.8 Information was being collected from the public and private sector to create baseline data and a single city database was in development, in conjunction with the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service. The Council was seeking Government funding to address current actions and to install additional protection and regular updates were being provided to the Government.

6.9 Members of the Council asked questions relating to the presentation and responses were given by the Chief Executive and the Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods, as summarised below:

6.10 In response to question about the installation of sprinkler systems, Members were informed that there were mixed views regarding the use of sprinklers. There were different types of sprinkler system and the Council intended to install sprinklers if supported by tenants and residents but would first consult on a block by block basis. The tragic events at the Grenfell Tower would mean that once the outcome of the inquiry was completed it was likely that all local authorities would have to work through any recommendations. The City Council was highly responsible in the management of its estate and was

seeking to clarify matters with regard to the Hanover block. The Council had made assurances to tenants and leaseholders at the Hanover block that it would work on options for replacement cladding with them. There would be a timescale for the procurement and delivery of the new cladding system, although it was not intended that the building would be without cladding for an undue length of time.

6.11 The planning process alone was not adequate to consider in detail issues such as fire safety, although it was used to the extent that it could be legitimately. It was important to make sure good fire safety was designed into a building, but the planning process was limited to the extent that it could determine product or materials except if a building had listed status. One of the issues arising from the Grenfell tragedy might be the extent to which planning and building regulations might be used differently. Works undertaken to housing stock had to ensure that improvements and specifications met the relevant building standards. Sometimes design work was done by a contractor and at other times by a Council architect. Members were informed of such schemes as were tenants and leaseholders and Members were also offered briefings to help them respond to queries from local residents.

6.12 In relation to the level of confidence in current fire safety and building regulations, there was usually a high level of trust in state regulations. However, there was a question over how a product which had passed building regulations had now been found to have failed the new Government test. It could be that either a different test had been used or that the regulations being used were confusing or not adequate. Confidence in the measures in place and regulation might come out of the Inquiry if there was shown to be a process of learning.

6.13 The Council had a number of responsibilities which it had to perform under regulations to make sure tenants and properties were kept safe. The Council had a strong relationship with the Fire and Rescue Service. Annually, there was a joint inspection of all blocks of flats owned by the Council which also did its own checks. Six weekly inspections were carried out to help ensure safety and there were specific deadlines in relation to any works to properties.

6.14 A question was asked in relation to whether the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service had the necessary funding and equipment to respond to such an incident and this would be referred to the Fire Rescue Service for a response. The Government would also be asked to provide resources to put in place the necessary safety work and measures.

6.15 In relation to the response of the local authority to an event such as that relating to the Grenfell Tower, the City Council did undertake emergency planning exercises, although reality was often different to training. Exercises were scenario based and included a debriefing process. The Council also reviewed its responses to real occurrences, such as with the floods in 2007. As to whether the City could cope with the scenario faced by Kensington and

Chelsea, there was capacity to re-home several hundred people, based on the fact that the Council was itself a large landlord and also had in place strong partnerships.

6.16 Whilst the Council had most power in relation to the residential sector, this was less so for the education and business sector, unless a building was in structural danger of collapse. The Council had offered schools access to the independent testing it was putting in place. Although the Council would not fund testing for the school, it would facilitate them gaining access to it.

6.17 The 'Stay Put' policy was advice and people would always make their own judgements. The Fire and Rescue Service advise that, on balance, it was appropriate to follow the 'Stay Put' policy on the basis of inspections of each tower block. The advice would depend on a particular building and the Inquiry relating to the Grenfell fire would establish whether or not a Stay Put policy was correct in that case.

6.18 As regards, the use of particular cladding materials and evidence relating to fire breaks, buildings behaved as whole and in relation to fire, it was important to deal with prevention of fire, containment and preventing the spread of fire.

6.19 Sprinklers were installed in a sheltered tower block at Gleadless Valley and fire stopping works had been carried out in other sheltered housing accommodation and all other Council owned accommodation in the City. Sprinklers and misting systems were used in accommodation for highly vulnerable people who could not evacuate a building themselves. The Council was, in conjunction with the Fire and Rescue Service, reviewing whether any additional measures were required.

6.20 The emergency planning service was a joint arrangement with Rotherham Borough Council and it applied to back office support and resilience. There were activities which were specific to Sheffield, such as the allocation of Forward Liaison Officers and Duty Chief Officers. The Sheffield specific functionality was not compromised by the joint arrangement.

6.21 It was acknowledged that the events at the Grenfell Tower affected tenants and leaseholders in Sheffield. The Council had provided information the day following that event and was talking to tenants and residents. There had been a comprehensive programme of drop-in sessions, information and liaison and people were also asking questions and getting answers from other expertise, including the Fire and Rescue Service. Working together with the Cabinet Member, there was also a programme of consultation. People wanted to see the results of testing on cladding and material which were being communicated as the results of the tests were confirmed. It was important that people's questions were answered so they felt confident.

6.22 It was important to obtain a city-wide picture of the condition of high rise buildings and the Council had a duty in relation to buildings for which it was responsible and was asking questions about other buildings. For example,

the Council was liaising with the City's Universities in relation to student accommodation blocks.

6.23 Fire-stopping measures had been installed in low and medium rise sheltered accommodation for vulnerable people and some had sprinklers. This had been done as part of a five year programme which had now come to an end. The Council had said that it would review the use of sprinklers and was working with the Fire and Rescue Service to consider proposals. There were behavioural issues which might contribute to safety in tower blocks and it was part of tenancy conditions to make sure that the behaviour of one person did not put others at risk.

6.24 In relation to the Hanover Tower, the Council would clarify why top level records stated that aluminium composite cladding had been installed in one tower block whereas, cladding on other blocks installed by the same contractor was solid aluminium. The cladding product used on Hanover Tower was legal and had passed the relevant standard.

6.25 The Council did not intend to ask leaseholders to contribute to the costs of cladding works when it was re-clad. The Council would look at the issue of insurance for tenants and leaseholders and also seek clarification from the Government.

6.26 Fire risk assessments included checks on fire doors. There were a small number of leaseholder properties where there was an option for the leaseholder or the Council to install a fire door and the cost would be met by the leaseholder. This matter was subject to a legal process to bring it to a conclusion so that all doors fully comply.

6.27 Consultation regarding sprinklers would take place after the summer and consultation would be on a block by block basis.

6.28 It was the Council's view that the Government should pay for the works necessary. However, work would not be delayed whilst the Council waited for the Government to deal with the matter of cost.

6.29 As regards the possibility of installing additional stairs, nothing would be ruled out at this point in time. However, there were issues to be dealt with in the immediate time following the Grenfell Tower tragedy; the Council would then deal with the issue of sprinkler systems, following which other potential measures could be assessed.

6.30 There had been incidents of fires in flats. Two had occurred in the Hanover Tower and both had been contained. There were approximately 65 fires annually and all of these were treated very seriously but the fire stopping work installed had contained the fires on all occasions.

6.31 Further information on what the Council was doing with regard to fire safety would be made available, including on the Council website.

6.32 It was proposed that consultation would take place at the same time in relation to sprinklers and bin chutes.

6.33 In response to question concerning the use of UPVC windows, Members were informed that Windows were an integral part of cladding systems. There were timber framed windows in 3 tower blocks and plans were in place to replace them.

6.34 Prior to the fire at Grenfell Tower, the Council and South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service had a programme of activity to ascertain how close the Fire Service could get to Tower Blocks and with regard to access. There were some issues which needed to be addressed concerning the parking of cars around blocks and the work to improve access was underway.

6.35 There was specific advice regarding what people should do in the event of a fire. Literature would be adapted to reflect the type of home that people lived in.

6.36 Joint inspections regarding fire safety were carried out with the Fire and Rescue Service and there was work such as to door closers that was done as part of that programme. Checks were being carried out to make sure there were no works outstanding and that all works previously identified had been completed in accordance with what the Fire Service had requested.

6.37 In relation to other buildings, such as hotels, the Council's primary role was in relation to the design and planning process. Developers may use an independent building control provider. Responsibility with regard to fire safety passed to the Fire and Rescue Service, which carried out regular checks of hotels.

6.38 It was proposed that sprinkler systems would include the public areas of Tower Blocks and individual flats within those buildings.

6.39 Periodic visits were made to tenants as part of the new Housing Service operating model and if an individual was hoarding material, which might present a problem, this was in breach of their tenancy condition and officers would work with that person to clear a property. Multi-agency work was also carried out with families.

The Council noted the information reported in relation to the review of Tower Blocks in Sheffield and thanked the Chief Executive and Director of Housing and Neighbourhoods for their presentation and for their responses to Members' questions.

