

Agenda Item 11

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Ponds Forge International Sports Centre, Sheaf Street, Sheffield, S1 2BP, on Wednesday 2 February 2022, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Gail Smith)

THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards)

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|--|----|---|
| 1 | <i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i>
Simon Clement-Jones
Richard Shaw
Sophie Thornton | 10 | <i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i>
Vic Bowden
Moya O'Rourke
Alan Woodcock | 19 | <i>Nether Edge & Sharrow Ward</i>
Peter Garbutt
Maroof Raouf
Alison Teal |
| 2 | <i>Beighton Ward</i>
Bob McCann
Chris Rosling-Josephs
Ann Woolhouse | 11 | <i>Ecclesall Ward</i>
Roger Davison
Barbara Masters
Shaffaq Mohammed | 20 | <i>Park & Arbourthorne</i>
Ben Miskell
Jack Scott |
| 3 | <i>Birley Ward</i>
Denise Fox
Bryan Lodge
Karen McGowan | 12 | <i>Firth Park Ward</i>
Fran Belbin
Abdul Khayum | 21 | <i>Richmond Ward</i>
Mike Drabble
Dianne Hurst |
| 4 | <i>Broomhill & Sharrow Vale Ward</i>
Angela Argenzio
Brian Holmshaw
Kaltum Rivers | 13 | <i>Fulwood Ward</i>
Sue Alston
Andrew Sangar
Cliff Woodcraft | 22 | <i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i>
Dawn Dale
Peter Price
Garry Weatherall |
| 5 | <i>Burngreave Ward</i>
Talib Hussain
Mark Jones
Safiya Saeed | 14 | <i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i>
Alexi Dimond
Cate McDonald
Paul Turpin | 23 | <i>Southey Ward</i>
Mike Chaplin |
| 6 | <i>City Ward</i>
Douglas Johnson
Ruth Mersereau
Martin Phipps | 15 | <i>Graves Park Ward</i>
Ian Auckland
Sue Auckland
Steve Ayriss | 24 | <i>Stannington Ward</i>
Penny Baker
Vickie Priestley
Richard Williams |
| 7 | <i>Crookes & Crosspool Ward</i>
Mohammed Mahroof
Ruth Milsom | 16 | <i>Hillsborough Ward</i>
Christine Gilligan
George Lindars-Hammond
Josie Paszek | 25 | <i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i>
Lewis Chinchin
Francyne Johnson |
| 8 | <i>Darnall Ward</i>
Mazher Iqbal
Mary Lea
Zahira Naz | 17 | <i>Manor Castle Ward</i>
Terry Fox
Anne Murphy
Sioned-Mair Richards | 26 | <i>Walkley Ward</i>
Bernard Little |
| 9 | <i>Dore & Totley Ward</i>
Joe Otten
Colin Ross
Martin Smith | 18 | <i>Mosborough Ward</i>
Tony Downing
Kevin Oxley
Gail Smith | 27 | <i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i>
Alan Hooper
Mike Levery
Ann Whitaker |
| | | | | 28 | <i>Woodhouse Ward</i>
Mick Rooney
Jackie Satur
Paul Wood |

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors David Barker, Ben Curran, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Neale Gibson, Julie Grocutt, Tim Huggan, Abtissam Mohamed and Sophie Wilson.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.1 Councillor Paul Turpin declared personal interests, on the grounds that he was a Director of an insulation company, in (a) agenda items 6 (Housing Revenue Account Business Plan and Budget 2022/23) (item 5 of these minutes), (b) agenda item 10 (Notice of Motion Regarding "Net Zero Energy Homes For Sheffield") (item 9 of these minutes) and (c) agenda item 11 (Notice of Motion Regarding " Cost of Living Crisis") (item 10 of these minutes).

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

- 3.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Gail Smith) reported that six petitions and questions from five members of the public had been received prior to the published deadline for submission of petitions and questions for this meeting. Representations were to be made on behalf of the petitioners on five of the six petitions and the other petition would be received in the absence of a speaker. One further petition was to be debated at the end of the item, and this was referred to at item 4(b) on the agenda for the meeting.

3.2 Petitions

3.2.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Give Consideration to the Provision of Burial Sites for the Muslim Community as part of the Local Plan Process

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 4,459 signatures, requesting the Council to give consideration to the provision of burial sites for the Muslim community as part of the Local Plan Process.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Ibrar Hussain. Mr Hussain stated that there was one main Muslim burial site at Shiregreen. He said there was an issue with Darnall and Tinsley Park as the cemeteries were full. He stated that due to the pandemic and the growth of the community these burial sites were almost full. Mr Hussain said he had spoken with Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, who had agreed that the sites were filling up quickly. Mr Hussain stated that he was requesting a long-term framework to support burial sites for the Muslim community. He asked that this issue be taken to an upcoming Committee. He said 72 hours' notice was currently required for a burial, which he said was unacceptable. Mr Hussain asked that this issue be included in the Local Plan. He thanked Councillors across the political parties for their support.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Alison Teal (Executive Member for Sustainable Neighbourhoods, Wellbeing, Parks and Leisure). Councillor Teal thanked Mr Hussain for bringing this petition. She stated there were 4 specific burial sites for the Muslim community. She agreed that the Council needed to find new sites. Councillor Teal stated the Council was going to set up a stakeholder group and would be taking a multi-faith approach. She said she had been informed that there were more staff receiving training to use diggers in order to provide plots in a time sensitive manner. She invited Mr Hussain to be part of the stakeholder group. She said the Council currently had 6 years of provision; however, she agreed a longer-term strategy was needed. Councillor Teal stated she was speaking to colleagues in Property Services to ensure land was available.

3.2.2 Petition Requesting the Council to Reconsider the Policy Regarding the Age Limit of Taxis

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 117 signatures, requesting the Council to reconsider the policy regarding the age limit of taxis.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Ibrar Hussain. Mr Hussain stated that due to the proposed introduction of the Clean Air Zone, in September, 2022, taxi drivers were requesting an extension to the current age limit of nine years for private hire vehicles and 15 years for hackney carriage vehicles. He added that there was also a shortage of newer vehicles on the market, namely Euro 4 and 6, due to a missing electronic chip, as well as the price of such vehicles being around 60% higher at the present time. Mr Hussain was also requesting that the age limit of such vehicles, on entry to the trade, be increased from five years to six years. He stated that many taxi drivers were already facing financial difficulties after the Covid-19 pandemic, and needed urgent assistance from the Council.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Paul Wood (Executive Member for Housing, Roads and Waste Management). Councillor Wood thanked Mr Hussain for bringing this petition, and stated that he would bring his concerns to the attention of the Licensing Service, and respond to Mr Hussain at the earliest possible opportunity.

3.2.3 Petition Requesting the Council not to Change the Bus Lane Times on Abbeydale Road

The Council received an electronic petition containing 483 signatures, requesting the Council not to change the bus lane times on Abbeydale Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Richard Hennessey. Mr Hennessey stated that it was solely the 12-hour bus lane element of the wider package of proposed highway measures that he was objecting to. He stated that he and his wife ran a therapy business on Abbeydale Road, and their premises were used by around 40 other therapists. They provided therapy for people suffering from both physical and mental issues. Many other business

owners on Abbeydale Road had expressed their objections to the proposed 12-hour bus lane, mainly on the basis that customers would find it difficult to access their premises. He stated that many people were forced to drive to the shops/businesses, for health and other reasons, specifically his clients.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Douglas Johnson (Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport). Councillor Johnson thanked Mr Hennessey for bringing this petition, and stated that it was important that, as part of the consultation, the Council found out the precise impact of the proposal on businesses on Abbeydale Road. He accepted that the present bus service in the city was not good enough, and encouraged Mr Hennessey to submit his comments as part of the consultation exercise.

3.2.4 Petition Requesting the Council to Enforce Parking Restrictions and Bus Lanes on Abbeydale Road and London Road Before Resorting to Increasing Bus Lane Opening Times on Abbeydale Road

The Council received an electronic petition containing 38 signatures, requesting the Council to enforce parking restrictions and bus lanes on Abbeydale Road and London Road before resorting to increasing bus lane opening times on Abbeydale Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Elaine Bird. Ms Bird stated that the petition related specifically to the section of London Road, from St. Mary's Gate to Sharrow Vale Road, and that the lack of regular enforcement of current parking restrictions on this section of London Road was resulting in very slow traffic flow, both in and out of the city centre. In addition, there were a high number of illegally parked cars, many of them idling, and parked at bus stops, thereby contributing to increased pollution levels, which affected residents who lived in the area, as well as people walking or cycling through the area. Ms Bird made reference to the fact that the Council must have licensed the many takeaways/restaurants on London Road, therefore must have been aware of the potential parking problems. She stated that the petitioners were also objecting to the increase in parking, stopping and loading restrictions on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, stating that if such restrictions on the small section of London Road could not be enforced adequately, there would be wider problems if such further restrictions were to be introduced.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Douglas Johnson (Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport). Councillor Johnson thanked Ms Bird for bringing this petition, and stated that he shared the views expressed with regard to illegal parking on this section of London Road, and the resulting increase in pollution levels in the area. He stated that the comments raised would be considered as part of the consultation exercise.

3.2.5 Petition Requesting the Council to Reconsider the Proposed 12-Hour Bus Lane Restrictions on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road

The Council received a petition containing 158 signatures, requesting the Council to reconsider the proposed 12-hour bus lane restrictions on Abbeydale

Road and Ecclesall Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Nighat Basharat. She stated that the bus lane proposals would likely result in several businesses being forced to close, which would subsequently result in job losses and the loss of vital services for the local community. Residents were very concerned at the potential loss of independent businesses on Abbeydale Road, which formed part of the multi-cultural community in this area. Many businesses on Abbeydale Road had already faced huge challenges as a result of the Covid-19 pandemic, and the recent wave of the pandemic continued to bring uncertainty for business owners. She stated that there were issues with the effectiveness of the local bus service, and all Sheffield residents wanted a reliable and affordable service. A number of business owners were not aware of the bus lane proposals, and were requesting an extension to the consultation period.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Douglas Johnson (Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport). Councillor Johnson thanked Ms Basharat for bringing this petition, and stated that he appreciated the difficult circumstances being faced by business owners on Abbeydale Road. He stated that the Council needed to look at ways in which it could assist the business owners.

3.2.6 Petition Requesting the Council to Reduce Council Tax

The Council received an electronic petition containing six signatures, requesting the Council to reduce Council Tax. There was no speaker for this petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Cate McDonald (Executive Member for Finance and Resources). The Lord Mayor requested that Cllr McDonald provide a written response to the organiser of the petition.

3.3 Public Questions

3.3.1 Public Questions Regarding the Sheffield Clean Air Zone

Graham Jones asked the following question:

“The Sheffield Clean Air Zone has a focus on the city centre.

Some residential areas, including Burngreave outside the city centre already suffer from illegally high levels of air pollution. The CAZ is forecast to actually increase pollution on some of Burngreave’s roads through the anticipated displacement of polluting vehicles.

What immediate steps will the Council take to reduce the public health hazards caused by the injustice of deliberately diverting polluting traffic through one of the most disadvantaged areas of the city?”

