

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH, on Wednesday 5 September 2018, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Magid Magid)
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Tony Downing)

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| 1 <i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i>
Simon Clement-Jones
Bob Pullin
Richard Shaw | 10 <i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i>
Moya O'Rourke
Steve Wilson | 19 <i>Nether Edge & Sharrow Ward</i>
Mohammad Maroof
Jim Steinke
Alison Teal |
| 2 <i>Beighton Ward</i>
Chris Rosling-Josephs
Ian Saunders
Sophie Wilson | 11 <i>Ecclesall Ward</i>
Roger Davison
Shaffaq Mohammed | 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
Magid Magid
Kaltum Rivers | 13 <i>Fulwood Ward</i>
Sue Alston
Andrew Sangar
Cliff Woodcraft | 22 <i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i>
Dawn Dale
Peter Price
Garry Weatherall |
| 5 <i>Burngreave Ward</i>
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
Martin Phipps | 15 <i>Graves Park Ward</i>
Ian Auckland
Sue Auckland
Steve Ayris | 24 <i>Stannington Ward</i>
David Baker
Penny Baker
Vickie Priestley |
| 7 <i>Crookes & Crosspool Ward</i>
Mohammed Mahroof
Anne Murphy | 16 <i>Hillsborough Ward</i>
Bob Johnson
George Lindars-Hammond
Josie Paszek | 25 <i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i>
Keith Davis
Francyne Johnson |
| 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 |
| 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
Mike Levery |
| | | 28 <i>Woodhouse Ward</i>
Mick Rooney
Jackie Satur
Paul Wood |

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Andy Bainbridge, Jack Clarkson, Adam Hanrahan and Paul Scriven.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.1 Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed declared a personal interest in Item 8 – Notice of Motion regarding “Transport Funding”, due to him having worked with the Doncaster/Sheffield Airport in the past to engage with local travel agents to help them prepare a business case to attract airlines serving South Asia, and he stated that he would not speak or vote on that item of business.

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 Amendments to Motions

RESOLVED: In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11(a)(ii) – Motions Which May Be Moved Without Notice At Council Meetings – and on the motion of Councillor David Baker, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that only one amendment per Party Group per motion be permitted to be submitted at future meetings of the Council.

3.2 Petitions

3.2.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Develop a Network of New Public Bridleways in the Rivelin Valley Area

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 409 signatures, requesting the Council to develop a network of new public bridleways in the Rivelin Valley area.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Louise Huson, of Hallam Riders group. The petition requested the Council to develop an improved network of public bridleways in the Rivelin Valley to help keep people safe from unnecessarily using Rivelin Valley Road. She said that bridleways were a most inclusive right of way as they embraced horse riders, cyclists, walkers and wheelchair users and they were also broader than footpaths.

She said it was possible for a mixture of different users to amicably share routes, which was socially inclusive and children often liked to see horses and ponies. Riding for the disabled also provided a means of accessing the countryside. Whilst there were multiple public footpaths in the area, there was no legal provision for riders and cyclists to avoid the heavy road traffic. Barriers and signage excluded people other than walkers. Signage in the Rails Road car park also indicated that the nature trail was not suitable for wheelchair users. She said that this might unnecessarily endanger people and was contrary to

disabilities and equalities legislation the Council's Rights of Way Improvement Plan, the purpose of which was to make as many green spaces accessible to as many people as possible.

Louise Huson said that Rivelin Valley Road had a history of accidents and fatalities and there was great stress for people travelling on the road. She said that there could be changes to Council policy and minimal infrastructure investment. There were 20 stable yards in the Rivelin Valley and these were used by riders from a number of places, and included women and children and disabled people, who needed safe provision. At present, horse riders and cyclists were only able to use parts of the nature trail discreetly and illicitly. The petitioners wished for traditional routes to be made inclusive for everyone. Some routes had originally been cart roads and were thought to be wide enough for multi-use. The paths in question had been identified on a map which had been submitted to the Council with the petition. These reduced the distances which otherwise would be travelled on Rivelin Valley Road. Sustainable surfacing was already in place on those routes.

She referred to accidents involving horses and cyclists nationally and said that access to off road bridleways in Sheffield was below the national average. The Council was asked to upgrade existing routes, as identified by the petition, to multi-user bridleway status and create a network to prioritise use by vulnerable user groups.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Development and to Councillor Mary Lea, Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure.

Councillor Jack Scott, said that with regard to transport and public rights of way, there were multiple footpaths and a number of bridleways in place. He acknowledged that, in some cases, these were poorly signed and that some entrance signage also prohibited riding and bicycles and that was something the Council should review. He said the Council was sympathetic to the need for a more joined up network of bridleways for reasons of inclusion.

Councillor Scott said that in relation to work on Rivelin Valley Road, the Council did not anticipate any large scale removal of trees to create a public right of way. This was a location where consideration would be given to the installation of a Pegasus crossing to help keep horse riders safer. With reference to the maps provided by the petitioners, a proper assessment was required to understand the issues and see how to improve matters for horse riders and cyclists and everyone. There were considerations, including fairness and inclusivity and Sheffield's outdoor heritage was integral to the City. He said that he would look forward to meeting with representatives of the petitioners and with Councillor Mary Lea, Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure.

3.2.2 Petition Requesting the Revocation of the Licence for Doggy Den, Little London Road

The Council received an electronic petition containing 566 signatures,

requesting the revocation of the licence for Doggy Den, Little London Road.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Development. Councillor Scott stated that the premises were currently licensed and he would be referring the matter to the Licensing Committee and he had asked officers to prepare a report for the Committee.

3.3 Public Questions

3.3.1 Public Questions Concerning Governance

Ruth Hubbard asked firstly, for it to be confirmed that Sheffield was about “you, me and all the diverse communities that live here”. It was not owned by any political party or multinational corporation. She said the Council were temporary stewards for communities and those who lived in the City.

Secondly, she said that communities in Sheffield had launched the Sheffield People’s petition under the Localism Act 2011 and would present a petition of five percent of the electorate and have a referendum and that communities would vote for a change of governance model. She said that referendums cost money and referred to decisions which had been made and which had necessitated financial spending, which was inadvisable. She asked for reconsideration of the decision of 6 June 2018 not to investigate a change in governance. The Council could itself decide to embrace a change in governance before a petition was presented, and avoid a referendum.

Thirdly, she said once the decision of 6 June had been reconsidered, would the Council join communities in a collaborative process of redesigning a committee system which was fit for the city. She read a quote from a publication for which Councillor Dore had been a co-author and relating to problem solving by interested parties, sharing power and progressive politics.

She asked that the Council join with communities to co-produce a new, better governance system both to improve transparency and accountability and give a more meaningful role for those in the Council Chamber. She said that communities wanted to see greater collaboration in the Council chamber which worked better for communities.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council stated that she did not agree with the definition of representation in Sheffield and citizenship which had been set out in the question. She did not think that anyone ‘owned’ Sheffield, although many people had an interest in the City, including its residents, people who worked in the City and other stakeholders and individuals that had an interest in Sheffield. Neither would she have claimed ownership of the City on behalf of the Cabinet or the ruling group on the Council.

She asked for people to be careful about statements regarding the possible

outcome of a referendum and presumptions about what people might think.

With regards co-production and stakeholder involvement, Councillor Dore stated that she had campaigned for those things both as a councillor and in her professional working career. She said there were nearly 600,000 people in Sheffield and various stakeholder groups and organisations within and outside of the City and she would be pleased to have a wider conversation with citizens about what was right for them.

