

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 7 February 2018, at 5.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Magid Magid)

1	<i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i> Andy Nash Bob Pullin	10	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Steve Wilson	19	<i>Nether Edge & Sharrow Ward</i> Mohammad Maroof Alison Teal
2	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders Sophie Wilson	11	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Roger Davison Shaffaq Mohammed Paul Scriven	20	<i>Park & Arbourthorne</i> Julie Dore Ben Miskell Jack Scott
3	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	12	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Abdul Khayum Alan Law Abtisam Mohamed	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> 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> Mike Chaplin Tony Damms Jayne Dunn
6	<i>City Ward</i> Douglas Johnson Robert Murphy Moya O'Rourke	15	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Sue Auckland Steve Ayriss	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Crookes & Crosspool Ward</i> Adam Hanrahan	16	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	25	<i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Keith Davis
8	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea Zahira Naz	17	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Lisa Banes Terry Fox Pat Midgley	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	18	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Tony Downing Gail Smith	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> John Booker Adam Hurst Zoe Sykes
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Paul Wood

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from the Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) and Councillors Andy Bainbridge, Penny Baker, Craig Gamble Pugh, Richard Shaw and Jim Steinke.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.1 Councillor Bryan Lodge declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in Agenda Item 9 – Notice of Motion regarding Carillion, due to him being an employee of that Company, and he did not speak or vote on that item of business.
- 2.2 Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed declared a personal interest in the same Item due to his son being an employee of Carillion, and he stated that he would not speak or vote on that item of business.
- 2.3 Councillor Paul Scriven declared a personal interest in the same Item, on the grounds that he had undertaken work for Carillion over 12 months ago.

3. SUSPENSION OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES

- 3.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor David Baker, that approval be given, for the duration of this meeting and (via suspension of Council Procedure Rule 4.1) the ordinary meeting of the Council on 28th March 2018, to certain revisions to the Council Procedure Rules, as set out in the schedule included with the agenda for this meeting, in order to apply, to these meetings, the changes to the operation of the full Council meeting that were used at the ordinary Council meetings held from September to December as part of a pilot exercise being overseen by the Review of Full Council Meetings Member Working Group.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Petitions

4.1.1 Petition Requesting a Safe House for Males Suffering Domestic Abuse

The Council received an electronic petition containing 123 signatures, requesting a safe house for males suffering domestic abuse.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Alex Szumski and Cameron Barber. They informed the Council that the rate of suicides among males in the United Kingdom was three times that of females, although here were more programmes in place to support females. Young males aged 11 to 16 were subject to physical and verbal abuse and represented 13 percent of such reported cases. There are only 18 safe houses for males in the country

and a much higher number for women and it was considered that the resources available to support males were significantly less.

This work had been carried out by young people as part of a National Citizenship Service Programme. The petition requested a safe house for males suffering domestic abuse, where they can feel safe and able to openly share their experiences without being judged.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Cate McDonald, Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care. Councillor McDonald thanked the petitioners and concurred that many people were affected by domestic abuse, sexual abuse and rape, which was clearly not acceptable. What was known was that the majority of people affected were women as shown by needs assessments. The Council did work with other agencies to provide services which supported people who had experienced abuse. There were options for men seeking accommodation to escape abuse. However, there was not a specific refuge for men in Sheffield. Arrangements were made for young men suffering abuse. There was also a domestic violence helpline and services provided at Howden House, independent domestic violence advocacy service, outreach services and homelessness support.

There was not a lot of demand for specific support for men and therefore in cases where it was thought men would benefit from all male support groups, people should contact the organisations, such as the helpline.

She welcomed the work which the young people leading the petition had done. She said that if it was felt that people would benefit from the provision of an all-male support group then she urged people to make contact so that discussion could be held with the relevant service.

4.1.2 Petition Requesting a Change to the Policy on Black Bins

The Council received an electronic petition containing eight signatures, requesting a change to the policy on black bins, to allow for one large, and one standard size bin for students in households with six or more residents.

There was no speaker to the petition.

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

4.1.3 Petition Requesting Road Safety Improvements in Woodseats

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition containing 245 signatures, requesting road safety improvements in Woodseats.

There was no speaker to the petition.

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

4.1.4 Petition Requesting Action in Connection with Slippery Pavements, and the lack of grit bins, in the Tinsley area

The Council received a petition containing 300 signatures, requesting action in connection with slippery pavements, and the lack of grit bins, in the Tinsley area.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Zaffarullah Khan who stated that recently, due to the winter temperatures people, including older and young people had slipped and fallen on pavements. He said that grit bins had been removed and there was no salt treatment of footpaths. There was concern that local school children would fall. The local community would he said be willing to help assist, if this was activity which the Council was not able to resource as they had done for litter-picks, for example. He asked the Council to consider installing a grit bin and taking action before a more serious injury occurred.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport. Councillor Lodge said that reports of people slipping and tripping on pavements were taken seriously by the Council. A review of winter maintenance was undertaken at the end of each winter season and the issues raised by the petition would be included as part of the review. Councillor Lodge said that there had been a relatively high number of contacts to the Council regarding winter conditions so far this year. The Council had never gritted pavements other than those in the City centre or in District Shopping Centres. He said that he would write to the petitioners following the winter review. He asked people to report empty grit bins to the Council, so that these could be replenished. The Council was also looking at the feasibility of using self-monitoring grit bins in the future.

4.1.5 Petition Regarding the Placement of Homeless Families in Bed and Breakfast Accommodation

The Council received a petition containing 58 signatures regarding the placement of homeless families in bed and breakfast accommodation.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Violet Dickenson who stated that there had been reports of concerns relating to the conditions for mothers and children in bed and breakfast accommodation. There were various concerns about the living conditions for mothers with children, including at the Earl Marshall Guest House where a lone mother and child had spent more than six weeks in such accommodation; there was overcrowding such that they had to share a single room, showers and toilets; and there was one cooker available for some 20 people.

On 21 November 2017, the South Yorkshire Migration and Asylum Action Group wrote to senior councillors, although the letter had not been acknowledged. A Freedom of Information request had found that there were 43 families with children in bed and breakfast accommodation in Sheffield and

some on more than one occasion or for many weeks. The Council had an obligation not to place women who were pregnant or who had children in bed and breakfast accommodation but it could do so where no other emergency accommodation was available and only as a last resort and for up to six weeks. The women in question were homeless and some were the survivors of human trafficking.

There was concern that children were being placed in accommodation which was potentially unsafe and the petition called on the Council to stop placement of mothers and children in potentially unsafe temporary accommodation and accommodation where single men were also placed.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families. Councillor Drayton thanked the petitioners for bringing this issue to the Council's attention and she said that she had not seen the correspondence which had been referred to. However, she apologised that a reply had not been given.

Councillor Drayton said that the petition and letter had raised important issues. The Housing Solutions service worked with people at risk of homelessness. Bed and Breakfast accommodation was only used in absolute emergencies and for short periods. Establishments providing accommodation had to hold a licence and were subject to checks detailed in a schedule of requirements. The Earl Marshall Guest House held such a licence was also subject to checks.

31 of the 43 families in bed and breakfast accommodation had been placed there for more than one night and two families longer still. These families were asylum seekers who had been refused with no recourse to public funds. However, the Council did have obligations to the children despite the families having no recourse to stay in the UK. Councillor Drayton said that she would write to the lead petitioner concerning this matter and said that the Council did work with anyone who is homeless to try to support them.

4.1.6 Petition Objecting to Council Cuts

The Council received a petition containing 20 signatures, objecting to Council cuts and requesting that services be brought back under Council control.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Alistair Tice, who stated that he had submitted a similar petition in 2017 and which included the bringing in house of major contracts, including the Streets Ahead contract. He commented that events of the past 12 months vindicated what was proposed by the previous petition and said that the contract with Amey was unpopular and not one which protected jobs and conditions of Amey employees. Mr Tice referred to the Labour Party conference which had also indicated that PFI contracts should be taken back by public services. He said the Council had a legal means to free itself from the contract with Amey. The petition also proposed that the Council should refuse to implement the government cuts and instead set a lawful no cuts budget, using reserves and bringing services back in-house.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Olivia Blake, Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance. Councillor Blake said that no councillor wished to see cuts of the kind made by the Government in recent years. However, the Council had a legal duty to set a legal and balanced budget and if it did not do so, the Government would send in commissioners to run the organisation.

The Council's budget gap for 2018/19 was £44 million and since 2010, the Council had had savings of £430 million. The Council had said to the Government that enough is enough and had done its best to protect vulnerable people. Nor did the Council have a policy of privatisation and it was in fact bringing services in-house, including housing and out of hours' services. If the Government deployed commissioners, it was felt they would treat people with contempt.

