

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH, on Wednesday 5 April 2017, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

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

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

1. FORMER COUNCILLORS GORDON MILLS AND CATH WHITTY

- 1.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) reported with sadness, the death, in early March, of former Councillor Gordon Mills, who had served as a Member of the Council from 1980 to 1986. Members of the Council observed a minute's silence in his memory.
- 1.2 Several Members of the Council paid tribute to former Councillor Mills, and also to former Councillor Cath Whitty whose death had been reported to, and a minute's silence had been held at, the previous meeting of the Council on 3rd March 2017.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Nasima Akther, Sue Auckland, Keith Davis, Bryan Lodge, Moya O'Rourke, Richard Shaw and Martin Smith.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS

- 4.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 1st February 2017 and the special meeting of the Council held on 3rd March 2017 be approved as true and accurate records.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

5.1 Appointment of the Deputy Leader of the Council

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore) announced the appointment, with effect from 4th April 2017, of Councillor Olivia Blake to the position of Deputy Leader, following the resignation of the previous Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Business and Economy, Mr. Leigh Bramall, on 20th March 2017. Councillor Dore congratulated Councillor Blake and welcomed her appointment, and indicated that she would reserve paying thanks to the previous Deputy Leader until the next meeting of the Council, when tributes will be paid to Mr. Bramall, and a vote of thanks passed, for his service to the Council.

5.2 Petitions

5.2.1 Petition Supporting the Removal of Trees on Goddard Hall Road

The Council received a petition containing 30 signatures requesting the removal of trees on Goddard Hall Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Salma Khan, who informed the Council that the trees were causing difficulties. The Council was not able to clean the area due to parked vehicles and traffic in the vicinity of the Northern General Hospital. Surfaces were slippery, vehicles were subject to deposits from trees and leaf fall affected gullies. The petitioners supported the replacement of trees on Goddard Hall Road.

The Council referred the petition to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore. Councillor Dore thanked the Salma Khan for presenting the petition. She commented that the subject of highway trees was a divisive issue in Sheffield. Tree replacement was a last resort and since 2012, a contract had been in place whereby trees had been replaced in accordance with the agreed criteria. 2017 was the final year of the core investment period of the Streets Ahead programme.

Objections had been raised concerning proposals in the contract and the Council introduced a consultation process which sought to obtain the opinions of residents. This was done mainly because it was brought to the Council's attention that some people did not agree with the tree replacement programme as it was.

As regards Goddard Hall Road, there were 40 households affected and 30 people had signed the petition which agreed with the proposals regarding tree replacement and wished the Council to carry out the tree replacement in accordance with residents' wishes. She explained that the Council would carry out the replacement programme on Goddard Hall Road.

(Note: Mrs Khan requested that no film recording was made of her at the meeting).

5.2.2 Petition Requesting Community Safety Measures on Cross Bedford Street

The Council received an electronic petition containing 28 signatures requesting community safety measures on Cross Bedford Street.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Joseph Omeiza. He stated that residents who parked their cars on the street had been victims of car crime and that there had been 53 reported crimes in the area since the summer of 2015. Incidents had included broken vehicle windows and property stolen from cars which had a considerable value. This resulted in unnecessary stress for residents. The petitioners wanted something to be done regarding this situation and they wanted the area to be safe. The petition suggested safety measures, including CCTV, brighter street lighting and Neighbourhood Watch signage, which it was thought would help act as a deterrent in relation to crime.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing. Councillor Dunn thanked the petitioners for bringing this matter to Council and suggested that the various partners involved, including the petitioners, community groups, the Anti-Social Behaviour team, Police and local councillors meet to consider the issues detailed in the petition with regard to community safety in the area of Cross Bedford Street. She said that she would contact the petitioners.

5.2.3 Petition Requesting the Council to Implement a New Air Pollution Action Plan

The Council received an electronic petition containing 1220 signatures and requesting the Council to implement a new Air Pollution Action Plan.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Eamonn Ward. He stated that it was widely agreed that the objectives of the Sheffield Air Quality Action Plan, not been achieved. He referred to the impact of air quality on people's health and to the need to mitigate the effects of the M1 motorway. He said that the budget situation was recognised and there was a need to obtain government funding. Mr Ward stated that a specific action plan was required with objectives which were acted upon. He referred to the Notice of Motion on the Summons for this meeting of the Council and said that he hoped there would be support for the bringing forward of a new action plan with regard to air quality.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, Councillor Mazher Iqbal. Councillor Iqbal thanked the petitioners. He said the subject of air pollution was a key issue and it was a priority for the Council to improve air quality in Sheffield. With regard to the proximity of Tinsley to the M1, he stated that he was one of the local councillors for the Tinsley area and he understood concerns regarding air quality and the motorway. The Council had taken a decision with regard to moving the location of a school adjacent to the M1.

Air quality was a challenge for cities globally and it was important that it was addressed. Whilst there were options, it was subject to resources. At its meeting in March, Cabinet approved a new sustainability strategy, which set out a sustainability vision and this was an issue which had included work with other Cabinet Members and the Green Commission. He assured Mr Ward that the Council would be producing a plan.

5.2.4 Petition Requesting Urgent Repairs on Cornish Street

The Council received a petition containing 32 signatures requesting urgent repairs on Cornish Street.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by David Marsh. Mr Marsh stated that Streets Ahead work had been taking place at Kelham Island, including adjustments to the footway and kerb. This work was not completed. Complaints had been received concerning the removal of the cobbled surface and work had then stopped. Access to Cornish Street had been restricted as part of a programme to manage traffic at Kelham Island.

He said that the winter weather and flooding had resulted in the deterioration of the surface, including the formation of pot holes. It was also of concern that cars were becoming damaged and there had been no communication with residents since the works had ceased in September 2016. People had been assured that the cobbles were in safe storage. The petition asked for appropriate communications with residents and work to bring the area back to how it should be.

The Council referred the petition to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore. Councillor Dore thanked the petitioners and apologised that she had only limited information at this time and that the Cabinet Member for Environment was not able to be present at the Council meeting.

She had made enquiries of Council Officers and had ascertained that some temporary repairs had recently been made. However, she acknowledged that the petitions had identified that more work was required. Amey would visit the location in the next two days, to carry out repairs to keep the street safe and to consider the final scheme, which was under discussion. Conservation Officers would be contributing to the process and a sympathetic scheme was sought, which recognised the nature of the area.