## 7. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JAYNE DUNN

**Fire Safety on Tower Blocks**

7.1 It was moved by Councillor Jayne Dunn, and seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that this Council:-

(a) expresses its shock and sadness at the tragic Grenfell Tower fire, and our thoughts are with the families of people who have been killed and people who are injured and everyone who has been forced out of their homes as a result of the fire;

(b) notes that investigations into the fire and its causes are still ongoing and believes it will be important to consider any recommendations and their implications for Sheffield when the investigations are concluded;

(c) believes it is important that, following the fire, all local authorities across the country are conducting extensive investigations into the safety of their tower blocks and that the Council has been working with South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service to carry out appropriate checks over the past week;

(d) welcomes the commitment that has been made to retrofit all Council tower blocks in Sheffield with sprinkler systems and believes it is important that the Government commit to provide the funding for these systems in addition to any additional safety measures that are required as a result of the Grenfell Tower fire;

(e) notes that in addition to this, the Government is conducting fire safety tests on tower blocks with composite cladding and the Council has taken the decision to ensure that all Sheffield blocks are tested;

(f) notes that the tests from Hanover tower block have revealed that the cladding on the building should be removed and that action is being taken to do this immediately;

(g) confirms that the cladding at Hanover is not the same as that used at Grenfell Tower and in addition to this there are none of the other concerns that have been found at other tower blocks in other authorities, such as gas in the building and lack of fire doors, which resulted in some blocks being evacuated;

(h) reiterates the advice that Hanover residents are safe to remain in their homes while work to remove the cladding takes place and that this view is supported by South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service (SYF&R), however temporary accommodation has been offered to anyone who wishes to take it during the works;

(i) welcomes that swift action has been taken to remove the cladding and have security on site 24 hours a day while the building works take place and that updates have been held with residents to inform them of progress;

(j) recognises that, following the tragic fire at Grenfell Tower, tenants are concerned about their safety and believes it is important that the Council continues to provide as much information as possible to tenants and to continue to meet with residents, and welcomes the visits to tower blocks across the city from the Cabinet Member, Council Leader and local councillors since the incident to provide reassurance to tenants; and

(k) believes it is important that all partners continue to work together to ensure that work is carried out as quickly as possible to ensure all Sheffield tower blocks are safe and that people feel safe living in them, and particularly thanks South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service for their work in partnership with the Council.

7.2 Whereupon it was moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, and seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (l) as follows:-

(l) considering the safety implications of the Hanover Tower Block cladding and the need to reassure the public of the robustness of building safety frameworks, requests that a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee setting out:-

(i) the reasons why the Hanover Tower Block came to fail fire safety tests;

(ii) the cause of the failures; and

(iii) the implications for other work carried out under the Decent Homes improvement scheme and for any other buildings in Sheffield.

7.2.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the amendment (Councillor Robert Murphy), the amendment as circulated at the meeting was altered by the substitution of the words “next meeting of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee” for the words “next full Council meeting”.)

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) expresses its shock and sadness at the tragic Grenfell Tower fire, and our thoughts are with the families of people who have been killed and people who are injured and everyone who has been forced out of their

homes as a result of the fire;

(b) notes that investigations into the fire and its causes are still ongoing and believes it will be important to consider any recommendations and their implications for Sheffield when the investigations are concluded;

(c) believes it is important that, following the fire, all local authorities across the country are conducting extensive investigations into the safety of their tower blocks and that the Council has been working with South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service to carry out appropriate checks over the past week;

(d) welcomes the commitment that has been made to retrofit all Council tower blocks in Sheffield with sprinkler systems and believes it is important that the Government commit to provide the funding for these systems in addition to any additional safety measures that are required as a result of the Grenfell Tower fire;

(e) notes that in addition to this, the Government is conducting fire safety tests on tower blocks with composite cladding and the Council has taken the decision to ensure that all Sheffield blocks are tested;

(f) notes that the tests from Hanover tower block have revealed that the cladding on the building should be removed and that action is being taken to do this immediately;

(g) confirms that the cladding at Hanover is not the same as that used at Grenfell Tower and in addition to this there are none of the other concerns that have been found at other tower blocks in other authorities, such as gas in the building and lack of fire doors, which resulted in some blocks being evacuated;

(h) reiterates the advice that Hanover residents are safe to remain in their homes while work to remove the cladding takes place and that this view is supported by South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Service (SYF&R), however temporary accommodation has been offered to anyone who wishes to take it during the works;

(i) welcomes that swift action has been taken to remove the cladding and have security on site 24 hours a day while the building works take place and that updates have been held with residents to inform them of progress;

(j) recognises that, following the tragic fire at Grenfell Tower, tenants are concerned about their safety and believes it is important that the Council continues to provide as much information as possible to tenants and to continue to meet with residents, and welcomes the visits to tower blocks across the city from the Cabinet Member, Council Leader and local councillors since the incident to provide

reassurance to tenants;

(k) believes it is important that all partners continue to work together to ensure that work is carried out as quickly as possible to ensure all Sheffield tower blocks are safe and that people feel safe living in them, and particularly thanks South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Service for their work in partnership with the Council; and

(l) considering the safety implications of the Hanover Tower Block cladding and the need to reassure the public of the robustness of building safety frameworks, requests that a report be submitted to the next meeting of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee setting out:-

(i) the reasons why the Hanover Tower Block came to fail fire safety tests;

(ii) the cause of the failures; and

(iii) the implications for other work carried out under the Decent Homes improvement scheme and for any other buildings in Sheffield.

## 8. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

8.1 Deputy Lord Mayor – Declaration of Office

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) informed the Council that on 28th June, in the presence of the Whips of the political groups on the Council, Councillor Magid Magid, the Deputy Lord Mayor Elect for the Municipal Year 2017-18, made and subscribed to the declaration required by law to qualify him to act as Deputy Lord Mayor. The Council noted the information reported by the Lord Mayor.

8.2 Petitions

8.2.1 Petition Objecting to the Felling of Trees in Millhouses

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition containing 1,671 signatures, objecting to the felling of trees in Millhouses.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Phil Yates, who stated that the Council had a statutory duty to manage air quality under the Environment Act. Recent research suggested that the planting of trees along the side of roads could reduce Nitrogen Dioxide concentrations. In May 2017, it was widely publicised that there were dangerously high levels of air pollutants around the City. National Clean Air day was held on 6 June and he said there was nothing on the Council website relating to it and it was felt that the Council was not taking

seriously its responsibilities in relation to air quality.

People had made clear their concerns in relation to street trees but trees had not been saved, even though the Independent Tree Panel had recommended that many were saved. It was also felt that whilst many people had asked for trees to be saved and the Council had said that felling of trees would be as a last resort, trees were to be replaced without explanation or exception.

He said that it was felt that trees were being removed to save annual maintenance costs for Amey and asked that in a written response it be confirmed that this was not the case and to supply the name of the councillor or officer that stated this. He also requested the reason as to why trees recommended for retention were to be replaced. People had been told that there were more trees in the area which were to be felled without formal notice and he asked, if the trees were declared healthy when the survey was completed, then why did these need to be removed now? Residents wished to begin a process of mediation with the Council and would welcome the Council to suggest a suitable process whilst halting any tree felling. People wished to keep healthy mature street trees, which he said helped to mitigate the effects of air pollution and it was acknowledged that this might mean that there would not be perfect pavement surfaces.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene and to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, responded that a number of petitions had been considered by the Council in relation to street trees. The Council had statutory duties in relation to the highways and with regards to equalities legislation and this included such issues as safe pavements and inclusive mobility.

He said that a scoping project with regard to the highways programme was undertaken in 2005 and an outline business case was also produced, which identified that large numbers of street trees would need to be replaced. Consideration had to be given to the future and long term benefit of work and it was acknowledged that there were views on both sides as to the replacement of street trees. Councillor Lodge said that a written response to the petition would be provided.

Councillor Jack Scott stated that poor air quality was responsible for many deaths in the City and in the UK as a whole and it was also a social justice issue. It was clear that the Government needed to do more with regard to air quality. It was not correct to say that the replacement of trees had a significant effect on air quality in Sheffield. There were 4 million trees across the City and real solutions were needed to the problem of poor air quality. As an example, the Council had relocated a school on the basis of poor air quality. There were significant things which might be done with regards to vehicles, diesel engines and a scrappage scheme. The Council had given a commitment in relation to air quality and it was hoped that people's energy could be harnessed towards improving air quality in the City.

8.2.2 Petition Requesting the Suspension of the Streets Ahead Contract on Health and Safety Grounds

The Council received a petition containing seven signatures, requesting the suspension of the Streets Ahead Contract on health and safety grounds.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Richard Davis who stated that the Council must be informed by Amey of any conviction relating to health and safety. He asserted that Amey had not informed the Council of a subsequent conviction and he asked why the Council had not enforced the terms of the Streets Ahead contract in that regard. He said that there would be termination clauses in the contract. He said there was evidence which supported the possibility of misconduct.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene. Councillor Lodge requested that, if there were further points in the presentation Mr Davis had made to Council and which were in addition to those he had already made in writing to the Council, that these be sent to him as Cabinet Member and he would make sure that they were passed on to the appropriate person and investigated. He may have already received responses to the points made in previous correspondence.

The Health and Safety Executive had investigated the issues previously raised by Mr Davis and had decided to take no further action. He referred to lost time injuries in relation to the Streets Ahead programme and to the policy of Amey with regard to accidents. If there were issues which require further investigation then action would be taken. Councillor Lodge said that a written response would be produced in relation to the petition.

8.2.3 Petition Requesting Traffic Calming Measures on Newman Road

The Council received a petition containing 80 signatures, requesting traffic calming measures on Newman Road. There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability.

8.2.4 Petition Supporting the Felling of Trees on Abbeyfield Road

The Council received a petition containing 32 signatures, supporting the felling of trees on Abbeyfield Road. There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene.

8.2.5 Petition Requesting Weight Restriction on Twentywell Lane, Prospect Road and Queen Victoria Road

The Council received a petition containing 112 signatures, requesting weight restrictions on Twentywell Lane, Prospect Road and Queen Victoria Road. There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability.

8.3 Questions

8.3.1 Public Question Concerning Tinsley Park

Adil Mohammed stated that when the school was built in Tinsley, there was a community user agreement and agreement to give the remainder of the Park protection by gaining trust status. He asked how far this matter had progressed.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that in relation to the community use, local councillors had been active with regard to the agreement to provide community activities for pupils at the school and for the community and there were classes and support for carers, although she did not have the details at this meeting.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure, stated that the Tinsley Green and recreation ground had previously been in a poor condition and in 2003, a Surestart scheme was developed and there had been regeneration of the Park. Fields in Trust status for the Park was being pursued.