4.1.7 Petition Requesting the Council to Limit Work on the Chelsea Road Elm Tree to Essential Maintenance Required for Public Safety

The Council received a petition containing 67 signatures, requesting the Council to limit work on the Chelsea Road Elm tree to essential maintenance required for public safety.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by David Glass who stated that the Chelsea Elm tree was especially important because it was resistant to disease and had a White Letter Hairstreak Butterfly population. The Council wished to cut the tree down and had said that engineering works to retain it would cost around £50K, whilst an alternative quotation for the engineering works had been attained by residents, which put the cost at significantly less, if Amey was not employed to do the work.

Mr Glass said that the independent Arborist engaged by the Council had said that one branch should be removed rather than the tree canopy but the Council had said that the tree was dangerously decayed, which he said misrepresented that facts and there was a zero cost option.

He referred to a breakdown in trust in relation to highways trees and to the use of force and litigation with associated ongoing costs and damage to communities, which was something which he said had to change and the Chelsea Elm tree was a good place to start. He believed that mediation would assist in this process. Sheffield and Rotherham Wildlife Trust represented the butterfly population and those organisations did not necessarily accept the use of Amey to provide opinions on the future of the tree which would be trusted by people. If the Council was to push ahead with the plans to fell the tree, it would only create more mistrust and he urged the Council to allow mediation to take place and for meaningful discussion to attempt to resolve the issue.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene. Councillor Lodge thanked the petitioners for bringing the matter to Council. He said that an independent assessment of the tree had been conducted in October 2016 by ACS Consulting and an aerial

survey of the tree had taken place. The survey had identified a significant cavity in the south eastern canopy and which extended 600 mm into the limb. Other decay to the tree was found and work was identified in relation to safety. A mitigation plan had been produced in relation to the White Letter Hairstreak butterfly with the Wildlife Trust and Butterfly Conservation UK (BCUK). The outcome of the activity relating to the butterfly would not be known until the summer. Indeed, there was also a risk to the butterfly colony if work was not done. Genetic material would be taken of the Huntingdon Elm tree by cloning by making cuttings and growing them for the future.

A number of organisations and individuals were involved in the proposals regarding the Elm tree or were being consulted. Councillor Lodge confirmed that the next stage in the work during week commencing 12 February related to safety and did not include the felling of the tree.

4.2 Public Questions

4.2.1 Public Question Concerning Sickle Cell

Leonie Williams said that she had suffered with Sickle Cell since birth and it had a huge effect on her life, caused by the resultant pain, which meant that she would be hospitalised for significant periods of time. She said that the SCAT organisation had provided her with understanding and advice on living with the condition. She said that whilst resources relating to Sickle Cell were limited, a positive difference could be made to people who suffered with Sickle Cell by building partnerships with health organisations and schools and she asked if councillors understood how the condition affected peoples' lives.

A question was also submitted on this subject by Gerald Edwards.

Councillor Cate McDonald, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, said that she had previously discussed the matters raised by Leonie Williams with the Director of Public Health and that she would make sure a response was provided to her as soon as possible. She thanked her for the question and for sharing her personal experiences.

4.2.2 Public Questions Concerning Temporary Accommodation for Homeless Women

Manuchehr Maleki Dizayi asked a question which also related to the petition submitted by Violet Dickenson concerning the use of bed and breakfast accommodation for lone mothers and children.

Nazona Mphande said that she had been accommodated in the Earl Marshall Guest House for a year and she was asking for help for both herself and her child.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, responded that she would meet with the questioners so that the particular details of the case could be discussed.

4.2.3 Public Question Concerning High Green Youth Club

David Ogle informed the Council that a volunteer run youth club in High Green, which had approximately 200 members, had closed because of the actions of the Parks department since November 2017. He said that a request for a meeting was refused and asked why this had happened. He said that he was, as a Parish Councillor, asking for the City Council's help with this matter.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure, said that the Pavilion building and youth club was not closed but the use of deep fat fryers in the building had been stopped on the grounds of health and safety. She said that a communication had sent to a Mr Bawden regarding this matter but that the Council was awaiting a reply from him. Councillor Lea said that she would be pleased to arrange a meeting with the relevant interested parties.

4.2.4 Public Questions Concerning Streets Ahead Programme

Maggie Young said that it was understood that there was a plan to fell a further 250 street trees during the core investment period and whilst she would like that plan to be rescinded, would the Council provide full information and undertake consultation prior to any further action on this matter.

Celia Pinnington asked whether the Council accepted that parking restrictions on more than 20 streets for several continuous weeks to allow work to street trees caused a major inconvenience to residents and whether the duration of restrictions could be reduced.

Isabel O'Leary said that one of the principles of good governance to which the Council was committed was to take informed and transparent decisions, which were subject to effective scrutiny and management of risk. In view of this, she asked what independent audits had been undertaken to check that the contractor Amey was reporting work accurately, including details of by whom these had been done, dates undertaken and where the results had been published.

Julie Stribley asked the Council to make available the independent report regarding the Chelsea Elm tree and to explain the nature of the safety work to be undertaken in relation tree and the one dead limb. She commented that heavy pollarding would present a risk to the future of the tree in the form of disease and that cuttings taken of the tree were likely to fail due the climate. She also commented that the transportation of the butterfly was something which had not been done before.

Shelly Cockayne asked whether the Council acknowledge that it had created the circumstances that led to recent protest events and conflict on Meersbrook Park Road and commented that there were solutions available including genuine negotiation and mediation.

Justin Buxton asked whether the Council would rescind the Streets Ahead contract on the grounds of information not having been disclosed by Amey

during the bidding process. He asked why the Council had made payments to Amey LG when there was no contract with that firm visible on the contract register. He commented that he had asked this question at the January meeting of Council but had not yet received a reply.

Nigel Slack made reference to a response to his question at Cabinet in January provided by the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene and said he awaited responses to the following part of the question:

“Irrespective of whether they will be met, will Council give full details of all the milestones for this initial 'Core Investment' period of the contract, detailing the original milestone, and any changes to milestones that were made during the course of the contract to date? Please provide supporting documentary evidence for the answers to these questions.”

Secondly, Mr Slack referred to the collapse of Carillion, and to people questioning whether some major contracts remained financially prudent. He said that many of these major contracts had been won with undervalued bids that have little hope of creating any added value for the contractors. He said that Amey Hallam Highways appeared to have made no profit in the first five years of the contract and now Capita was issuing profit warnings and its share value had more halved.

He asked what steps Council was taking to ensure it had contingency plans in place should any of the City's major contractors collapse.

Thirdly, Mr Slack asked whether the Council had undertaken any formal analysis of the reputational impact on the City of the widespread media coverage, locally, nationally and internationally surrounding the protests regarding the City's street trees; if so, when will the results of this analysis be published; and if not, why such an analysis had not been undertaken.

Fourthly, Mr Slack referred to Sheffield MP Louise Haigh recently having called (via an early day motion) for private contractors delivering public services to be included in Freedom of Information Act (FOI) regulations. He said that in an exchange on social media, a Cabinet Member praised this idea and commented “SCC already requires contractors to comply with FOI law. Quite rightly”.

He said that he had been told that private contractors were not themselves covered by FOI and can only be scrutinised for information they hold on behalf of Council. This, he said was irrespective of the apparent blanket use of Commercial Confidentiality as an escape clause which Council seem too eager to accept.

He asked the following:

Are members of the public able to place FOI requests on individual contractors? If so, which contracts are included, all or just selected contracts? If not, could the Council please clarify, for each of the major contracts, the information the contractor's hold on behalf of the Council?

Fifth, Mr Slack said that at the last Cabinet meeting he made the following comment: “The silence from this Council over the violence and unlawful behaviour of security staff employed by its Streets Ahead contractor is shameful and for women Councillors to remain silent in the face of violence to women is unbelievably so.”

He said that he had included evidence of the casual abuse handed out to a female Councillor at just one protest and had then asked for any comment. He said that the response he received was clearly a carefully pre-prepared legal statement that boiled down to 'take it up with the police'.

He asked, in the centenary year of the first victory for Women's Suffrage, is this how Council wish to be remembered?

Richard Davis referred to the termination of a contract by the Council with another organisation and that the same action had not been taken with regard to Amey. He asked whether there was a disparity in the application of contract management. Secondly, he referred to an injury (a broken wrist) to a member the Amey workforce which had been reported by Amey, whilst a Freedom of Information request to the Health and Safety Executive had found that no such injury was reported. He asked whether there was disparity in the accounts and incidents reported by Amey.

Russell Johnson asked whether the Cabinet Member would be listening to residents of Nether Edge who wanted healthy trees retained. Secondly, he asked whether the Leader of the Council would consider her position with a view to resigning.

Paul Turpin asked a question about the use of unacceptable language on social media to refer to people involved in tree related protests.

Dave Dillner referred to the anniversary of women winning the right to vote and the opening of an exhibition celebrating 200 years of people and protest in Sheffield. He asked whether the Leader of the Council would join him in paying tribute to the women of the tree campaign.

Sheldon Hall asked whether the Leader of the Council was satisfied that the Streets Ahead PFI Project Board exercised all due diligence during the procurement of the Streets Ahead contract?