Councillor Dore said that she believed that Amey would welcome the lead petitioner's contact details, in order that they be kept informed and involved in discussions. Councillor Dore said that she would refer the matter to Councillor Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment. She commented that Kelham Island was one of the City's 'jewels in the crown' and it was important to make sure a sympathetic scheme was implemented.

5.2.5 Petition Requesting the Council to Save the "Norfolk Park 6" Trees

The Council received a petition containing 978 signatures requesting the Council to save the "Norfolk Park 6" trees.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Graham Wroe. Mr Wroe referred to four photographs of pavement around trees in the area. Whilst three images showed damage to pavements, one image, which showed that the pavement surface looked smooth, related to a tree selected for felling. He said that he believed that the trees to be felled had not been selected with care.

With regard to mobility scooters and wheelchair users, Mr Wroe said that his wife used a wheelchair and he considered that the problems for people using wheelchairs related mainly to drivers parking across dropped kerbs and steps at the bottom of Shrewsbury Road. Norfolk Park was an area with relatively few street trees, which made those trees which did exist very special. It was accepted that some of the trees had reached the end of their lives and should be replaced.

Mr Wroe said that an ecologist had advised that six of the 27 trees in question on Norfolk Park should be saved and more recently an Arborist had said that a further five trees should also be retained. He said that he had questions which remained unanswered from requests made in January. This included the inspection reports relating to the six trees, which had been requested on 30 January. He asked whether the issues relating to damage to pavements on Tylney Road and Seabrook Road could be dealt with through the use of engineering specifications covered by the Streets Ahead contract. He said that he believed that a mistake had been made in relation to Tylney Road because the tree outside number 7 was not damaging the pavement to the extent that other trees were.

He referred to the survey of households which had been conducted and he believed that Norfolk Park Avenue had not been included and he also suspected that other roads had also been excluded. He therefore urged that trees on Guildford Avenue, Park Spring Drive and Park Spring Way also be referred to the Independent Tree Panel. He said that communications with Streets Ahead were problematic whereby a number of responses had been given to him, which had indicated that complaints were still being investigated and a full response would be provided when the outcomes were known. He asked the Council to please save the six Norfolk Park trees.

The Council referred the petition to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore. Councillor Dore thanked the petitioners for submitting the petition. The trees had been inspected by experienced tree and highway experts and, where it was proposed to replace and replenish highway trees, a consultation communication would be sent to households on streets which were affected. This totalled 284 households in the Norfolk Park area. The Council had received some responses from households in streets that Mr Wroe had indicated might not have been included in the consultation process. Consultation surveys sent to households in November had resulted in the receipt of 8 responses. An online survey was undertaken 25 November to 9 December 2016. Consultation was also carried out on Guildford Avenue and Park Spring Way, to which there had been no responses received. Out of the households surveyed, two households disagreed with the proposals and, although there had been a low turnout, in cases where more than fifty percent of those responding disagreed, the matter would be referred to the Independent Tree Panel. The proposals relating to trees on Seabrook Road and Tylney Road were referred to the Independent Tree Panel and the report of the Panel was awaited.

When the report of the ITP was available, if there were additional works which could be applied and which were within the contract, these could be carried out. However, if there were measures required which were outside of the contract, the Council could not afford to take financial resources from elsewhere in the budget in order to fund these. She said that Mr Wroe had made reference to trees on Guildford Avenue in emails to her and she said that although these trees were in poor condition, they did not yet present an immediate category 1 safety risk and replacement had been delayed with a view to monitoring their condition. They would need to be replaced if there was further decline. The Council would receive the report of the Independent Tree Panel in relation to this issue and a response would be made in accordance with the process and policy.

5.2.6 Petition Objecting to the Proposed Changes to the Care Provided for the Disabled

The Council received an electronic petition containing 101 signatures objecting to the proposed changes to the care provided for the disabled.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Cate McDonald, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care. Councillor McDonald reported that a response had been made to the petition.

5.3 Public Questions

5.3.1 Public Question Concerning Smithy Wood

Nigel Slack stated that the special planning meeting for the proposed Smithy Wood Motorway Services had been delayed. He asked what Council could tell people of the reason behind the delay; who asked for the delay; for what reason; and when was this decision likely to return to the meetings calendar?

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure and Transport, stated that the application relating to Smithy Wood was a complex one. The delay was because of a pre-application in Rotherham at Junction 33 of the M1 which the Council had been asked to take into account. Advice had been sought from the Highways Agency and with regard to legal issues and, once the advice was received, the Council would be in a position to bring the planning application to the Planning and Highways Committee.

5.3.2 Public Question Concerning Gleadless Valley

Nigel Slack stated that he was delighted to see that Gleadless Valley was an area that will benefit from £500K redevelopment funding in the near future. He said that the Council also appeared to be indicating a consultation process on how this will be achieved. He asked whether the Council would ensure that local community groups were an integral part of this process and (Friends of the Valley/Reach/Tara/Forum/Wildlife Trust) including those that may currently be at odds with some Council projects and stated that whilst 500K may not be a huge amount of money, it could effect significant changes if neighbourhood priorities were recognised alongside party political objectives.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing, stated that there was no indication that there would not be consultation on this issue. She said that the Council would be working with community groups in the Gleadless area on what was an exciting development and there would also be work with local councillors.

5.3.3 Public Question Concerning Business and Economy Cabinet Portfolio

Nigel Slack congratulated Councillor Olivia Blake on her appointment to the post of Deputy Leader and stated that the Cabinet Portfolio of Business and Economy remained vacant. He commented that whilst the former Cabinet member, Councillor Bramall and he did not agree on everything, he could count on a fair hearing and a considered response for the most part and that he would be missed. Mr Slack asked that, with the number of strategic investment projects currently on the books could Council comment on who will be taking on this portfolio?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, thanked Mr Slack for his congratulations in respect of Councillor Oliva Blake. She said that tributes to Councillor Leigh Bramall would be made at a later Council meeting. She said that she hoped that Mr Slack also felt that he could count on her giving him a fair hearing, whilst recognising that there may not be agreement on every issue. She

said that she would continue to contribute and have input with regard to issues including strategic investment, infrastructure of HS2/3, the advanced manufacturing and innovation district and major investment, to make sure these continued and were successful. The Cabinet Adviser supporting this area of work was Councillor Lewis Dagnall. It was not possible to bring in a new Cabinet Member at this point in time and prior to the Council's Annual Meeting. Councillor Dore said that she had an excellent Deputy Leader to assist her. The Cabinet would be presented at the Council Annual Meeting in May.