3.3.2 Public Questions Concerning Footways in Angram Bank

Terence Bawden said that two years ago, Amey set a date for December 2016, to return to High Green and to repair footways. Since that time, the footways had become in part impassable for many of the elderly and disabled people living on the Angram Bank estate. He asked when it was likely that work would take place to have the footway made to the same standard as other places as it was a concern that someone may become hurt as a result of a trip or fall.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, stated that he would request Council officers to look with Amey at the matters which had been raised and he would write to Mr Bawden with further details about the situation and when the work would be completed.

3.3.3 Public Question Concerning a Zebra Crossing in High Green

David Ogle referred to a petition which had been presented to Council concerning the provision of a zebra crossing in High Green. He said that he had also asked at that time for the Council to stop ignoring High Green. He said that whilst he had received a letter acknowledging the petition, he had heard nothing since. He asked for this to be dealt with.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, stated that he would restate what he had said previously in relation High Green not being an ignored area of the City. A road safety assessment of the area had been undertaken and there had been found to be no parts of that area which were dangerous enough to merit a zebra crossing. He said it was right that the Council invested funds in road safety and crossings wherever it was necessary. High Green had been examined and it had been decided that there was no aspect to High Green which was sufficiently dangerous where a zebra crossing would make a significant difference.

Following the submission of the petition to full Council, he had followed up this matter by speaking with a number of people, including the local councillors, and a similar view had been formed. He said that he would wish to make it clear that the Council did not ignore any area of the City and its residents. If there were areas of High Green where there were significant road safety issues and which would be dealt with by the installation of a crossing, then the Council would examine the issue and, if at all possible, would do so. However, the Council would not undertake work which was not justified by a clear and agreed methodology.

3.3.4 Public Question Concerning Community Boxing Gym in High Green

David Ogle said that the community in High Green had been trying to set up a community boxing gym and he referred to potential benefits of a gym, including reducing crime and anti-social behaviour and social isolation and improving health. He asked the Lord Mayor for help and to visit High Green and to participate in a boxing match with him. He referred to the publicity and good will which might be generated as a result.

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) responded by asking Mr Ogle to contact him by email to which he would respond.

3.3.5 Public Question Concerning Birley Spa

Nigel Slack referred to the postponement of the auction sale of Birley Spa to allow for discussions between the Council and the Friends of the Spa on potential solutions that would keep this heritage location in public hands. He commented that there were issues relating to the sale and disagreements about who said what to whom and whether there had been previous consultation with local residents that gave the perception of a Council making decisions behind closed doors and without reasonable consideration of local feelings.

He asked the following questions:

How long would the sale be postponed?

With Lottery funding having been involved in the refurbishment of this site, what do the Council know of the conditions attached to this grant if the property is sold? (repayment/share of sale price etc.)

What do the Council know of any restrictive covenants on this property that may have been attached to its use or disposal by Earl Manvers?

What was the ownership status of the site? Public, private or some quasi charitable ownership with the Council as trustees?

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance responded that the sale of Birley Spa would initially be postponed for two months to allow the group to come up with options. These would be reviewed and, if any required more time then this would be considered at that point. However, there had also been a separate application for an Asset of Community Value and, if that was granted, then it would give a further six months delay to any sale in order to give time for that to be considered.

Councillor Blake said that with regard to Lottery funding, the Council had spoken with the Heritage Lottery Fund which was aware of the plan to sell the site. The terms of the grant had lapsed and it would not be open to any clawback as a result of the site being sold. The Council was not aware of any restrictive covenants on the property and the Council owned the site. The site and land around it was freehold.

3.3.6 Public Question Concerning South Yorkshire Pensions Fund

Nigel Slack referred to a report in the Financial Times on 3rd September which had stated that local council pension funds in the UK had more than £9bn invested in companies engaged in fracking, despite fierce debate over shale gas exploration.

He asked whether, as a Council which was publicly opposed to fracking, the Council was certain that current South Yorkshire Pensions Authority investments did not include any in companies associated with fracking.

He also asked in the context of the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority moving from direct management of pension funds to setting strategy under a privatised fund management arrangement, how robust were the protocols to ensure fracking companies were not invested in through this intermediary.

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Finance stated that there had also been reports in the local media concerning part of the Pension Fund being invested in companies involved with fracking. The Pensions Authority was separate to the City Council and comprised councillors from all of the South Yorkshire Authorities. She said that she was working in this regard with Sheffield City Councillors who were Members of the Pensions Authority.

She had also received a statement from the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority, which she would be pleased to share with Mr Slack and which set out the rate at which the Pension Fund was disinvesting. There was, for example, a reduction in shares in oil, gas and mining companies of 26 percent last year. The Pension Fund was changing, which would take a number of years and whilst she would be pleased to go through matters with Mr Slack, the questions he had asked might also be put to the South Yorkshire Pensions Authority.

Councillor Blake noted that the Pensions Authority was conducting a review of its strategies. She confirmed that Sheffield City Council had passed motions against fracking on its own land and did not invest directly in fossil fuels.

3.3.7 Public Questions Concerning Register of Interests and Lobbying

Nigel Slack stated that he was interested to see that the Councillors' Register of Interests finally appeared to be in electronic form, which was a good step for transparency and accountability if this also meant that the register could be kept up to date on a 'live' basis, reflecting the changes in Councillors' circumstances as they occurred. He asked whether the Council could confirm that this will be the case and that Councillors will be expected to provide any changes in their interests promptly.

He also asked whether, with this template for contemporary transparency in place, it would be possible for a similar register to be established for a Lobbying Register to record who has privileged access to Councillors, Cabinet Members and Senior Officers.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that she would expect councillors to promptly change registered interests, as necessary. She would be able to check on any associated timescales but there was no reason why this should not be done by councillors as quickly as possible.

As regards lobbying and professional lobbyist organisations, Councillor Dore said that if there was an awareness of an approach by lobbyist companies then she would be happy to disclose the fact. For her part, she had never been lobbied by a lobbyist. In terms of some sort of 'privileged access', Mr Slack himself had been offered several meetings to discuss issues. She said that she would hope that she did as much as she was able to engage with the many interested stakeholders in the City.

3.3.8 Public Questions Concerning Streets Ahead Programme

Justin Buxton asked on what date the Leader of the Council was made aware that the Forestry Commission were investigating the legality of felling healthy trees in Sheffield. He also asked if the Council had informed South Yorkshire Police of the investigation by the Forestry Commission.

Mr Buxton referred to the meeting of Council on 7 February 2018 and the minutes of that meeting concerning Amey and health and safety and a response made by the Cabinet Member, including reference to an investigation by KPMG. He asked when the investigation was instigated, when it reported and as to the scope of the investigation.

He asked the Cabinet Member for an update regarding the investigation into payments made to Amey LG and Amey OV where no contracts existed. He asked whether those substantial payments in error had been rectified.

Mr Buxton asked whether the present Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene had received briefings concerning the tree replacement programme and if he was sure that he had been thoroughly and sufficiently briefed on the programme and the Council's contract with Amey.

Russell Johnson asked whether, in view of the austerity suffered by the City over recent years, the Leader of the Council was sanguine about expenditure of at least £400K on legal attempts on what he said was to crush opposition and remove legitimate dissent. He asked whether the Leader would reconsider her decision not to resign.

Dave Dillner asked which staff were currently working on the highways tree strategy as described by the former Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport on 5 September 2015 at the second Highways Trees Advisory Forum and what stage had it reached.