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Sustainability, responded as regards parking restrictions, which he said were imposed by the Council and not Amey. He agreed that parking restrictions might potentially be annoying and disruptive for some people, but they were only temporary and there was a wish that these were in place for as short a time as possible. When work to the highways was completed, people were satisfied with the results.

Councillor Olivia Blake, Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, responded with regard to the question concerning major contracts. She said that all Council services had to develop business continuity plans and

where necessary other providers would be engaged or the Council would step-in to provide services.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council responded as regards peaceful protest and stated that she had said on many occasions that she would welcome people who had chosen to protest in relation to a worthy cause. As regards the use of inappropriate language concerning the abuse of women, she would suggest that the matter was brought to the attention of the provider of the social media platform concerned. She said such comments as those which insight hatred and violence were not acceptable and should not be tolerated. With regard to the allegations of violent or unlawful behaviour of security personnel, Councillor Dore responded that if someone had evidence of such behaviour, they should report this to the Police.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, responded in relation to the pause in work as part of the Streets Ahead programme. This was the result of a review taking place and given concerns regarding safety. He referred to the protest on Meersbrook Park Road and said it was wise that the Amey workers had decided to cease work given the situation. Councillor Lodge said that he supported the right to peaceful protest.

As regards the reports of injuries, the Police were investigating a number of allegations of assault and if there was evidence of criminal activity, this should be handed to the Police. He said that the reasons for the work to street trees had not changed and this was according to the Six D's criteria: dangerous, dead, diseased, dying, damaging or discriminatory. Amey was assessing the risk as regards the safety of members of the public, protesters, workers, stewards and the Police.

In relation to governance, Councillor Lodge said that he would provide a more detailed response to Isabel O'Leary. In summary, the relevant standards was ISO 14001 2015 and the Streets Ahead contract was self-monitoring. Independent assessment had been undertaken of work to street lighting and two audits had also been carried out in the past 5 years with another due later this year.

Councillor Lodge said that the report relating to the Chelsea Elm and previous reports were available to view on the Council website.

With regards the issue of use or reasonable force during the situation on Meersbrook Park Road, Councillor Lodge said that if people had evidence of any alleged criminality, this should be reported to the Police.

The Council policy with regards to the tree replacement programme included addressing trees where they fell into the category of discriminatory or were damaging and work was to continue and formed part of the Streets Ahead programme which was over a longer period of time.

Councillor Lodge referred to the question from Mr Slack, which concerned milestones for the core investment period of the contract, the original milestone

and any changes to milestones, and said that he would provide a full response in writing to Mr Slack. Information concerning the milestones was published on the Council's website and in fact the milestones had not changed. The proportion of work to which he had previously referred concerned the amount of improvement work completed in relation to condition surveys

Councillor Lodge said that in respect of reputational impact on the Council and the City, the reports in the media were partly due to the effectiveness of campaign activity relating to highway trees in Sheffield. He did not believe that this was an issue which was being discussed widely in other places in the UK.

In relation to Mr Slack's question concerning violence and unlawful behaviour, Councillor Lodge said that he had seen footage from body cameras of the incident to which Mr Slack referred. There was evidence of abuse which both he and other colleagues had received which was not acceptable and he hoped that everybody would decry such behaviour. He said that whilst councillors may have their political differences, he believed that no councillor deserved to be subjected to abuse.

Councillor Lodge undertook to provide a written response to Mr Davis in relation to the questions which he had asked concerning contract management; and reports relating to health and safety and injury.

In response to Russell Johnson's question concerning listening to residents who asked wanted healthy trees retained, Councillor Lodge said that the Council did listen to all of the comments made from all over the City. However, he said that some people did not accept that there were different opinions amongst the public and Councillors.

With reference to the question of Justin Buxton regarding rescinding the Streets Ahead contract with Amey, Councillor Lodge said that he had nothing further to add regarding the issue of Amey and health and safety and that there had been an investigation regarding that matter by KPMG. With regards Mr Buxton's second point regarding payments to Amey LG to which he had not yet had a reply, Councillor Lodge said that a response would be sent to Mr Buxton.

Councillor Olivia Blake stated that as regards Freedom of Information (FOI) requests, public bodies were subject to FOI legislation and the public could submit FOI requests to the Council regarding information that it held.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council stated in response to the question from Mr Johnson that she was not going to resign and that the electorate would effectively make a decision on her behalf.

4.2.5 Public Questions Concerning Temporary Accommodation for Homeless Women

Carrie Hedderwick made reference to a report which had been submitted to Cabinet on 13 December 2017 and in which it had been stated that existing temporary accommodation provided for homeless people by the Council was 'not fit for purpose' and urgent action was recommended as a result. She asked

when action would be taken and by when did the Council aim to have decent suitable accommodation available?

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, said that she would send Carrie Hedderwick information concerning general homeless accommodation which was out of scope of the Cabinet Member for Children Young People and Families. The Council was examining the issues of housing for people who were homeless, supported housing and housing commissioning and it was thought that £700K of funding would be required. The Government had offered £140K for the Council to fulfil statutory obligations. There were challenges relating to homelessness and rough sleeping and the Council was working to maximise and improve available resources and a submission had been sent to the Government. It was important that suitable accommodation was found for people and especially for those who were vulnerable and the Council was committed to act on this issue.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children Young People and Families, referred to the questions which had previously been asked on the issue of use of bed and breakfast accommodation. The individual concerned had been successful in her claim to remain in the UK and Councillor Drayton stated that she would follow up the issues which had been raised concerning the quality of the temporary accommodation where the woman and her child were staying.

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

5.1 Urgent Business

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

5.2 Questions

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

5.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

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

6. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN & HRA BUDGET 2018/19

6.1 It was moved by Councillor Jayne Dunn, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, that the following recommendations made by the Cabinet at its meeting on 17th January 2018 in relation to the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan and Budget 2018/19, be approved:-

“RESOLVED: That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 7 February 2018 that:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2018/19 as set out in the appendix to the report is approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget 2018/19 as set out in the appendix to the report is approved;
- (c) rents for council dwellings, including temporary accommodation, are reduced by 1% from April 2018 in line with the requirements in the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016;
- (d) a single rate for garage rents of £9.35 per week for a garage plot and £2.10 per week for a garage site be applied to new garage tenancies from April 2018 and to existing garage tenancies once improvements have been made to existing garage sites and plots;
- (e) the community heating unit charges remain unchanged for 2018/19;
- (f) the sheltered housing service charge remain unchanged for 2018/19;
- (g) burglar alarm charges remain unchanged for 2018/19; and
- (h) service charges for furnished accommodation remain unchanged from April 2018.”

6.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and seconded by Councillor Steve Ayriss, as an amendment, that the recommendations made by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 17th January, 2018, concerning the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan and HRA Budget 2018/19, be approved with the addition of a new paragraph (i) as follows:-

- (i) (i) notes that it was necessary to remove the cladding from Hanover Tower, due to safety concerns following the devastating Grenfell Tower fire;
- (ii) notes that the original purpose of the cladding was to insulate the tower block and that now residents of the building may face higher heating bills to compensate for the lack of insulation since the removal of the cladding; and

(iii) requests that officers ensure that any increase in heating costs since the removal of the cladding is identified and, if necessary, arrange to provide financial support to the residents from the District Heating Account or alternative sources of financial assistance.

- 6.3 After contributions from other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Jayne Dunn, the amendment was put to the vote and was negated.
- 6.4 The original Motion was then put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 17th January, 2018:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2018/19 as set out in the appendix to the report is approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget 2018/19 as set out in the appendix to the report is approved;
- (c) rents for council dwellings, including temporary accommodation, are reduced by 1% from April 2018 in line with the requirements in the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016;
- (d) a single rate for garage rents of £9.35 per week for a garage plot and £2.10 per week for a garage site be applied to new garage tenancies from April 2018 and to existing garage tenancies once improvements have been made to existing garage sites and plots;
- (e) the community heating unit charges remain unchanged for 2018/19;
- (f) the sheltered housing service charge remain unchanged for 2018/19;
- (g) burglar alarm charges remain unchanged for 2018/19; and
- (h) service charges for furnished accommodation remain unchanged from April 2018.

7. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "THE STREETS AHEAD CONTRACT" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR ADAM HANRAHAN

- 7.1 It was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and seconded by Councillor Adam Hanrahan, that this Council:-
- (a) notes the concerns reported in the press regarding the tendering process which resulted in the Amey StreetsAhead contract;
 - (b) believes that this contract should serve the people of Sheffield; that the Council Administration should work towards achieving greater flexibility,

timeliness, cost effectiveness and improve the safety whilst achieving better value for money from the StreetsAhead programme;

- (c) is deeply concerned by the reported allegations that Amey may have failed to declare legal proceedings that were pending or threatened, leading to a criminal conviction, and therefore believes this warrants further investigation as, if found to be true, it could be the basis to determine a legal validity of the StreetsAhead contract; and
- (d) resolves that due to the serious nature of the allegations, the Administration should ensure that an open and independent inquiry be carried out as a matter of urgency by a person such as a retired judge with expertise in commercial law, which would report back to full Council so an open, independent and transparent recommendation can be made to this Council to allow us to continue to invest in our highways infrastructure.