In response, Councillor Douglas Johnson (Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport) referred to the Firvale area of the city as a prime example of why action on pollution was necessary. He stated that Firvale has some of the worst levels of air pollution due to the fact that the area was situated in a dip with high levels of transport with many bus routes passing through, many taxis and also two schools, a hospital and densely packed housing area with many poor people living there. He said that there was a misapprehension that the Clean Air Zone (CAZ) would make it worse for people when in fact it would make it better for that area of the city. The geography of Sheffield meant that the inner ring road was where the measurement for air quality was taken and where the cameras had been sited to enforce the proposed Zone. The main thing was to introduce the CAZ to pave the way for taxi drivers to obtain Government grants to enable them to upgrade their vehicles, as well as to provide bus companies with access to grants so that they would be in a position upgrade their fleets. Over time, levels of air pollution should go down if the taxis and buses clean up their vehicles. Councillor Johnson acknowledged that there was a risk of displacement, with some drivers avoiding passing through the Zone so as not to incur a charge, but this was likely to be modest and short term given that private vehicles would be exempt from charges. There had been an argument to do nothing at all. If this scheme had been introduced without Government legislation, things would have been very different. The choice was to either introduce the clean air zone to tackle air pollution or do nothing at all and the Council was committed to tackling air pollution in and around the city.

3.3.2 Public Question Regarding the Streets Ahead Contract

Russell Johnson asked the following question:

In July 2021, in answer to a public question of mine, Councillor Paul Wood agreed that the part of the Streets Ahead Contract Clause 6.38 that requires the felling of 17,500 street trees would be deleted / removed from the Contract. The response was reported in the Yorkshire Post. My question: would the Leader please confirm that this has been actioned?

Mr. Johnson went on to ask additional questions about the reputation of the Council, which he stated he had submitted to the Council, but he was informed by the Lord Mayor that these had not been received for this meeting. He was informed that the additional questions he was asking were directed towards the Leader of the Council who had, unfortunately, been forced to leave the meeting due to his wife being taken ill. Mr. Johnson was informed that if there had been an omission of further questions on the part of the Council, this would be investigated and acted upon. As such, the question received, and asked, regarding the Streets Ahead Contract would receive a reply.

In response to that question, Councillor Paul Wood (Executive Member for Housing, Roads and Waste Management) stated that he had sent an email to Mr. Johnson detailing the position at the present time. He added that he did liaise with Councillor Douglas Johnson regarding the issue of tree maintenance and confirmed that this matter was looked at on a regular basis. As regards the

contract clause relating to the felling of trees, Councillor Wood stated that this issue would be picked up by the Council's legal service in conjunction with other changes being made to the contract, which should be concluded in the near future, and he undertook to inform Mr. Johnson when the contract changes had been completed.

3.3.3 Public Questions Regarding the Climate Emergency

Sam Wakeling asked the following questions:

This meeting marks three years since the Council declared a climate emergency. The Council had taken scientific advice in relation to carbon budgets, but the changes which that advice would require have not been seen in any policy, actions or public communications from the Council. How much more time do senior councillors and officials need or does the continuing blah blah demonstrate that they are neither willing or competent to act to protect life in Sheffield and around the world? Who will offer an apology, or demonstrate repentance, for this breach of trust? Will the council leadership resign, and when will the long-promised citizens assembly be established as a step to begin to repair our shattered democracy?

In response, Councillor Douglas Johnson (Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport) said that in his opinion this was not the time for anyone in the Council's leadership to resign but stated that there had been changes within the Council and within the city. The climate emergency was formally declared by the Council and people have been working hard since then to keep pushing that agenda. He said he had been working with a national body to try and bring some funding into the city to promote engagement with the public. He said more and more people were talking about the climate and the need for action. There was no quick fix at a time when a quick fix was needed, which was of concern. He hoped to keep pushing forward on the big things that needed to be addressed, two of which were the subject of discussion at this meeting, with one of the biggest emitters of carbon being in domestic heating and the other being road transport. There were plans for a radical transformative approach to public transport but there was a lot of reaction and hostility to outline proposals, as there were balances to strike between improved public transport and promotion of public health whilst needing to protect the livelihoods of individuals. He said that later on during the meeting, the matter of a more radical approach to home insulation would be discussed, with the aim of securing net zero consumption homes in large numbers across the city.

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

Robin Hughes asked the following questions:

This question concerns the disposal of a small piece of unused land owned by the Council at Walshaw Road, in the village of Worrall. A developer has approached Property and Regeneration Services asking to buy the land. They

wish to purchase the land in order to create an access road to a proposed housing development, so as to avoid using an alternative that would require the demolition of a historic 18th century farmhouse and barn and impact the setting of listed buildings. The developer had previously been refused planning permission for that demolition, the Council indicating clearly that it considered the use of the Council's land to be the preferred alternative. The developer did not appeal the decision, but instead sought to buy the land from the Council, in line with the Council's wishes.

The response from Property and Regeneration Services was that they preferred to await the outcome of any appeal that the developer might make. This reply was only made two months after the deadline for appeals had passed, and it was no longer possible for the developer to appeal, which in any case they showed no intention of doing.

So, given:

- (1) The objective in the Council's Land and Property Plan to dispose of surplus land in a timely manner;
- (2) The objective in the Council's Land and Property Plan to act as 'one' council and to ensure all estate decisions are taken with the wider interests of the Council in mind;
- (3) The Council's statutory duty under the Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, Section 66(2) to have regard to the desirability of preserving features of special architectural or historic interest, and in particular, listed buildings, in the exercise of its powers of disposal;
- (4) The clear preference expressed by both Members and officers; and
- (5) The existence of a ready and willing buyer for surplus Council land;

Will the Council immediately enter into negotiations to sell the land?

Please can the Council also explain:

- (1) Why the developer was invited to make an appeal, a potentially expensive procedure for the Council, two months after it was no longer possible for such an appeal to be made?
- (2) How it is possible for a department of the Council to act so as effectively to thwart a previous decision by elected Members?

In response, Councillor Cate McDonald (Executive Member for Finance and Resources) stated that there was a complicated series of events to this issue. She said that in selling Council land, there was a need to ensure that best consideration was obtained, and schemes would be built out in a timely manner once planning had been approved. She said that the Council was in active discussions with the developer about alternative access to the site and the sale of Council owned land. The Council will seek to conclude these discussions before determining the correct course of action for the planning application.

- 3.3.5 (NOTE: A question which had been submitted by Duncan Seraphim, but which was not asked at the meeting, would receive a written response from the relevant Executive Member).

3.4 Petition Requiring Debate: Opposing Proposed Extensions to Bus Lane Restrictions on Ecclesall and Abbeydale Road

3.4.1 The Council received an electronic petition containing over 6,750 signatures opposing the plans put forward by Connecting Sheffield to extend bus lane operation times to 12 hours, remove parking and create a red route on Ecclesall Road and Abbeydale Road.

3.4.2 The Council's Petitions Scheme required any petition containing over 5000 signatures to be the subject of debate at the Council meeting.

3.4.3 Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Nasar Raof, who stated that the proposals would have an adverse effect on a number of businesses on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road. Business owners were upset, stressed and angry at the proposals. Mr Raof referred specifically to the impact on his post office business on Ecclesall Road, indicating that having red lines outside his premises would mean that Royal Mail, delivery companies and vulnerable customers who were forced to use the car, would no longer be able to park outside, or near the post office. The post office, as well as many other businesses, had already suffered financially due to the Covid-19 pandemic, and these proposals would make the situation much worse for them. Mr Raof referred to a recent visit by Councillor Douglas Johnson to a number of businesses on Ecclesall Road, to listen to their concerns, then expressed his frustration at Councillor Johnson's subsequent announcement that the Council would not be amending any of the proposals. Mr Raof stated that he had been forced to change careers, from a taxi driver to a postmaster, as a result of the pandemic, and that he had invested everything, including his children's savings and inheritance, into his business. He did not believe that the proposed 12-hour bus lane proposals were proportionate or fair.

3.4.4 Councillor Douglas Johnson (Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport), in responding to the petition, stated that it was important to consider, and balance up, the comments received as part of the consultation on the proposals. He stated that the Council would use the outcome of the initial consultation to bring forward more detailed proposals for further consultation at a later date. He encouraged people to make suggestions as to their specific circumstances and needs, as part of the consultation, and further decisions would be made based on the comments received.

3.4.5 Due to the absence of Councillor Tim Huggan (Shadow Executive Member for Climate Change, Environment and Transport) at the meeting, Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed (Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group) spoke. He thanked the petitioners for attending the meeting, and putting forward their views on these specific proposals, and expressed his concern at the possibility of independent traders losing their livelihoods if the bus lane proposals were implemented. Despite comments made by Councillor Douglas Johnson, he believed it was the responsibility of the Council to look at the potential economic impact that the bus lane proposals would have on businesses on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, prior to drafting up such proposals.

- Councillor Mohammed considered that some of the proposals would be effective, but stressed that the bus lane proposals were more than likely to put yet further pressure on traders, who were already struggling in the current economic climate.
- 3.4.6 Councillor Bryan Lodge thanked Mr Raof for his passionate speech, and believed that the Council needed to listen seriously to the comments he raised. He also agreed that there were some positive changes contained in the set of proposals.
- 3.4.7 Councillor Andrew Sangar thanked the petitioners for attending the meeting to present their petitions relating to the proposals, and stated that he had also walked around Ecclesall Road to talk to those traders who were likely to be affected by the proposals, and noted the strength of feeling amongst them. He acknowledged the long shopping history on both Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road, and more specifically, the difficulties faced by independent traders in both shopping areas over the last few years. Councillor Sangar stresses that there was a need for the Council to work with the traders to ensure that both roads continued as thriving shopping centres. He did not believe that the implementation of a 12-hour bus lane would help with this, and believed that the Council needed to start working more closely with, and listen to the views of, local residents and local businesses. He believed the Council should concentrate on developing the other bus priority measures, and remove the 12-hour bus lane element, which would hopefully help to improve the bus service for the people of Sheffield.
- 3.4.8 Councillor Ruth Milsom thanked the petitioners for raising their concerns regarding the proposed 12-hour bus lanes, and believed that the submission of such petitions should not have been necessary. She also believed that business owners on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road should not have been forced to suffer such alarm and anxiety, and considered that the Council should have talked to them prior to announcing such proposals, as well as offering assurances to them that their views would form part of the final plans. Councillor Milsom stated that the current bus service in Sheffield was inadequate, and that removing car parking spaces would have a major adverse impact on business owners' ability to trade.
- 3.4.9 Councillor Paul Turpin welcomed the engagement of the public in terms of the petitions, and hoped that, by working with local residents and businesses in the areas, a satisfactory resolution could be found. He believed that changes were required in order to improve the bus service in the city, and that implementing 12-hour bus lanes on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road would help to improve connectivity and reliability, air quality and safety for cyclists and pedestrians. Councillor Turpin did not believe that there was any evidence to prove that the bus lane proposals would result in business closures.
- 3.4.10 Councillor Mohammed Mahroof stated that accusations were already being made that the Council was "anti-business", and that the bus lane proposals would only exacerbate such claims. He referred to problems already being faced by independent traders on Ecclesall Road, and stated that the proposals

would make things much worse. Councillor Mahroof quoted approximate figures in terms of average rent and rates for small businesses on Ecclesall Road, as well as utility and employee costs, highlighting the financial difficulties they were facing. He stated that there had been positive signs of recovery in the business sector on Abbeydale Road, and such proposals would have a major adverse effect. He had been contacted by many independent traders, who had informed him that they relied on customers being able to park outside, or close to, their premises.