8.3.2 Public Questions Concerning Street Trees

Mark Banner asked why peaceful protesters, residents and bystanders were being intimidated with pre-injunction letters and the threat of the High Court and whether it was an attempt to stop legitimate opposition to free felling. He asked whether this demonstrated double-standards by the Council as it celebrated the mass trespass at Kinder Scout in 1932 and the right to roam.

He also referred to a process regarding a Councillor under the process relating to the Code of Conduct.

Dave Dillner stated that the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, Councillor Bryan Lodge had indicated that he would debate ecological, environmental and arboricultural issues on a public platform and he asked for this to now take place.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, stated that there was a difference between peaceful protest and unlawful acts and whilst the Council was supportive of peaceful protest, in some cases people had trespassed inside the safety barriers. This presented a risk both to them and to the operatives on site. The Council was seeking individuals' agreement not to step inside the safety zones. It was an individual's decision whether they chose to ignore or challenge the matter in court. The Council had been faced with the decision, with regard to taking legal action due to the delays to the programme.

Councillor Lodge said that approximately six to eight percent of households objected as part of the surveys relating to proposals for street trees. The matter had also been tested in the court. Councillor Lodge said that he would not wish to see anyone arrested or stepping inside the safety barriers or in court. There had been support for the Streets Ahead programme from recent Council administrations to improve the highways in Sheffield. An Advisory Forum had also been set up and the issues relating to street trees had been debated in various places in the Council. Meetings had also been held with individuals and representatives of the Sheffield Tree Action Group. He would meet with members of the public and he had met with local councillors and residents in various wards in the City and would be pleased to meet again with the Sheffield Tree Action Group.

8.3.3 Public Question Concerning Legal Action

Nigel Slack stated that the final destination on the Council's current track with respect to the tree campaigners could lead to actions for contempt of court. He said that this, in turn, could lead to people losing homes, businesses and personal belongings. It could also result in the bankrupting of pensioners and families with young children. He asked if the Council was willing, individually and collectively, to sanction such actions on its own residents.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene stated that the Council was asking people to sign an undertaking that they would cease from disrupting work. If they agreed to sign the undertaking, no further action would be taken. He said the Council supported peaceful protest. If an individual decided not to sign the undertaking, seek to persuade a Judge of the merits of their case or breach a safety zone, this was the decision of that individual and not the Council.

8.3.4 Public Question Concerning Cladding on Tower Blocks

Nigel Slack asked, if it is shown that the cladding on Sheffield tower blocks is not that originally specified would the Council’s legal team devote as much resource to and be as assiduous in pursuing the contractors and suppliers of the cladding for damages as they were with “peaceful protesters”; and will any Councillors or Council Officers be disciplined, if they are found to have been involved in such a change to specifications?

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, stated that the issues relating to cladding on Tower Blocks would be considered by the relevant Scrutiny Committee. She did not wish to draw conclusions too early in relation to the change in specification of cladding material used on the Hanover Tower or to rush to conclusions about such matters as disciplinary action. There were a number of people involved, including building contractors. The issue would be investigated and appropriate action would be taken.

8.3.5 Public Question Concerning Streets Ahead Work

Nigel Slack stated that on the 15th March 2017, he asked a question about what he believed to be the lack of care for vulnerable people exhibited by the Amey contract. He referred to an incident outside of his mother's home which had left her without her telephone. He said that after a distressing week, she had a fall and an extensive stay in hospital and was now unable to leave her home independently. He quoted the minutes of the meeting, which stated that "Lessons would be learned from the incident reported by Mr Slack and Councillor Lodge would investigate the particular case further."

Mr Slack said that, despite this, he had not had a response to the issue. He asked the following: "Has any 'further investigation' begun; When will it report;
When will I hear something; and Why should I believe anything the Cabinet Member tells me?"

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene responded and said that he was sorry to hear what had happened to Mr Slack's mother regarding her fall. He had addressed the matter at the Cabinet meeting on 15 March and had said that Streets Ahead would do what they could. The issue relating to the telephone line was an issue for BT (British Telecommunications). Utilities were not always located where they were said to be and occasionally, lines were broken. Utility companies usually had protocols for dealing with vulnerable people. The Council had reviewed related processes and both Amey and sub-contractors were aware of the procedures. He urged other people to contact the Council if similar problems occurred and said that he would request the Head of Highways to respond to Mr Slack on the issues which he had raised.

8.3.6 Public Question Concerning Community Safety in Burngreave

Katun Elmi asked whether the Leader of the Council would visit Burngreave to meet with the community and especially with Somali mothers, to explain what the local Councillors and the Council were doing to stop violence in the area. She said that it seemed as if nothing was happening at present to make people feel safe on the streets of Burngreave.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, said that she would gladly visit Burngreave to meet people. There were issues which had occurred in Burngreave and Spital Hill, which had been reported in the media. Action had been taken and she would ask Councillor Jayne Dunn and Councillor Jackie Drayton to also respond.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, stated that community safety in Burngreave was a priority and that she met with the Police and Crime Commissioner in Burngreave and with her Cabinet Adviser. A Neighbourhood Police Officer was to be deployed in Burngreave. Further to this, Gill Furniss MP for Brightside and Hillsborough had called a meeting in relation to the issues in Burngreave.

Councillor Jackie Drayton referred to incidents which had occurred in Spital Hill, including breaking of shop windows, which had made local people frightened. Local Councillors had met with the Police and the Council's Chief Executive with regard to action which might be taken. She had contacted local people including the mothers of Burngreave, Gill Furniss MP and the Assistant Police and Crime Commissioner and had done a walkabout to help reassure people. There would be Policing teams both in Burngreave and across the City as indicated by the Chief Constable when he attended the meeting of the City Council earlier in the year.

8.3.7 Public Question Concerning Streets Ahead Programme

Nick Jordan referred to an incident involving him and someone representing Amey and he said that the person photographed him and they had said that they found him to be aggressive. They had also indicated that they would not talk to him.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, stated that he was sorry that Mr Jordan was faced with the situation that he had outlined in his question and if someone had been rude to him. He would expect people to behave respectfully, regardless of whether they were sub-contractors. He asked Mr Jordan to leave his contact details so that the matter could be investigated.

Councillor Julie Dore stated that people were encouraged to engage with the Council. She said that she was sorry that Mr Jordan had a negative experience. She said that contracts were complex matters and that certain services and projects were best delivered by the public sector and others by the private sector. However, the use of the Private Finance initiative was the only way to progress the Streets Ahead programme. Sub-contractors were allowed as part of the Streets Ahead contract, although those working on the programme should adhere to expected standards of behaviour. If a contractor was chosen from a different area of the country, such as Birmingham, that could not be stopped. The Council did, where possible, encourage ethical and locally based contracting and service provision.

8.3.8 Public Question Concerning Provision for Homeless People

Chris Simpson asked what the Council was going to do about the night café for the homeless to access when there were no other services available and referred to the petition on this subject.

The question was to be addressed by the Cabinet Member as part of the debate on the petition to Council.

(Note: During this item of business, and under Council Procedure Rule 20, the Lord Mayor ordered the removal of a member of the public from the public gallery on the grounds that they had repeatedly interrupted the meeting and following several warnings as to their behaviour.)

8.4 Petition Requiring Debate

*L.I.F.E. Petition to Open a Sheffield Night Shelter*

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition containing 5,463 signatures, requesting the Council to open a night shelter for the homeless.

The Council's Petitions Scheme required that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures was the subject of debate at the Council meeting. A qualifying petition was received as follows:-

> "*After being involved with the homeless and vulnerable situation for a full year on the ground doing outreach I've noticed that there is a huge hole within the safety net of our city to keep people protected from rough sleeping and who generally find themselves homeless without warning. L.I.F.E (a new beginning) was created for the general public to just come together and help others in need with Sheffield Tent City being at the forefront of providing overnight accommodation with food/clothes/supplies/outreach services/medical supplies & assistance etc.*
>
> *What myself [the organiser of the petition] and volunteers from Sheffield and surrounding areas plan to do next is open a night shelter within Sheffield city centre where not one single person will find themselves in need of help ever again".*

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Anthony Cunningham. He stated that people were out on the streets perhaps because of mental health problems and issues including unemployment. He said that it appeared as though nothing was changing and things were generally getting worse for them.

He said that the provision of a night shelter would ease the tension, particularly at weekends. Street Pastors also needed a place to take people and people did not know where else they might go. The Tent City had been put in place but that could not be kept going. There was support available from organisations including Roundabout, Shelter, Crisis and the Archer Project. People were also coming to Sheffield from other places due to the housing crisis and trying to access help and support. People needed sanctuary. In some cases, people had come directly from prison and wished to access help. Services, such as at Howden House were not open over the weekend and people could not be expected to survive over the weekend period.

Whilst there were hostels and bed and breakfast accommodation, there were problems with existing provision, including security. A building had been identified for a night shelter but he had been informed it was not possible to establish a night shelter there. However, he said that a night shelter was required to bridge the gap between public services and charity provision. Services could be made available to meet the needs of people, including medical provision, mental health services, which Street Pastors, and the Police might also be able to access. He expressed concern that relevant organisations were not making progress and there were arguments concerning financial resources.