5.3.4 Public Question Concerning Conduct of Members

Nigel Slack stated that there had been much made of the lack of respect shown in recent Council Meetings, both between councillors and to members of the public. He said that he had witnessed Cabinet Members denigrating the contributions of experts. He referred to another incident to which he been made aware by a friend regarding the disrespect shown by at least one Councillor about the Sheffield public. He asked whether the Council agreed that, whilst they may accept that level of disrespect in the Chamber between themselves, it was unacceptable to disrespect the public in such a way and that we should expect better of elected members of this Council.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, said that she hoped that Mr Slack felt that she had shown respect to the public in relation to her own conduct. She was sorry to hear about the incident to which Mr Slack had referred and stated that if he did not wish to make a complaint under the Council's Code of Conduct complaints procedure, then she would be pleased to hold a conversation in confidence on the matter and so that the matter could be addressed.

5.3.5 Public Questions Concerning Streets Ahead

Justin Buxton stated that on 23 March in the Sheffield Star, Councillor Bryan Lodge had made reference to redacted parts the Streets Ahead contract not relating to street tree replacement, engineering solutions, numbers of trees to be replaced or penalties and he asked where the information regarding those details which Councillor Lodge had listed could be found, if they were not in the redacted parts of the contract.

He asked about an article in the Star newspaper in which the Cabinet Member had stated that timber from street trees was donated to charities and to community groups. He asked if this this was the case, why Heeley City Farm was purchasing timber from Amey?

Mr Buxton referred to the previous meeting of Council, when he said the Cabinet Member had referred to the resurfacing works being delayed because of the controversy concerning street trees and had said that 6km of roads were behind schedule because of the controversy. He asked whether this accounted for roads which did not have street trees on and which were to be resurfaced.

Shelley Cockayne stated that the PFI contract explicitly stated in section 19.2 that Amey would bear the costs of any delays relating to protesters. She asked why

councillors continued to say in the media that protesters were costing the Council money and for the detail of specific costs which could be attributed to protesters.

Secondly, Shelley Cockayne stated that Highways Act legislation allowed for curved kerb lines and even missing kerb stones, when required. She asked why councillors were insisting the opposite, when she said that was not true and what specific reasons were stopping Amey and the Council from using curved kerbs and saving street trees.

Thirdly, Shelley Cockayne asked, as the Council was not obliged to take notice of the independent Tree Panel, when the Panel recommended saving a number of mature trees; what was the Panel for and was it anything more than costly window dressing?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded to the questions. She said that it would be unfair to Mr Buxton and to the Cabinet Member, Councillor Lodge, for her to respond to the comments made in newspaper articles at this Council meeting, without checking what had been stated. She suggested that Mr Buxton provide the written questions to her and she would then make sure that a response was provided. Similarly, the questions concerning specific contract clauses would be subject to a written response because she would not be in a position to address them directly at this meeting.

With regard to the Independent Tree Panel, Councillor Dore stated that the consultation process had been introduced during the course of the core investment period of the Streets Ahead Programme. Trees had been replaced or replenished in the period before the Panel was established. The consultation process came about when it came to the Council's attention that people were concerned about highways trees. The Council had endeavoured to explain the Streets Ahead contract and the related constraints. The Private Finance Initiative on which the Streets Ahead Programme was based was widely supported by cross section of Members of the Council. She said that it would be extremely difficult to vary the contract under contract law and legislation and it was important to ensure there was a healthy tree population for present and future generations.

Within the programme, the retention of trees was a priority and removing trees was a last resort. The Independent Tree Panel was set up in relation to cases where residents oppose proposals relating to the removal of trees. In some streets, people were supportive of proposals to remove trees. The Independent Panel provided a second opinion and acted to address any concerns relating to bias. The Panel included a range of experts to look at proposals. The Council also continued to meet with the Sheffield Trees Action Group (STAG). Councillor Dore stated that that she had offered that a further Panel was established to include two representatives from the Sheffield Trees Action Group in addition to Council Members, Officers and representatives of Amey to look at reports of the Tree Panel to enable people to challenge the Council with regards to the contract. However, this was rejected. STAG had made a counter proposal to cease the Independent Tree Panel. The Council would also consider whether two representatives from STAG could be included in the membership of the Independent Tree Panel.

Councillor Dore said that the Council continued to meet with STAG and would continue dialogue. The retention of trees was a priority and replacement was a last resort.

5.3.6 Public Questions Concerning Gleadless Valley

Steven Sheppard, representing Friends of the Valley, Gleadless Valley Community Group, stated that the Community Group would like to be involved in the consultation process regarding the developments in the area. The Group was gathering ideas from local residents as to what they wanted and regarding their needs. Apart from small projects, two specific areas had been identified which might be utilised for the good of the estate. The University of Sheffield was also interested in being involved in projects and Sheffield College had also offered support. The Friends of the Valley was a fully constituted group and it was in the process of an application to the Charity Commission. The group aimed to apply and raise funding for various local projects.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries, said that it was positive that a group had been established and that local Gleadless Valley Councillors were also keen to support the work of the Friends of the Valley and its activity in working with other local groups.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing, stated that it was pleasing that local groups were enthusiastic about the Masterplan for the area and she drew attention to the importance of local groups and organisations. She said that the Council would like everyone to be involved who would wish to be and she also thanked people for their interest and enthusiasm.

5.3.7 Public Questions Concerning Children's Centres

Mike Levery referred to comments by a Department for Education (DfE) spokesperson in response to the concerns expressed by Dan Jarvis MP in February 2017, concerning the rising number of Children's Centre closures. The DfE response had been that many councils were merging centres to allow services to be delivered more efficiently and, where it was decided to close a children's centre site, it must be demonstrated that the outcomes for children would not be adversely affected and it would not compromise the duty to have sufficient children's centres to meet local need. He asked if the Council would explain how the requirements of the Children's Act 2006 were met in the consultation to change from 16 Children's Centres to 7 Family Centres.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, responded that she hoped that she had made it clear that the Council was not closing any Children's Centres. She said that the work which took place in early years was highly valued and the help and support provided to children, parents and carers did make a difference.