- 3.4.11 Councillor Lewis Chinchin thanked the petitioners, and stated that he strongly opposed the proposals to extend the bus lane operating times on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road. He believed such proposals would make it more difficult for traders, customers and delivery firms, to park outside or close to the premises. Councillor Chinchin stated that the Council needed to do everything it could to support local businesses, particularly due to adverse effects on the local economy following the Covid-19 pandemic. He did not believe that the proposals would necessarily help to improve connectivity and reliability of the bus service as the bus lanes were already in operation during the most congested times of the day. Councillor Chinchin stated that he supported many of the other Connecting Sheffield proposals, but considered that the Council needed to listen to the views of local traders with regard to the bus lane proposals.
- 3.4.12 Councillor Abdul Khayum stressed the need for the Council to listen to the views of the petitioners, who were speaking on behalf of many other local residents and businesses on Abbeydale Road and Ecclesall Road. He believed there was a requirement for the Council to give serious consideration to all the views and comments received as part of the consultation. Councillor Khayum referred to the financial difficulties already being faced by local businesses due to the pandemic, and considered that their views should be taken seriously.
- 3.4.13 Councillor Maroof Raouf thanked everyone who had signed the petition, and stated that he considered the bus lane extensions necessary to improve bus times in the city. He did, however, consider the extension to 12 hours too far, suggesting that they, at least initially, be extended to seven hours – 07:00 to 10:00 hours and 15:00 to 19:00 hours. Councillor Raouf stressed that no decisions had been taken with regard to the proposals, and that this was the initial consultation. He stated that the Council would continue to listen to the views of local residents and businesses, and make informed decisions based on their views.
- 3.4.14 Nasar Raouf, in his right of reply, referred to the lack of a business impact assessment, and expressed his thanks to those Council Members who had spoken against the proposed bus lane extensions. He stated that he and fellow business owners on Ecclesall Road had worked out how the proposal would impact on their businesses, and stressed that despite comments made by some Councillors, there would not be exemptions for all the different companies which delivered to the post office, in terms of being able to park on the red lines. Mr Raouf urged the Council to reconsider the bus lane proposals, not just

to save the businesses at the present time, but to also safeguard their future existence.

3.4.15 Councillor Douglas Johnson responded to issues raised during the debate and highlighted the fact that all the Connecting Sheffield proposals were still at consultation stage, and no decisions had yet been made thereon.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council refers the petition to the Co-operative Executive for consideration.

4. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

4.1 Urgent Business

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

4.2 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Gail Smith) reported that Councillor Martin Phipps had given advance notice of a question relating to the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority's investment in factory farming. This had enabled Councillor Garry Weatherall, the Council's Spokesperson on the Pensions Authority, to provide a written response, and copies of the question and response had been circulated at the meeting and would be published on the Council's website.

4.3 Written Questions

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

5. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN AND HRA BUDGET 2022/23

5.1 It was moved by Councillor Cate McDonald, and seconded by Councillor Paul Wood, that the following recommendations made by the Co-operative Executive at its meeting held on 19th January 2022 in relation to the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan and Budget for 2022/23, be approved:-

“RESOLVED: That Co-operative Executive recommends to the meeting of the

City Council on 2nd February 2022 that:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2022/23 be approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget 2022/23 as set out in the financial appendix to the report be approved;
- (c) rents for council dwellings are increased by 4.1% from April 2022 in line with the Regulator of Social Housing's Rent Standard;
- (d) rents for temporary accommodation are increased by 4.1% for 2022/23;
- (e) garage rents for garage plots and garage sites are increased by 4.1% from April 2022;
- (f) the community heating kWh unit charge is increased from 3.04 pence to 5.69 pence from April 2022, and the standing charge is also increased from £4.80 to £4.90 per week from April 2022;
- (g) the sheltered housing charge is increased by 3.1% for 2022/23;
- (h) the burglar alarm charge is increased by 3.1% for 2022/23; and
- (i) the furnished accommodation charge is increased by 3.1% for 2022/23."

5.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Mark Jones, seconded by Councillor Josie Paszek, as an amendment, that the recommendations made by the Co-operative Executive at its meeting held on 19th January, 2022, concerning the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan and Budget 2022/23, be approved with the addition of new paragraphs (j) to (m) as follows:-

- (j) welcomes the 5 year investment programme commitment to bringing all council homes up to EPC level C, but commits to develop, by Spring 2022, a 'road map' to show how we not only can get our homes to EPC C, as quickly as possible, but for a deliverable vision and timetable by which we can get to net zero for the Council's housing stock;
- (k) believes that this road map needs to encompass a forward thinking approach, open to new ideas and technologies, in how to deliver this – looking at everything from retrofitting, heat pumps, insulated rooftops with solar panels – to name just a few examples;
- (l) believes that Energiesprong may have a part to play within this, but so too may other organisations, and that once a robust roadmap has been devised we can really engage with the market to ensure deliverability and to rise to the challenges successfully; and
- (m) believes that, ultimately, council tenants need to be consulted on any changes and that action can only be undertaken with their backing.

- 5.3 It was then moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, seconded by Councillor Christine Gilligan, as an amendment, that the recommendations made by the Co-operative Executive at its meeting held on 19th January, 2022, concerning the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan and Budget 2022/23, be approved with the addition of a new paragraph (j) as follows:-
- (j) requests that the Director of Housing investigate the Energiesprong model as an approach to address the retrofit of our housing stock, ascertain if similar models exist and report back within the next 6 months to the Co-operative Executive (or an appropriate Committee under the committee system).
- 5.4 After contributions from five other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Cate McDonald, the amendment moved by Councillor Mark Jones was put to the vote and was carried.
- 5.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was then put to the vote and was also carried.
- 5.6 The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2022/23 is approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget 2022/23, as set out in the financial appendix to the report, is approved;
- (c) rents for council dwellings are increased by 4.1% from April 2022 in line with the Regulator of Social Housing's Rent Standard;
- (d) rents for temporary accommodation are increased by 4.1% for 2022/23;
- (e) garage rents for garage plots and garage sites are increased by 4.1% from April 2022;
- (f) the community heating kWh unit charge is increased from 3.04 pence to 5.69 pence from April 2022, and the standing charge is also increased from £4.80 to £4.90 per week from April 2022;
- (g) the sheltered housing charge is increased by 3.1% for 2022/23;
- (h) the burglar alarm charge is increased by 3.1% for 2022/23;
- (i) the furnished accommodation charge is increased by 3.1% for 2022/23;
- (j) this Council welcomes the 5 year investment programme commitment to bringing all council homes up to EPC level C, but commits to develop, by

Spring 2022, a 'road map' to show how we not only can get our homes to EPC C, as quickly as possible, but for a deliverable vision and timetable by which we can get to net zero for the Council's housing stock;

- (k) this Council believes that this road map needs to encompass a forward thinking approach, open to new ideas and technologies, in how to deliver this – looking at everything from retrofitting, heat pumps, insulated rooftops with solar panels – to name just a few examples;
- (l) this Council believes that Energiesprong may have a part to play within this, but so too may other organisations, and that once a robust roadmap has been devised we can really engage with the market to ensure deliverability and to rise to the challenges successfully;
- (m) this Council believes that, ultimately, council tenants need to be consulted on any changes and that action can only be undertaken with their backing; and
- (n) this Council requests that the Director of Housing investigate the Energiesprong model as an approach to address the retrofit of our housing stock, ascertain if similar models exist and report back within the next 6 months to the Co-operative Executive (or an appropriate Committee under the committee system).

6. SHEFFIELD (LOCAL) PLAN SPATIAL OPTIONS

- 6.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Gail Smith) reported that this item of business was to provide to the Co-operative Executive, the Council's view on whether Option 3 or one of the other four options should be the preferred overall spatial option taken forward in the Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Sheffield Plan, as set out in the report of the Executive Director, Place, published with the agenda for the meeting.
- 6.2 It was moved by Councillor Mark Jones, and seconded by Councillor Martin Smith, that this Council agrees with the advice provided by the Climate Change, Economy and Development Transitional Committee and recommends Option 3 as the preferred overall spatial option that should be taken forward in the Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Sheffield Plan.
- 6.3 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Dianne Hurst, seconded by Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs, as an amendment, that the motion now submitted be amended by the insertion of "(a)" after the words "That this Council", and the addition of the following paragraphs:-
 - (b) commends the cross-party work of the Climate Change, Economy and Development Transitional Committee for their work on the Local Plan Spatial Options, and notes the general consensus supporting the

Administration's approach;

- (c) notes that under the national legislation imposed on councils by government, many areas across the country have been forced to build on green belt over recent years, but that due to the importance of protecting green spaces, in 2019/20 the Council undertook detailed work and widespread public consultation to look at how the development of new homes in central Sheffield could be maximised;
- (d) believes that the approach laid out by the previous Administration would have delivered the housing requirement of 40,000 new homes, as determined by government at the time;
- (e) regrets that despite this substantial consultation with Sheffield citizens, the current Government took the decision in December 2020 to increase Sheffield's housing target by 35%;
- (f) believes that this decision was not even remotely evidence based, and that this number is far too high and that Sheffield, like many northern areas, saw such a high uplift in housing target as a means to protect the green belt in the South of England – the majority of which falls within Conservative-led local authority areas;
- (g) believes that this was a blatant disregard for the people of Sheffield, with the Government putting different rules to our city, than that of the south of England, and notes that this uplift has caused further delay to the process of determining Sheffield's Local Plan;
- (h) notes that the previous, and current, Administration has repeatedly challenged the Government on the high housing target and, whilst accepting that we must deliver a local plan for the city, believes that what is finally delivered must work in the interests of Sheffield;
- (i) believes that, on balance, Option 3 is the right spatial approach for Sheffield, which would utilise brownfield sites throughout the city, as well as delivering homes in sustainable and connected places;
- (j) notes the support for Option 3 from Campaign To Protect Rural England (Peak District and South Yorkshire) in their media statement (12 January 2022) "The re-use of a very small number of derelict brownfield sites in the Green Belt, in sustainable locations at the edge of the urban area (as outlined in the Council's 'Option 3') may be a way forward that helps meet Sheffield's realistic housing needs rather than the Government's target"; and
- (k) believes that the Local Plan is about much more than housing alone – and that the strategy needs to be rooted in how new housing fits in with communities, infrastructure development, connectivity, green spaces and ecology, and lead to prosperous, well-connected, sustainable communities, as well as bringing economic growth (more jobs and higher

wages) and that the Local Plan must be flexible enough to deliver on these aims and to link intrinsically with other council strategies.