7.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Bryan Lodge, and seconded by Councillor Mike Chaplin, 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) reaffirms its commitment to the ongoing work under the Streets Ahead contract;
- (b) highlights the fact that a large number of Freedom of Information requests, and petitions, as well as a KPMG investigation instigated by members of the public, have been put forward in relation to the aforementioned allegations and the suggestion that the Streets Ahead contract can be terminated without significant financial penalties;
- (c) notes that Sheffield City Council's legal department have scrutinised claims that the contract could be cancelled penalty free due to legal reasons, and does not agree, and also notes that the allegation that Amey plc had a conviction for corporate manslaughter was found by the Court to be inaccurate;
- (d) further notes that Amey UK plc was the lead bidder in the procurement and was required to respond to the mandatory and discretionary procurement regulated Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) questions and that they did this to the satisfaction of the Council and our external legal advisers;
- (e) reaffirms awareness of the Health & Safety conviction in 2011;
- (f) reiterates satisfaction that there has been no breach by Amey of the PQQ process or the Bid Process Agreement and, therefore, strongly disagrees that there are grounds for terminating the contract without incurred penalties on the basis that has been set out;

- (g) notes that in relation to the most recent Health & Safety Contravention Notices given to Amey by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Amey are complying with the terms of the PFI Contract by notifying the Council of the Contravention Notices, and continue to update the Council;
- (h) notes that, subject to the outcome of the discussions between the HSE and Amey, the Council will determine if any action needs to be taken in accordance with the terms of the PFI contract, and reiterates that, at this point in time, there are no grounds for termination of the PFI contract without significant financial penalties;
- (i) further notes that, ultimately, the facts are not disputed but that it is a difference of opinion in the consequences of these facts, and these could only really be resolved by a court or tribunal;
- (j) reiterates that this Administration has never supported the PFI model, however, voluntarily terminating the contract would cost the Council millions, and at a time when the Council has made £390 million of cuts to services since 2011, believes this is not acceptable; and
- (k) notes that the Labour Party has outlined their plan for government to bring certain PFI contracts in-house, and support is given to this proposal.

7.3 It was then moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, and seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (e) and (f) as follows:-

- (e) asks officers, in the event that the inquiry finds evidence that the bidder for the Streets Ahead contract made a dishonest statement to obtain the contract, to investigate bringing the contract back in-house; and
- (f) believes that the Streets Ahead contract should be fully disclosed on the grounds of public interest to enable all Councillors and members of the public to see what has been signed up to on their behalf.

7.4 After a contribution from another Member, and following a right of reply from Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, the amendment moved by Councillor Bryan Lodge was put to the vote and was carried.

7.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Robert Murphy was then put to the vote and was negated.

7.5.1 (NOTE: Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Gail Smith, David Baker and Vickie Priestley voted against paragraph (e) and for paragraph (f) of the amendment, 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 was carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) reaffirms its commitment to the ongoing work under the Streets Ahead contract;
- (b) highlights the fact that a large number of Freedom of Information requests, and petitions, as well as a KPMG investigation instigated by members of the public, have been put forward in relation to the aforementioned allegations and the suggestion that the Streets Ahead contract can be terminated without significant financial penalties;
- (c) notes that Sheffield City Council's legal department have scrutinised claims that the contract could be cancelled penalty free due to legal reasons, and does not agree, and also notes that the allegation that Amey plc had a conviction for corporate manslaughter was found by the Court to be inaccurate;
- (d) further notes that Amey UK plc was the lead bidder in the procurement and was required to respond to the mandatory and discretionary procurement regulated Pre-Qualification Questionnaire (PQQ) questions and that they did this to the satisfaction of the Council and our external legal advisers;
- (e) reaffirms awareness of the Health & Safety conviction in 2011;
- (f) reiterates satisfaction that there has been no breach by Amey of the PQQ process or the Bid Process Agreement and, therefore, strongly disagrees that there are grounds for terminating the contract without incurred penalties on the basis that has been set out;
- (g) notes that in relation to the most recent Health & Safety Contravention Notices given to Amey by the Health and Safety Executive (HSE), Amey are complying with the terms of the PFI Contract by notifying the Council of the Contravention Notices, and continue to update the Council;
- (h) notes that, subject to the outcome of the discussions between the HSE and Amey, the Council will determine if any action needs to be taken in accordance with the terms of the PFI contract, and reiterates that, at this point in time, there are no grounds for termination of the PFI contract without significant financial penalties;
- (i) further notes that, ultimately, the facts are not disputed but that it is a difference of opinion in the consequences of these facts, and these could only really be resolved by a court or tribunal;
- (j) reiterates that this Administration has never supported the PFI model, however, voluntarily terminating the contract would cost the Council

millions, and at a time when the Council has made £390 million of cuts to services since 2011, believes this is not acceptable; and

- (k) notes that the Labour Party has outlined their plan for government to bring certain PFI contracts in-house, and support is given to this proposal.

8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "WOMEN'S EQUALITY & WOMEN AGAINST STATE PENSION INEQUALITY CAMPAIGN" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR OLIVIA BLAKE AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR ZAHIRA NAZ

8.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Olivia Blake, and formally seconded by Councillor Zahira Naz, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that this month we celebrate the 100 year anniversary of the Representation of the People Act (1918), which first granted the vote to 8.4 million women in the UK, being initially only to those over the age of 30 who meet a property qualification;
- (b) notes that in addition to this important milestone, International Women's Day will be celebrated globally on 08 March and it is, therefore, a pertinent time to consider how far we have travelled in the fight for gender equality but to also recognise how much further we have to go, both in the UK and internationally;
- (c) believes that the challenge now is to build on past achievements and push for full equality for women: financially, in the workplace, in families and homes and in public spaces, but further believes, with regret and anger, that many policies introduced by this Government are retrograde for the economic equality for women;
- (d) believes it is outrageous that in 2016, women in the UK are more likely to work for less pay than men, in low paid sectors and be disproportionately affected by austerity;
- (e) notes that women approaching the pensionable age have also been badly affected by the 2011 Pensions Act, which legislated that women's State Pension Age would increase to 65 by 2018;
- (f) believes that whilst the equalisation of the State Pension Age should be welcomed, the acceleration of that equalisation, implemented by the Coalition Government and overseen by former Liberal Democrat Pensions Minister, the Rt. Hon. Steve Webb, discriminates against women born in the early 1950s, and has left them with inadequate time to make alternative arrangements and adversely affected their retirement plans;

- (g) notes Steve Webb's admission to the Institute for Government in December 2015 that he made a "bad decision" on raising the State Pension Age;
- (h) calls on Richard Harrington MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Pensions, to immediately introduce transitional arrangements to provide protection for women affected by the equalisation of the State Pension Age;
- (i) notes with regret that the Women Against State Pension Inequality (WASPI) movement and the Labour Party have been demanding such transitional arrangements for seven years and yet Conservative governments, and the preceding Coalition government, have failed to implement such arrangements and have, as such, affected millions of women in the UK, which this Council believes is unfair and unjust;
- (j) notes that for 2016's Autumn Statement, 86% of the amount taken by HM Treasury through tax and benefit measures had come from women, with a disproportionate impact on women from black and minority ethnic backgrounds; and
- (k) supports the Labour Party's on-going consultation on a new Economic Equality Bill, as this Bill will aim to strengthen legislation around equal pay and tackle the structural and economic barriers that stop women, BAME communities and disabled people from reaching their full potential.

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

1. the addition of the following words at the end of paragraph (g) - “, however, notes that the Minister then went on to secure concessions from HM Treasury that provided some mitigation against the equalising of the State Pension Age”;
2. the deletion of paragraph (h) and the addition of a new paragraph (h) as follows:-
 - (h) calls on Guy Opperman MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Pensions and Financial Inclusion, to immediately introduce transitional arrangements to provide protection for women affected by the equalisation of the State Pension Age;
3. the deletion of paragraphs (i) and (k) and the re-lettering of paragraph (j) as a new paragraph (i); and
4. the addition of a new paragraph (j) as follows:-
 - (j) requests that the Rt. Hon. Esther McVey MP, in her new role as the

Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, examines the case of women born on or after the 6th April 1950 and looks at ways to compensate them from the discrimination that was made against them regarding the equalisation of the pension age.