The proposals relating to Children's and Family Centres and delivery of Children's Centres services related to geographical areas and Ofsted inspections referred to

an examination of services in those areas as a whole. The proposals concerned services being available to people in localities, a main site and linked sites. Of the 16 Children's Centres, 7 would become Family Centres and the remaining 9 would be linked centres and there would also be outreach services. Proposals covered the age range from 0 to 19 and 0 to 25 for children and young people with special educational needs or disabilities. The core and extra services would be delivered from a range of venues and by a range of organisations, where and when required.

Councillor Drayton stated that she would make sure that a written response was provided to Mr Levery's questions and in relation to questions that he had previously asked. She said in relation to the Children's Centre at Angram Bank, that the Centre was not closing and both the Ecclesfield Parish Council and local City Councillors had been kept informed. The changes concerned investment in early years, including with health organisations.

5.3.8 Public Questions Concerning Heavy Good Vehicles

Jeffery Brabban referred to residents' concerns with regard to traffic levels, speeding, heavy goods vehicles and pedestrian safety. Whilst the carriageway was 6 metres wide, there were parked vehicles present. On Monday between 7.15am and 8.45am, 1,200 and 1,400 vehicles had been recorded. People were using alternative routes in residential areas so as to avoid traffic congestion in Woodseats. Vehicles in the area included articulated lorries and distribution vehicles, which he said were not appropriate for roads in residential areas. There were also occasions when vehicles had mounted the pavements and the safety of pedestrians was of concern, including children's safety. Mr Brabban asked whether there were any plans to make improvements to the circumstances which he had outlined.

Janet Chapman made reference to the points raised concerning road safety and said that a man had been hit by a car whilst standing at the side of a vehicle and referred to other incidents. She said that no action had been taken.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Infrastructure, asked Mr Brabban to provide him with further information. He said that he was working with the local ward councillors and had also visited locations in Dore. Councillor Iqbal said that he would be pleased to look at the situation which Mr Brabban had described and to involve local councillors. He commented that heavy goods vehicles should not be travelling through residential areas and indicated that there was some activity to prevent vehicles using inappropriate routes. However, there were limited resources which affected the extent to which monitoring and enforcement activity could take place. He said that this issue would be investigated further and a response would be provided.

Councillor Iqbal stated that the Council received many requests in relation to highways safety schemes and all requests were assessed according to certain criteria. He would liaise with local councillors as regards the issues raised and the installation of a footpath.

5.3.9 Public Question Concerning Social Inclusion

Mr A Savoury asked how the Council was able to say that it was responsible to the people when he believed that he was socially excluded and received no help from the Council.

Councillor Cate McDonald, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, asked Mr Savoury to provide to her details of his individual case and said that she would speak with him and also provide a response to him in writing.

5.3.10 Public Question Concerning Somaliland

Kaltun Elmi stated that Somaliland had suffered a serious drought and much of the livestock there had been lost. She said that people were dying because of lack of food and water and due to other illness and many children were malnourished. Whilst people were proud, they needed support in relation to this natural disaster. There had been no rain and people had lost everything. She said that she had organised an event on 20 April to raise funds to help people in Somaliland. She asked whether the Leader of the Council would help to support the fundraising and attend the event as guest speaker.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that events, such as those which were occurring in Somaliland, were not given a high profile in the media and so were not brought to people's attention. Social media was something which was used instead to help make people aware. She said that she had sometimes felt let down by the international community and national politicians. The Council supported the Somali community and this was something on which there was cross party support. She stated that the community in Sheffield were also affected as they had friends and family who might be involved in the circumstances in Somaliland. She confirmed that help could be given with fundraising and that she would make sure that there was a Member of the Cabinet at the fundraising event.

5.3.11 Public Question Concerning a driving range in High Hazels Park

Gabrielle Marsden Wheeler, junior captain of Tinsley Park Golf Course, asked for a small part of High Hazels Park to be used for a driving range to allow the teaching of local women and children to play golf. At this time, there were only two juniors and no women from black and minority ethnic communities and it was believed that this initiative would help community cohesion.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure, stated that she was impressed at the enthusiasm which Gabrielle showed in relation to the sport. High Hazels Park was part of a charitable trust and therefore had special status. There was also a Friends Group for the Park. She suggested that a meeting was arranged with the appropriate Council officers to look at the issue further.

5.3.12 Public Question Concerning Service Provided by Charities

Jonathan Marsden made reference to cuts to Council funding and expectations

that charities would provide services. He commented in relation to the economic differences between areas of Sheffield and he asked how charities could be democratically accountable to local people so they could have a say and whether there was a way for charities to include local people and communities who might also wish to run organisations themselves.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Community Services and Libraries, stated that the City was blighted by inequality and austerity, there were 19 food banks and there had been 7 years of unprecedented cuts and austerity which had affected the poorest people most, including disabled people and young people to a disproportionate extent. He said that the cuts were cruel and harmful and the Government had been warned about the consequences relating to increasing inequality and the need for the voluntary and community sectors having to increasingly provide support.

He said that the voluntary and community sector in the City was amazing, with some 3,500 charitable and voluntary groups, many of which had grown from the bottom up. The estimated value of their activities to the economy was £810 million and 110,000 people gave their time to the voluntary sector and their work had a positive effect on the people the volunteers helped and on the volunteers themselves.

Councillor Scott said that in respect of accountability and how we might ensure that there was not a loss of democratic accountability, there was a robust structure to make sure that services, including those run by the voluntary and community sector, remained accountable to local people, including open grants rounds, which were explicit and fair for all organisations who were interested in applying. There was an open procurement process to make sure services were purchased in a fair manner and there was also proper contract management and performance management to make sure organisations delivered what they said they would.

He explained that City Councillors were involved with organisations and they were on the boards of local charities for example and that was a way of helping to make sure that organisations which received public money made the right decisions and there was accountable use of public money. Any expenditure was accountable to a Member of the Cabinet or the Leader of the Council and a democratic system meant that groups were held accountable to Cabinet Members and in turn Cabinet were held accountable. It was important for the City to have thriving voluntary and community sector.