6.4 It was then moved by Councillor Paul Turpin, seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, 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) recommends Option 4 as the preferred overall spatial option that should be taken forward in the Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Sheffield Plan, which would allow a very small amount of greenbelt land to be developed with the security of very strong and robust site selection criteria; and
- (b) believes a Local Plan should:-
 - (i) recognise that some urban green sites are of higher ecological and social value than some Greenbelt sites;
 - (ii) aim to green the Greenbelt further;
 - (iii) by accepting very small amounts of development in the Greenbelt, provide a greater range of housing, such as family accommodation, and improve public transport and services that will benefit communities and tackle rural poverty; and that these sites should be decided using a robust and strict Site Selection Criteria model; and
 - (iv) ensure areas designated as brownfield within, surrounded by or close to Green Belt land are carefully assessed as to their current status, and where rewilding has taken place, they should be re-designated as greenfield, so as to enhance the Greenbelt.

6.5 It was then moved by Councillor Lewis Chinchon, and formally seconded by the Lord Mayor (Councillor Gail Smith), as an amendment, that the motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council", and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) believes that elected members should listen to the people of Sheffield when deciding where new homes are built;
- (b) notes that during the consultation on the Sheffield Plan Issues and Options document in September/October 2020, the people of Sheffield were strongly against development on low quality urban greenspace and Green Belt land, and supported the reuse of brownfield sites;
- (c) believes that Option 1 (a brownfield-only approach) is the only option that delivers on this;
- (d) notes that all other options involve building on undeveloped land and/or

the Green Belt;

(e) believes that this would put sites similar to Hollin Busk in Deepcar at risk; and

(f) therefore, proposes that Option 1 be the preferred overall spatial option taken forward in the Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Sheffield Plan.

6.6 After contributions from nine other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Mark Jones, the amendment moved by Councillor Dianne Hurst was put to the vote and was carried.

6.6.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Ann Woolhouse, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Kevin Oxley, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Richard Williams, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery and Ann Whitaker voted for paragraph (i) and abstained from voting on paragraphs (b) to (h), (j) and (k) of the amendment moved by Councillor Dianne Hurst, and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Alexi Dimond, Paul Turpin, Christine Gilligan, Peter Garbutt, Alison Teal and Bernard Little voted for paragraphs (b) to (h), (j) and (k), and voted against paragraph (i) of the amendment moved by Councillor Dianne Hurst, and asked for this to be recorded.)

6.7 The amendment moved by Councillor Paul Turpin was then put to the vote and paragraph (a) was negatived and paragraph (b) of the amendment was carried.

6.7.1 The votes on the amendment moved by Councillor Paul Turpin were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For paragraph (a) of the amendment (12) - Councillors Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Alexi Dimond, Paul Turpin, Christine Gilligan, Peter Garbutt, Alison Teal and Bernard Little.

Against paragraph (a) of the amendment (56) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ann Woolhouse, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Mohammed Mahroof, Ruth Milsom, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Moya O'Rourke, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Fran

Belbin, Abdul Khayum, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Cate McDonald, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Anne Murphy, Tony Downing, Kevin Oxley, Ben Miskell, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Richard Williams, Lewis Chinchin, Francyne Johnson, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery, Ann Whitaker, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Abstained from voting on paragraph (a) of the amendment (1)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Gail Smith).

For paragraph (b) of the amendment (41)

- The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) and Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Kaltum Rivers, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Ruth Milsom, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Moya O'Rourke, Fran Belbin, Abdul Khayum,, Alexi Dimond, Cate McDonald, Paul Turpin, Christine Gilligan, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Anne Murphy, Tony Downing, Peter Garbutt, Alison Teal, Ben Miskell, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Francyne Johnson, Bernard Little, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against paragraph (b) of the amendment (27)

- Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Ann Woolhouse, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Kevin Oxley, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Richard Williams, Lewis Chinchin, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery and Ann Whitaker.

Abstained from voting on paragraph (b) of the amendment (1)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Gail Smith).

6.8 The amendment moved by Councillor Lewis Chinchin was then put to the vote and was negatived.

- 6.8.1 (NOTE: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Ann Woolhouse, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Kevin Oxley, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Richard Williams, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery and Ann Whitaker voted for paragraphs (a) and (b) and voted against paragraphs (c) to (f) of the amendment moved by Councillor Lewis Chichen, and asked for this to be recorded.)
- 6.9 The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) agrees with the advice provided by the Climate Change, Economy and Development Transitional Committee and recommends Option 3 as the preferred overall spatial option that should be taken forward in the Publication (Pre-Submission) Draft Sheffield Plan;
- (b) commends the cross-party work of the Climate Change, Economy and Development Transitional Committee for their work on the Local Plan Spatial Options, and notes the general consensus supporting the Administration's approach;
- (c) notes that under the national legislation imposed on councils by government, many areas across the country have been forced to build on green belt over recent years, but that due to the importance of protecting green spaces, in 2019/20 the Council undertook detailed work and widespread public consultation to look at how the development of new homes in central Sheffield could be maximised;
- (d) believes that the approach laid out by the previous Administration would have delivered the housing requirement of 40,000 new homes, as determined by government at the time;
- (e) regrets that despite this substantial consultation with Sheffield citizens, the current Government took the decision in December 2020 to increase Sheffield's housing target by 35%;
- (f) believes that this decision was not even remotely evidence based, and that this number is far too high and that Sheffield, like many northern areas, saw such a high uplift in housing target as a means to protect the green belt in the South of England – the majority of which falls within Conservative-led local authority areas;
- (g) believes that this was a blatant disregard for the people of Sheffield, with the Government putting different rules to our city, than that of the south of England, and notes that this uplift has caused further delay to the

process of determining Sheffield's Local Plan;

- (h) notes that the previous, and current, Administration has repeatedly challenged the Government on the high housing target and, whilst accepting that we must deliver a local plan for the city, believes that what is finally delivered must work in the interests of Sheffield;
- (i) believes that, on balance, Option 3 is the right spatial approach for Sheffield, which would utilise brownfield sites throughout the city, as well as delivering homes in sustainable and connected places;
- (j) notes the support for Option 3 from Campaign To Protect Rural England (Peak District and South Yorkshire) in their media statement (12 January 2022) "The re-use of a very small number of derelict brownfield sites in the Green Belt, in sustainable locations at the edge of the urban area (as outlined in the Council's 'Option 3') may be a way forward that helps meet Sheffield's realistic housing needs rather than the Government's target";
- (k) believes that the Local Plan is about much more than housing alone – and that the strategy needs to be rooted in how new housing fits in with communities, infrastructure development, connectivity, green spaces and ecology, and lead to prosperous, well-connected, sustainable communities, as well as bringing economic growth (more jobs and higher wages) and that the Local Plan must be flexible enough to deliver on these aims and to link intrinsically with other council strategies; and
- (l) believes a Local Plan should:-
 - (i) recognise that some urban green sites are of higher ecological and social value than some Greenbelt sites;
 - (ii) aim to green the Greenbelt further;
 - (iii) by accepting very small amounts of development in the Greenbelt, provide a greater range of housing, such as family accommodation, and improve public transport and services that will benefit communities and tackle rural poverty; and that these sites should be decided using a robust and strict Site Selection Criteria model; and
 - (iv) ensure areas designated as brownfield within, surrounded by or close to Green Belt land are carefully assessed as to their current status, and where rewilding has taken place, they should be re-designated as greenfield, so as to enhance the Greenbelt.

6.9.1 (NOTE: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Ann Woolhouse, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq

Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Kevin Oxley, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Richard Williams, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery and Ann Whitaker voted for paragraphs (a) to (k) and against paragraph (l) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

(NOTE: In recognition of the meeting having been adjourned soon after the start of the proceedings whilst a Member of the Council received medical assistance, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Gail Smith) used her discretion and removed the 25-minute time limit for the item on the Sheffield (Local) Plan Spatial Options and extended the duration of the meeting by 25 minutes, to 5.55 p.m.).

7. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "GETTING ON THE ROAD TO BUS FRANCHISING" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR TERRY FOX AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR JOSIE PASZEK

7.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Tony Downing, and formally seconded by Councillor Josie Paszek, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that the previous Administration has consistently, and repeatedly, called for the South Yorkshire Mayor to start the process of bus franchising;
- (b) welcomes the announcement in January 2022 from South Yorkshire Mayor, Dan Jarvis, that the Mayoral Combined Authority (MCA) would consider whether Franchising should be considered in further detail;
- (c) notes that a franchising model would give South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) the powers to set routes, timetables and fares - which are then managed through tenders to operators - but that all of the costs and risks associated with service delivery would rest with SYMCA under this option;
- (d) believes, therefore, that as part of this process the financial implications must be clarified as to what impact this will have on the Council's finances and on the city's taxpayers, and that SYMCA should conduct a Franchising Scheme Assessment (FSA) to consider the legal, financial, and operational case for moving away from a commercial bus network to a Franchised network;
- (e) notes that the MCA have estimated that developing a Franchising Scheme Assessment could cost around £4-5 million and take 3-4 years to complete;
- (f) believes, therefore, that this decision should not be taken lightly due to the cost impacts but that, ultimately, Sheffield's transport offer is simply not

good enough and radical action is required to get the service to where it should be for Sheffield; and

- (g) notes that Franchising is no panacea to the problem of poor 'public' transport, with sustained government underfunding and privatisation the root problem, but that franchising may provide a crucial step in the right direction of reform.

7.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and formally seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

- 1. in paragraph (a), the substitution of the words "previous Administration has" by the words "Liberal Democrats and Labour in Sheffield have";

2. the addition of new paragraphs (h) to (k) as follows:-

- (h) notes the long record of previous Labour Administrations of entering into bus partnership agreements and consistently defending the Sheffield Bus Partnership Agreement as a "good deal for Sheffield";

- (i) further notes how this contrasts with the refusal of Liberal Democrats in Administration to sanction bus service cuts;

- (j) notes that at the December 2021 meeting of this Council a motion on this subject was passed; and

- (k) believes, therefore, that this Council's Executive needs to 'get on with it' and take action now to bring in franchising for Sheffield's public transport, working with the metro Mayor and his successor to do so, rather than simply talking about it.