8.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Alison Teal, and formally seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (e) to (k) as new paragraphs (f) to (l):-

(e) therefore looks forward to the publication by this Council, and its major contractors, of their gender pay data at the earliest opportunity;

8.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Mary Lea, and formally seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (l) to (o) as follows:-

(l) notes that Sheffield City Council is working closely with its partners to bid for the Women's Vote Centenary Grant Scheme, and that, together, we are also looking at other funding opportunities that may be available;

(m) further notes that a website ran by the Council and its partners will be launched to co-ordinate events across the city celebrating the campaign for women's suffrage and the historic role of Sheffield in the struggle for women's rights and equality;

(n) notes the strong legacy of Sheffield women in the campaign for equal rights and that Labour and Co-Operative Party Councillor, Eleanor Barton (Attercliffe ward), was one of the first women to be elected to public office anywhere in the UK in 1919; and

(o) opposes comments by Liberal Democrat MP, Jo Swinson, calling for a statue of Margaret Thatcher in Westminster and believes this demonstrates the ignorance of the Lib Dem's to all the lives and communities that were destroyed by the Thatcher government in the 1980s and notes that whilst the Liberal Democrats campaign for statues of Margaret Thatcher, Labour are putting up statues to celebrate Sheffield women of steel.

8.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Sue Auckland was put to the vote and was negated, with the exception of Part 2 - the proposed new paragraph (h) - which was carried.

8.6 The amendment moved by Councillor Alison Teal was then put to the vote and was negated.

8.7 The amendment moved by Councillor Mary Lea was then put to the vote and was carried.

8.7.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (l) to (n) of the amendment and against paragraph (o) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded: and

2. Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (l) to (n) of the amendment and abstained from voting on paragraph (o) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

8.8 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 this month we celebrate the 100 year anniversary of the Representation of the People Act (1918), which first granted the vote to 8.4 million women in the UK, being initially only to those over the age of 30 who meet a property qualification;
- (b) notes that in addition to this important milestone, International Women's Day will be celebrated globally on 08 March and it is, therefore, a pertinent time to consider how far we have travelled in the fight for gender equality but to also recognise how much further we have to go, both in the UK and internationally;
- (c) believes that the challenge now is to build on past achievements and push for full equality for women: financially, in the workplace, in families and homes and in public spaces, but further believes, with regret and anger, that many policies introduced by this Government are retrograde for the economic equality for women;
- (d) believes it is outrageous that in 2016, women in the UK are more likely to work for less pay than men, in low paid sectors and be disproportionately affected by austerity;
- (e) notes that women approaching the pensionable age have also been badly affected by the 2011 Pensions Act, which legislated that women's State Pension Age would increase to 65 by 2018;
- (f) believes that whilst the equalisation of the State Pension Age should be welcomed, the acceleration of that equalisation, implemented by the Coalition Government and overseen by former Liberal Democrat Pensions Minister, the Rt. Hon. Steve Webb, discriminates against women born in the early 1950s, and has left them with inadequate time to make alternative arrangements and adversely affected their retirement plans;
- (g) notes Steve Webb's admission to the Institute for Government in

December 2015 that he made a “bad decision” on raising the State Pension Age;

- (h) calls on Guy Opperman MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Pensions and Financial Inclusion, to immediately introduce transitional arrangements to provide protection for women affected by the equalisation of the State Pension Age;
- (i) notes with regret that the Women Against State Pension Inequality (WASPI) movement and the Labour Party have been demanding such transitional arrangements for seven years and yet Conservative governments, and the preceding Coalition government, have failed to implement such arrangements and have, as such, affected millions of women in the UK, which this Council believes is unfair and unjust;
- (j) notes that for 2016's Autumn Statement, 86% of the amount taken by HM Treasury through tax and benefit measures had come from women, with a disproportionate impact on women from black and minority ethnic backgrounds;
- (k) supports the Labour Party's on-going consultation on a new Economic Equality Bill, as this Bill will aim to strengthen legislation around equal pay and tackle the structural and economic barriers that stop women, BAME communities and disabled people from reaching their full potential;
- (l) notes that Sheffield City Council is working closely with its partners to bid for the Women's Vote Centenary Grant Scheme, and that, together, we are also looking at other funding opportunities that may be available;
- (m) further notes that a website ran by the Council and its partners will be launched to co-ordinate events across the city celebrating the campaign for women's suffrage and the historic role of Sheffield in the struggle for women's rights and equality;
- (n) notes the strong legacy of Sheffield women in the campaign for equal rights and that Labour and Co-Operative Party Councillor, Eleanor Barton (Attercliffe ward), was one of the first women to be elected to public office anywhere in the UK in 1919; and
- (o) opposes comments by Liberal Democrat MP, Jo Swinson, calling for a statue of Margaret Thatcher in Westminster and believes this demonstrates the ignorance of the Lib Dem's to all the lives and communities that were destroyed by the Thatcher government in the 1980s and notes that whilst the Liberal Democrats campaign for statues of Margaret Thatcher, Labour are putting up statues to celebrate Sheffield women of steel.

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

- For paragraphs (a) to (h) and (l) to (n) of the Substantive Motion (76) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid) and Councillors Bob Pullin, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Moya O'Rourke, Adam Hanrahan, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Gail Smith, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, David Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.
- Against paragraphs (a) to (h) and (l) to (n) of the Substantive Motion (0) - Nil
- Abstained from voting on paragraphs (a) to (h) and (l) to (n) of the Substantive Motion (0) - Nil
- For paragraphs (i), (k) and (o) of the Substantive Motion (55) - Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Moya O'Rourke, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Pauline Andrews, 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, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

- Against paragraphs (i), (k) and (o) of the Substantive Motion (17) - Councillors Bob Pullin, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker and Vickie Priestley.
- Abstained from voting on paragraphs (i), (k) and (o) of the Substantive Motion (4) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal.
- For paragraph (j) of the Substantive Motion (72) - Councillors Bob Pullin, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Moya O'Rourke, Adam Hanrahan, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Gail Smith, Tony Downing, Mohammad Maroof, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, David Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.
- Against paragraph (j) of the Substantive Motion (0) - Nil

Abstained from voting on - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid paragraph (j) of the Substantive Motion (4) Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal.

9. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "CARILLION" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LISA BANES AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MARK JONES

9.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Lisa Banes, and formally seconded by Councillor Mark Jones, that this Council:-

- (a) believes Carillion's collapse is deeply concerning and that the Government have significant questions to answer as to how this situation was allowed to develop and why they so recently awarded contracts worth billions of taxpayers' money;
- (b) notes that Carillion's demise will be felt right across the county, but gives reassurances that Sheffield City Council has no contracts for services with Carillion, and that all works under previous construction deals have already been completed;
- (c) notes that Carillion employs 250 people in Sheffield at their call centre on Broad Street West, and the Council's Administration will provide whatever support it can to those affected;
- (d) believes that the Carillion case highlights Government negligence and corporate failure and, whilst the government have committed to an investigation, it is essential that this is thorough and of consequence;
- (e) notes that on 10 July 2017, Carillion issued its first profit warning, with its share price dropping by 39%, but only one week later the Transport Secretary, the Rt. Hon Chris Grayling MP, awarded Carillion a £1.4 billion HS2 contract as part of a joint venture;
- (f) reiterates the Labour Party's belief that workers should have representatives on company boards, and that had such a policy been in place it would have almost certainly improved the governance of Carillion;
- (g) further notes that Carillion has had a long history of involvement in the blacklisting of trade union workers, and reiterates that, whilst under this Administration, this Council has previously passed a motion (November 2012) decreeing blacklisting as an unacceptable practice which cannot be condoned;
- (h) supports the Labour Party's position that the Government need to act quickly to bring Carillion's public sector contracts back in-house to protect public services and ensure employees, supply-line businesses, taxpayers and pension fund members are all protected, as the

Government cannot outsource its responsibility and duty of care to these workers and vital public sector projects;

- (i) notes that this Council Administration has never supported financing through the PFI model when work can be properly done in-house, but under the present Government, and the Coalition government before them, this is often the only means of securing funding to improve and maintain Council services and that organisations are forced to, in the words of the Shadow Chancellor, the Rt. Hon John McDonnell MP, use the “only show in town” as a means of getting required funding from central government;
- (j) notes that, where possible, Council services are being brought back in-house, such as housing repairs, human resources, payroll and the 101 telephone service (ran with South Yorkshire Police);
- (k) reiterates that a Labour government would review all large government contracts outsourced and that it is vital that shareholders and creditors are not allowed to walk away with the rewards from profitable contracts while the taxpayer bails out loss-making parts of the business; and
- (l) supports the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Corbyn MP’s call for Carillion bosses to hand back bonuses recently paid – awarded despite running the Company into debts and liabilities worth £1.5 billion, and in addition, believes this affair is yet more proof that there is need for far greater pay transparency.