5.4 Petition Requiring Debate - Calling on the Council to "Save Ecclesall Road Trees"

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 5,925 signatures, calling on the Council to "save Ecclesall Road trees".

The Council's Petitions Scheme requires that any petition containing over 5,000 signatures would be the subject of debate at a Council meeting. The wording of the qualifying paper and e-petition was as follows:-

“We, the undersigned, refute the assertion that the felling of over one third of the street trees on Ecclesall Road, Sheffield is necessary. We demand, and believe it imperative, that sensitive, alternative highway engineering specifications for pavements and kerbs be adopted and implemented to enable the long-term retention of those mature street trees designated as damaging. We also demand that those trees designated as dying be reconsidered in the light of the best arboricultural advice recently offered by experts such as Jeremy Barrell (BSc FArborA DipArb CBiol FICFor FRICS) with a view to retaining as many mature street trees on Ecclesall Road as possible and the felling of any of these trees be used only as a true last resort”.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Paul Hemmings. He stated that the petition had 5925 signatures and concerned the proposed removal of 13 out of 35 street trees on Ecclesall Road. The issue had been referred to the Independent Tree Panel for consideration. Eight of the trees were said to be damaging pavements or kerbs. Five were said to be senescent or ageing. He said that not one of the trees was diseased, dead or dangerous and that in the case of the damaging trees, there were engineering specifications within the Streets Ahead contract which could be applied at no cost to the Council. He asked why the contract was so heavily redacted as compared to Birmingham which he said was much more open to public scrutiny. He said that local councillors had, with him, undertaken a ward walk to look at the trees affected by the proposals. The Road was, he said, important for people in the area and people in Sheffield more generally and yet, due to the survey methodology, those who lived in the area, but not on the road itself, did not have a vote on whether the proposals were correct. Even though the local people would be just as affected by the removal of the trees, including environmental effects on canopy cover and the attractiveness of the street scene, which also contributed to the economic success of the area. Businesses on Ecclesall Road and surrounding area had been approached and were supportive of the campaign and 25 had indicated that they would be willing to talk to the press about the issue if requested. He also referred to proposals concerning the removal of Lime Trees on Thompson Road and Khartoum Road, which whilst not forming part of this petition, formed part of the historical setting of the Botanical Gardens and deserved special consideration. He asked the Council to consider whether it was willing to concede that the removal of a third of the trees on Ecclesall Road would diminish the amenity of the road and should be reconsidered in an open and honest debate and respond constructively to the issue; and commit to informing people what it was in the PFI contract which was stopping the Council from changing course on what he said was the unnecessary felling of street trees.

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

Councillor Julie Dore (the Leader of the Council) responded to the petition. She thanked local councillors for taking part in the local tree walk. The Streets Ahead programme was a major Private Finance Initiative (PFI) over a period of 25 years with the first 5 years of the programme being the core investment period, which

included the replacement and replenishment of highways trees. There were 36,000 highways trees in Sheffield and approximately 6,000 of those required replacement or replenishment. This was because some trees were dead, dying, diseased or dangerous and there was a further criteria of trees which were damaging or discriminatory. Around one and a half thousand trees were in need of replacement due to them being damaging or discriminatory.

In specific relation to Ecclesall Road, consultation on proposals for highways trees took place between 20 November and 9 December 2016. 653 households were included in the survey and 15 responses were received, three of which agreed with proposals and 12 which did not agree. The matter was referred to the Independent Tree Panel (ITP) for consideration. The Panel would make its findings shortly and the Council would consider the findings and respond. There was a list of engineering applications within the Streets Ahead contract which had been applied on numerous occasions in the City during the first 4 years of the Streets Ahead programme. Seven trees had been removed on Ecclesall Road, prior to the commencement of the Streets Ahead programme because they were either: dying, dead, dangerous or damaging. The proposal was to replace 13 of the 33 existing trees and plant an additional 18 trees, which meant that there would be 51 trees in total.

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

The Council might show flexibility in relation to the standards applied to street trees so that more of them could be retained. A greater value should be attached to the benefit of mature trees on the highway. It was also thought that the issue of senescence was a matter of judgement and some flexibility could be applied in that regard. Ecclesall Road was a major commercial and leisure destination and an economically important one and the attractiveness of its environment also had an economic value. It was thought that the wide pavements on the road would allow sufficient access and space for trees.

Where a majority of residents objected to a proposal, a decision would not be made until the Independent Tree Panel had considered the issue and there had been analysis of the condition of trees and potential engineering solutions and the results would be made public when these became available. The tree replacement programme and highways programme would protect the green environment for future generations and give some of the best roads, pavements and street lights. 6,000 out of 36,000 trees were to be removed and replaced during the programme and would be classified using the agreed criteria. To date, some 600 additional roadside trees had been planted. There were a number of engineering solutions considered during works to retain a tree and it cost more to remove a tree than to keep it. It was an issue of resources in that the Council did not have additional financial resources to put into the Streets Ahead programme.

This was an important issue for people and people were clearly engaged in the process of bringing a petition to Council to debate. Comment was made about the openness of decision making and the Council having a role in being a

spokesperson for people in relation to the Streets Ahead contractor Amey. It was thought that removal of the trees would have a detrimental impact on Ecclesall Road.

The local councillors had engaged with the local community and had participated in a walk with constituents to get their views and communicate with them with regard to the trees on Ecclesall Road. The results of the referral to the Independent Tree Panel would be looked at closely.

The trees on Ecclesall Road were an asset for people who lived, worked, shopped and visited the area and they enhanced the street scene. The campaigners were passionate about protecting street trees and the Council should review proposals and seek to retain the healthy trees. Saplings took many years to develop and did not provide the same amenity as mature trees.

The Council should continue with the tree replacement programme, which would address issues including access on pavements and an opportunity for future generations.

Reference was made to the role of councillors in representing their wards and to a number of petitions relating to the issue of highways trees in relation to which the Council would need to take notice. There was an opportunity to take a different approach to the issues concerning street trees.

The Council was keen to find solutions to the issues concerning highways trees, where these existed. There was an attempt to put forward new ideas in relation to engagement and problem solving with residents and the campaign groups. It was understood that there were issues relating to trust and that people might be sceptical in relation to proposals by the Council on this matter. There was a proposal for new experts to sit alongside the Independent Tree Panel, citizens and political representatives and to look in detail, where there were differences of expert opinion in relation to proposals relating to highways trees.