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

- 1. the addition of a new paragraph (b) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (b) to (g) as new paragraphs (c) to (h):-

- (b) notes with disappointment that, despite the apparent cross-party support for it over many years, the Labour-controlled Combined Authority has not yet taken any real steps towards bus franchising;

2. the addition of new paragraphs (i) to (w) as follows:-

- (i) notes that in Greater Manchester, 87% of the costs of transitioning to franchising are expected to be met through Combined Authority funding, limiting the additional burden on local councils;

- (j) believes that for buses to offer a fast and reliable alternative to private car usage, greater road priority needs to be given to buses;
- (k) believes that whilst the funding and delivery of Connecting Sheffield schemes are important for this, more needs to be done in addition to this to improve public and active transport infrastructure;
- (l) notes that millions of pounds could be raised per year, ring-fenced for transport improvements, through a Workplace Parking Levy (WPL) for medium and large employers, and that in Nottingham this raised £64m for transport improvements in its first seven years;
- (m) notes that a WPL works by charging employers who decide to offer parking to staff with cars a set charge per parking space, with the safeguard of a 100% discount for all employers with 10 or fewer parking spaces;
- (n) notes that the charge per liable car parking space is currently £428 a year in Nottingham, equivalent to a charge of £1.17 per day for a car parking space;
- (o) notes that exemptions to local emergency services, NHS frontline staff and blue badge parking can be set;
- (p) notes that Nottingham was able to extend its tramline, more than doubling its network, due to matched funding thanks to the WPL;
- (q) notes that grants of up to £25,000 to businesses to improve their cycling and walking, public transport and ultra low emission vehicle infrastructure are available in Nottingham, funded by the WPL;
- (r) believes that all groups have shown support for "implementing" the commissioned Arup report on "Pathways to Zero Carbon in Sheffield";
- (s) believes that investing the millions of pounds that could be generated a year through a WPL into active and public transport would be a real boost for the city: for the health and well-being of residents, in reducing our carbon footprint and air pollution and to the city's economy, with retail and businesses benefiting from the improved links;
- (t) believes that implementing a workplace parking levy and using the funds raised to improve public and active transport infrastructure is precisely the kind of policy called for in the Arup report's prioritised action to "Revolutionise transport patterns";
- (u) notes the Arup report highlights how solely relying on the transition of cars to electric should not be seen as the way forward, as this will not deliver the health, congestion, road safety, air quality or

economic benefits that improvements to active and public transport would;

- (v) notes that Nottingham City Council have a blueprint of how a WPL can be delivered due to their work, and are able to assist with the design, delivery and, optionally, the running of the levy; and
- (w) requests the Administration to take steps to implement a Workplace Parking Levy, starting by producing a report to be presented to the Co-operative Executive (or an appropriate Committee under the committee system), to enable greater investment in public and active transport, which is crucial in decarbonising our city and achieving our aims to be net zero by 2030.

7.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed was put to the vote and was negated.

7.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Ruth Mersereau was then put to the vote and Part 1 was carried and Part 2 was negated.

7.5.1 (NOTE: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Ann Woolhouse, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Kevin Oxley, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Richard Williams, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery and Ann Whitaker voted for Part 1 and voted against Part 2 of the amendment moved by Councillor Ruth Mersereau, and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that the previous Administration has consistently, and repeatedly, called for the South Yorkshire Mayor to start the process of bus franchising;
- (b) notes with disappointment that, despite the apparent cross-party support for it over many years, the Labour-controlled Combined Authority has not yet taken any real steps towards bus franchising;
- (c) welcomes the announcement in January 2022 from South Yorkshire Mayor, Dan Jarvis, that the Mayoral Combined Authority (MCA) would consider whether Franchising should be considered in further detail;
- (d) notes that a franchising model would give South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority (SYMCA) the powers to set routes, timetables and

fares - which are then managed through tenders to operators - but that all of the costs and risks associated with service delivery would rest with SYMCA under this option;

- (e) believes, therefore, that as part of this process the financial implications must be clarified as to what impact this will have on the Council's finances and on the city's taxpayers, and that SYMCA should conduct a Franchising Scheme Assessment (FSA) to consider the legal, financial, and operational case for moving away from a commercial bus network to a Franchised network;
- (f) notes that the MCA have estimated that developing a Franchising Scheme Assessment could cost around £4-5 million and take 3-4 years to complete;
- (g) believes, therefore, that this decision should not be taken lightly due to the cost impacts but that, ultimately, Sheffield's transport offer is simply not good enough and radical action is required to get the service to where it should be for Sheffield; and
- (h) notes that Franchising is no panacea to the problem of poor 'public' transport, with sustained government underfunding and privatisation the root problem, but that franchising may provide a crucial step in the right direction of reform.

8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "15-MINUTE NEIGHBOURHOODS FOR SHEFFIELD" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR RICHARD SHAW AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TIM HUGGAN

8.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Richard Shaw, and formally seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, that this Council:-

- (a) acknowledges and welcomes the diverse range of neighbourhoods and settlements across the Sheffield area, believes that the Covid pandemic has served to remind us all of the range of parks, local shops and leisure facilities available in Sheffield, but recognises that access to these services is often limited by poor mobility, distance, and limited transport options;
- (b) welcomes the latest update to the Highway Code that introduces a 'hierarchy of road users', giving more responsibility to operators of motor vehicles to reduce danger towards more vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists, and includes updates and clarifications such as giving pedestrians greater priority at crossings and junctions;
- (c) believes that traditional zoning of land uses has in many cases led to limited access to services and local amenities by active travel, mass

transit or mobility aids;

- (d) therefore believes that as a Council we should work towards the concept of '15 minute neighbourhoods', reducing time and distance to access services; meaning residents should have within a 15-minute journey via foot, cycle or other mobility aid from their home: living, working, commerce, healthcare, education, entertainment, parks and green spaces;
- (e) notes that 15-minute neighbourhoods concept would also support regeneration of district centres and local and independent businesses, something this Council wishes to see across Sheffield;
- (f) believes that the Council's recently established Local Area Committees provide a great way to work to establish 15-minute neighbourhoods, designed by local communities from the bottom up and believes that Local Area Committees need to be empowered to identify where zoning rules can be changed to make work and leisure sites more accessible to local residents;
- (g) believes the creation of vibrant district centres and neighbourhoods would be supported by greater local retention of the neighbourhood portion of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);
- (h) notes the EU Objective One investment in 2007 to break up the Parson Cross estate and create hubs around community facilities and shopping centres, which could have led to the creation of 15-minute neighbourhoods, and believes regrettably that the previous Administration did not have the vision to use CIL to enhance the local centres, improve active travel and reduce car dependency;
- (i) believes that the building of up to 2,500 houses in Attercliffe, using the Council's Compulsory Purchase Order powers if necessary, should be used as an example of how to deliver 15-minute neighbourhoods;
- (j) believes that 15-minute neighbourhoods will also benefit our environment, reducing the reliance on cars for many residents, helping Sheffield reach its goal of being carbon neutral by 2030, alongside the switch to electric vehicles and the decarbonisation of the electricity supply;
- (k) believes that the principles behind 15-minute neighbourhoods could also be adapted to benefit our rural communities by improving access to basic services and amenities;
- (l) acknowledges some of our city's current policies are a good step towards this, such as the low traffic neighbourhoods where appropriate, but believes that the Council needs to do more to encourage short journeys being made by foot, bicycle, or mobility aids such as wheelchairs and mobility scooters;

- (m) believes we must also recognise that there are many physical and psychological barriers to travel that encourage car dependency, such as lack of pedestrian crossings and dropped kerbs and a lack of joined-up segregated cycle routes, and that we must tackle issues such as these so many more people can easily access essential services and amenities safely and conveniently;
- (n) recognises that active travel options are not always possible for many people with mobility impairments and that provision for public transport and private vehicles is essential; and
- (o) notes Metro Mayor Dan Jarvis's calls to "transform our infrastructure for cycling and walking, and put in place the building blocks for compact and liveable 15 minute neighbourhoods" and therefore calls on him and his successor to act on this and work with the City Council to make 15-minute neighbourhoods a reality across our area.

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

- (a) notes that delivering 15-minute neighbourhoods is not something new for the Council, and that this is something the Co-operative Administration is committed to;
- (b) notes the premise of the Connecting Sheffield Programme is to provide a step change in the ability for people to feel comfortable using active travel, which directly ties into the 15-minute neighbourhood proposals whereby the barriers to use are removed, either through design or behavioural change;
- (c) notes, in addition, the use of Active Neighbourhoods and 20mph zones, policies developed under the previous Administration, are a way to further enhance localised areas by reduced through traffic and prioritising active trips within, helping to create walkable and accessible communities that connect everyday social amenities;
- (d) notes that the Co-operative Administration is continuing 'school streets' and other behavioural change programmes which help the public to understand how accessible locations are, and believes this is fundamental to achieving the objectives of a 15-minute neighbourhood;
- (e) believes that the 15-minute neighbourhood theory was effectively incorporated into the current Transport Strategy, developed by the previous Administration, though it was not specifically called 15-minute neighbourhoods, the idea behind the strategy was of creating communities that do not rely on the private car, and integrated with the right services, in the right location with the right connections;

- (f) notes, therefore, that this is all part of planning policy, as well as more broader transport planning and, therefore, at the forefront of future policy development;
- (g) notes that the key principles of 15-minute neighbourhoods are embedded in the Local Plan – to support connected neighbourhoods where people can meet their everyday needs within a short walk, cycle or trip by public transport, variously referred to as 20-minute neighbourhoods (meaning a 10 minute journey and return), and 15-minute cities, the core benefits include improving health and well-being, increasing connections, tackling the climate crisis and boosting local economies;
- (h) notes that draft policies in the Local Plan will include a range of measures that underpin the principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods, and in particular believes that the Local Plan should include a policy that details the 20-minute neighbourhood approach in relation to access to key local services and community facilities for new residential developments;
- (i) believes that the ambition in the draft Local Plan is for new residential developments within ‘easy walking distance’ of a shop and other types of community facilities, as well as a minimum service frequency public transport stop and, in addition to this, new homes will have to be within a specified maximum travelling time by cycle or public transport to a primary health care centre, as well as a primary school and a secondary school;
- (j) notes that a critical component of the Local Plan is the focus on delivering homes in the Central Area, and the role of the emerging City Centre Strategic Plan is to maximise delivery of new homes; ensuring that new and growing communities evolve sustainably to make best use of this highly accessible location;
- (k) believes that the Local Plan will maximise new housing delivery in sustainable urban locations, including Attercliffe which has significant potential to be an important location for growth over the Local Plan period and beyond, with opportunities to draw on existing public transport and active travel connectivity in that area and, with a greater focus on the role of Attercliffe as a centre, will support delivery of a more sustainable neighbourhood utilising the principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods;
- (l) notes the support given to the city’s district centres via the £2 million budget amendment proposed by the previous Administration, and notes that this helped projects in Hillsborough, Firth Park, Walkley, Broomhill, Mosborough, Totley and Chapelton, and that opposition parties at the time voted against this investment;
- (m) believes that district centres play a crucial role within the concept of 15-minute neighbourhoods and that their continued development is essential to the future prosperity of Sheffield as we recover from the pandemic; and
- (n) believes that the Local Area Committees must play an important part in

the development of 15-minute neighbourhoods, and delivering services locally, and helping to make sure our staff work more closely in the communities they serve.

8.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Paul Turpin, and formally seconded by Councillor Brian Holmshaw, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of a new paragraph (b) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (b) to (o) as new paragraphs (c) to (p):-

(b) believes that Option 4 in the Local Plan spatial options will best protect our urban green spaces, which are not only some of the green spaces of highest ecological value but are also the spaces with the highest social value as they are situated where people live;

2. the addition of a new paragraph (q) as follows:-

(q) requests the Administration to:-

(i) promote and celebrate the changes to the Highway Code hierarchy of road users; and

(ii) ensure designs for new housing must include schools, shops, services and open green space; and be carbon-neutral.

8.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal was put to the vote and was carried on the basis that the paragraphs in the amendment [paragraphs (a) to (n)] were not to replace paragraphs (a) to (o) of the Motion but instead were to be additional paragraphs to those in the Motion.