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

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety responded to the petition. She said that she acknowledged much of what was said in the petition and said that both she and Mr Cunningham had met in relation to the issue. Many people were vulnerable and were preyed upon by dealers, were exploited or involved in prostitution. There were also people on the streets that were not homeless but did sleep on the streets. There was provision for people in Sheffield but there was also an understanding that improvements were needed.

A successful bid had been made, which had resulted in additional financial resources in South Yorkshire to help to support people who were sleeping rough. The Housing First scheme was designed to provide housing related support for 10 people with complex needs and the wrap-around support that was needed.

Councillor Dunn stated that support was also available through the Help Us Help campaign and the Help Us Help website provided information on the support available to people that were on the street. The Business Improvement District was also involved in the initiative. She recommended that City Councillors access the information on the Help Us Help website.

A night shelter was not thought to be a solution to the issues facing people that were on the streets. The 'Tent City' was also something which had not provided a solution to the problems faced by people. The streets were not the right place for people and might serve only to worsen problems such as addiction.

Councillor Dunn thanked the petitioners and Mr Cunningham for submitting the petition. People could be housed and there was awareness that hostel provision also needed to be improved. The problems facing people sleeping rough and living on the streets were being looked at closely and from different perspectives. However, the Council would not be requesting that a night shelter be opened.

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

There was a significant amount of work being done by the Council and in the City in relation to people on the streets. The petitioner had presented his experiences and it was for the Council to listen to that and review the issue as perhaps there were things that were being missed.

The issue of rough sleepers was increasing in the UK. Support was provided locally by organisations including the Archer Project and people needed advice on a range of issues. It was thought that evidence based solutions would be most effective, such as the Housing First programme, which had been set up and funded by the Council. There were also issues to be considered relating to

homelessness and LGBT (lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender) people.

Ex-service personnel and former prisoners had to be considered and people might not be able to access housing advice at Howden House at all times. There were buildings available which could be used to provide a place for rough sleepers to go and to access support from relevant agencies.

The issue of rough sleeping and people living on the street was a complex matter and the Council needed to continue to talk to people regarding their needs. St Wilfrid's was to open a residential facility for people with a history of being homeless or vulnerably housed.

Homelessness and rough sleeping were not the same things and people concerned were in crisis in their lives through various causes, including their mental health, substance abuse and relationship breakdown. There was not an easy way to categorise people in such circumstances. There had been an increase in the visible number of people who were homeless or on the streets and at the same time as government cuts. It was also difficult to deal with the considerable range of complex needs.

The representative of the petitioners, Anthony Cunningham, exercised a right of reply. He referred to a young person whose parents were both addicts and the child had been forced to leave home. Whilst people turned to advice and support, there were also many people accessing services, including at Howden House, which dealt with 15,000 calls each month. Central Government also had an important role to perform in supporting people. He said that there were buildings which could potentially be used to help house people, such as at Park Hill. It was also important to continue to help people and to build communities.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. She suggested that some Members might wish to receive a briefing by the Housing Team. It was right, she said, to keep the dialogue going and she asked for recognition that the recent changes in relation to homeless provision had only been in place for a couple of weeks. The Council would continue to monitor the issue and keep talking with people.

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

Proposal 1

It was moved by Councillor Julie Dore and seconded by Councillor Jayne Dunn, that:

This Council notes the petition calling on the Council to open a Sheffield Night Shelter, and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety to determine any further action and to continue to monitor the position regarding rough sleepers in the City.

Proposal 2

It was moved by Councillor Penny Baker and seconded by Councillor David Baker, that:

This Council notes the petition calling on the Council to open a Sheffield Night Shelter, and refers the petition to the Cabinet on the grounds that it affects various Cabinet portfolios.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council notes the petition calling on the Council to open a Sheffield Night Shelter, and refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety to determine any further action and to continue to monitor the position regarding rough sleepers in the City.

## 9. REVIEW OF FULL COUNCIL MEETINGS

9.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Peter Rippon and seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.1, the order of business as published on the Council Summons be altered by taking item 8 on the agenda (Review of Full Council Meetings) as the next item of business, to enable the Council to receive the verbal update from the Director of Legal and Governance prior to the termination of the meeting after four hours and 30 minutes duration.

9.2 The Director of Legal and Governance reported on the progress of the work of the Member Working Group in reviewing the operation of the full Council meetings.

9.3 She outlined the composition of the Working Group and reported that a work programme had been agreed which is split into two stages. The first stage was to look at the purpose and the function of the Council meeting, consider solutions and change under the themes of “a modern, accessible and open meeting” and “an efficient, effective meeting that is fit for purpose”, look at best practice in other local authorities, and decide changes from the Council’s September meeting, and the second stage was to consider a wider review of Council decision making and public engagement over the 2017/18 municipal year.

9.4 The Director commented that the Working Group had met on two occasions to date and had, at its first meeting, discussed the purpose of the full Council meeting and, at its second meeting, had discussed practical and structural issues associated with full Council meetings, including the importance of maintaining time for engagement with the public as well as Member debate, the time and duration of the meetings, managing the content and length of

agendas, tributes to former Councillors, and questions from the public and Members.

9.5 The Director added that members of the Working Group had been asked to consult with other members of their political group prior to further discussion being held at the Working Group's next meeting on 7th July on changing the start time and duration of the meeting, defining the purpose of the meeting, audio recording, layout and seating, managing the number of motions, time limits for speakers, order of business/structure of meetings, introduction of a regular break time, and simplifying the voting process, and she concluded her report by stating that she would circulate a written note of her report to all Members of the Council within the next few days.

9.6 The Council noted the information reported by the Director.

## 10. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

10.1 Urgent Business

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

10.2 Supplementary Questions

10.2.1 A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated.

10.2.2 Supplementary questions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4) were not able to be asked before the meeting terminated (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 5.5) after four hours and 30 minutes duration.

10.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

10.3.1 Questions relating to the discharge of the functions of the South Yorkshire Joint Authorities for Fire and Rescue and Pensions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6i), were not able to be asked before the meeting terminated (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 5.5) after four hours and 30 minutes duration.

## 11. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

11.1 RESOLVED**:** On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Dianne Hurst, that (a) it be noted that Councillor Jim Steinke, who was elected on 22nd June, 2017 as a Nether Edge and Sharrow Ward Councillor, has joined the Labour Group on the Council, thereby restoring the political composition of the Council to the position that was reported to the Council's Annual General Meeting on 17th May 2017 when political proportionality was last

reported to the Council (i.e. 56 Labour : 20 Lib Dem : 4 Green : 4 UKIP), and that, accordingly, there is no requirement to revise the allocation of seats on Council Committees to the political groups;

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee | - | Councillor Lisa Banes to replace Councillor Terry Fox; Councillor Jim Steinke to fill a vacancy.<br>To appoint Mr. Sam Evans to serve as a Diocese representative on the Committee, filling a vacancy. |
| Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee | - | Councillor Mike Chaplin to replace Councillor Lisa Banes; Councillor Paul Wood to fill a vacancy. |
| Healthier Communities & Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee | - | Councillor Tony Downing to replace Councillor Karen McGowan. |
| Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee | - | Councillor Karen McGowan to replace Councillor Tony Downing; Councillor Terry Fox to fill a vacancy. |
| Access Liaison Group | - | Councillor Lisa Banes to replace Councillor Olivia Blake. |
| Allotments and Leisure Gardens Advisory Group | - | Councillor Lewis Dagnall to fill a vacancy. |

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Sheffield City Region Combined Authority | - | To appoint Councillor Mazher Iqbal to serve as a rotational member of the Authority (in addition to the Leader and Deputy Leader). |
| Church Burgesses Educational Foundation | - | Councillor Peter Rippon to fill a vacancy. |
| Environment Agency – Yorkshire Regional Flood and Coastal Committee | - | Councillor Karen McGowan to replace Councillor Tony Downing. |
| Learn Sheffield | - | Councillor Andy Bainbridge to |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | replace Councillor Michelle Cook. |
| Parking and Traffic Regulations Outside London (PATROL) Joint Committee | - | Councillor Karen McGowan to replace Councillor Tony Downing. |
| Parkwood Landfill Liaison Group | - | Councillor Karen McGowan to replace Councillor Tony Downing. |
| Sheffield Clean Air Partnership | - | Councillor Karen McGowan to replace Councillor Tony Downing. |
| Sheffield Compact | - | Councillor Cate McDonald to replace Councillor Jack Scott. |
| Sheffield Health and Social Care Foundation Trust - Council of Governors | - | Councillor Steve Ayris to replace Councillor Bob Pullin. |
| Sheffield Tobacco Control Programme Accountable Board | - | Councillor Karen McGowan to replace Councillor Tony Downing. |
| Sheffield Theatres Trust – Directors and Members | - | Mrs. Joan Barton to replace Mr. Tim Rippon. |
| Sheffield Waterways Strategy Group | - | Councillor Karen McGowan to replace Councillor Tony Downing. |
| South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Users' Advisory Group | - | Councillor Karen McGowan to replace Councillor Tony Downing. |
| Southey/Owlerton Area Regeneration Board | - | Councillor Mike Chaplin to replace Councillor Mark Jones; Councillor Andy Bainbridge to fill a vacancy. |
| Special Interest Group of Municipal Authorities | - | Councillor Olivia Blake to replace Councillor Ben Curran. |
| Transport 4 All | - | Councillor Craig Gamble Pugh to replace Councillor George Lindars-Hammond. |
| University Technical College Trust Board | - | Councillor Dawn Dale to fill a vacancy. |
| Voluntary Action Sheffield | - | Councillor Mark Jones to replace Councillor Adam Hurst. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Yorkshire and Humber Regional Migration Partnership | - | Councillor Jayne Dunn to replace Councillor Jack Scott. |
| Yorkshire and the Humber Tobacco Governance Board | - | Councillor Karen McGowan to replace Councillor Tony Downing. |

(d) it be noted that, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its annual meeting held on 17th May 2017, the Chief Executive had authorised the appointment of Councillors Olivia Blake, Mark Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed and Peter Rippon to serve as the Council's representatives on the Local Government Association's General Assembly;

(e) it be noted that the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 16th February 2017, appointed Carly Speechley to the post of Director of Children and Families, and that Carly Speechley commenced post on 3rd April 2017;

(f) it be noted that the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 31st March 2017, appointed Mark Gannon to the post of Director of Business Change and Information Solutions, and that Mr Gannon commenced in post on 5th June 2017;

(g) it be noted that the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 24th May 2017, appointed Mark Bennett to the post of Director of Human Resources and Customer Services, and that Mr Bennett will start in post on 14th August 2017; and

(h) it be noted that the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 26th June 2017, appointed Eugene Walker (Interim Executive Director, Resources) to serve in that post on a permanent basis.