Calvin Payne referred to, and invited the Council's leaders to welcome, the findings of the Independent Office of Police Conduct that arrests made under Trade Union Legislation between November 2016 and February 2017 were neither appropriate or necessary. He asked whether councillors or officers were

involved in the decision making that lead to the arrest of people under trade union law in 2016 and 2017.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, in responding to questions from Mr Buxton, stated that he had also asked the same questions during a Radio Sheffield 'hot-seat' programme. Whilst she could not give an exact date, she could remember reference to this issue during a previous Cabinet or Council meeting. She said that the Forestry Commission had not informed her, either personally or formally, that it was investigating the legality [of tree felling]. She had also not informed the police personally or officially, that the Forestry Commission was conducting an investigation. However, she commented that she had said that she would be surprised if the police were not aware of it, because of comments by others.

In response to the question of Mr Johnson, Councillor Dore said that she had no intention of resigning. She said that the Council took informed decisions based on the facts before it and the associated risks, in order to carry out necessary actions. Where the Council got things wrong, it would say so, and there had been examples when that had happened. On this occasion, it was necessary to take action in order to ensure that the highways contract might proceed.

In answer to the question by Mr Payne, Councillor Dore said that there was a clear division between the role of the Police and the City Council. The Police took action based on the information provided to them and the relevant legislation. It was for the Police to determine its actions.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, stated that he would respond in writing to Mr Buxton in relation to the questions that he had put relating to health and safety, to explain the current situation.

Councillor Dagnall stated that, with regard to payments to Amey LG, he had written to Mr Buxton concerning this matter in July and on two subsequent occasions. He reassured the Council that the administrative error which had been identified was being rectified.

In relation to the Forestry Commission, Councillor Dagnall stated that he believed that the work being conducted to highways trees was legal and he said that Council officers were co-operating with the Forestry Commission's enquiries.

He said that he had been fully briefed in relation to all duties relevant to his role as Cabinet Member and was satisfied with the briefings which he had received.

Councillor Dagnall said that in connection with the Highways Tree strategy, preparations were taking place for direct face to face talks with Sheffield Tree Action Groups (STAG) as the main representative campaign group. One of the issues was likely to be the future of the highways strategy and he believed that decisions could be made in relation to that strategy, following the talks with STAG.

3.4 Petitions (2)

3.4.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Stop Spending Money on Demolishing Trees

The Council received an electronic petition containing 12 signatures, requesting the Council to stop spending money on demolishing trees.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Lewis Dagnall, Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene.

3.4.2 Petition Requesting the Council to Consult with Residents to Apply for a Public Space Protection Order to the Alley Between Ainsty Road and South View Crescent

The Council received a petition containing 42 signatures requesting the Council to consult with residents to apply for a Public Space Protection Order to the alley between Ainsty Road and South View Crescent.

There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jim Steinke, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety.

4. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

4.1 Urgent Business

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

4.2 Written Questions

4.2.1 A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated. Supplementary questions, under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4, were asked and were answered by the appropriate Cabinet Members until the expiry of the 30 minute time limit for Members' Questions (in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.7).

4.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

4.3.1 Questions relating to the discharge of the functions of the South Yorkshire Joint Authorities for Fire and Rescue and Pensions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6(i) were not able to be asked before the expiry of the 30 minute time limit for Members' Questions (in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16.7).

5. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "DEVELOPING A FAIRER MODEL TO DISTRIBUTE COMMUNITY INFRASTRUCTURE LEVY IN SHEFFIELD" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR IAN AUCKLAND AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR GAIL SMITH

- 5.1 It was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, and seconded by Councillor Gail Smith, that this Council:-
- (a) notes the publication of the draft document outlining how the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) will be allocated across the city, however condemns the current Administration for the unacceptable delays in bringing forward these proposals;
 - (b) notes the consultation on CIL is currently live and ends on the 14th September, and is disappointed that the Administration chose to launch this important consultation during the peak school holiday period;
 - (c) notes the following national guiding principles of how to spend the CIL:
 - (i) be allocated in line with Councillors' annual ward priorities, which have been informed by local community engagement, data and feedback from service providers / partner agencies; and
 - (ii) be allocated to electoral wards and provide local Councillors the opportunity to work closely with the community to decide how best to allocate the fund;
 - (d) notes that the purposed allocation of the neighbourhood portion does not fully adhere to these guiding principles and is dismayed that this Administration in their initial draft has ignored these guiding principles;
 - (e) believes that, in ignoring the guiding principles, the Administration is favouring selected parts of the city, and disadvantaging others;
 - (f) notes that the Administration intends to use 85% of CIL for city-wide projects;
 - (g) notes that in the draft document, in the neighbourhood portion, only 1.5% of CIL is guaranteed to be retained in communities where the development takes place and the rest is distributed based on Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD);
 - (h) believes distributing the neighbourhood portion of CIL using IMD does not fairly compensate local communities for developments that take place directly in their areas unless in a Labour favoured area;
 - (i) believes this goes directly against the guiding principles on how CIL is spent in local communities and this Administration is letting down the communities it should be serving; and

- (j) resolves to:
- (i) encourage local residents to take part in the consultation process and share their views with the Administration; and
 - (ii) encourage local residents to set up their own parish council or develop their own Neighbourhood Plans to allow them to allow their communities to receive a larger portion of CIL.

5.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Lisa Banes, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) notes that the consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is currently live and after it concludes the Administration will consider responses before making any decisions about this issue, which considers a full range of issues around the Community Infrastructure Levy;
- (b) notes that, despite setting out objections, the main opposition group have not brought forward any alternative proposals, and therefore looks forward to their response to the consultation;
- (c) regrets that in their motion the main opposition group fail to recognise that some areas are not compensated for development through CIL at all, because development has led to a zero CIL requirement on the developer, due to lower levels of development value in some areas;
- (d) believes it is wrong and unfair to penalise communities because land is of a lower financial value through allocating the funding on the basis of the value of development, meaning that CIL funding would be disproportionately allocated to the areas with the highest level of land values;
- (e) (i) confirms that the Indices of Multiple Deprivation is a robust, nationally recognised and independently formulated means of calculating deprivation and notes the document 'The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 – Frequently Asked Questions' published by the Department for Communities and Local Government which states "The Index of Multiple Deprivation combines information from the seven domains to produce an overall relative measure of deprivation. The domains are combined using the following weights:
 - Income Deprivation (22.5%)
 - Employment Deprivation (22.25%)
 - Education, Skills and Training Deprivation (13.5%)
 - Health Deprivation and Disability (13.5%)
 - Crime (9.3%)
 - Barriers to Housing and Services (9.3%)
 - Living Environment Deprivation (9.3%)"

and (ii) therefore believes that categorising this nationally recognised basis for calculating need “A Labour favoured area” is completely ridiculous and deeply troubling;

- (f) supports the use of the Index of Multiple Deprivation as a fair, balanced and more objective way of allocating funding, demonstrated by the fact that many local, national and international bodies use this set of indicators;
- (g) notes that poverty and inequality are amongst the largest challenges facing the city and believes that concerted, long-term policies like those of the Administration are needed to tackle them, especially so given government austerity measures enacted on Sheffield since 2010 which have disproportionality affected the poorest;
- (h) condemns the “Labour Favoured Areas” attacks on the Administration as being misrepresentative, out of step with public opinion and cheap political shots;
- (i) believes that the main opposition group are going back to their bad old ways of supporting failed right wing policies, through small-minded, mean-spirited and parochial approaches to public policy and the allocation of resources, whilst remembering that they supported the policy of the previous coalition government to impose the greatest level of cuts to councils with the greatest level of need, with the areas with the highest levels of deprivation getting the most cuts and the wealthiest parts of the country, comparatively, receiving the least; and
- (j) encourages local people to come forward and have their say on this important consultation and looks forward to welcoming the development of a fair, inclusive, balanced and just CIL policy in the near future.