8.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Paul Turpin was then put to the vote and paragraph (q)(i) of Part 2 of the amendment was carried and Part 1 and paragraph (q)(ii) of Part 2 of the amendment were negatived.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) acknowledges and welcomes the diverse range of neighbourhoods and settlements across the Sheffield area, believes that the Covid pandemic has served to remind us all of the range of parks, local shops and leisure facilities available in Sheffield, but recognises that access to these services is often limited by poor mobility, distance, and limited transport options;

(b) welcomes the latest update to the Highway Code that introduces a

- 'hierarchy of road users', giving more responsibility to operators of motor vehicles to reduce danger towards more vulnerable road users such as pedestrians and cyclists, and includes updates and clarifications such as giving pedestrians greater priority at crossings and junctions;
- (c) believes that traditional zoning of land uses has in many cases led to limited access to services and local amenities by active travel, mass transit or mobility aids;
 - (d) therefore believes that as a Council we should work towards the concept of '15 minute neighbourhoods', reducing time and distance to access services; meaning residents should have within a 15-minute journey via foot, cycle or other mobility aid from their home: living, working, commerce, healthcare, education, entertainment, parks and green spaces;
 - (e) notes that 15-minute neighbourhoods concept would also support regeneration of district centres and local and independent businesses, something this Council wishes to see across Sheffield;
 - (f) believes that the Council's recently established Local Area Committees provide a great way to work to establish 15-minute neighbourhoods, designed by local communities from the bottom up and believes that Local Area Committees need to be empowered to identify where zoning rules can be changed to make work and leisure sites more accessible to local residents;
 - (g) believes the creation of vibrant district centres and neighbourhoods would be supported by greater local retention of the neighbourhood portion of Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);
 - (h) notes the EU Objective One investment in 2007 to break up the Parson Cross estate and create hubs around community facilities and shopping centres, which could have led to the creation of 15-minute neighbourhoods, and believes regretfully that the previous Administration did not have the vision to use CIL to enhance the local centres, improve active travel and reduce car dependency;
 - (i) believes that the building of up to 2,500 houses in Attercliffe, using the Council's Compulsory Purchase Order powers if necessary, should be used as an example of how to deliver 15-minute neighbourhoods;
 - (j) believes that 15-minute neighbourhoods will also benefit our environment, reducing the reliance on cars for many residents, helping Sheffield reach its goal of being carbon neutral by 2030, alongside the switch to electric vehicles and the decarbonisation of the electricity supply;
 - (k) believes that the principles behind 15-minute neighbourhoods could also be adapted to benefit our rural communities by improving access to basic services and amenities;

- (l) acknowledges some of our city's current policies are a good step towards this, such as the low traffic neighbourhoods where appropriate, but believes that the Council needs to do more to encourage short journeys being made by foot, bicycle, or mobility aids such as wheelchairs and mobility scooters;
- (m) believes we must also recognise that there are many physical and psychological barriers to travel that encourage car dependency, such as lack of pedestrian crossings and dropped kerbs and a lack of joined-up segregated cycle routes, and that we must tackle issues such as these so many more people can easily access essential services and amenities safely and conveniently;
- (n) recognises that active travel options are not always possible for many people with mobility impairments and that provision for public transport and private vehicles is essential;
- (o) notes Metro Mayor Dan Jarvis's calls to "transform our infrastructure for cycling and walking, and put in place the building blocks for compact and liveable 15-minute neighbourhoods" and therefore calls on him and his successor to act on this and work with the City Council to make 15-minute neighbourhoods a reality across our area;
- (p) notes that delivering 15-minute neighbourhoods is not something new for the Council, and that this is something the Co-operative Administration is committed to;
- (q) notes the premise of the Connecting Sheffield Programme is to provide a step change in the ability for people to feel comfortable using active travel, which directly ties into the 15-minute neighbourhood proposals whereby the barriers to use are removed, either through design or behavioural change;
- (r) notes, in addition, the use of Active Neighbourhoods and 20mph zones, policies developed under the previous Administration, are a way to further enhance localised areas by reduced through traffic and prioritising active trips within, helping to create walkable and accessible communities that connect everyday social amenities;
- (s) notes that the Co-operative Administration is continuing 'school streets' and other behavioural change programmes which help the public to understand how accessible locations are, and believes this is fundamental to achieving the objectives of a 15-minute neighbourhood;
- (t) believes that the 15-minute neighbourhood theory was effectively incorporated into the current Transport Strategy, developed by the previous Administration, though it was not specifically called 15-minute neighbourhoods, the idea behind the strategy was of creating communities that do not rely on the private car, and integrated with the

- right services, in the right location with the right connections;
- (u) notes, therefore, that this is all part of planning policy, as well as more broader transport planning and, therefore, at the forefront of future policy development;
 - (v) notes that the key principles of 15-minute neighbourhoods are embedded in the Local Plan – to support connected neighbourhoods where people can meet their everyday needs within a short walk, cycle or trip by public transport, variously referred to as 20-minute neighbourhoods (meaning a 10 minute journey and return), and 15-minute cities, the core benefits include improving health and well-being, increasing connections, tackling the climate crisis and boosting local economies;
 - (w) notes that draft policies in the Local Plan will include a range of measures that underpin the principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods, and in particular believes that the Local Plan should include a policy that details the 20-minute neighbourhood approach in relation to access to key local services and community facilities for new residential developments;
 - (x) believes that the ambition in the draft Local Plan is for new residential developments within ‘easy walking distance’ of a shop and other types of community facilities, as well as a minimum service frequency public transport stop and, in addition to this, new homes will have to be within a specified maximum travelling time by cycle or public transport to a primary health care centre, as well as a primary school and a secondary school;
 - (y) notes that a critical component of the Local Plan is the focus on delivering homes in the Central Area, and the role of the emerging City Centre Strategic Plan is to maximise delivery of new homes; ensuring that new and growing communities evolve sustainably to make best use of this highly accessible location;
 - (z) believes that the Local Plan will maximise new housing delivery in sustainable urban locations, including Attercliffe which has significant potential to be an important location for growth over the Local Plan period and beyond, with opportunities to draw on existing public transport and active travel connectivity in that area and, with a greater focus on the role of Attercliffe as a centre, will support delivery of a more sustainable neighbourhood utilising the principles of 20-minute neighbourhoods;
 - (aa) notes the support given to the city’s district centres via the £2 million budget amendment proposed by the previous Administration, and notes that this helped projects in Hillsborough, Firth Park, Walkley, Broomhill, Mosborough, Totley and Chapeltown, and that opposition parties at the time voted against this investment;
 - (bb) believes that district centres play a crucial role within the concept of 15-minute neighbourhoods and that their continued development is essential to the future prosperity of Sheffield as we recover from the pandemic;

- (cc) believes that the Local Area Committees must play an important part in the development of 15-minute neighbourhoods, and delivering services locally, and helping to make sure our staff work more closely in the communities they serve; and
- (dd) requests the Administration to promote and celebrate the changes to the Highway Code hierarchy of road users.

8.6.1 (NOTE: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Ann Woolhouse, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Kevin Oxley, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Richard Williams, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery and Ann Whitaker voted for paragraphs (a) to (o), abstained from voting on paragraphs (p) to (cc), and voted against paragraph (dd) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

9. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "NET ZERO ENERGY HOMES FOR SHEFFIELD" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS JOHNSON AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CHRISTINE GILLIGAN

9.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and formally seconded by Councillor Christine Gilligan:-

That this Council notes:-

- (a) the proposed 87% increase in community heating charges in the Housing Revenue Account from 3.04p to 5.69p per unit, with further increases mooted, and the consequent impact on those tenants on the lowest incomes;
- (b) the significant difficulties delivering retrofit solutions to make homes energy efficient due to a severe lack of skills and capacity in the energy efficiency sector, and that, conversely, there is real potential for training to help create new skilled jobs;
- (c) in May 2020 the charity, National Energy Action, estimated that 1 in 10 households in the Sheffield Area were in Fuel Poverty; with huge price hikes expected in energy bills, this is going to get significantly worse, and only through energy efficiency schemes that significantly reduce energy demand will householders be protected from the fluctuations of volatile energy markets;
- (d) achieving a zero carbon Sheffield by 2030 will require the Council to develop a viable way of reducing emissions at scale in the built environment while ensuring warm, healthy homes that are affordable to

heat;

- (e) the work being carried out by a number of councils in the Retrofit Accelerator Homes Innovation Partnership using the Energiesprong method (first developed in The Netherlands) to retrofit homes in around a day;
- (f) the Retrofit Accelerator Homes Innovation Partnership provides a way for councils, and other social housing providers, to collaborate, share information, procure and jointly bid for government and other funding streams;
- (g) that Energiesprong, a not-for-profit company, works with local councils on developing a programme to deliver warmer homes through a retrofit programme delivering a home which is net zero energy, meaning it generates the total amount of energy required for its heating, hot water and electrical appliances; it also provides superior indoor comfort; this is achieved using bespoke prefabricated facades, insulated rooftops with solar panels, smart heating, and ventilation and cooling installations, and a refurbishment comes with a long-year performance warranty on both the indoor climate and the energy performance for up to 40 years;
- (h) Energiesprong are not contractors themselves but work with councils to help procure contractors to deliver to the Energiesprong specification;
- (i) the Energiesprong finance model for the Council is viable due to the reduction in future costs to the Council due to less boiler replacement and servicing costs, improvements to the property guaranteed for 40 years; there is also a “comfort charge” to tenants which, when added to their new energy bill, following refurbishment, will be less than their current energy bill, and this is guaranteed so tenants can not be required to pay more than they would without the scheme;
- (j) there is a significant opportunity for Sheffield to develop a manufacturing facility to deliver energiesprong components for the South Yorkshire Region, creating jobs and skills in the region, and providing for a pipeline to deliver retrofitted homes; and

That this Council resolves:-

- (k) to request the Administration to consider developing an approach to a Partnership with Energiesprong and the Retrofit Accelerator Homes Innovation Partnership to begin the retrofit to net zero energy standard of the Council’s Housing stock and to start building the capacity needed to deliver an Energiesprong offer to the wider housing sector.