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

- 1. the replacement, in paragraph (f), of the words “reiterates the Labour Party’s belief” by the words “supports the belief”; and
- 2. the deletion of paragraphs (i) to (l) and the addition of new paragraphs (i) to (k) as follows:-
 - (i) notes that the UK saw an explosion of PFI contracts being awarded to private companies during the prime ministerships of Tony Blair and Gordon Brown, and further notes that over a third of the Carillion PFI contracts were awarded by the previous Labour government;
 - (j) resolves to support the Rt. Hon. Sir Vince Cable MP’s position that “shareholders and creditors, not taxpayers, should take the financial “hit” of saving struggling construction giant Carillion from collapse”; and
 - (k) further notes his call for a National Audit Office investigation and Parliamentary scrutiny by the Public Accounts Committee to understand what led to Carillion’s collapse and why the Government awarded public

sector contracts to the Company when they had issued concerning profit warnings.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes Carillion's collapse is deeply concerning and that the Government have significant questions to answer as to how this situation was allowed to develop and why they so recently awarded contracts worth billions of taxpayers' money;
- (b) notes that Carillion's demise will be felt right across the county, but gives reassurances that Sheffield City Council has no contracts for services with Carillion, and that all works under previous construction deals have already been completed;
- (c) notes that Carillion employs 250 people in Sheffield at their call centre on Broad Street West, and the Council's Administration will provide whatever support it can to those affected;
- (d) believes that the Carillion case highlights Government negligence and corporate failure and, whilst the government have committed to an investigation, it is essential that this is thorough and of consequence;
- (e) notes that on 10 July 2017, Carillion issued its first profit warning, with its share price dropping by 39%, but only one week later the Transport Secretary, the Rt. Hon Chris Grayling MP, awarded Carillion a £1.4 billion HS2 contract as part of a joint venture;
- (f) reiterates the Labour Party's belief that workers should have representatives on company boards, and that had such a policy been in place it would have almost certainly improved the governance of Carillion;
- (g) further notes that Carillion has had a long history of involvement in the blacklisting of trade union workers, and reiterates that, whilst under this Administration, this Council has previously passed a motion (November 2012) decreeing blacklisting as an unacceptable practice which cannot be condoned;
- (h) supports the Labour Party's position that the Government need to act quickly to bring Carillion's public sector contracts back in-house to protect public services and ensure employees, supply-line businesses, taxpayers and pension fund members are all protected, as the Government cannot outsource its responsibility and duty of care to these workers and vital public sector projects;

- (i) notes that this Council Administration has never supported financing through the PFI model when work can be properly done in-house, but under the present Government, and the Coalition government before them, this is often the only means of securing funding to improve and maintain Council services and that organisations are forced to, in the words of the Shadow Chancellor, the Rt. Hon John McDonnell MP, use the “only show in town” as a means of getting required funding from central government;
- (j) notes that, where possible, Council services are being brought back in-house, such as housing repairs, human resources, payroll and the 101 telephone service (ran with South Yorkshire Police);
- (k) reiterates that a Labour government would review all large government contracts outsourced and that it is vital that shareholders and creditors are not allowed to walk away with the rewards from profitable contracts while the taxpayer bails out loss-making parts of the business; and
- (l) supports the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Corbyn MP’s call for Carillion bosses to hand back bonuses recently paid – awarded despite running the Company into debts and liabilities worth £1.5 billion, and in addition, believes this affair is yet more proof that there is need for far greater pay transparency.

9.4.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Bob Pullin, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) to (e) of the Motion, voted against paragraphs (f), (h), (i), (k) and (l) of the Motion, and abstained from voting on paragraphs (g) and (j) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded;

2. Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a) to (h) of the Motion and abstained from voting on paragraphs (i) to (l) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded;

3. Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker voted for paragraphs (a) to (e) and (g) to (l) of the Motion and voted against paragraph (f) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

4. Councillors Bryan Lodge, Shaffaq Mohammed, having declared Disclosable Pecuniary or Personal Interests in this item of business, did not speak or vote on this item.)

10. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "COST EFFECTIVE IMPROVEMENT IN PUBLIC HEALTH" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR KEITH DAVIS

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

- (a) notes that South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive uses Global Positioning System (GPS) technology and software, etc., to tell passengers where the bus is and inform the person at the bus stop how long they have to endure their wait there;
- (b) believes this Council should introduce a Ward trial where this type of system is applied to bin lorries, whereby customers could register their mobile phone with the advertised SCC number, and on bin collection day they would receive a text stating "your bin lorry is ten minutes away, please put your bin out for collection, today is green/black/blue/brown bin";
- (c) recognises that many people forget to put their bin out for collection; a black bin full of domestic waste that is not emptied on collection day will have waste up to a month old by the time of the next collection; and in summer months especially, this would be detrimental to public health;
- (d) believes that this would alleviate the amount of litter strewn around our streets resulting from bins being put out prematurely in inclement weather conditions;
- (e) notes the 'yield' of the rubbish/waste from the bin lorry, if weighed before and after the Ward trail, would prove if the scheme was successful and worth city-wide roll out;
- (f) further notes that Geo-tracking could replace mobile phone registration, if the number is registered from a home address, with linked postcode; and
- (g) states that the objective of this initiative is cost effective improvement in public health, and requests the Administration to assess its feasibility.

10.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Steve Wilson, and formally seconded by Councillor Denise Fox, 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 the many inherent flaws in the proposed motion, without even going into what a costly exercise such measures would cost;
- (b) notes that, as a very rough estimate, to fit all the Veolia vehicles in the fleet would need the system to be fitted, along with back up units that would need to be placed to hired vehicles that are used from time to

time, therefore for the units and fitment alone would cost around £15,000;

- (c) further notes that whilst the cost of the actual system could not be properly estimated, the last minor change requested to be made to Veolia CRM system was in excess of £15k; the scheme would likely need someone to oversee the system, and that even part-time this would likely be £10k a year and there would also be administration set up costs of around £25k;
- (d) notes that, regardless of cost, waste collection crews do not follow a set route, unlike buses, therefore it is impossible to give a “10 minute warning” as the crew could be in the next street but may not collect the bin for another hour;
- (e) further notes that Sheffield City Council trialled a scheme a number of years ago where students could sign up for a text reminder the night before their scheduled collection day, and the sign up rate was extremely poor and the trial was dropped;
- (f) believes that the original proposal rests on the highly dubious assertion that the vast majority of Sheffield residents are at home and able to place their bin out in the daytime, and further believes that UKIP, a self-proclaimed “party of the people”, without any evidence of this, should really know better;
- (g) further contends that the Council asks residents to place their bins out by 7am, with many people putting out their bin the night before, so as to avoid any confusion and miss a collection and that such a scheme, as originally proposed, could lead to an over reliance on the reminders;
- (h) notes that Veolia already provide a yearly collection calendar to those households who have to place their containers out for collection; therefore, the number of collections reported as being missed due to the resident forgetting to place their containers out is small, and as such believes this is not an issue than needs addressing; and
- (i) further believes that residents can easily find their collection day online and that it is incredible that a party like UKIP, who have frequently decried that the UK is a “nanny state”, have come up with such a scheme and that this does really denote that UKIP have ran out of all ideas, and relevance, now that the country has voted to leave the EU.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the many inherent flaws in the proposed motion, without even going into what a costly exercise such measures would cost;
- (b) notes that, as a very rough estimate, to fit all the Veolia vehicles in the fleet would need the system to be fitted, along with back up units that would need to be placed to hired vehicles that are used from time to time, therefore for the units and fitment alone would cost around £15,000;
- (c) further notes that whilst the cost of the actual system could not be properly estimated, the last minor change requested to be made to Veolia CRM system was in excess of £15k; the scheme would likely need someone to oversee the system, and that even part-time this would likely be £10k a year and there would also be administration set up costs of around £25k;
- (d) notes that, regardless of cost, waste collection crews do not follow a set route, unlike buses, therefore it is impossible to give a “10 minute warning” as the crew could be in the next street but may not collect the bin for another hour;
- (e) further notes that Sheffield City Council trialled a scheme a number of years ago where students could sign up for a text reminder the night before their scheduled collection day, and the sign up rate was extremely poor and the trial was dropped;
- (f) believes that the original proposal rests on the highly dubious assertion that the vast majority of Sheffield residents are at home and able to place their bin out in the daytime, and further believes that UKIP, a self-proclaimed “party of the people”, without any evidence of this, should really know better;
- (g) further contends that the Council asks residents to place their bins out by 7am, with many people putting out their bin the night before, so as to avoid any confusion and miss a collection and that such a scheme, as originally proposed, could lead to an over reliance on the reminders;
- (h) notes that Veolia already provide a yearly collection calendar to those households who have to place their containers out for collection; therefore, the number of collections reported as being missed due to the resident forgetting to place their containers out is small, and as such believes this is not an issue than needs addressing; and
- (i) further believes that residents can easily find their collection day online and that it is incredible that a party like UKIP, who have frequently decried that the UK is a “nanny state”, have come up with such a scheme and that this does really denote that UKIP have ran out of all ideas, and relevance, now that the country has voted to leave the EU.

11. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "PUBLIC ACCOUNTABILITY OF MEMBERS AND OFFICERS" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ROBERT MURPHY AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS JOHNSON

11.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, and formally seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the recent application to the High Court by Sheffield City Council to commit Councillor Alison Teal, potentially to prison;
- (b) notes that the case was dismissed by the Court against Councillor Teal after the Judge agreed with Councillor Teal's view of the facts and law;
- (c) is seriously concerned that a member of the opposition on this City Council was selected from a significantly larger group of protestors for the case;
- (d) believes that the nationwide bad publicity has brought severe reputational damage to the City Council and the City of Sheffield;
- (e) is seriously concerned that despite the Judge's findings, there has been no public apology, statement or investigation by the Administration;
- (f) calls for an independent enquiry into the conduct of members of the Administration and Council officers that led to this case being brought, the enquiry team being agreed by all groups represented on Sheffield City Council, and the findings made public; and
- (g) will ensure that the enquiry team will have access to all information requested.