5.3 It was then moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of new paragraphs (f) to (i) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (f) to (j) as new paragraphs (j) to (n):-
 - (f) believes the consultation questionnaire contains 12 leading questions that can only be answered one way – in other words, asking questions to secure a certain answer;
 - (g) notes that a single question conflates both the proposal to take funding away from communities in areas where development is taking place and the concept of fairness, thus leading a respondent to answer in a certain way;
 - (h) recalls that this Council resolved in December 2017 that “in any consultation, it is vital to be open and clear about the most significant

practical changes being proposed.”;

- (i) believes this consultation fails to meet the test set by the Council and is therefore fundamentally flawed;
- 2. the deletion in the original paragraph (h) [new paragraph (l)] of the words “unless in a Labour favoured area” and the addition of the words “and believes this Council should recognise the impact of large-scale property development on residents’ quality of life, health and well-being, in particular with regards to the need for open and green space, better air quality, better protection from traffic congestion and improved community strength.”; and
- 3. the deletion of all the words in the original sub-paragraph (j)(i) [new sub-paragraph (n)(i)] and the addition of the words “request the Administration to abandon this consultation and instead require ward councillors to decide the spending of CIL arising from developments in the wards for which they are elected, on the basis of agreed ward priorities”.

5.4 It was then moved by Councillor John Booker, seconded by Councillor Keith Davis, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (k) as follows:-

- (k) believes that CIL is an unfair levy and is predominantly a consequence of value and viability and is concerned that this gives the impression of perverse incentives in place for councils to consider developments based more on value than suitability.

5.5 It was then moved by Councillor Richard Shaw, seconded by Councillor Steve Ayris, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (k) to (n) as follows:-

- (k) believes there is a loss of public confidence and a lack of trust, truth and transparency in the way the current Administration operates, most recently in how the Administration has dealt with providing information related to Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL);
- (l) notes that officers have confirmed that illustrative calculations were provided to the current Administration showing the amount of neighbourhood CIL money that would be spent in each ward if the current proposals were accepted;
- (m) notes that, despite requests for this information to be made available more widely, the Administration has failed to do so; and
- (n) believes that this information should have been included in the consultation document.

5.6 After contributions from two other Members, and following a right of reply from

Councillor Ian Auckland, the amendment moved by Councillor Jack Scott was put to the vote and was carried.

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

5.7.1 (NOTE: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Mohammed Mahroof, 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, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery voted for part 1 of the amendment and voted against parts 2 and 3 of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

5.8 The amendment moved by Councillor John Booker was then put to the vote and was also negated.

5.9 The amendment moved by Councillor Richard Shaw was then put to the vote and was also negated.

5.9.1 The votes on the amendment were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For the amendment (25) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, Alison Teal, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery.

Against the amendment (52) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) and Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Anne Murphy, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Moya O'Rourke, 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, Mohammad Maroof, Jim Steinke, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Keith Davis, Francyne Johnson, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, John Booker, Adam

Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Abstained from voting on the amendment (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid).

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that the consultation on the Community Infrastructure Levy (CIL) is currently live and after it concludes the Administration will consider responses before making any decisions about this issue, which considers a full range of issues around the Community Infrastructure Levy;
- (b) notes that, despite setting out objections, the main opposition group have not brought forward any alternative proposals, and therefore looks forward to their response to the consultation;
- (c) regrets that in their motion the main opposition group fail to recognise that some areas are not compensated for development through CIL at all, because development has led to a zero CIL requirement on the developer, due to lower levels of development value in some areas;
- (d) believes it is wrong and unfair to penalise communities because land is of a lower financial value through allocating the funding on the basis of the value of development, meaning that CIL funding would be disproportionately allocated to the areas with the highest level of land values;
- (e) (i) confirms that the Indices of Multiple Deprivation is a robust, nationally recognised and independently formulated means of calculating deprivation and notes the document 'The English Indices of Deprivation 2015 – Frequently Asked Questions' published by the Department for Communities and Local Government which states "The Index of Multiple Deprivation combines information from the seven domains to produce an overall relative measure of deprivation. The domains are combined using the following weights:
 - Income Deprivation (22.5%)
 - Employment Deprivation (22.25%)
 - Education, Skills and Training Deprivation (13.5%)
 - Health Deprivation and Disability (13.5%)
 - Crime (9.3%)
 - Barriers to Housing and Services (9.3%)
 - Living Environment Deprivation (9.3%)"

- and (ii) therefore believes that categorising this nationally recognised basis for calculating need “A Labour favoured area” is completely ridiculous and deeply troubling;
- (f) supports the use of the Index of Multiple Deprivation as a fair, balanced and more objective way of allocating funding, demonstrated by the fact that many local, national and international bodies use this set of indicators;
 - (g) notes that poverty and inequality are amongst the largest challenges facing the city and believes that concerted, long-term policies like those of the Administration are needed to tackle them, especially so given government austerity measures enacted on Sheffield since 2010 which have disproportionality affected the poorest;
 - (h) condemns the “Labour Favoured Areas” attacks on the Administration as being misrepresentative, out of step with public opinion and cheap political shots;
 - (i) believes that the main opposition group are going back to their bad old ways of supporting failed right wing policies, through small-minded, mean-spirited and parochial approaches to public policy and the allocation of resources, whilst remembering that they supported the policy of the previous coalition government to impose the greatest level of cuts to councils with the greatest level of need, with the areas with the highest levels of deprivation getting the most cuts and the wealthiest parts of the country, comparatively, receiving the least; and
 - (j) encourages local people to come forward and have their say on this important consultation and looks forward to welcoming the development of a fair, inclusive, balanced and just CIL policy in the near future.

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

- For the Substantive Motion (50) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) and Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Anne Murphy, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Moya O'Rourke, 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, Mohammad Maroof, Jim Steinke, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price,

Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Francyne Johnson, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Against the Substantive Motion (22)

- Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Mohammed Mahroof, 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, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Keith Davis, John Booker and Mike Levery.

Abstained from voting on the Substantive Motion (6)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal.

6. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "SUPPORTING THE TUC'S GREAT JOBS AGENDA" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BEN MISKELL

6.1 It was moved by Councillor Julie Dore, and seconded by Councillor Ben Miskell, that this Council:-

(a) notes that:

- (i) insecure work includes people working on zero-hours contracts, temporary and agency work, and low-paid self-employment;
- (ii) 3.5 million people could be in insecure work by the start of 2022 if current trends continue - a rise of 290,000; that's the equivalent of the entire working population of Sheffield;
- (iii) workers on zero-hours and short-hours contracts earn a third less per hour than the average worker;
- (iv) 1 in 13 Black, Asian and minority ethnic employees are in insecure jobs, compared to 1 in 20 white employees; and
- (v) insecure work costs the HM Treasury £4 billion a year in lost income tax and national insurance contributions, along with extra benefits and tax credits;

(b) further notes that:

- (i) UK workers are, on average, £38 a week worse off than before the crash in 2008 (figures to April 2017); this is the longest squeeze on pay since Victorian times;