9.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, and formally seconded by Councillor Peter Price, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (e) as follows:-
 - (b) that the sharp rise in utility prices worldwide has meant that the overall cost for gas and electricity has risen significantly, with wholesale energy prices being at the highest they have been in a long time, and there is still a lot of uncertainty about the ongoing costs in the months ahead;
 - (c) that there are two parts to the district heating charges: a weekly standing charge, this essentially covers the fixed costs in providing heating and hot water, e.g. system heat losses, management and administration costs including billing, taking payments, IT, and data handling costs etc and, secondly, a kWh unit charge for metered units consumed in homes;
 - (d) that the standing charge is increasing by 2% to cover the inflation cost, from £4.80 to £4.90, and that the kWh charge changing from 3.04p to 5.69p is a direct impact of the increase in the purchase price for both gas and electricity;
 - (e) that moving from fixed rate charges in 2014 to meters has saved money for tenants, with the saving up until this year being on average 30% less than the original flat rate charges that were in place;
 2. the re-lettering of original paragraphs (b) to (k) as new paragraphs (f) to (o); and
 3. the addition of new paragraphs (p) to (r) as follows:-
 - (p) believes that whilst Energiesprong may have a part to play in getting housing stock to net zero, so too may other organisations, and that once a robust 'roadmap' has been devised (by Spring 2022) we can really engage with the market to ensure deliverability and to rise to the challenges successfully;
 - (q) reaffirms the HRA's 5-year investment programme commitment to bringing all council homes up to EPC level C, and commits to developing a 'road map' to show how we not only can get our homes to EPC C as quickly as possible, but for a deliverable vision and timetable by which we can get to net zero for the Council's housing stock; and
 - (r) believes that, ultimately, council tenants need to be consulted on any changes and that action can only be undertaken with their backing.
- 9.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Barbara Masters, and formally seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of new paragraphs (k) to (m) as follows:-
 - (k) that, however, the Energiesprong method is a very expensive form of retrofitting and that it will not be suitable for all housing stock in Sheffield;
 - (l) furthermore, that it would only be possible to retrofit a small percentage of homes each year and that, therefore, thousands are likely to remain in poorly insulated homes for years to come and will be in fuel poverty as a result of pursuing a single technological solution to retrofitting;
 - (m) that relying on one form of retrofitting will not allow us to achieve zero carbon Sheffield by 2030;
2. the deletion of original paragraph (k) and the addition of new paragraphs (n) to (q) as follows:-

That this Council resolves to ask the Administration to:-

- (n) explore a range of retrofitting solutions which can be rolled out in a shorter time frame and help more people, whilst exploring the potential use of Energiesprong;
 - (o) identify which retrofitting solutions will provide best value for money for the different types of housing stock through a cost/benefit analysis;
 - (p) improve the energy efficiency in its housing stock by scheduling retrofitting into its estate management strategy for Council-owned properties based on the findings, which may include developing an approach to a Partnership with Energiesprong and the Retrofit Accelerator Homes Innovation Partnership; and
 - (q) explore the job creation potential in the range of retrofitting solutions identified and any upskilling necessary to help reach the potential.
- 9.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards was put to the vote and was carried.
- 9.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Barbara Masters was then put to the vote and was also carried.
- 9.6 The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED:

That this Council notes:-

- (a) the proposed 87% increase in community heating charges in the Housing Revenue Account from 3.04p to 5.69p per unit, with further increases mooted, and the consequent impact on those tenants on the lowest incomes;
- (b) that the sharp rise in utility prices worldwide has meant that the overall cost for gas and electricity has risen significantly, with wholesale energy prices being at the highest they have been in a long time, and there is still a lot of uncertainty about the ongoing costs in the months ahead;
- (c) that there are two parts to the district heating charges: a weekly standing charge, this essentially covers the fixed costs in providing heating and hot water, e.g. system heat losses, management and administration costs including billing, taking payments, IT, and data handling costs etc and, secondly, a kWh unit charge for metered units consumed in homes;
- (d) that the standing charge is increasing by 2% to cover the inflation cost, from £4.80 to £4.90, and that the kWh charge changing from 3.04p to 5.69p is a direct impact of the increase in the purchase price for both gas and electricity;
- (e) that moving from fixed rate charges in 2014 to meters has saved money for tenants, with the saving up until this year being on average 30% less than the original flat rate charges that were in place;
- (f) the significant difficulties delivering retrofit solutions to make homes energy efficient due to a severe lack of skills and capacity in the energy efficiency sector, and that, conversely, there is real potential for training to help create new skilled jobs;
- (g) in May 2020 the charity, National Energy Action, estimated that 1 in 10 households in the Sheffield Area were in Fuel Poverty; with huge price hikes expected in energy bills, this is going to get significantly worse, and only through energy efficiency schemes that significantly reduce energy demand will householders be protected from the fluctuations of volatile energy markets;
- (h) achieving a zero carbon Sheffield by 2030 will require the Council to develop a viable way of reducing emissions at scale in the built environment while ensuring warm, healthy homes that are affordable to heat;
- (i) the work being carried out by a number of councils in the Retrofit Accelerator Homes Innovation Partnership using the Energiesprong method (first developed in The Netherlands) to retrofit homes in around a day;

- (j) the Retrofit Accelerator Homes Innovation Partnership provides a way for councils, and other social housing providers, to collaborate, share information, procure and jointly bid for government and other funding streams;
- (k) that Energiesprong, a not-for-profit company, works with local councils on developing a programme to deliver warmer homes through a retrofit programme delivering a home which is net zero energy, meaning it generates the total amount of energy required for its heating, hot water and electrical appliances; it also provides superior indoor comfort; this is achieved using bespoke prefabricated facades, insulated rooftops with solar panels, smart heating, and ventilation and cooling installations, and a refurbishment comes with a long-year performance warranty on both the indoor climate and the energy performance for up to 40 years;
- (l) Energiesprong are not contractors themselves but work with councils to help procure contractors to deliver to the Energiesprong specification;
- (m) the Energiesprong finance model for the Council is viable due to the reduction in future costs to the Council due to less boiler replacement and servicing costs, improvements to the property guaranteed for 40 years; there is also a “comfort charge” to tenants which, when added to their new energy bill, following refurbishment, will be less than their current energy bill, and this is guaranteed so tenants can not be required to pay more than they would without the scheme;
- (n) there is a significant opportunity for Sheffield to develop a manufacturing facility to deliver energiesprong components for the South Yorkshire Region, creating jobs and skills in the region, and providing for a pipeline to deliver retrofitted homes;
- (o) that, however, the Energiesprong method is a very expensive form of retrofitting and that it will not be suitable for all housing stock in Sheffield;
- (p) furthermore, that it would only be possible to retrofit a small percentage of homes each year and that, therefore, thousands are likely to remain in poorly insulated homes for years to come and will be in fuel poverty as a result of pursuing a single technological solution to retrofitting;
- (q) that relying on one form of retrofitting will not allow us to achieve zero carbon Sheffield by 2030;

That this Council:-

- (r) believes that whilst Energiesprong may have a part to play in getting housing stock to net zero, so too may other organisations, and that once a robust ‘roadmap’ has been devised (by Spring 2022) we can really engage with the market to ensure deliverability and to rise to the challenges successfully;

- (s) reaffirms the HRA's 5-year investment programme commitment to bringing all council homes up to EPC level C, and commits to developing a 'road map' to show how we not only can get our homes to EPC C as quickly as possible, but for a deliverable vision and timetable by which we can get to net zero for the Council's housing stock;
- (t) believes that, ultimately, council tenants need to be consulted on any changes and that action can only be undertaken with their backing

That this Council resolves to ask the Administration to:-

- (u) explore a range of retrofitting solutions which can be rolled out in a shorter time frame and help more people, whilst exploring the potential use of Energiesprong;
- (v) identify which retrofitting solutions will provide best value for money for the different types of housing stock through a cost/benefit analysis;
- (w) improve the energy efficiency in its housing stock by scheduling retrofitting into its estate management strategy for Council-owned properties based on the findings, which may include developing an approach to a Partnership with Energiesprong and the Retrofit Accelerator Homes Innovation Partnership; and
- (x) explore the job creation potential in the range of retrofitting solutions identified and any upskilling necessary to help reach the potential.

10. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "COST OF LIVING CRISIS" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR KAREN MCGOWAN AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BEN MISKELL

10.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Karen McGowan, and formally seconded by Councillor Ben Miskell, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that we are facing a cost-of-living crisis, with rising bills and ballooning prices;
- (b) notes that we have seen a decade of low growth under Conservative-led governments, and believes that this is holding back Britain and has left the national economy weakened and unable to deal with shocks;
- (c) notes that this is particularly felt in northern cities like Sheffield, leaving many of the city's residents acutely vulnerable to a worrying combination of factors – such as inflation, rocketing energy bills, increased costs for food and fuel, and the forthcoming rise to national insurance;
- (d) notes that eligibility for Free School Meal Vouchers in Sheffield is

increasing, indicating that poverty in the city is increasing, and Council Hardship funds are coming under increased pressure;

- (e) notes that a Labour government would immediately cut VAT on domestic energy bills to ease the burden on households during winter – giving a potential saving of up to £400 for many Sheffield residents – which would be paid for by a one-off windfall tax on booming oil and gas profits;
- (f) believes that we need radical long-term change to keep energy bills low in the future, and yet this Government have consistently failed to keep in check rising energy bills and have a very poor record on insulating homes and improving energy efficiency; and
- (g) believes the Government should get a grip and tackle this crisis – but instead they continue to sit back complacently; trapping us in a high-tax, low-growth economy, and rather than putting the interests of the country first they are consumed with infighting and, as such, are failing to take the decisive action needed.

10.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Mike Levery, and formally seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

- 1. the deletion of original paragraphs (b), (e), (f) and (g), and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (c) and (d) as new paragraphs (b) and (c); and
- 2. the addition of new paragraphs (d) to (j) as follows:-
 - (d) notes that the Liberal Democrats were the first to propose immediate action on domestic energy bills to ease the burden on households during winter – doubling the Warm Homes discount for the vulnerable and doubling the Winter Fuel Allowance for pensioners – which would be paid for by a one-off windfall tax on oil and gas profits;
 - (e) notes there has been no development of a long-term energy strategy to secure network resilience by successive governments since privatisation; the dash for gas in the 1990's led to significant investment in gas-fired power stations to replace coal, fossil fuel for fossil fuel, and no strategy for replacing ageing nuclear reactors;
 - (f) believes this Government needs to abandon the current competitive market on energy provision, which is based on relatively stable wholesale prices, and replace it with a regulated provision which ensures providers are sufficiently resilient to withstand wholesale price shocks, whilst maintaining customer prices index linked over an agreed period;
 - (g) notes the significant rise in food prices and shortages on the

supermarket shelves, leading to greater reliance by the poorest on food banks, and believes that the main contributory factors are:-

- (i) the second increase in January of customs declaration paperwork and increasing transport costs for foreign sourced foods, both of which lead to rising food prices;
 - (ii) the shortage of foreign workers in both the farming sector and food processing sector, leading to shortages and the inevitable price rises;
 - (iii) new trade deals where they are not back to back with previous EU trade deals, such as with Australia and New Zealand, where tariff free beef and lamb are now impacting on the British market and putting farmers' livelihoods at risk;
 - (iv) the new trade deal with Norway on fish, which has resulted in a quota reduction of 50% for the Kirkella in Hull, the last deep sea fishing trawler in the UK; and
 - (v) weakness of the pound since the Brexit referendum, and the negative impact on imported food prices;
- (h) notes the failure to resolve the Northern Ireland protocol, as shown by the resignation of Lord Frost, who failed to renegotiate the Brexit deal, and believes that any trade deal without a customs union will always lead to these problems, when the Good Friday Agreement needs to be protected;
- (i) notes the victories by the Liberal Democrats in by-elections in Chesham and Amersham, where the voters rejected building in the Green Belt, and North Shropshire where livestock farming is under threat, and believes this is showing more and more that the British public have had enough of this Government's failure to get a hold of the issues people have to face every day; and
- (j) believes the Government's "oven ready" deal is now unfolding and has led to rising food prices, and that it should revisit its failing Brexit strategy in order to protect our farmers, fishermen and the general public.