11.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Jack Scott, and formally seconded by Councillor Mick Rooney, 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 Sheffield City Council was successful in its applications to the court in issuing civil injunctions against Messrs Calvin Payne and Dave Dillner, Councillor Alison Teal and "persons unknown";
- (b) reiterates that any decisions to pursue potential breaches of the injunction are made completely independently of Members and that the impartiality of the legal process and the courts must be respected;
- (c) notes the mover and seconder of this motion have been informed on several occasions that the legal action against Councillor Teal was not political, but an independent decision, and asks Councillors to stop making allegations which are categorically untrue, and notes that Councillors have already been informed of this by the Chief Executive and the Monitoring Officer;

- (d) further notes that no Councillor is above the law and that this Council opposes the illegal entry of safety zones to prevent work from happening;
- (e) notes that this Administration has always respected the right to peacefully protest, but when someone enters the safety zone their action is no longer legal as it prevents work from being safely carried out, and that by entering the safety zone a trespasser is putting the potential safety of themselves, staff and other protestors and bystanders at substantial risk;
- (f) believes that public safety is of paramount importance and, as reaffirmed and agreed by the High Court, it is a breach of the injunction and therefore unlawful for protestors to enter the safety zone and prevent work from being safely carried out;
- (g) believes that the reported intimidation tactics being used by protestors to frighten people in their own homes are deplorable and notes that pre-dawn mask wearing by protestors has been described by residents as “sinister”, and condemns all threats and abuse regardless of which side one takes in this debate; and
- (h) reaffirms its commitment to the Streets-Ahead scheme which is ensuring a sustained and greener future for Sheffield streets, as well as significantly improved roads and pavements, and that any illegal activity preventing such work should be opposed.

11.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and formally seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (h) as follows:-

(h) apologises for the alarm and distress caused to Councillor Alison Teal.

11.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Jack Scott was put to the vote and was carried.

11.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was then put to the vote and was negated.

11.6 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 Sheffield City Council was successful in its applications to the court in issuing civil injunctions against Messrs Calvin Payne and Dave Dillner, Councillor Alison Teal and “persons unknown”;

- (b) reiterates that any decisions to pursue potential breaches of the injunction are made completely independently of Members and that the impartiality of the legal process and the courts must be respected;
- (c) notes the mover and seconder of this motion have been informed on several occasions that the legal action against Councillor Teal was not political, but an independent decision, and asks Councillors to stop making allegations which are categorically untrue, and notes that Councillors have already been informed of this by the Chief Executive and the Monitoring Officer;
- (d) further notes that no Councillor is above the law and that this Council opposes the illegal entry of safety zones to prevent work from happening;
- (e) notes that this Administration has always respected the right to peacefully protest, but when someone enters the safety zone their action is no longer legal as it prevents work from being safely carried out, and that by entering the safety zone a trespasser is putting the potential safety of themselves, staff and other protestors and bystanders at substantial risk;
- (f) believes that public safety is of paramount importance and, as reaffirmed and agreed by the High Court, it is a breach of the injunction and therefore unlawful for protestors to enter the safety zone and prevent work from being safely carried out;
- (g) believes that the reported intimidation tactics being used by protestors to frighten people in their own homes are deplorable and notes that pre-dawn mask wearing by protestors has been described by residents as “sinister”, and condemns all threats and abuse regardless of which side one takes in this debate; and
- (h) reaffirms its commitment to the Streets-Ahead scheme which is ensuring a sustained and greener future for Sheffield streets, as well as significantly improved roads and pavements, and that any illegal activity preventing such work should be opposed.

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

- | | | |
|---------------------------------|---|--|
| For the Substantive Motion (51) | - | Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Kieran Harpham, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Moya O'Rourke, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, 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, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against the Substantive Motion (8) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Pauline Andrews, Alison Teal, Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis and John Booker.

Abstained from voting on the Substantive Motion (16) - Councillors Bob Pullin, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Gail Smith, David Baker and Vickie Priestley.

12. NOTICE OF MOTION "TO CELEBRATE THE LEGACY OF THE CENTENARY OF WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ALISON TEAL AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS JOHNSON

12.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Alison Teal, and formally seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that the city of Sheffield should take pride in its heritage;
- (b) believes it is important to create a legacy to celebrate and commemorate Sheffield's campaign for women's suffrage, with the founding of the Female Political Association in 1851;
- (c) expresses a view that a cross-party steering group of councillors, community and university members be formed to develop proposals on suitable options to create a worthy legacy;
- (d) notes that a number of UK cities already successfully bid for funding to mark the centenary of the Representation of the People Act 1918 this year, and there is still time to apply for some Women's Vote Centenary Grant Scheme funding from the Government Equalities Office;
- (e) notes that Sheffield has a rightful opportunity to develop a lasting legacy to attract visitors and scholars to the city, as the place of the UK's founding organisation for the political struggle for women's suffrage;

- (f) notes possible legacies could include a wide range of ambitious projects such as a home for a centre for Women's History, to smaller scale provision of a PhD scholarship with a women's studies focus; and
- (g) requests that a steering group be established without delay to take advantage of current funding opportunities.

12.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Gail Smith, and formally seconded by Councillor Sue Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of new paragraphs (e) and (f) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (e) to (g) as new paragraphs (g) to (i):-

- (e) expresses disappointment that Sheffield City Council, though invited to apply for the Centenary City Fund, as a city with significant suffrage history, failed to meet the deadline and missed out on a share of the £1.2million fund allocated to the seven cities who applied;
- (f) expresses disappointment at what this Council regards as the unrealistic time frames and shambolic organisation applied to the small grant applications available via the Women's Vote Centenary Grant Scheme;

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

- (j) requests that the Government Equalities Office (GEO) reopens the Women's Vote Centenary Grant Scheme for applications for small grants by community groups to help fund centenary celebrations; and
- (k) asks officers to investigate other sources of funding available to celebrate Sheffield's history of women's suffrage.

12.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Julie Dore, 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 this month we celebrate the 100 year anniversary of the Representation of the People Act (1918), which first granted the vote to 8.4 million women in the UK, being initially only to those over the age of 30 who meet a property qualification;
- (b) notes that in addition to this important milestone, International Women's Day will be celebrated globally on 08 March and it is, therefore, a pertinent time to consider how far we have travelled in the fight for gender equality but to also recognise how much further we have to go, both in the UK and internationally;

- (c) believes that the challenge now is to build on past achievements and push for full equality for women: financially, in the workplace, in families and homes and in public spaces, but further believes, with regret and anger, that many policies introduced by this Government are retrograde for the economic equality for women;
- (d) believes it is outrageous that in 2016, women in the UK are more likely to work for less pay than men, in low paid sectors and be disproportionately affected by austerity;
- (e) notes that women approaching the pensionable age have also been badly affected by the 2011 Pensions Act, which legislated that women's State Pension Age would increase to 65 by 2018;
- (f) believes that whilst the equalisation of the State Pension Age should be welcomed, the acceleration of that equalisation, implemented by the Coalition Government and overseen by former Liberal Democrat Pensions Minister, the Rt. Hon. Steve Webb, discriminates against women born in the early 1950s, and has left them with inadequate time to make alternative arrangements and adversely affected their retirement plans;
- (g) notes Steve Webb's admission to the Institute for Government in December 2015 that he made a "bad decision" on raising the State Pension Age;
- (h) calls on Guy Opperman MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Pensions and Financial Inclusion, to immediately introduce transitional arrangements to provide protection for women affected by the equalisation of the State Pension Age;
- (i) notes with regret that the Women Against State Pension Inequality (WASPI) movement and the Labour Party have been demanding such transitional arrangements for seven years and yet Conservative governments, and the preceding Coalition government, have failed to implement such arrangements and have, as such, affected millions of women in the UK, which this Council believes is unfair and unjust;
- (j) notes that for 2016's Autumn Statement, 86% of the amount taken by HM Treasury through tax and benefit measures had come from women, with a disproportionate impact on women from black and minority ethnic backgrounds;
- (k) supports the Labour Party's on-going consultation on a new Economic Equality Bill, as this Bill will aim to strengthen legislation around equal pay and tackle the structural and economic barriers that stop women, BAME communities and disabled people from reaching their full potential;
- (l) notes that Sheffield City Council is working closely with its partners to

bid for the Women's Vote Centenary Grant Scheme, and that, together, we are also looking at other funding opportunities that may be available;