- (ii) public sector workers' real wages are down thousands of pounds a year compared to 2010; for example, prison officers and paramedics are all down over £3,800 a year, firefighters are down nearly £2,900, while teachers are down approximately £2,500;
 - (iii) just one in three people (33%) say their employer offers regular training opportunities - and one in four workers (24%) say that no training is offered at their workplace at all apart from a new starters' induction;
 - (iv) more than a million workers suffer from ill-health related to their employment, and around 23 million working days are lost each year due to injury or illness in the workplace;
 - (v) almost one in three workers have been bullied in the workplace;
 - (vi) more than a third (37%) of Black, Asian and minority ethnic workers have been bullied, abused or singled out at work; and
 - (vii) more than half (52%) of women and nearly two-thirds (63%) of women aged 18-24 years old have experienced sexual harassment at work;
- (c) believes that:
- (i) every job should be a great job: that means every worker must be paid fairly; work in a safe and healthy workplace; be treated decently and with respect; have guaranteed hours; have the chance to be represented by unions and be consulted on what matters at work; and have the chance to get on in life;
 - (ii) currently, too many jobs in the UK aren't great jobs – and too many people feel that great jobs aren't available where they live;
 - (iii) it is positive that there is now a public debate about how we improve jobs in the UK – much of it driven by union campaigning and legal action against employers like Sports Direct, Uber and Hermes; and
 - (iv) however, the proposals put forward by Mathew Taylor's review of employment standards for the Government are inadequate; and
- (d) resolves to:
- (i) support the TUC's Great Jobs Agenda, which sets out the actions employers and the Government must take for every job to be a great job, and tell the TUC of this support;
 - (ii) ask the Cabinet Member for Finance to present a paper to the

Council's Cabinet setting out the actions the Authority proposes to take to ensure that every job in this Authority is a great job, and relating those to the six standards in the Great Jobs Agenda; at a minimum this should include:

- (1) signing up to be a Living Wages authority, where no-one is paid less than the real Living Wage;
 - (2) reporting on how many workers are employed on zero or short-hours contracts, or agency contracts, and what actions the Authority is taking to reduce this; and
 - (3) setting out how the Authority proposes to use its procurement process to raise employment standards among its subcontractors;
- (iii) write to all MPs in Sheffield and the Sheffield City Region Mayor informing them of our position and encouraging them to support the Great Jobs Agenda too;
 - (iv) invite the Regional Secretary of Yorkshire & Humber TUC to present the Great Jobs Agenda to the next meeting of the City Growth Board;
 - (v) make increasing job quality a key part of the conversation when pursuing local economic development opportunities in Sheffield; and
 - (vi) continue to value meaningful workforce engagement and representation through our recognised trade unions.

6.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Martin Smith, seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, 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 trade unions have been a force for good in our country, championing the rights and living standards for everyone;
- (b) believes the British economy is simply not working for enough people today and is not fit to face the challenges of tomorrow, in that:
 - (i) the inequalities of wealth and income are getting worse;
 - (ii) the economy is geographically and sectorally unbalanced, and productive investment is too low; and
 - (iii) much economic activity is unsustainable, threatening the planet on which future generations depend;

- (c) notes that a substantial portion of UK health & safety regulations and workers' rights originated from the European Union;
- (d) notes a government impact assessment has identified workers' rights as an area that might be used to 'maximise regulatory opportunities' after Brexit;
- (e) notes that the Prime Minister has pledged not to erode workers' rights after the UK leaves the EU but has failed to commit to maintaining any specific protections;
- (f) agrees therefore that the greatest current threat to those rights and living standards is leaving the European Union; and
- (g) resolves to:
 - (i) support the creation and widespread adoption of a 'good employer' standard covering areas such as paying a living wage, avoiding unpaid internships and using name-blind recruitment to make it easier for customers and investors to exercise choice and influence;
 - (ii) support an independent review to consult on how to set a genuine Living Wage across all sectors of the UK economy;
 - (iii) support the extension of transparency requirements on larger employers to include publishing the number of people in the organisation who are paid less than the Living Wage, together with the ratio of top and median pay; and
 - (iv) write to the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions and ask for a formal commitment to maintain or enhance all of the employment rights currently derived from EU law.

6.3 It was then moved by Councillor Alison Teal, seconded by Councillor Martin Phipps, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (d) to (g) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraph (d) as a new paragraph (h):-

- (d) believes that insecure work is the product of a system which prioritises profit over people;
- (e) believes that, while the current system exists, there can be no reasonable expectation of seeing an end to the problems identified in the TUC's Great Jobs Agenda;
- (f) notes this Council first took steps in July 2009 to implement the Living Wage, on the motion of Green Councillor, Bernard Little;
- (g) believes the TUC's Great Jobs Agenda description of a great job outlines

merely the minimum standard all employees ought to expect.

6.4 It was then moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and formally seconded by Councillor Kaltum Rivers, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (e) to (h) as follows:-

- (e) furthermore, notes that the governments of recent years have not so much removed workers' rights as the means of obtaining those, and condemns:
 - (i) cuts to legal aid that helped workers enforce their employment rights against employers who broke the law;
 - (ii) the unlawful introduction of employment tribunal fees to deter claimants from seeking their rights; and
 - (iii) the abolition of the Equality and Human Rights Commission's free advice helpline and grant funding for legal advice and representation to challenge breaches of anti-discrimination and human-rights legislation;
- (f) recognises that timely advice on employment rights is critical to maintaining decent jobs and has a hugely beneficial social impact;
- (g) notes the drastic reduction of free employment advice services in the city; and
- (h) therefore asks officers to take steps to identify funding to support three full-time equivalent posts to provide employment advice in not-for-profit advice services in the city.

6.5 After contributions from three other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Julie Dore, the amendment moved by Councillor Martin Smith was put to the vote and was negated.

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

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that:
 - (i) insecure work includes people working on zero-hours contracts, temporary and agency work, and low-paid self-employment;

- (ii) 3.5 million people could be in insecure work by the start of 2022 if current trends continue - a rise of 290,000; that's the equivalent of the entire working population of Sheffield;
 - (iii) workers on zero-hours and short-hours contracts earn a third less per hour than the average worker;
 - (iv) 1 in 13 Black, Asian and minority ethnic employees are in insecure jobs, compared to 1 in 20 white employees; and
 - (v) insecure work costs the HM Treasury £4 billion a year in lost income tax and national insurance contributions, along with extra benefits and tax credits;
- (b) further notes that:
- (i) UK workers are, on average, £38 a week worse off than before the crash in 2008 (figures to April 2017); this is the longest squeeze on pay since Victorian times;
 - (ii) public sector workers' real wages are down thousands of pounds a year compared to 2010; for example, prison officers and paramedics are all down over £3,800 a year, firefighters are down nearly £2,900, while teachers are down approximately £2,500;
 - (iii) just one in three people (33%) say their employer offers regular training opportunities - and one in four workers (24%) say that no training is offered at their workplace at all apart from a new starters' induction;
 - (iv) more than a million workers suffer from ill-health related to their employment, and around 23 million working days are lost each year due to injury or illness in the workplace;
 - (v) almost one in three workers have been bullied in the workplace;
 - (vi) more than a third (37%) of Black, Asian and minority ethnic workers have been bullied, abused or singled out at work; and
 - (vii) more than half (52%) of women and nearly two-thirds (63%) of women aged 18-24 years old have experienced sexual harassment at work;
- (c) believes that:
- (i) every job should be a great job: that means every worker must be paid fairly; work in a safe and healthy workplace; be treated decently and with respect; have guaranteed hours; have the chance to be represented by unions and be consulted on what matters at work; and have the chance to get on in life;

- (ii) currently, too many jobs in the UK aren't great jobs – and too many people feel that great jobs aren't available where they live;
 - (iii) it is positive that there is now a public debate about how we improve jobs in the UK – much of it driven by union campaigning and legal action against employers like Sports Direct, Uber and Hermes; and
 - (iv) however, the proposals put forward by Mathew Taylor's review of employment standards for the Government are inadequate; and
- (d) resolves to:
- (i) support the TUC's Great Jobs Agenda, which sets out the actions employers and the Government must take for every job to be a great job, and tell the TUC of this support;
 - (ii) ask the Cabinet Member for Finance to present a paper to the Council's Cabinet setting out the actions the Authority proposes to take to ensure that every job in this Authority is a great job, and relating those to the six standards in the Great Jobs Agenda; at a minimum this should include:
 - (1) signing up to be a Living Wages authority, where no-one is paid less than the real Living Wage;
 - (2) reporting on how many workers are employed on zero or short-hours contracts, or agency contracts, and what actions the Authority is taking to reduce this; and
 - (3) setting out how the Authority proposes to use its procurement process to raise employment standards among its subcontractors;
 - (iii) write to all MPs in Sheffield and the Sheffield City Region Mayor informing them of our position and encouraging them to support the Great Jobs Agenda too;
 - (iv) invite the Regional Secretary of Yorkshire & Humber TUC to present the Great Jobs Agenda to the next meeting of the City Growth Board;
 - (v) make increasing job quality a key part of the conversation when pursuing local economic development opportunities in Sheffield; and
 - (vi) continue to value meaningful workforce engagement and representation through our recognised trade unions.

7. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "THE RECYCLING SERVICE" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR KAREN MCGOWAN AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MICHELLE COOK

7.1 It was moved by Councillor Karen McGowan, and seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes Sheffield's success in Reducing, Reusing, Recycling and Recovering household waste, with our achievement of one of the lowest levels of waste to landfill in the country at a rate of just 0.28% last year;
- (b) welcomes the new recycling service, noting that:
 - (i) the removal of the blue box will be welcomed, as it has proven to be unpopular with local people;
 - (ii) there is greater capacity in the new monthly 140 litre blue bin for paper and card than the old fortnightly blue box collection;
 - (iii) the new 240-litre brown bin gives much greater capacity for glass bottles, cans and plastic bottles to residents who had used the blue box, and a broadly similar monthly capacity to residents who used the blue bin;
 - (iv) that the greater efficiency for collection vehicles will reduce emissions, and notes further the innovative trial of electric bin lorries that have been engineered locally; and
 - (v) the Council is maintaining a fortnightly black bin collection and has no plans to change this;
- (c) welcomes the value for money achieved in the new service, which provides a £750,000 saving to the waste service, and further notes:
 - (i) that the Government's austerity programme has made an unprecedented attack on public services since 2010 with local government facing the heaviest level of cuts;
 - (ii) the continued impact of Government cuts and increasing demand for services such as social care means that the Council has had to make cuts of around £430 million since 2010; and
 - (iii) that efficiency and improvements to services must be welcomed in this context, and no political group on the Council proposed alternative savings to the new recycling service in the 2018/19 budget; and
- (d) endorses recent calls by the Local Government Association for manufacturers to take responsibility for their production of unrecyclable plastics and work with councils to improve recycling, noting:

- (i) that only a third of plastic supplied to households is currently recyclable;
- (ii) that manufacturers could change to recyclable plastics or pay for complex recycling of other materials; and
- (iii) that Sheffield's Energy Recovery Facility is an excellent resource in this context, allowing the recovery of energy from unrecyclable plastics.

7.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, 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 in Sheffield, only 29.6% of household waste was recycled last year, the worst recycling performance in Yorkshire and ranked 314th out of 350 in the national recycling league table;
- (b) notes that the current recycling scheme only covers plastic bottles, cans, glass and paper and excludes all other plastic waste such as food trays and bottle tops, whereas these items can be recycled in neighbouring Chesterfield;
- (c) notes that in Watford, a Liberal Democrat-controlled council, they have weekly black bin and recycling collections and increased their recycling rate to 43%, significantly higher than the rate in Sheffield;
- (d) notes the widespread public concern about plastic waste following the BBC's Blue Planet series and the growing call for local councils to recycle more types of plastics to reduce the threat to our ecosystem;
- (e) believes that, instead of cutting funding to recycling services, Sheffield City Council should invest in and expand recycling services to improve performance and no longer be towards the bottom of the league table and a national embarrassment;
- (f) notes the Sheffield Liberal Democrats will introduce a 'Keep Sheffield Green' fund where local communities can use the money to invest in recycling; and
- (g) requests the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene to bring forward proposals to cover more types of plastic waste in Sheffield's recycling service and make it easier for people to recycle their household waste.

7.3 It was then moved by Councillor Martin Phipps, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraph (a) and the addition of a new paragraph (a) as follows:-
 - (a) notes that:
 - (i) Sheffield City Council was most recently ranked 314 out of 350 authorities for “Percentage of household waste sent for reuse, recycling or composting” as of 2016/17 (last collective set of data), as derived by letsrecycle.com from the waste reporting portal WasteDataFlow which is used by authorities to report waste figures to the government;
 - (ii) although in 2017/18 only 0.28% of household waste was sent to landfill, over two-thirds (67.31%) was sent to the incinerator, with only 32.41% recycled or composted in this year; and
 - (iii) notes that CO2 emissions from the incinerator have been growing steadily over the last decade, contrary to the national trend for reductions in emissions;
2. the deletion of sub-paragraphs (b)(i) to (iii) and the addition of new sub-paragraphs (b)(i) to (iii) as follows:-
 - (i) welcomes the trial of electric bin lorries and the introduction of plastic recycling into flats, something the Green Councillors have long campaigned for;
 - (ii) understands, however, the concerns of residents over where the brown bins will go;
 - (iii) notes this is an overall reduction in the number of litres of recycling capacity that may be collected;
3. the deletion of paragraph (c) and the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-
 - (c) notes that:-
 - (i) to change the waste services offered to Sheffield would require a renegotiation of the 35-year Veolia contract, which could be costly;
 - (ii) Cabinet decided to retender the waste contract in January 2017;
 - (iii) bringing contracts back in house would give the Council and Sheffield much more control over the services offered to residents; and
 - (iv) residents of Sheffield, including opposition councillors, do not have access to full information about the Council’s contracts to

know whether the service they are paying for is good value for money;

4. the deletion of sub-paragraph (d)(iii) and the addition of sub-paragraphs (d)(iii) and (iv) as follows:-

(iii) that the Council will ask officers to research further how it can influence the packaging used in retail in Sheffield to be recyclable and sustainable via a policy of incentives, disincentives and/or other means; and

(iv) that the Council will request the Administration to fully disclose the Veolia contract to the public and opposition councillors for improved transparency, accountability and democracy in allowing others to access information that will facilitate alternate proposals which can then be considered for the benefit of Sheffield people.

7.4 After contributions from four other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Karen McGowan, the amendment moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed was put to the vote and was negated.

7.4.1 (NOTE: Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e) and (g) of the amendment and abstained from voting on paragraphs (c) and (f) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

7.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Martin Phipps was then put to the vote and was also negated.