Other experts had looked at the same sets of proposals relating to the removal and replacement of trees, as had been considered by those with experience in the Council and had arrived at different conclusions. It was the Council's role to scrutinise Amey. Concerns were expressed in relation to the survey process, with households having one vote regardless of the number of people that reside there. Relatively few of the trees referred to the Independent Tree Panel as a result of the survey had been retained, despite recommendations from the Panel. Reference was made to the 14 solutions within the contract and their consideration both by Amey prior to referral to the Panel and by the Panel during its consideration of particular trees.

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

(Note: The wording of the note above incorporates the alteration made at the meeting of the Council held on 5th July 2017 when approving the minutes of its

meeting on 5th April.)

Upon the reconvening of the meeting, further contributions were made to the debate, as follows:

The Streets Ahead programme included highways, pavements, lighting and the replacement of trees. This was a long term project and by the end of the programme, there would be more highways trees. It was also important to consider people that wished to have certain trees replaced where they lived. The Streets Ahead programme represented investment for the future and there were also areas where residents clearly wanted work to continue.

The representative of the petitioners, Paul Hemmings, exercised a right of reply. He stated that the difficulty with the Independent Tree Panel was that although the Panel had recommended that 67 trees be saved, 61 of those had been removed. There were 35 trees on Ecclesall Road and he believed that there were no issues relating to the trees which could not be resolved by the use of sensitive engineering solutions. There had been a low response rate to the survey of households because of how the survey had been issued, using plain brown envelopes and there were also a number of properties occupied by students, in which case it may have been assumed that the item was junk mail. 12 households had responded although, depending on the size of the household, this may have represented many people.

Mr Hemmings commended the fact that the Council wished to resolve the issues relating to street trees and said that people needed to talk with each other to come to a solution. He said that it was a practical rather than a party political issue but it was also something which was emotional. He agreed that the investment and Streets Ahead Programme should not be jeopardised because of the issues relating to highways trees.

At this point in the proceedings, Councillor Alison Teal returned to the meeting and the Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) requested that she reconsider whether she would withdraw her earlier statement.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 19, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) put to the vote that Councillor Teal be excluded for the remainder of the meeting.

On being put to the vote, the motion to exclude Councillor Teal for the remainder of the meeting was carried.

The votes on the motion to exclude Councillor Teal for the remainder of the meeting were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

- For the Motion (51)
- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) and Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham,

Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against the Motion (21) - Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Magid Magid, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, Alison Teal, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley.

Abstained on the Motion (0) - Nil

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. She said that the PFI contract was a major issue. Options which had been put forward by people included terminating the contract with Amey or the application of variations to the contract.

The Council had ruled out engineering works which were not within the contract. The Council was not able to terminate the contract because of the cost implications and whilst another major contract, the Waste Management contract with Veolia, was being terminated, there were considerable costs which were being re-profiled.

Councillor Dore stated that whilst personally she did not support PFI, there was a need for contractual arrangements to be in place. The PFI arrangements included the Council, the Government and financiers. The Government had been requested to discuss renegotiation of PFI but had not yet responded positively. She said that the Council had made contact with the Government to discuss PFI in general and, if there was a way of changing PFI contracts then she would be supportive of that. PFI was not a suitable solution for every circumstance.

Councillor Dore outlined the proposed course of action in response to the petition,

which was to note the petition, continue dialogue with people in relation to the issue and to refer the matter to the Cabinet Member to consider in conjunction with the advice of the Independent Tree Panel.

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing: That this Council (a) notes the petition entitled "Save Ecclesall Road Trees", (b) refers the petition to the Cabinet Member for Environment to consider in conjunction with the advice awaited from the Independent Tree Panel in relation to those trees and (c) requests the Cabinet Member to continue to liaise with the petitioners.

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

For the Motion (50) - Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against the Motion (0) - Nil

Abstained on the Motion (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox).

6. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

(Note: At this point in the proceedings, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) left the meeting and the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) joined the meeting, taking the chair for the remainder of the proceedings.)

6.1 Urgent Business

6.1.1 There were no questions relating to urgent business, under the provisions of

Council Procedure Rule 16.6(ii).

6.2 Questions

6.2.1 A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated. No supplementary questions, under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4, were asked at the meeting.

6.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

6.3.1 The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) reported that Councillor Douglas Johnson had given advance notice of several questions relating to the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority, and this has enabled Councillor Paul Wood, the Council's Spokesperson on the Pensions Authority, to provide a detailed response. She stated that written copies of the questions and response had been circulated in the Chamber.

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

7. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

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

(a) it be noted that the Leader of the Council has appointed Councillor Olivia Blake to be a member of the Cabinet (without Portfolio), and the Cabinet Highways Committee, and to serve as Deputy Leader of the Council, with effect from 4th April 2017, following the resignation of the previous Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Business and Economy, Mr. Leigh Bramall, on 20th March 2017; and

(b) Councillor Olivia Blake be appointed to serve on the Corporate Joint Committee with Trade Unions, and the Corporate Members Group, to fill vacancies.

8. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR GEORGE LINDARS-HAMMOND

Bus Services Bill And Municipal Bus Companies

8.1 It was formally moved by Councillor George Lindars-Hammond, and formally seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, that this Council:-

(a) notes that in 1986 the Conservative government deregulated the bus market here in Sheffield and throughout England (outside of London); this record of deregulation has seen fares rise faster than inflation, patronage fall by more than a third nationally and bus market monopolies have become the norm;