(NOTE: Further to paragraph (a) of the above resolution, the Council agreed to a suggestion made by the Leader of the Council that, in view of there being no time available for the Council to pay tribute to former Councillor Nasima Akther before the meeting terminated, and with the next Council meeting not being held until September, she should write to former Councillor Akther on behalf of the Council to express its thanks and appreciation for her service to the City of Sheffield.)

## 12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR OLIVIA BLAKE

**Recent Elections**

12.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Olivia Blake, and formally seconded by Councillor Kieran Harpham, that this Council:-

(a) thanks the people of Sheffield for turning out in such large numbers and for using their vote in the General Election on 8th June 2017 and the recent Council By-Elections in Southey and Nether Edge & Sharrow Wards;

(b) notes that it is likely a record number of young voters took part in the General Election in Sheffield and throughout the UK and believes that this is a highly positive development for democracy in our country;

(c) congratulates Sheffield's newest Member of Parliament, Jared O'Mara MP, and thanks all candidates for taking part in the General Election;

(d) notes there have been two Council By-Elections since the last business Council meeting in April 2017 and welcomes both new Sheffield Councillors to the Town Hall and thanks all candidates for taking part in these elections; and

(e) gives thanks to the police and all staff at the polling stations and the count for their hard work on and around the General Election on 8th June, and for the smooth running of the General Election and both Council By-Elections.

12.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and formally seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraph (e) as a new paragraph (f):-

(e) gives thanks to former Councillors Leigh Bramall and Nasima Akther and the former MP for Sheffield Hallam, the Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg, for their services representing the people of Sheffield and wishes them all the best for the future; and

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) thanks the people of Sheffield for turning out in such large numbers and for using their vote in the General Election on 8th June 2017 and the recent Council By-Elections in Southey and Nether Edge & Sharrow Wards;

(b) notes that it is likely a record number of young voters took part in the General Election in Sheffield and throughout the UK and believes that this is a highly positive development for democracy in our country;

(c) congratulates Sheffield's newest Member of Parliament, Jared O'Mara MP, and thanks all candidates for taking part in the General Election;

(d) notes there have been two Council By-Elections since the last business Council meeting in April 2017 and welcomes both new Sheffield Councillors to the Town Hall and thanks all candidates for taking part in these elections; and

(e) gives thanks to the police and all staff at the polling stations and the count for their hard work on and around the General Election on 8th June, and for the smooth running of the General Election and both Council By-Elections.

## 13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOE OTTEN

### South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner

13.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Joe Otten, and formally seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that this Council:-

(a) notes the recent High Court judgment, which ruled that South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner, Dr. Alan Billings, acted "unlawfully" in suspending former Chief Constable, David Crompton, and then asking him to resign;

(b) notes that the High Court further stated the decisions made by Dr. Billings were "irrational, perverse, unreasonable, misconceived and wholly disproportionate";

(c) further notes that in the light of the suspension, the independent comment from HM Chief Inspector of Constabulary, Sir Tom Winsor, was to describe the action against the Chief Constable as "conspicuously unfair, disproportionate and so unreasonable that I cannot understand how the PCC has reached this view";

(d) notes that Dr. Billings failed to criticise the conduct of police counsel at the Hillsborough inquest – this being a grievance of the Hillsborough victims' families – in the evidence he gave for his decision, even though he was dismissing Mr. Crompton for seeking to defend that conduct;

(e) believes that this ruling reveals Dr. Billings to be incompetent and irrational;

(f) notes that removing Mr. Crompton from his post is likely to cost taxpayers more than £500,000 in legal fees, plus additional staff expenses;

(g) recalls previous calls by the Sheffield Liberal Democrats for Dr. Billings to resign over his gross mishandling of this situation; and

(h) in light of the High Court judgment, endorses those calls for Dr. Billings to resign and requests him to consider his position.

13.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Peter Rippon, and formally seconded by Councillor Mark Jones, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (h) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (f) as follows:-

(b) accepts the ruling of the High Court and notes that the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) has confirmed he will not be appealing the court judgement and that the Council's representatives on the Police and Crime Panel are able to question the PCC and scrutinise his actions in this matter at the Police and Crime Panel;

(c) regrets that the Police and Crime Commissioner positions were created by the coalition government and that the Police and Crime Commissioner is accountable to the public through the mechanisms of the legislation to introduce Police and Crime Commissioners, which was only able to be passed due to the support of Liberal Democrat MPs, which means that, ultimately, judgement is passed on the Commissioner's decisions at the next Police and Crime Commissioner election;

(d) notes the comments of Councillor Paul Scriven on 28th July 2016 in the BBC article "South Yorkshire's Chief Constable 'should be sacked'" which was after the decision of the Police and Crime Commissioner to suspend David Crompton "I was saying 18 months ago that David Crompton was not part of the solution he was part of the problem and he should have been sacked. I'm still of the view that the door should not be opened for him to walk through and get his pension. I believe he should be sacked for poor management, for not dealing with the problems of South Yorkshire Police and for bringing it in to disrepute. It's clear that [Dr] Billings does not have the backbone to take the strong action that's needed.";

(e) therefore believes it is clear that even after the decision had been taken to suspend David Crompton, the Liberal Democrats were criticising the PCC for not going further, by saying David Crompton should have been sacked, and further believes that yet again Sheffield Liberal Democrats have been caught out as hypocrites not concerned by the interests of policing in South Yorkshire but practising the most cynical form of political opportunism; and

(f) continues to extend its deepest sympathies to all families and friends and those affected by the horrific events of 15 April 1989, and to all of those who have campaigned for justice in the many years since; and

acknowledges that, with some individuals deemed to have been at fault by the Hillsborough Inquest having recently been charged with criminal offences, anguish will likely be experienced by a great many through the court process, and the Council's sincere sympathies go out to all of those affected in the continuing search for justice.

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

13.3.1 (NOTE: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (b), (c) and (f) of the amendment, and abstained from voting on paragraphs (d) and (e) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) notes the recent High Court judgment, which ruled that South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner, Dr. Alan Billings, acted "unlawfully" in suspending former Chief Constable, David Crompton, and then asking him to resign;

(b) accepts the ruling of the High Court and notes that the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) has confirmed he will not be appealing the court judgement and that the Council's representatives on the Police and Crime Panel are able to question the PCC and scrutinise his actions in this matter at the Police and Crime Panel;

(c) regrets that the Police and Crime Commissioner positions were created by the coalition government and that the Police and Crime Commissioner is accountable to the public through the mechanisms of the legislation to introduce Police and Crime Commissioners, which was only able to be passed due to the support of Liberal Democrat MPs, which means that, ultimately, judgement is passed on the Commissioner's decisions at the next Police and Crime Commissioner election;

(d) notes the comments of Councillor Paul Scriven on 28th July 2016 in the BBC article "South Yorkshire's Chief Constable 'should be sacked'" which was after the decision of the Police and Crime Commissioner to suspend David Crompton "I was saying 18 months ago that David Crompton was not part of the solution he was part of the problem and he should have been sacked. I'm still of the view that the door should not be opened for him to walk through and get his pension. I believe he should be sacked for poor management, for not dealing with the problems of South Yorkshire Police and for bringing it in to disrepute. It's clear that [Dr] Billings does not have the backbone to take the strong action that's needed.";

(e) therefore believes it is clear that even after the decision had been taken to suspend David Crompton, the Liberal Democrats were criticising the PCC for not going further, by saying David Crompton should have been sacked, and further believes that yet again Sheffield Liberal Democrats have been caught out as hypocrites not concerned by the interests of policing in South Yorkshire but practising the most cynical form of political opportunism; and

(f) continues to extend its deepest sympathies to all families and friends and those affected by the horrific events of 15 April 1989, and to all of those who have campaigned for justice in the many years since; and acknowledges that, with some individuals deemed to have been at fault by the Hillsborough Inquest having recently been charged with criminal offences, anguish will likely be experienced by a great many through the court process, and the Council's sincere sympathies go out to all of those affected in the continuing search for justice.