7.5.1 (NOTE: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Mohammed Mahroof, 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, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery abstained from voting on sub-paragraph (a)(iii) of part 1 and sub-paragraph (c)(iii) of part 3 of the amendment, and voted for all remaining paragraphs and parts of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) welcomes Sheffield's success in Reducing, Reusing, Recycling and Recovering household waste, with our achievement of one of the lowest levels of waste to landfill in the country at a rate of just 0.28% last year;

(b) welcomes the new recycling service, noting that:

(i) the removal of the blue box will be welcomed, as it has proven to be unpopular with local people;

- (ii) there is greater capacity in the new monthly 140 litre blue bin for paper and card than the old fortnightly blue box collection;
 - (iii) the new 240-litre brown bin gives much greater capacity for glass bottles, cans and plastic bottles to residents who had used the blue box, and a broadly similar monthly capacity to residents who used the blue bin;
 - (iv) that the greater efficiency for collection vehicles will reduce emissions, and notes further the innovative trial of electric bin lorries that have been engineered locally; and
 - (v) the Council is maintaining a fortnightly black bin collection and has no plans to change this;
- (c) welcomes the value for money achieved in the new service, which provides a £750,000 saving to the waste service, and further notes:
- (i) that the Government's austerity programme has made an unprecedented attack on public services since 2010 with local government facing the heaviest level of cuts;
 - (ii) the continued impact of Government cuts and increasing demand for services such as social care means that the Council has had to make cuts of around £430 million since 2010; and
 - (iii) that efficiency and improvements to services must be welcomed in this context, and no political group on the Council proposed alternative savings to the new recycling service in the 2018/19 budget; and
- (d) endorses recent calls by the Local Government Association for manufacturers to take responsibility for their production of unrecyclable plastics and work with councils to improve recycling, noting:
- (i) that only a third of plastic supplied to households is currently recyclable;
 - (ii) that manufacturers could change to recyclable plastics or pay for complex recycling of other materials; and
 - (iii) that Sheffield's Energy Recovery Facility is an excellent resource in this context, allowing the recovery of energy from unrecyclable plastics.

7.6.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Mohammed Mahroof, 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, Penny Baker,

Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery voted for sub-paragraph (b)(v) and paragraph (d) of the Motion, voted against paragraph (a), sub-paragraphs (b)(i)-(iii) and paragraph (c) of the Motion, and abstained from voting on sub-paragraph (b)(iv) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded;

2. Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal voted for sub-paragraphs (d)(i) and (ii) and voted against paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and sub-paragraph (d)(iii) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

3. Councillors Keith Davis and John Booker voted for paragraphs (a), (b), sub-paragraphs (c)(i) and (ii) and paragraph (d) of the Motion and voted against sub-paragraph (c)(iii) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "TRANSPORT FUNDING" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ROBERT MURPHY AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS JOHNSON

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

- (a) notes that the Mayor of Sheffield City Region has submitted proposals to build a £250 million East Coast Main Line railway station at Doncaster/Sheffield Airport;
- (b) notes that the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority has recently part funded the £66.5 million new road between the M18 and Doncaster/Sheffield Airport;
- (c) notes that the second phase of the road, which in effect is an access road for a private business, cost £10.55 million and included £9.1 million from Sheffield City Region with the balance paid by Doncaster Council;
- (d) notes The Peel Group obtained the freehold of the Sheffield City Airport site for the price of £1, and then closed the airport and built a business park;
- (e) notes that the Doncaster/Sheffield Airport site also benefits from Government tax incentives through its Enterprise Zone and has already benefitted from millions of pounds in grants;
- (f) notes the criticism made by the then Chair of the Public Accounts Committee, the Rt. Hon. Dame Margaret Hodge MP, who said "The most profitable parts of the Peel Group are managing to pay no UK corporation tax" and that "They do not pay their fair share of tax.";
- (g) believes the main beneficiaries of these investments are property developers in the area, including Harworth Group and the owners of

Doncaster/Sheffield Airport (Peel Airports Ltd., part of The Peel Group);

- (h) believes that the priority for rail passengers in Sheffield, the surrounding area, and travellers on our congested transport networks, is improvements to current services and investment in local routes;
 - (i) believes numerous local improvements offer more direct benefits to regional travellers than a new link to the airport, for example, the reopening of stations such as Heeley, Millhouses and lines such as Sheffield Victoria to Stocksbridge; a direct connection between Doncaster and Barnsley; and improvements to cross-Pennine routes;
 - (j) believes any further investment in links to Doncaster/Sheffield Airport should be made by the private sector; and
 - (k) requests that a copy of this motion be forwarded to the Sheffield City Region Mayor and the Minister of State for Transport.
- 8.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Mohammad Maroof, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-
- (a) welcomes the recent news that Doncaster Sheffield Airport has been named the best in the UK following a survey of passengers;
 - (b) believes the development and future growth of the Airport represents an economic opportunity for the region and could lead to the development of significant job and business growth and improved local and national transport connectivity;
 - (c) notes that phase two of the Finningley and Rossington Regeneration Route Scheme will play a significant role in supporting the development of the Airport as well as supporting other economic opportunities in the area such as the inventive and job creating iPort;
 - (d) welcomes that phase one has been a catalyst for business expansion of the Airport with 55% passenger growth over the past two years, making it one of the fastest growing airports in the UK;
 - (e) notes that the Great Yorkshire Way has helped to create over 400 new jobs at the Airport itself and many more with over 100 businesses occupying another half a million square feet of space there;
 - (f) notes that the road scheme has also opened the door to major housing projects and the wider regeneration of the local community;
 - (g) welcomes the comments from the Mayor of Doncaster: "We always said Great Yorkshire Way was the route to jobs and growth. The pace and scale of private sector development delivered as a result of this new

road in just two years is quite remarkable. We must remember that none of this existed a couple of years ago. The impact on our economy and the wider region is simply startling. Hundreds of millions of pounds worth of private sector investment has come into Doncaster, over 1,400 new jobs have so far been created and hundreds of new homes have been built”;

- (h) notes the overwhelming evidence illustrating the disparity in transport spending between the north and the south of England and supports the growing campaign across the north of England to get a fairer transport settlement for the North of England;
 - (i) is astounded that, instead of campaigning for a fairer settlement for the north of England, the Green Party are calling on the removal of economic development projects in the region, such as HS2, and believes it should not be an ‘either/or’ situation in improving transport infrastructure and connections for Doncaster Sheffield Airport or funding the development of an improved local transport network in the region;
 - (j) welcomes that the people of South Yorkshire overwhelmingly rejected what this Council regards as the anti-jobs Green Party candidate in the recent Sheffield City Region mayoral election and instead elected Mayor Dan Jarvis to secure the transport investment and economic growth the region needs, including supporting the implementation of the 2015 Sheffield City Region deal; and
 - (k) believes that all companies should pay their fair share of tax and believes that a more effective means of tackling tax avoidance would be pursued under a Labour government than under the current government and previous coalition government.
- 8.2.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the amendment (Councillor Jack Scott), the amendment as circulated at the meeting was altered by the insertion of the words “such as HS2” between the words “in the region” and “and believes” in paragraph (i).)
- 8.3 It was then moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Mohammed Mahroof, 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 ongoing development of Doncaster/Sheffield Airport, a great example of “swords into ploughshares” giving Sheffield, South Yorkshire and the wider City Region an airport with world class potential, and offering Sheffielders easy access to a range of popular holiday destinations;
 - (b) congratulates the Airport on being voted as the ‘UKs Favourite Airport’ in a customer satisfaction survey by Saga and ‘Best UK Airport’ for the second time running in a survey by Which? magazine;

- (c) further notes Which? Magazine comments “that with its ambitions to expand, Doncaster Sheffield could soon become the go-to airport for holidaymakers in the North if it can maintain its high standard.”;
 - (d) notes that long term infrastructure improvements have timescales which often well exceed political and administrative cycles;
 - (e) notes and deplores the fact that the UK remains an overcentralized state, especially so in England, and so, irrespective of political differences, local government, including Sheffield, often must adopt a pragmatic approach to secure the delivery of much needed improvements to the local economy;
 - (f) believes that Sheffield needs to be better connected, within local communities in Sheffield, within the City Region, and more widely, including internationally by air transportation;
 - (g) notes that the real issue of concern is the long term transport funding injustice between London and the South East, and the “North”;
 - (h) re-affirms concern at the failure of the Labour Leaders in South Yorkshire and the Labour administration of this Council to unlock long-term funding of £30 million per annum over 30 years (£900 million in total), by means of the City Region Devolution deal, in contrast to the support given to the development of the Airport; and
 - (i) requests that a copy of this motion be forwarded to the Sheffield City Region Mayor and the Minister of State for Transport.
- 8.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (l) to (o) as follows:-
- (l) notes that the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority Transport Committee was wound up and has not met since 8th May 2017;
 - (m) notes that this Committee was previously cross party, held meetings in public and was webcast;
 - (n) believes it is important that major decisions, such as support for the proposed airport link, are transparent and open to effective scrutiny in public; and
 - (o) asks for the Leader of the Council to use her place on the Combined Authority to push for greater transparency and scrutiny through the revival of the Transport Committee.
- 8.5 It was then moved by Councillor John Booker, and formally seconded by Councillor Keith Davis, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (l) to (v) as follows:-