- (b) notes that the number of people using buses in South Yorkshire since the Conservatives' deregulation of the bus service has dropped significantly; according to figures from South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYLTE) there were 268,000,000 bus passengers in 1986 but now the number has fallen to 102,000,000; a drop in passenger numbers of 62%;
- (c) notes that this Administration is committed to improving the standards of the bus service and welcomes the positive work undertaken with the bus partnership to improve on bus services in the city;
- (d) believes that better bus services for the people of Sheffield are essential in providing affordable and convenient travel and notes that this Administration is actively exploring all options at its disposal to improve public transport in the city; in turn, reducing congestion and air pollution;
- (e) is encouraged that the forthcoming Bus Services Bill will allow local communities to have a much greater say over the operation of bus services in their area and hopes are raised that this Bill could go some way to re-regulating the bus industry;
- (f) notes, however, that despite positive aspects of the Bus Services Bill, including enhanced bus partnerships and greater franchising powers, there is considerable concern about the inclusion of Clause 21 when the Bill was proposed; the clause would have banned local authorities from forming and running their own bus companies in the future;
- (g) notes that municipal bus operators provide some of the best services in the country as evident by the service provided by Nottingham City Council which consistently performs well in all outcomes measures; being well used and good value for local taxpayers;
- (h) welcomes the work by the Labour Party in successfully implementing an amendment in the House of Lords to remove what this Council believes is a senseless clause; a clause which seems to be driven by an ideological commitment that the "market knows best" in providing public transport, despite extensive evidence to the counter;
- (i) regrets that despite Labour's victory in the Lords, the Government has reintroduced this clause during House of Commons Committee stage; and it is likely that Clause 21 will be reinstated into the Bus Services Bill when considered at the Report Stage and Third Reading commencing on 27 March;
- (j) believes that any attempts by the Government to reinstate the clause should be fought and supports Labour's opposition in Parliament; and
- (k) believes that the running of local bus services should be determined by the local communities they serve, and that all methods for ensuring this is so should be at the disposal of local authorities; whether in the form of

franchising, bus partnerships or by local authorities running services themselves.

8.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Lewis Dagnall, and formally seconded by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (l) and (m) as follows:-

- (l) raises concerns that the Bus Services Bill has now been passed in its entirety (in the third reading stage) by MPs and that a Labour amendment to remove Clause 21 was defeated by 276 to 188 votes; and notes that the Bill will now go back to the House of Lords before it can be passed into law; and wishes to continue to put pressure on Lords to consider removing Clause 21 and allowing councils such as Sheffield to decide themselves whether they wish to run bus services themselves or not; and
- (m) reaffirms that, despite the inclusion of Clause 21, the Bus Services Bill should be welcomed for allowing local authorities to replace the current deregulated system of bus provision by allowing for enhanced bus partnerships and greater franchising powers; something this Administration has been calling for.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that in 1986 the Conservative government deregulated the bus market here in Sheffield and throughout England (outside of London); this record of deregulation has seen fares rise faster than inflation, patronage fall by more than a third nationally and bus market monopolies have become the norm;
- (b) notes that the number of people using buses in South Yorkshire since the Conservatives' deregulation of the bus service has dropped significantly; according to figures from South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) there were 268,000,000 bus passengers in 1986 but now the number has fallen to 102,000,000; a drop in passenger numbers of 62%;
- (c) notes that this Administration is committed to improving the standards of the bus service and welcomes the positive work undertaken with the bus partnership to improve on bus services in the city;
- (d) believes that better bus services for the people of Sheffield are essential in providing affordable and convenient travel and notes that this Administration is actively exploring all options at its disposal to improve public transport in the city; in turn, reducing congestion and air pollution;

- (e) is encouraged that the forthcoming Bus Services Bill will allow local communities to have a much greater say over the operation of bus services in their area and hopes are raised that this Bill could go some way to re-regulating the bus industry;
- (f) notes, however, that despite positive aspects of the Bus Services Bill, including enhanced bus partnerships and greater franchising powers, there is considerable concern about the inclusion of Clause 21 when the Bill was proposed; the clause would have banned local authorities from forming and running their own bus companies in the future;
- (g) notes that municipal bus operators provide some of the best services in the country as evident by the service provided by Nottingham City Council which consistently performs well in all outcomes measures; being well used and good value for local taxpayers;
- (h) welcomes the work by the Labour Party in successfully implementing an amendment in the House of Lords to remove what this Council believes is a senseless clause; a clause which seems to be driven by an ideological commitment that the "market knows best" in providing public transport, despite extensive evidence to the counter;
- (i) regrets that despite Labour's victory in the Lords, the Government has reintroduced this clause during House of Commons Committee stage; and it is likely that Clause 21 will be reinstated into the Bus Services Bill when considered at the Report Stage and Third Reading commencing on 27 March;
- (j) believes that any attempts by the Government to reinstate the clause should be fought and supports Labour's opposition in Parliament;
- (k) believes that the running of local bus services should be determined by the local communities they serve, and that all methods for ensuring this is so should be at the disposal of local authorities; whether in the form of franchising, bus partnerships or by local authorities running services themselves;
- (l) raises concerns that the Bus Services Bill has now been passed in its entirety (in the third reading stage) by MPs and that a Labour amendment to remove Clause 21 was defeated by 276 to 188 votes; and notes that the Bill will now go back to the House of Lords before it can be passed into law; and wishes to continue to put pressure on Lords to consider removing Clause 21 and allowing councils such as Sheffield to decide themselves whether they wish to run bus services themselves or not; and
- (m) reaffirms that, despite the inclusion of Clause 21, the Bus Services Bill should be welcomed for allowing local authorities to replace the current deregulated system of bus provision by allowing for enhanced bus partnerships and greater franchising powers; something this Administration has been calling for.



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

For the Substantive Motion (50) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) and Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against the Substantive Motion (0) - Nil

Abstained on the Substantive Motion (0) - Nil

8.5 (NOTE: In the absence of a mover for the amendment, Amendment Number 1 on the list of amendments circulated at the meeting, was not considered by the Council.)

9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE

Boeing Investment

9.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Lisa Banes, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the recent news that Sheffield City Region is set to partner Boeing, the world's largest aerospace company, in a deal worth millions of pounds to the city;
- (b) notes that this will be Boeing's first factory in Europe and that, alongside

- the University of Sheffield's Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre (AMRC), this has further cemented Sheffield City Region's credentials as a global centre for innovation-inspired advanced manufacturing;
- (c) notes the significant national coverage the recent deals with Boeing and McLaren are bringing to the area and believes that under this Administration the message is clear: "Sheffield is open for business";
 - (d) reaffirms that this Administration is committed to growing our local economy and is having great success in this; in turn, creating jobs and increasing living standards;
 - (e) believes that this Administration's approach is in stark contrast to the Liberal Democrats who, when in national government, chose to make damaging cuts in funding for regional growth and failed to provide adequate financial support to local businesses and cancelled the Labour Government's loan to Sheffield Forgemasters;
 - (f) notes that the recruitment for the proposed 2,300-square-metre Boeing Sheffield facility is anticipated to begin from late 2018, with a planned Boeing investment of more than £20 million into the site, and believes this demonstrates what can be achieved with a proactive approach to business creation and investment, as undertaken by this Administration; and
 - (g) supports the Administration's commitment to making Sheffield a leader in advanced manufacturing in the country.