- (m) further notes that a website ran by the Council and its partners will be launched to co-ordinate events across the city celebrating the campaign for women's suffrage and the historic role of Sheffield in the struggle for women's rights and equality;
 - (n) notes the strong legacy of Sheffield women in the campaign for equal rights and that Labour and Co-Operative Party Councillor, Eleanor Barton (Attercliffe ward), was one of the first women to be elected to public office anywhere in the UK in 1919; and
 - (o) opposes comments by Liberal Democrat MP, Jo Swinson, calling for a statue of Margaret Thatcher in Westminster and believes this demonstrates the ignorance of the Lib Dem's to all the lives and communities that were destroyed by the Thatcher government in the 1980s and notes that whilst the Liberal Democrats campaign for statues of Margaret Thatcher, Labour are putting up statues to celebrate Sheffield women of steel.
- 12.3.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the amendment (Councillor Julie Dore), the amendment as circulated at the meeting and published with the agenda, was altered by the substitution, in paragraph (h), of the words "Guy Opperman MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Pensions and Financial Inclusion" for the words "Richard Harrington MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Pensions".)
- 12.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Gail Smith was put to the vote and was negatived.
- 12.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Julie Dore, as altered, was then put to the vote and was carried.
- 12.5.1 (NOTE: Councillors Bob Pullin, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) to (h), (j) and (l) to (n) of the amendment and voted against paragraphs (i), (k) and (o) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)
- 12.6 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 this month we celebrate the 100 year anniversary of the Representation of the People Act (1918), which first granted the vote to 8.4 million women in the UK, being initially only to those over the age of 30 who meet a property qualification;

- (b) notes that in addition to this important milestone, International Women's Day will be celebrated globally on 08 March and it is, therefore, a pertinent time to consider how far we have travelled in the fight for gender equality but to also recognise how much further we have to go, both in the UK and internationally;
- (c) believes that the challenge now is to build on past achievements and push for full equality for women: financially, in the workplace, in families and homes and in public spaces, but further believes, with regret and anger, that many policies introduced by this Government are retrograde for the economic equality for women;
- (d) believes it is outrageous that in 2016, women in the UK are more likely to work for less pay than men, in low paid sectors and be disproportionately affected by austerity;
- (e) notes that women approaching the pensionable age have also been badly affected by the 2011 Pensions Act, which legislated that women's State Pension Age would increase to 65 by 2018;
- (f) believes that whilst the equalisation of the State Pension Age should be welcomed, the acceleration of that equalisation, implemented by the Coalition Government and overseen by former Liberal Democrat Pensions Minister, the Rt. Hon. Steve Webb, discriminates against women born in the early 1950s, and has left them with inadequate time to make alternative arrangements and adversely affected their retirement plans;
- (g) notes Steve Webb's admission to the Institute for Government in December 2015 that he made a "bad decision" on raising the State Pension Age;
- (h) calls on Guy Opperman MP, Parliamentary Under Secretary of State for Pensions and Financial Inclusion, to immediately introduce transitional arrangements to provide protection for women affected by the equalisation of the State Pension Age;
- (i) notes with regret that the Women Against State Pension Inequality (WASPI) movement and the Labour Party have been demanding such transitional arrangements for seven years and yet Conservative governments, and the preceding Coalition government, have failed to implement such arrangements and have, as such, affected millions of women in the UK, which this Council believes is unfair and unjust;
- (j) notes that for 2016's Autumn Statement, 86% of the amount taken by HM Treasury through tax and benefit measures had come from women, with a disproportionate impact on women from black and minority ethnic backgrounds;

- (k) supports the Labour Party's on-going consultation on a new Economic Equality Bill, as this Bill will aim to strengthen legislation around equal pay and tackle the structural and economic barriers that stop women, BAME communities and disabled people from reaching their full potential;
- (l) notes that Sheffield City Council is working closely with its partners to bid for the Women's Vote Centenary Grant Scheme, and that, together, we are also looking at other funding opportunities that may be available;
- (m) further notes that a website ran by the Council and its partners will be launched to co-ordinate events across the city celebrating the campaign for women's suffrage and the historic role of Sheffield in the struggle for women's rights and equality;
- (n) notes the strong legacy of Sheffield women in the campaign for equal rights and that Labour and Co-Operative Party Councillor, Eleanor Barton (Attercliffe ward), was one of the first women to be elected to public office anywhere in the UK in 1919; and
- (o) opposes comments by Liberal Democrat MP, Jo Swinson, calling for a statue of Margaret Thatcher in Westminster and believes this demonstrates the ignorance of the Lib Dem's to all the lives and communities that were destroyed by the Thatcher government in the 1980s and notes that whilst the Liberal Democrats campaign for statues of Margaret Thatcher, Labour are putting up statues to celebrate Sheffield women of steel.

12.6.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Bob Pullin, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Gail Smith, David Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) to (h), (j) and (l) to (n) of the Substantive Motion and voted against paragraphs (i), (k) and (o) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

2. Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a) to (h) and (l) to (n) of the Substantive Motion and abstained from voting on paragraphs (i), (j), (k) and (o) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

13. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "CARE LEAVERS AND COUNCIL TAX" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ALISON TEAL AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS JOHNSON

13.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Alison Teal, and formally seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that, last year, around 75 young people (aged 16 or over) left the

care of Sheffield City Council and began the difficult transition out of care and into adulthood;

- (b) further notes that a 2016 report by The Children's Society found that when care leavers move into independent accommodation they begin to manage their own budget fully for the first time and can find this extremely challenging, often with no family to support them and insufficient financial education;
- (c) further notes research from The Centre for Social Justice, which found that over half (57%) of young people leaving care have difficulty managing their money and avoiding debt when leaving care;
- (d) believes that as national welfare cuts are removing financial support and the national strategy on care leavers is inadequate, care leavers are a particularly vulnerable group for Council Tax debt;
- (e) notes that Sheffield City Council has statutory corporate parenting responsibilities towards young people up to the age of 25 who have left care;
- (f) further notes that there are around 440 care leavers in Sheffield liable to pay Council Tax at any one time;
- (g) believes that, to ensure that the transition from care to adult life is as smooth as possible, and to mitigate the chances of care leavers falling into debt as they begin to manage their own finances, they should be exempt from paying Council Tax until they are 25;
- (h) believes that the lost revenue of around £75,000 in Council Tax receipts is excellent value given the positive impact that exemption will have for this vulnerable group, the duty the Council has under its corporate parenting responsibilities and the savings in reduced instances of housing and social care staff input; and
- (i) therefore requests officers to take steps to exempt all care leavers from Council Tax up to the age of 25.

13.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Jackie Drayton, and formally seconded by Councillor Kieran Harpham, 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 a form of Council Tax exemption has been in place for care leavers since November 2017, through the use of the Council's discretionary powers;
- (b) further notes that the Care Leaver Team support customers who receive Council Tax Support in applying for assistance from the Council Tax Hardship Scheme and that, under this Scheme, the

Revenues and Benefits Client Team can reduce the care leaver's Council Tax amount further - this allows the Council to lower or reduce an individual's Council Tax bill to nil in appropriate circumstances;

- (c) notes that, not for the first time, the Green Group have their figures wrong and that, as of the end of November 2017, there were 115 care leavers who are aged under 25 who have a current Council Tax bill, and of these 115 care leavers, 91 are receiving Council Tax Support;
- (d) notes that what the Council has in place for care leavers currently is a bespoke deal for Council Tax Support, which attends to the individual needs, and that this arrangement is the outcome of significant consultation, working with Sheffield care leavers; and
- (e) reiterates that a new piece of work is already ongoing for care leavers, including measures of support for Council Tax payments, which will be formalised soon.

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

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that a form of Council Tax exemption has been in place for care leavers since November 2017, through the use of the Council's discretionary powers;
- (b) further notes that the Care Leaver Team support customers who receive Council Tax Support in applying for assistance from the Council Tax Hardship Scheme and that, under this Scheme, the Revenues and Benefits Client Team can reduce the care leaver's Council Tax amount further - this allows the Council to lower or reduce an individual's Council Tax bill to nil in appropriate circumstances;
- (c) notes that, not for the first time, the Green Group have their figures wrong and that, as of the end of November 2017, there were 115 care leavers who are aged under 25 who have a current Council Tax bill, and of these 115 care leavers, 91 are receiving Council Tax Support;
- (d) notes that what the Council has in place for care leavers currently is a bespoke deal for Council Tax Support, which attends to the individual

needs, and that this arrangement is the outcome of significant consultation, working with Sheffield care leavers; and

- (e) reiterates that a new piece of work is already ongoing for care leavers, including measures of support for Council Tax payments, which will be formalised soon.

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

14. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

- 14.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 3rd January 2018 be approved as a true and accurate record.

15. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

- 15.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that:-

(a) approval be given to the following change to the memberships of Committees, Boards, etc.:-

Audit & Standards Committee - Lynda Hinxman to be appointed to serve as a non-voting independent co-opted member of the Committee.

(b) the appointment of Councillor Tony Downing as a Director of the River Stewardship Company, be confirmed; and

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

Sheffield Health and Social Care Foundation Trust – Council of Governors - Councillor Josie Paszek to serve a 2nd term of office ending 03/02/2021.