13.4.1 (NOTE: 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a) to (c) and (f) of the Motion, and abstained from voting on paragraphs (d) and (e) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

2. Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, 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), (b), (d) and (f) of the Motion, and voted against paragraphs (c) and (e) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

## 14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR STEVE WILSON

### Armed Forces Community

14.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Steve Wilson, and formally seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that this Council:-

(a) wishes to pay tribute to all those serving, or who have served, in our armed forces, and places on record our enormous gratitude to them for keeping us all safe;

(b) notes that Armed Forces Day took place on Saturday 24th June; an occasion giving support to the men and women who make up the Armed Forces community, from currently serving troops to Service families, veterans and cadets;

(c) reaffirms the importance of such events and notes the success of recent events held in Sheffield in support of Armed Forces Day, including a veterans parade and a short ceremony led by the Lord

Mayor;

(d) notes that this year's event marks the 35th anniversary of the Falklands War and the sinking of HMS Sheffield;

(e) regrets the loss of life caused by the sinking of HMS Sheffield and places on record our sympathies to the friends and families of the 20 crew members who were killed in the missile attack of 4th May 1982;

(f) notes work undertaken by this Council to improve support of our armed forces communities, including a grant of £180,695 which Sheffield City Council successfully led a bid for from the Ministry of Defence's Covenant Fund, in partnership with Rotherham, Doncaster and Barnsley Councils, and Sheffield Hallam University; and

(g) notes that this grant, awarded in April, will help South Yorkshire gain a better understanding of the local Armed Forces community and strengthen the delivery of the Community Covenant; the grant money is being spent on research and training at Sheffield Hallam University and was officially launched to coincide with national Armed Forces Day in June.

14.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Ian Saunders, and formally seconded by Councillor Tony Damms, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of the following words at the end of paragraph (e) - "and recognises all who survived that, and other, attacks during all wars, and that support must be given to all those who suffered mental health related issues (such as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder) as result of conflict, some of whom live in Sheffield".

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) wishes to pay tribute to all those serving, or who have served, in our armed forces, and places on record our enormous gratitude to them for keeping us all safe;

(b) notes that Armed Forces Day took place on Saturday 24th June; an occasion giving support to the men and women who make up the Armed Forces community, from currently serving troops to Service families, veterans and cadets;

(c) reaffirms the importance of such events and notes the success of recent events held in Sheffield in support of Armed Forces Day, including a veterans parade and a short ceremony led by the Lord Mayor;

(d) notes that this year's event marks the 35th anniversary of the Falklands War and the sinking of HMS Sheffield;

(e) regrets the loss of life caused by the sinking of HMS Sheffield and places on record our sympathies to the friends and families of the 20 crew members who were killed in the missile attack of 4th May 1982, and recognises all who survived that, and other, attacks during all wars, and that support must be given to all those who suffered mental health related issues (such as Post Traumatic Stress Disorder) as result of conflict, some of whom live in Sheffield;

(f) notes work undertaken by this Council to improve support of our armed forces communities, including a grant of £180,695 which Sheffield City Council successfully led a bid for from the Ministry of Defence's Covenant Fund, in partnership with Rotherham, Doncaster and Barnsley Councils, and Sheffield Hallam University; and

(g) notes that this grant, awarded in April, will help South Yorkshire gain a better understanding of the local Armed Forces community and strengthen the delivery of the Community Covenant; the grant money is being spent on research and training at Sheffield Hallam University and was officially launched to coincide with national Armed Forces Day in June.

## 15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE

### Safety of LGBT People in the Chechen Republic

15.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Neale Gibson, that this Council:-

(a) is horrified by the reports coming out of the Chechen Republic, Russia, that as many as 100 gay men have been detained, tortured and killed because of their sexuality;

(b) notes that the Russian Government has ultimate responsibility for the safety of its citizens, yet it appears to have been wilfully in disregard of this duty as Chechen authorities committed the most terrible abuses due to appalling and disgusting prejudices, which have no place anywhere in the world;

(c) notes that whilst the Foreign and Commonwealth Office described these reports as "credible" and expressed concern, our whole Council believes the UK's representations on this issue should have been escalated to a much higher political level;

(d) believes there has been a significant deterioration in the human rights

situation for LGBT people across Russia in recent years and the Government should use the UK's influence to fight discrimination and promote equality; and

(e) reaffirms our commitment to LGBT rights throughout the world and directs that a copy of this motion be sent to the Foreign Secretary.

## 16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MARTIN SMITH

### Freedom of Information Requests

16.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and formally seconded by Councillor Adam Hanrahan, that this Council:-

(a) notes that in 2016 nearly one in three requests to this Council for information under the Freedom of Information (FOI) Act were refused either in part or as a whole;

(b) notes this was a 35% increase in the refusal rate compared to 2014/15;

(c) notes that Sheffield, unlike some other core cities, does not publish data on FOI or Environmental Information Regulations (EIR) request refusal rates;

(d) believes that failure to publish an unredacted copy of the Amey contract or any documentation for the Guodong deal has contributed to a lack of trust in this Administration;

(e) agrees that it is right to withhold personal information, but withholding information on issues that are strategically important for the future of our city should not be done on a routine basis; and

(f) requests the Leader of the Council to carry out a review of the relevant policies and procedures and publish the outcome and recommendations of that review within the next three months, and immediately request the Chief Executive to publish FOI request refusal rates on a monthly basis.

16.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Olivia Blake, and formally seconded by Councillor Jack Scott, 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 under 30% (less than one third) of FOIs received in 2016 were refused in part or full and that consideration should be given to the fact that a partial refusal can mean only a very small element of a large request is refused; for example, all other information under a

request may be provided but where one question is exempted (refused) due to the information being available already in the public domain, such as the Sheffield City Council website, then this would count as a partial refusal;

(b) notes that the above can be construed as a problem of how refusals in FOIs are legally classified, as signposting to relevant information should in no way count as a refusal to grant information when the avenue for finding this information is made easily accessible (Section 21 of the Freedom of Information Act);

(c) further notes that the exemptions from disclosure which were most used during 2016 were Section 21, where information is accessible by other means (i.e. via the Council website) and Section 40, where the request was for, or included, information considered personal data which would have been refused or redacted in the response provided to protect the Data Protection Act rights of those individuals;

(d) contends that the Liberal Democrats public claims that there has been a 35% increase in the refusal rate in the last year, is completely inaccurate and that, in actuality, less FOIs were refused in 2016 than the year before it - the Council refused fully or partially 574 requests in response to the 1862 requests received in 2015 (just under 31%), whereas in 2016 the Council refused 558 of 1903 requests, which equates to just over 29% of requests received; and clearly this denotes a decrease in the overall numbers and percentage of requests refused, and nothing like the 35% increase quoted by the Liberal Democrats;

(e) notes that the Council publishes information on its FOI compliance online and there is no requirement to publish any information on FOI compliance or the use of exemptions, and as a result, the Authority has focused on providing details of its timeliness in response to FOI requests in accordance with the Act (20 working days); and in addition, this Administration is unaware of any other core cities publishing information to this level and would welcome details of those councils that do publish, so we can benchmark our transparency on the handling of FOIs;

(f) further notes that the Council cannot provide an unredacted copy of the Amey contract as in any commercial agreement there may be information within it which is legitimately commercially sensitive, including costing structures and the unique offer provided by the supplier during the tender process; however, in terms of the Amey contract, the Council is currently completing a full review of the contract to ensure that as open a version of the contract can be made as public as possible; this is a complex process and requires the review of the extensive contract by the Council and Amey, but once this review is complete a new version of the redacted contract will be made publically available;

(g) is unaware of any individual FOI requests for specific details of the "Guodong deal" and notes that the Council has published information through its website and press releases on the discussions with the Guodong Group;

(h) notes that, in addition, from an FOI perspective, the Council has mainly received requests focused on correspondence with the Guodong Group rather than specific details of the "deal" and, again, the Council may consider where appropriate the commercial sensitivity of information where disclosure would harm the commercial position of the Guodong Group, the Council or any other third party;

(i) confirms that every request will be assessed and reviewed in accordance with the Act but there are specific requests which might result in a similar refusal; for example, the Council will for certain exemptions apply the public interest test in the application both for and against an exemption, in accordance with the law and statutory guidance; and

(j) notes that the current process is transparent and in full accordance with the law and best practice with other local authorities; moreover the Council does not have the ability to rewrite statute and legal precedent in the handling of Freedom of Information Act and Environmental Information Regulations requests and, therefore, believes no further review is merited and that providing refusal rates regularly to the public as statistics in this case do not provide the full details.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) notes that under 30% (less than one third) of FOIs received in 2016 were refused in part or full and that consideration should be given to the fact that a partial refusal can mean only a very small element of a large request is refused; for example, all other information under a request may be provided but where one question is exempted (refused) due to the information being available already in the public domain, such as the Sheffield City Council website, then this would count as a partial refusal;

(b) notes that the above can be construed as a problem of how refusals in FOIs are legally classified, as signposting to relevant information should in no way count as a refusal to grant information when the avenue for finding this information is made easily accessible (Section 21 of the Freedom of Information Act);

(c) further notes that the exemptions from disclosure which were most used during 2016 were Section 21, where information is accessible by other means (i.e. via the Council website) and Section 40, where the request was for, or included, information considered personal data which would have been refused or redacted in the response provided to protect the Data Protection Act rights of those individuals;

(d) contends that the Liberal Democrats public claims that there has been a 35% increase in the refusal rate in the last year, is completely inaccurate and that, in actuality, less FOIs were refused in 2016 than the year before it - the Council refused fully or partially 574 requests in response to the 1862 requests received in 2015 (just under 31%), whereas in 2016 the Council refused 558 of 1903 requests, which equates to just over 29% of requests received; and clearly this denotes a decrease in the overall numbers and percentage of requests refused, and nothing like the 35% increase quoted by the Liberal Democrats;