10.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Bernard Little, and formally seconded by Councillor Paul Turpin, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraph (b) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (h) as follows:-
 - (b) believes that growth in GDP, as a measure of economic success, has created a fragile economy wide open to shocks and has failed

us, in that, wealth and political power is now cascading upwards to the already super-rich;

- (c) believes that an economy based purely on economic growth is the cause of inequality rather than the cure and an Inclusive Economy - that prioritises local businesses - is one that everyone can benefit from and is the best way to address poverty and inequality through economic policy; using metrics such as healthy life expectancy and income inequality are better for society as a whole than the GDP based growth favoured by those who would see the rich get richer and the poor get poorer;
- (d) believes that growth in green industries, green spaces, leisure and hospitality, and arts and culture are things that will enrich lives and wellbeing without causing further inequality and environmental damage;
- (e) asserts that Sheffield City Council should adopt a fabric first approach to retrofitting insulation which will increase energy resilience from volatile global energy markets and reduce fuel poverty;
- (f) asserts that Sheffield City Council should stop the installation of new gas heating systems in council housing which will increase energy resilience from volatile global energy markets and reduce fuel poverty for tenants;
- (g) believes that one off payments from government grants to cover energy bills is a subsidy to the fossil fuel industry and while it is an essential sticking plaster for those facing a cost of living crisis, more needs to be done to tackle the long term problems caused by reliance on fossil fuels;
- (h) believes that the business-as-usual economic path we are on is a political choice: that an economy that puts the health and well-being of both people and the planet at its heart is best placed to drive Sheffield's commitment to addressing inequality, the nature emergency and becoming a leading zero-carbon city by 2030;

- 2. the deletion of original paragraph (e);
- 3. the re-lettering of original paragraphs (c) and (d) as new paragraphs (i) and (j), and original paragraphs (f) and (g) as new paragraphs (k) and (l); and
- 4. the addition of new paragraphs (m) to (o) as follows:-
 - (m) believes that the City Council's response to the cost of living crisis should not be to simply say "This is bad" but to formulate an action plan to address it;

- (n) therefore requests that the Food Poverty Working Group be reinstated and its remit expanded to cover all elements of rising living costs and to formulate an action plan to tackle this crisis; and
 - (o) requests that the Education, Health and Care Transitional Committee, and its successor under the committee system, should look into how Sheffield Council and Sheffield can support our ambition for an Inclusive Economy in the One Year Plan with the wellbeing economy model, and in order to put Sheffield's health and well-being front and centre of our aims, decision making and expenditure.
- 10.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Mike Levery was put to the vote and Parts 1 & paragraph (d) of Part 2 of the amendment were negatived and paragraphs (e) to (j) of Part 2 of the amendment were carried.
- 10.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Bernard Little was then put to the vote and Parts 1, 2, 3 & paragraph (m) of Part 4 of the amendment were negatived and paragraphs (n) & (o) of Part 4 of the amendment were carried.
- 10.6 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 we are facing a cost-of-living crisis, with rising bills and ballooning prices;
- (b) notes that we have seen a decade of low growth under Conservative-led governments, and believes that this is holding back Britain and has left the national economy weakened and unable to deal with shocks;
- (c) notes that this is particularly felt in northern cities like Sheffield, leaving many of the city's residents acutely vulnerable to a worrying combination of factors – such as inflation, rocketing energy bills, increased costs for food and fuel, and the forthcoming rise to national insurance;
- (d) notes that eligibility for Free School Meal Vouchers in Sheffield is increasing, indicating that poverty in the city is increasing, and Council Hardship funds are coming under increased pressure;
- (e) notes that a Labour government would immediately cut VAT on domestic energy bills to ease the burden on households during winter – giving a potential saving of up to £400 for many Sheffield residents – which would be paid for by a one-off windfall tax on booming oil and gas profits;
- (f) believes that we need radical long-term change to keep energy bills low

in the future, and yet this Government have consistently failed to keep in check rising energy bills and have a very poor record on insulating homes and improving energy efficiency;

- (g) believes the Government should get a grip and tackle this crisis – but instead they continue to sit back complacently; trapping us in a high-tax, low-growth economy, and rather than putting the interests of the country first they are consumed with infighting and, as such, are failing to take the decisive action needed;
- (h) notes there has been no development of a long-term energy strategy to secure network resilience by successive governments since privatisation; the dash for gas in the 1990's led to significant investment in gas-fired power stations to replace coal, fossil fuel for fossil fuel, and no strategy for replacing ageing nuclear reactors;
- (i) believes this Government needs to abandon the current competitive market on energy provision, which is based on relatively stable wholesale prices, and replace it with a regulated provision which ensures providers are sufficiently resilient to withstand wholesale price shocks, whilst maintaining customer prices index linked over an agreed period;
- (j) notes the significant rise in food prices and shortages on the supermarket shelves, leading to greater reliance by the poorest on food banks, and believes that the main contributory factors are:-
 - (i) the second increase in January of customs declaration paperwork and increasing transport costs for foreign sourced foods, both of which lead to rising food prices;
 - (ii) the shortage of foreign workers in both the farming sector and food processing sector, leading to shortages and the inevitable price rises;
 - (iii) new trade deals where they are not back to back with previous EU trade deals, such as with Australia and New Zealand, where tariff free beef and lamb are now impacting on the British market and putting farmers' livelihoods at risk;
 - (iv) the new trade deal with Norway on fish, which has resulted in a quota reduction of 50% for the Kirkella in Hull, the last deep sea fishing trawler in the UK; and
 - (v) weakness of the pound since the Brexit referendum, and the negative impact on imported food prices;
- (k) notes the failure to resolve the Northern Ireland protocol, as shown by the resignation of Lord Frost, who failed to renegotiate the Brexit deal, and believes that any trade deal without a customs union will always lead to these problems, when the Good Friday Agreement needs to be

protected;

- (l) notes the victories by the Liberal Democrats in by-elections in Chesham and Amersham, where the voters rejected building in the Green Belt, and North Shropshire where livestock farming is under threat, and believes this is showing more and more that the British public have had enough of this Government's failure to get a hold of the issues people have to face every day;
- (m) believes the Government's "oven ready" deal is now unfolding and has led to rising food prices, and that it should revisit its failing Brexit strategy in order to protect our farmers, fishermen and the general public;
- (n) therefore requests that the Food Poverty Working Group be reinstated and its remit expanded to cover all elements of rising living costs and to formulate an action plan to tackle this crisis; and
- (o) requests that the Education, Health and Care Transitional Committee, and its successor under the committee system, should look into how Sheffield Council and Sheffield can support our ambition for an Inclusive Economy in the One Year Plan with the wellbeing economy model, and in order to put Sheffield's health and well-being front and centre of our aims, decision making and expenditure.

10.6.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Ann Woolhouse, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Kevin Oxley, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Richard Williams, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery and Ann Whitaker voted for paragraphs (a), (c), (d) and (h) to (m), voted against paragraphs (n) and (o), and abstained from voting on paragraphs (b), (e), (f) and (g), of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Alexi Dimond, Paul Turpin, Christine Gilligan, Peter Garbutt, Alison Teal and Bernard Little voted for paragraphs (a), (c), (d) and (f) to (o), and voted against paragraphs (b) and (e) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

11. REVIEW OF POLLING DISTRICTS & POLLING PLACES

11.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Dianne Hurst, formally seconded by Councillor Martin Phipps, that this Council approves (a) the boundary changes to polling districts and proposed polling places outlined in the report of the Chief Executive, now submitted and (b) that a further review of the polling districts and polling places in the Ecclesall and Manor Castle Wards takes place following the

May 2022 elections to respond to the feedback received in respect of those Wards.

12. EXTERNAL AUDIT RE-PROCUREMENT

- 12.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, formally seconded by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, that this Council endorses the recommendation of its Audit and Standards Committee and accepts Public Sector Audit Appointments' invitation to opt into the sector-led option for the appointment of external auditors to principal local government and police bodies for five financial years from 1 April 2023.

13. TEMPORARY CHANGE TO THE CONSTITUTION - BUDGET AMENDMENTS AT THE SPECIAL MEETING OF THE COUNCIL ON 2ND MARCH 2022

- 13.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Dianne Hurst, formally seconded by Councillor Martin Phipps, that this Council:-
- (a) approves the addition to Section 12 (Amendments to Motions) of the Council Procedure Rules in Part 4 (Rules of Procedure) of the Constitution, as set out in the appendix to this report; and
 - (b) asks officers to give consideration, in consultation with the leaderships of the political groups on the Council, to the possibility of introducing, for the setting of the budget for 2023/24 onwards, an alternative process for determining the Council's budget, whereby the political groups could submit multiple amendments for consideration by the Council.

14. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS

- 14.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Dianne Hurst, formally seconded by Councillor Garry Weatherall, that the minutes of the meetings of the Council held on 18th November and 1st December 2021, be approved as true and accurate records.

15. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

- 15.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Dianne Hurst, formally seconded by Councillor Garry Weatherall, that:-
- (a) it be noted that, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its annual meeting held on 19th May 2021, the Chief Executive had (i) authorised Councillor Dawn Dale to replace Councillor Sioned-Mair

Richards on the Senior Officer Employment Committee with effect from 21st December 2021, and Councillor Mazher Iqbal to replace Councillor Paul Wood on that same Committee with effect from 12th January 2022; and (ii) authorised the appointment of Councillor Denise Fox to serve on the Sheffield Futures Board with effect from 12th January 2022;

- (b) it be noted that, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its annual meeting held on 19th May 2021, the Executive Director, Place (acting in the absence of the Chief Executive) had authorised Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to replace Councillor Dawn Dale on the Senior Officer Employment Committee with effect from 19th January 2022;
- (c) it be noted that (i) the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 13th December 2021, appointed Kate Martin to the post of Executive Director, City Futures within the Place Portfolio and that Ms. Martin is expected to start in post on 7th March 2022 and (ii) in view of the cancellation of the Council meeting scheduled on 12th January 2022, the Chief Executive had, on 12th January 2022, approved the salary package for this post, which is above £100,000, using her Emergency and Urgency powers contained in Section 3.5.3 of Part 3 of the Constitution;
- (d) it be noted that (i) the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 16th December 2021, appointed Ajman Ali to the post of Executive Director, Operational Services within the Place Portfolio and that Mr. Ali is expected to start in post on 11th April 2022 and (ii) in view of the cancellation of the Council meeting scheduled on 12th January 2022, the Chief Executive had, on 12th January 2022, approved the salary package for this post, which is above £100,000, using her Emergency and Urgency powers contained in Section 3.5.3 of Part 3 of the Constitution;
- (e) it be noted that the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 14th December 2021, appointed Joe Horobin to the post of Director of Integrated Commissioning within the People Services Portfolio and that Ms. Horobin started in post on 1st February 2022;
- (f) it be noted that the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 20th December 2021, appointed Richard Eyre to the post of Director of Streetscene and Regulations within the Place Portfolio and that Mr. Eyre started in post on 17th January 2022; and
- (g) it be noted that the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 21st December 2021, appointed Diana Stray to the post of Director of Economic Development within the Place Portfolio and that Ms. Stray started in post on 17th January 2022.