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

For the Motion (50)

- The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) and Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran,

Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against the Motion (0) - Nil

Abstained on the Motion (0) - Nil

9.2 (NOTE: In the absence of a mover for the amendment, Amendment Number 3 on the list of amendments circulated at the meeting, was not considered by the Council.)

10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED

Brexit Deal

10.1 In the absence of a mover for the motion, item 9 on the order of business published for this meeting (Notice of Motion Given By Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed), together with Amendment Number 4 on the list of amendments circulated at the meeting, were not considered by the Council.

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR CRAIG GAMBLE PUGH

Schools Funding (1)

11.1 **RESOLVED:** On the Motion of Councillor Craig Gamble Pugh, seconded by Councillor Ben Miskell, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that, through the Schools Fairer Funding Formula, the Government is imposing real term cuts on schools by freezing per-pupil funding while inflation and school costs, such as staff salary costs, employer pension and national insurance contributions, increase; which affect all schools and academies alike;
- (b) notes that the 'area cost adjustment' will still apply and that this system perpetuates the inherent unfairness of the system and, as according to the Government's own statistics, in Sheffield by 2019 there will be an average pupil funding decrease of approximately 10%, around £350 per pupil, and that, even with a new funding formula, 98% of schools will be worse off in real terms;
- (c) notes that, eventually, schools funding will be distributed by national government, not through local authorities and the Schools Forum, removing any local discretion, influence or accountability;
- (d) believes that these proposals create divisions between primary and secondary schools and pits local authorities, parts of our City and even neighbouring schools, against each other; at the same time as the Government is finding over £500m extra cash for its Free and Grammar School agenda - which this Council is totally opposed to;

- (e) believes that the Government is continuing to penalise small schools and effectively forcing them to look for economies of scale by joining a Multi Academy Trust, pushing its Academy Policy;
- (f) reaffirms its opposition to segregation and the creation of new grammar schools and believes that the evidence base for grammar schools improving social mobility is incredibly weak and the Government's decision is derived more from ideology than evidence;
- (g) believes that every child deserves the best possible start in life, and that an excellent education is central to this, yet this Government's Funding proposals will make it extremely difficult for schools to meet the increasing demand of pupil numbers or address the growing national crisis in teacher recruitment and retention; and
- (h) urges all schools, governors, parents, carers and students to join with the NUT, Unison, GMBU and the Council to support the More Funding for all Sheffield Schools' Campaign; fighting for more funding to be found for schools, not from the proposed redistribution of cash between local authorities or from taking money from primary schools to give to secondary schools, but from new money; and encourages them to write to their local MPs to support the Campaign and to the Secretary of State for Education for the Government to review these proposals and find more money for our schools.

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

For the Motion (50)

- The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) and Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick

Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against the Motion (0) - Nil

Abstained on the Motion (0) - Nil

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE

Proposed Closure Of Eastern Avenue Jobcentre

12.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Dianne Hurst, that this Council:-

- (a) opposes the decision to close Eastern Avenue Jobcentre on the basis of accessibility, capacity, impact on the community and inadequate departmental analysis & assessment of the impact itself;
- (b) believes that the process by which these proposals have been announced do not stand alone from the decision itself, with the initial decision having been made without conducting an impact assessment and without a clear picture of those individual claimants or future claimants whom it is likely to affect; including extremely vulnerable claimants with disabilities and mental health problems;
- (c) is concerned that the proposals are putting 70 jobs at risk and believes there are major concerns about whether claimants will be as well supported by a newly reconfigured service, with the local office potentially much further afield for claimants;
- (d) believes that even if these jobs are relocated, the changes to the service will take a large amount of workers out of the local community at Manor Top and this will impact on the area and local businesses;
- (e) notes that this Administration is vocal in its opposition to the damaging impact the closure of the Jobcentre could have on how vital employment support is provided, and believes that there is a need for these services to be as close to people as possible and yet the proposals do nothing for forming a serious joined-up strategy of how employment services should be run;
- (f) believes the proposed closure of Eastern Avenue Jobcentre is a bad decision by this Government and one which will become evidently worse as Universal Credit continues to be rolled out, as people who are in work will have to attend interviews at Jobcentres; and notes that, as such, councillors from this Administration have called on the Government to reconsider its decision; and furthermore, offers full support and solidarity to the Public and Commercial Services Union (PCS) in its campaign to keep the Centre open; and

(g) notes that the public consultation has recently finished and that all nine Labour Councillors who represent the communities most affected – Park and Arbourthorne, Manor Castle and Richmond - submitted their objections to the plans, and hopes the Government takes heed of their advice and reconsiders those plans.

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

For the Motion (50) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) and Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Craig Gamble Pugh, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Steve Wilson, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against the Motion (0) - Nil

Abstained on the Motion (0) - Nil

12.2 (NOTE: In the absence of a mover for the amendment, Amendment Number 5 on the list of amendments circulated at the meeting, was not considered by the Council.)

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR STEVE AYRIS

Schools Funding (2)

13.1 In the absence of a mover for the motion, item 12 on the order of business published for this meeting (Notice of Motion Given By Councillor Steve Ayris), together with Amendment Number 6 on the list of amendments circulated at the meeting, were not considered by the Council.

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ROB MURPHY

Air Pollution

- 14.1 In the absence of a mover for the motion, item 13 on the order of business published for this meeting (Notice of Motion Given By Councillor Rob Murphy), together with Amendment Number 7 on the list of amendments circulated at the meeting, were not considered by the Council.

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER

“Quantitative Easing For The People”

- 15.1 In the absence of a mover for the motion, item 14 on the order of business published for this meeting (Notice of Motion Given By Councillor John Booker), together with Amendments Numbered 8 and 9 on the list of amendments circulated at the meeting, were not considered by the Council.

16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MAGID MAGID

Higher Education Teaching Excellence Framework

- 16.1 In the absence of a mover for the motion, item 15 on the order of business published for this meeting (Notice of Motion Given By Councillor Magid Magid), together with Amendment Number 10 on the list of amendments circulated at the meeting, were not considered by the Council.