- (l) believes that a commercially viable, fully operational airport in Sheffield would be an enormous asset for the city;
- (m) notes that Sheffield City Airport was built as a CAP168 code 2C airport as per the agreement between The Sheffield Development Corporation (SDC), Glenlivet Ltd and Tinsley Park Ltd, dated 27th October 1995 and subsequent lease of August 1997; and that the definition of "Airport" for the purposes of the agreement is laid out in Article 106 of the Air Navigation Order of 1989 and is consistent with the definition as originally laid out in clause 1.17 of the agreement between SDC and British Steel Corporation;
- (n) further notes that in 1997, Sheffield City Airport opened as a CAT 5, code 2C airport, which means it should have had, and maintained, all the facilities needed to cope with an aircraft capable of carrying up to 115 passengers;
- (o) also notes that the Airport started commercial services some three years earlier than originally planned, with the successful introduction on 16th February 1998, of KLM's three times daily Amsterdam service, which was an instant success, with KLM saying it was their best start-up service ever, and that services followed to Jersey, London, Dublin, Belfast and Brussels and in 1998, 75,157 passengers passed through its terminal;
- (p) recognises that Sheffield Development Corporation estimated it would take at least seven years after opening before the airport would make any return on capital, and that this fact was well known and, indeed, as early as 1990, had been referred to by the SDC;
- (q) is interested to know how Peel Holdings and the airport operator, just eight weeks after them acquiring one half share of the Airport, were allowed to start downgrading it; for example (i) at the end of September 2001 they reduced airport Rescue and Fire Fighting Services cover from a CAT 5 to a CAT 3, (ii) by the end of September 2002 they reduced cover from CAT 3 to a CAT 1 and also turned off the Instrument Landing System (ILS) and (iii) at the end of August 2002 they started turning the terminal building into a business centre (offices) without planning permission;
- (r) regrets that all of these actions were quite clearly contrary to the intention of the lease, as well as Civil Aviation Authority legislation for a code 2C airport;
- (s) places on record that it is abundantly clear that the intention of the lease/agreement was for an operational airport to be in existence for at least "the reverter period", a minimum of ten years from the date of opening;
- (t) strongly asserts that rules and regulations should be abided by, and the

closure of Sheffield City Airport was done in a most unsatisfactory manner, causing Sheffield one of its worst civic lost opportunities;

- (u) further notes that Sheffield City Airport closed to all traffic in 2008, and that an area of eighty acres of prime development land, described as the best site on the M1 corridor between Leeds and Leicester, was transferred to Sheffield Business Parks Ltd, for a notional £1.00, which has never been collected; and
 - (v) further regrets that the City has lost an airport and has allowed Peel Holdings to profit from the land developments.
- 8.6 Following a right of reply from Councillor Robert Murphy, the amendment moved by Councillor Jack Scott, as altered at the meeting, was put to the vote and was carried.
- 8.6.1 (NOTE: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery voted for paragraphs (a) to (i) of the amendment and voted against paragraphs (j) and (k) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)
- 8.7 The amendment moved by Councillor Ian Auckland was then put to the vote and was negated.
- 8.8 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was then put to the vote and was also negated.
- 8.9 The amendment moved by Councillor John Booker was then put to the vote and was also negated.
- 8.9.1 (NOTE: Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (m) to (s) and (u) and (v) of the amendment, and abstained from voting on paragraphs (l) and (t) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)
- 8.10 The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the recent news that Doncaster Sheffield Airport has been named the best in the UK following a survey of passengers;
- (b) believes the development and future growth of the Airport represents an economic opportunity for the region and could lead to the development of significant job and business growth and improved local and national transport connectivity;

- (c) notes that phase two of the Finningley and Rossington Regeneration Route Scheme will play a significant role in supporting the development of the Airport as well as supporting other economic opportunities in the area such as the inventive and job creating iPort;
- (d) welcomes that phase one has been a catalyst for business expansion of the Airport with 55% passenger growth over the past two years, making it one of the fastest growing airports in the UK;
- (e) notes that the Great Yorkshire Way has helped to create over 400 new jobs at the Airport itself and many more with over 100 businesses occupying another half a million square feet of space there;
- (f) notes that the road scheme has also opened the door to major housing projects and the wider regeneration of the local community;
- (g) welcomes the comments from the Mayor of Doncaster: "We always said Great Yorkshire Way was the route to jobs and growth. The pace and scale of private sector development delivered as a result of this new road in just two years is quite remarkable. We must remember that none of this existed a couple of years ago. The impact on our economy and the wider region is simply startling. Hundreds of millions of pounds worth of private sector investment has come into Doncaster, over 1,400 new jobs have so far been created and hundreds of new homes have been built";
- (h) notes the overwhelming evidence illustrating the disparity in transport spending between the north and the south of England and supports the growing campaign across the north of England to get a fairer transport settlement for the North of England;
- (i) is astounded that, instead of campaigning for a fairer settlement for the north of England, the Green Party are calling on the removal of economic development projects in the region, such as HS2, and believes it should not be an 'either/or' situation in improving transport infrastructure and connections for Doncaster Sheffield Airport or funding the development of an improved local transport network in the region;
- (j) welcomes that the people of South Yorkshire overwhelmingly rejected what this Council regards as the anti-jobs Green Party candidate in the recent Sheffield City Region mayoral election and instead elected Mayor Dan Jarvis to secure the transport investment and economic growth the region needs, including supporting the implementation of the 2015 Sheffield City Region deal; and
- (k) believes that all companies should pay their fair share of tax and believes that a more effective means of tackling tax avoidance would be pursued under a Labour government than under the current government and previous coalition government.

- 8.10.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery voted for paragraphs (a) to (i) of the Substantive Motion and voted against paragraphs (j) and (k) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and
2. Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal voted for paragraph (h) of the Substantive Motion and abstained from voting on paragraphs (a) to (g) and (i) to (k) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

9. APPOINTMENT OF THE INDEPENDENT PERSONS

- 9.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor David Baker, that this Council appoints Mr. David Waxman and Ms. Jo Cairns as Independent Persons, as created under the Localism Act 2011, for a term of four years, in accordance with the details outlined in the report of the Director of Legal and Governance now submitted.

10. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

- 10.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Dianne Hurst, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 4th July 2018, be approved as a true and accurate record.

11. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

- 11.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Dianne Hurst, that:-

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

- | | | |
|---|---|---|
| Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee | - | Councillor Tony Downing to replace Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs |
| Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee | - | Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs to replace Councillor Tony Downing |
| Corporate Parenting Board | - | Councillors Talib Hussain, Ian Saunders and Sophie Wilson to fill vacancies |

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

Sheffield City Region
Combined Authority Scrutiny
Committee

- Councillors Ian Auckland and Dawn Dale
to serve as substitute members of the
Committee