(e) notes that the Council publishes information on its FOI compliance online and there is no requirement to publish any information on FOI compliance or the use of exemptions, and as a result, the Authority has focused on providing details of its timeliness in response to FOI requests in accordance with the Act (20 working days); and in addition, this Administration is unaware of any other core cities publishing information to this level and would welcome details of those councils that do publish, so we can benchmark our transparency on the handling of FOIs;

(f) further notes that the Council cannot provide an unredacted copy of the Amey contract as in any commercial agreement there may be information within it which is legitimately commercially sensitive, including costing structures and the unique offer provided by the supplier during the tender process; however, in terms of the Amey contract, the Council is currently completing a full review of the contract to ensure that as open a version of the contract can be made as public as possible; this is a complex process and requires the review of the extensive contract by the Council and Amey, but once this review is complete a new version of the redacted contract will be made publically available;

(g) is unaware of any individual FOI requests for specific details of the “Guodong deal” and notes that the Council has published information through its website and press releases on the discussions with the Guodong Group;

(h) notes that, in addition, from an FOI perspective, the Council has mainly received requests focused on correspondence with the Guodong Group rather than specific details of the “deal” and, again, the Council may consider where appropriate the commercial

sensitivity of information where disclosure would harm the commercial position of the Guodong Group, the Council or any other third party;

(i) confirms that every request will be assessed and reviewed in accordance with the Act but there are specific requests which might result in a similar refusal; for example, the Council will for certain exemptions apply the public interest test in the application both for and against an exemption, in accordance with the law and statutory guidance; and

(j) notes that the current process is transparent and in full accordance with the law and best practice with other local authorities; moreover the Council does not have the ability to rewrite statute and legal precedent in the handling of Freedom of Information Act and Environmental Information Regulations requests and, therefore, believes no further review is merited and that providing refusal rates regularly to the public as statistics in this case do not provide the full details.

## 17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER

### Brexit and Support to Small Businesses

17.1 It was formally moved by Councillor John Booker, and formally seconded by Councillor Pauline Andrews, that this Council:-

(a) believes there needs to be a bonfire of excessive EU regulations when the UK leaves the EU so that smaller businesses can compete successfully on the global stage;

(b) further believes Britain's 5.5 million small businesses are the life blood of our economy, making up 60 per cent of jobs in the private sector, according to the Federation of Small Businesses;

(c) also believes in (i) cutting business rates by 20 per cent for the 1.5 million British businesses operating from premises with a rateable value of less than £50,000, (ii) making HM Revenue and Customs investigate big business or public sector bodies that repeatedly make late payments to smaller customers, (iii) improving access to trade credit insurance to remove the drag on growth for businesses struggling to secure loans, and give small traders the confidence to expand their businesses and (iv) encouraging local trade by pushing every local authority to offer at least 30 minutes free parking in town centres and shopping parades;

(d) notes that local, regional and national governments have immense spending power totalling around £230 billion, and that whilst in the EU they are required to offer contracts right across Europe, which has

made it harder for British business to compete, and forced them to jump through expensive bureaucratic hoops, and believes that Brexit offers the perfect opportunity to open up government order books to smaller businesses, and encourage local, regional and national procurement strategies that will deliver better value for taxpayers;

(e) acknowledges that it takes courage and determination to set up your own business, and that many self-employed people work for less than the national living wage, especially when they start out, and believes that there should be no requirement for quarterly tax returns, and no increases in Class IV National Insurance or taxes for Britain's self-employed strivers and that taxes and red-tape should be kept to the minimum necessary; and

(f) places on record its belief that workers' rights must be protected once the UK leaves the EU, and that we must enforce the minimum and living wage and reverse government cuts to the number of minimum wage inspectors in England and Wales, and significantly tighten up the rules on zero hours contracts and severely limit their use.

17.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, and formally seconded by Councillor Ben Miskell, 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) believes that leaving the EU presents an opportunity to empower local businesses to compete successfully on the global stage;

(b) notes that the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) are very fond of stating that 'red tape and regulations need to be cut' and that there should be a 'bonfire of EU regulations', but in reality many EU regulations will need to be complied with in order to trade with members of the European Single Market and, as such, believes such claims that a lot of EU regulation will be "ripped-up" is disingenuous;

(c) further believes that instead of racing head-long into removing EU regulation, a considered approach needs to be taken and supports the position of the Labour Party that Brexit should ensure regulation which provides the 'exact same benefits' as the single market, with a focus on an outcome that prioritises jobs and economy;

(d) notes that the Labour Party has raised fears that Conservative backbench MPs will use the Repeal Bill to weaken EU rights and protections, and that Labour MPs will oppose any attempt to do so;

(e) highlights that the Labour Party had a manifesto commitment to replace the Repeal Bill with an EU Rights and Protections Bill that would address these concerns and ensure that all EU rights and protections would be enshrined in UK law without qualification, limitation or sunset clauses; and that Labour MPs will fight for

significant improvements along these lines in the Great Repeal Bill;

(f) believes that our country's small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are the backbone of our economy, providing 60 per cent of jobs in the private sector, according to the Federation of Small Businesses; and that technological changes, like the spread of digital manufacturing and rapid communication, mean smaller and faster businesses will be the future of our economy;

(g) believes that Labour is the party of small business and understands the challenges our smaller businesses face; and notes that, in order to provide the support many small businesses need, the Labour Party's 2017 Manifesto proposed to mandate a new National Investment Bank, and regional development banks in every region, to identify where other lenders fail to meet the needs of SMEs and prioritise lending to improve the funding gap;

(h) acknowledges that Labour stood on a manifesto commitment to reinstate the lower small-business corporation tax rate and introduce a package of reforms to business rates – including switching from RPI to CPI indexation, exempting new investment in plant and machinery from valuations, and ensuring that businesses have access to a proper appeals process – while reviewing the entire business rates system in the longer run – and to scrap the quarterly reporting for businesses with a turnover of under £85,000; and

(i) notes that Labour MPs opposed the Government's attempts to increase taxation on National Insurance (NI) contributions for the self-employed and further notes that, following the Labour Party's strong showing at the recent General Election whereby the Conservative Party lost its majority, this proposal has been dropped from the Government's recent Queen's speech.

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

17.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, and formally seconded by Councillor Adam Hanrahan, 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 56% of exports from Sheffield go to the EU, compared to 12% to the US and 2% to China;

(b) believes this demonstrates that the Government's plans to take Britain out of the Single Market are reckless and will hit local businesses hard when they are no longer able to export freely to their biggest customer;

(c) is disappointed with the Labour Party's position on Brexit and believes that its Leader, the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Corbyn MP, has failed

the young Labour voters who wanted a different approach to Brexit, after he imposed a three-line whip on Labour MPs to abstain on a cross-party amendment to keep the UK in the Single Market;

(d) notes that all Sheffield MPs abstained on the amendment to keep the UK in the Single Market despite 49% of Sheffield voting to remain in the EU last year; and

(e) directs that a copy of this motion be sent to all Sheffield MPs.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) believes that leaving the EU presents an opportunity to empower local businesses to compete successfully on the global stage;

(b) notes that the United Kingdom Independence Party (UKIP) are very fond of stating that 'red tape and regulations need to be cut' and that there should be a 'bonfire of EU regulations', but in reality many EU regulations will need to be complied with in order to trade with members of the European Single Market and, as such, believes such claims that a lot of EU regulation will be "ripped-up" is disingenuous;

(c) further believes that instead of racing head-long into removing EU regulation, a considered approach needs to be taken and supports the position of the Labour Party that Brexit should ensure regulation which provides the 'exact same benefits' as the single market, with a focus on an outcome that prioritises jobs and economy;

(d) notes that the Labour Party has raised fears that Conservative backbench MPs will use the Repeal Bill to weaken EU rights and protections, and that Labour MPs will oppose any attempt to do so;

(e) highlights that the Labour Party had a manifesto commitment to replace the Repeal Bill with an EU Rights and Protections Bill that would address these concerns and ensure that all EU rights and protections would be enshrined in UK law without qualification, limitation or sunset clauses; and that Labour MPs will fight for significant improvements along these lines in the Great Repeal Bill;

(f) believes that our country's small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) are the backbone of our economy, providing 60 per cent of jobs in the private sector, according to the Federation of Small Businesses; and that technological changes, like the spread of digital manufacturing and rapid communication, mean smaller and faster businesses will be the future of our economy;

(g) believes that Labour is the party of small business and understands the challenges our smaller businesses face; and notes that, in order to provide the support many small businesses need, the Labour Party's 2017 Manifesto proposed to mandate a new National Investment Bank, and regional development banks in every region, to identify where other lenders fail to meet the needs of SMEs and prioritise lending to improve the funding gap;

(h) acknowledges that Labour stood on a manifesto commitment to reinstate the lower small-business corporation tax rate and introduce a package of reforms to business rates – including switching from RPI to CPI indexation, exempting new investment in plant and machinery from valuations, and ensuring that businesses have access to a proper appeals process – while reviewing the entire business rates system in the longer run – and to scrap the quarterly reporting for businesses with a turnover of under £85,000; and

(i) notes that Labour MPs opposed the Government's attempts to increase taxation on National Insurance (NI) contributions for the self-employed and further notes that, following the Labour Party's strong showing at the recent General Election whereby the Conservative Party lost its majority, this proposal has been dropped from the Government's recent Queen's speech.

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

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| For paragraphs (a), (c) to (e) and (g) to (i) of the Substantive Motion (45) | - | Councillors Ian Saunders, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, 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, Abtisam Mohamed, Cate McDonald, Bob Johnson, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Jim Steinke, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes and Mick Rooney. |
| Against paragraphs (a), (c) to (e) and (g) to (i) of the Substantive Motion (22) | - | Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Pauline Andrews, Roger Davison, |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| | | Shaffaq Mohammed, 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 on paragraphs (a), (c) to (e) and (g) to (i) of the Substantive Motion (5) | - | The Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy), the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal. |
| For paragraphs (b) and (f) of the Substantive Motion (63) | - | Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Ian Saunders, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Moya O'Rourke, Craig Gamble Pugh, Adam Hanrahan, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Cate McDonald, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Bob Johnson, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Gail Smith, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Jim Steinke, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes and Mick Rooney. |
| Against paragraphs (b) and (f) of the Substantive Motion (4) | - | Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker. |
| Abstained on paragraphs (b) and (f) of the Substantive Motion (5) | - | The Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy), the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal. |

**18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACK SCOTT**

**Child Tax Credit Changes**

18.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Jack Scott, and formally seconded by Councillor Mike Drabble, that this Council:-

(a) notes with concern and alarm that child poverty has worsened in recent years and believes that the new changes to Child Tax Credit will make this situation worse; and further believes that levels of child poverty in this country are a disgrace and it should be seen that a central task of any Government should be to help prevent, reduce and eradicate child poverty;

(b) believes that the Government is in neglect of its duties by changing the Child Tax Credit and Universal Credit provision to two children per family; and notes that the changes were introduced as part of the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016, despite Parliamentary opposition from the Labour Party, citing in particular the lack of an equality impact assessment for any changes;

(c) notes that Child Poverty Action Group have raised concerns that this change will push more children and families into poverty, and that the Joseph Rowntree Foundation has published a report which suggests that the two child limit could push 200,000 children into poverty;

(d) highlights in particular the appalling so-called ‘rape clause’; which requires a mother seeking benefits for a third child to prove she has been sexually assaulted or that the child was conceived through abuse or within an abusive relationship;

(e) endorses entirely the view of the Fawcett Society, which has stated: "Women have been consistently and repeatedly hit hardest by austerity measures and tax and benefit changes. Child poverty is rising. The new two child limit in the Tax Credit system will see another 200,000 children pushed into poverty, and the disgraceful ‘rape clause’ that accompanies it pushes women into disclosing sexual violence in order to obtain financial support.";

(f) believes that the so-called ‘rape clause’ forces women into a horrifying ordeal; having to recount their sexual abuse via an eight-page document in order to prove that their abuse is worthy of government support, clearly showing how badly conceived the policy is;

(g) believes that rather than making suffering victims and survivors go through this ordeal, the policy should be entirely scrapped as it is extremely damaging to survivors of abuse and will lead to a greater number of children in child poverty; and

(h) calls upon the Government to immediately reverse, what this Council believes to be, this disastrous, unfair and spiteful policy and directs that a copy of this Motion be submitted to the Prime Minister and Sheffield's Members of Parliament.

18.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Joe Otten, and formally

seconded by Councillor Sue Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of the following words at the end of paragraph (b) – "despite Parliamentary opposition from the Labour Party, citing in particular the lack of an equality impact assessment for any changes";

2. the addition of new paragraphs (c) and (d) as follows:-

   (c) is therefore disappointed that, despite this rhetoric, analysis by the Resolution Foundation found that the 2017 Labour Party manifesto pledges to press ahead with £7bn of the £9bn of welfare cuts proposed by former Chancellor, the Rt. Hon George Osborne, and that the £2bn that had been allocated would reverse less than half of the cuts to child benefit and Universal Credit;

   (d) recalls that in July 2015, the then acting leader of the Labour Party, the Rt. Hon Harriet Harman MP, instructed Labour MPs to abstain on the Welfare Reform and Work Bill at its second reading rather than join SNP, Liberal Democrat and Green MPs in voting against the Bill;

3. the re-lettering of original paragraphs (c) to (h) as new paragraphs (e) to (j).

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) notes with concern and alarm that child poverty has worsened in recent years and believes that the new changes to Child Tax Credit will make this situation worse; and further believes that levels of child poverty in this country are a disgrace and it should be seen that a central task of any Government should be to help prevent, reduce and eradicate child poverty;

(b) believes that the Government is in neglect of its duties by changing the Child Tax Credit and Universal Credit provision to two children per family; and notes that the changes were introduced as part of the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016, despite Parliamentary opposition from the Labour Party, citing in particular the lack of an equality impact assessment for any changes;

(c) notes that Child Poverty Action Group have raised concerns that this change will push more children and families into poverty, and that the Joseph Rowntree Foundation has published a report which suggests that the two child limit could push 200,000 children into poverty;

(d) highlights in particular the appalling so-called ‘rape clause’; which requires a mother seeking benefits for a third child to prove she has been sexually assaulted or that the child was conceived through abuse or within an abusive relationship;

(e) endorses entirely the view of the Fawcett Society, which has stated: "Women have been consistently and repeatedly hit hardest by austerity measures and tax and benefit changes. Child poverty is rising. The new two child limit in the Tax Credit system will see another 200,000 children pushed into poverty, and the disgraceful ‘rape clause’ that accompanies it pushes women into disclosing sexual violence in order to obtain financial support.";

(f) believes that the so-called ‘rape clause’ forces women into a horrifying ordeal; having to recount their sexual abuse via an eight-page document in order to prove that their abuse is worthy of government support, clearly showing how badly conceived the policy is;

(g) believes that rather than making suffering victims and survivors go through this ordeal, the policy should be entirely scrapped as it is extremely damaging to survivors of abuse and will lead to a greater number of children in child poverty; and

(h) calls upon the Government to immediately reverse, what this Council believes to be, this disastrous, unfair and spiteful policy and directs that a copy of this Motion be submitted to the Prime Minister and Sheffield's Members of Parliament.

18.4.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Pauline Andrews, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, 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 voted for paragraphs (a) and (c) to (h) of the Motion, and voted against paragraph (b) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

2. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a) and (c) to (h) of the Motion, and abstained from voting on paragraph (b) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

## 19. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR GAIL SMITH

### Public Parks

19.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Gail Smith, and formally seconded by Councillor Roger Davison, that this Council:-

(a) notes that 14th to 23rd July is “Love Parks” week;

(b) believes that Sheffield has some of the best public parks in the country and our parks are something which sets Sheffield apart as the “Outdoor City”; and

(c) calls on the Authority to get involved in Love Parks week and become an official supporter of the campaign.

19.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Mary Lea, and formally seconded by Councillor Talib Hussain, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (c) and the addition of new paragraphs (c) and (d) as follows:-

(c) notes that this Administration is committed to promoting our green spaces and is fully supporting the upcoming ‘Love Parks week’ and that Sheffield City Council will be an official supporter of the campaign; and

(d) notes the Administration’s considerable achievements in securing the best possible parks and green spaces for the city, despite relentless government cuts, including:-

(i) a huge £1.5m investment in our parks over the next three years;

(ii) the biggest deal of its kind in the country for tennis in parks; with courts at nine sites being created, or otherwise brought back into use after becoming, in many cases, derelict and unplayable;

(iii) 30 signed Run Routes have been created at 14 locations across the city, providing simple to follow trails through Sheffield’s parks and woodlands;

(iv) state of the art 3G football pitches and football hub at Thorncliffe, High Green;

(v) improved wheelchair and disability access to our parks to make Sheffield an outdoor city for all;

(vi) officially recognised even more areas with fields in trust status, such as Ochre Dike Playing Fields which is one of more than 800 green open spaces in Sheffield;

(vii) creation of 14 additional woodlands and, in the last tree planting season alone, more than 8,600 extra trees in 40 locations; and

(viii) Sheffield boasts one of the largest numbers of 'Friends Of' groups in the UK, in comparison with other major cities, and by working in this partnership, the Administration ensures that our green spaces are well used and maintained.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) notes that 14th to 23rd July is “Love Parks” week;

(b) believes that Sheffield has some of the best public parks in the country and our parks are something which sets Sheffield apart as the “Outdoor City”;

(c) notes that this Administration is committed to promoting our green spaces and is fully supporting the upcoming ‘Love Parks week’ and that Sheffield City Council will be an official supporter of the campaign; and

(d) notes the Administration’s considerable achievements in securing the best possible parks and green spaces for the city, despite relentless government cuts, including:-

(i) a huge £1.5m investment in our parks over the next three years;

(ii) the biggest deal of its kind in the country for tennis in parks; with courts at nine sites being created, or otherwise brought back into use after becoming, in many cases, derelict and unplayable;

(iii) 30 signed Run Routes have been created at 14 locations across the city, providing simple to follow trails through Sheffield’s parks and woodlands;

(iv) state of the art 3G football pitches and football hub at Thorncliffe, High Green;

(v) improved wheelchair and disability access to our parks to make Sheffield an outdoor city for all;

(vi) officially recognised even more areas with fields in trust status, such as Ochre Dike Playing Fields which is one of more than 800 green open spaces in Sheffield;

(vii) creation of 14 additional woodlands and, in the last tree

planting season alone, more than 8,600 extra trees in 40 locations; and

(viii) Sheffield boasts one of the largest numbers of 'Friends Of' groups in the UK, in comparison with other major cities, and by working in this partnership, the Administration ensures that our green spaces are well used and maintained.

19.4.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, 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) of the Substantive Motion and abstained from voting on paragraph (d) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

## 20. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PAULINE ANDREWS

### Charges To Access Services In Hospitals

20.1 At the request of Councillor Pauline Andrews and with the consent of the Council, the Notice of Motion Numbered 18 on the Summons for this meeting was withdrawn in accordance with Council Procedure Rules 11(x) and 17.10.