

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 9 January 2019, 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>
Andy Bainbridge
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 | 22 | <i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i>
Dawn Dale
Peter Price |
| 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>
Jack Clarkson
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
Neale Gibson |
| 9 | <i>Dore & Totley Ward</i>
Joe Otten
Colin Ross
Martin Smith | 18 | <i>Mosborough Ward</i>
David Barker
Tony Downing | 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 Ben Curran, Adam Hanrahan, Paul Scriven, Gail Smith, Garry Weatherall and Cliff Woodcraft.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 Petitions

3.1.1 Petition Requesting the Implementation of Measures to Control Inappropriate Parking of Vehicles on Norton Church Road

The Council received a petition containing 11 signatures, requesting the implementation of measures to control inappropriate parking of vehicles on Norton Church Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Christopher Walker who stated that the petition requested the Council to implement measures to control inappropriate parking of vehicles on Norton Church Road and in close proximity to Norton Church, Rectory and Norton Hall. He drew the Council's attention to the absence of a highway turning space and said that parked vehicles potentially compromised access for emergency services to the Church and other buildings in the Norton Conservation Area. He said that it was difficult for vehicles to turn in and out of the Rectory and impossible if vehicles parked on both sides of the road. There was a path between Norton Church Road and Norton Lane which also contributed to some of the problems of access. It was suggested that parking restrictions be implemented outside the Norton Hall Lodge between the entrance of Norton Hall and the Church and on the other side of the road to make the entrance to the Rectory safer, protect pedestrians and to allow the emergency services access.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Development. Councillor Scott responded that there were a number of places in the city affected by parking problems. Drivers sometimes parked in places which did not give consideration to others. Whilst inappropriate parking in certain places could be deterred through the use of yellow line waiting restrictions, there were also constraints to the extent that such measures could be used. The Council had to prioritise where parking had an adverse impact upon road safety, deliveries to customers, shops or businesses and the effect on residents of all day commuter parking. He commented that, whilst those factors did not appear to apply in this case, he understood that there was an issue in what was outlined in the petition and

would be pleased to meet with the petitioners and with local councillors about the issues now raised and to properly assess the situation. It would be unlikely that in terms of priority, this case would fall within the top one hundred challenges relating to parking in the City and which the Council was trying to deal with and within constrained available resources. Nevertheless, if new information came to light and as part of the discussion, it would be examined further and in a fair and balanced way.

3.1.2 Petition Requesting the Council not to Place Children and Vulnerable Single Women in Earl Marshall Guest House

The Council received a petition containing 21 signatures, requesting the Council not to place children and vulnerable single women in Earl Marshall Guest House.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Violet Dickenson who stated that the Earl Marshall was not considered to be a place for children or vulnerable women to be placed or required to share a room. There were also concerns as to the safety of single women placed at the Earl Marshall. SYMAAG (South Yorkshire Migration and Asylum Action Group) had been campaigning to stop the placing of children in the Earl Marshall which had no safeguarding measures in place or trained staff. It was aware of families placed there for almost a year and another family for six months. She referred to the Council meeting on 9 December at which the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety had explained the situation with regards to the number of families with children placed in bed and breakfast accommodation. She said that all of the families placed at the Earl Marshall were refugees with No Leave to Remain and those with No Recourse to Public Funds and one family which had come to Sheffield to be reunited with family.

Violet Dickenson said that the Council had spent £277K last year on bed and breakfast accommodation, whereas the other South Yorkshire Authorities had spent nothing. She asked how much had been spent on placing people at the Earl Marshall in particular. She said that before Christmas, a visit had been made and there was no security at the Earl Marshall and she also referred to one woman's particular circumstances. The petitioners demanded that no children or vulnerable women were placed at the Earl Marshall. It also requested a meeting with the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety to discuss matters. She asked whether Sheffield was a city of sanctuary given the people who were placed in the Earl Marshall guest house.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jim Steinke, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety. Councillor Steinke stated that the Council had given a continuing commitment to move to no use of bed and breakfast accommodation. It was working on the use of temporary accommodation both by adaptations and acquisitions of properties. Clearly, the Council would not wish to have accommodation which was worse than the current standard. He said that he had visited the Earl Marshall guest house prior to Christmas and would be pleased to discuss his overview of the

situation following that visit with SYMAAG. Action had been taken to reduce the use of bed and breakfast accommodation only. One family had been placed in bed and breakfast accommodation over the Christmas period. He was working on a response to set out what the Council was doing in relation to proposals and in response to these issues. He welcomed the invitation to meet directly with SYMAAG and believed this could be done as soon as possible in connection with these matters and with regard to the potential changes to the asylum seeker contract. A further meeting was also planned at the end of January to include officers, Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families and himself. With regards to the City of Sanctuary, he said that he believed the range of services which the Council offered to refugees and asylum seekers was better than many places but there was clearly a need to do better.

3.2 Public Questions

3.2.1 Public Questions Concerning Streets Ahead

Justin Buxton asked a question as to whether the Council was contractually committed as part of the Streets Ahead contract to paying for the replacement of 17 and a half thousand trees, even if only ten thousand were replaced, at the end of the term of the contract.

Justin Buxton referred to the granting of an injunction relating to work on street trees and to a statement made on 15 August 2017 by the then Cabinet Member concerning the completion of work as part of the core investment period of the Streets Ahead programme and the potential financial consequences of not completing the work by the end of the year. He asked what the financial consequences had been of works having not been completed and whether the statement had been unfounded or deliberately misleading.

Russell Johnson asked for an explanation of the decision making in refusing to conduct an inquiry in relation to tree felling and asserted that there might be a wish to learn from errors made by an independent examination of what happened.

Russell Johnson asked which was more important, the protection of as many mature trees as possible or the maintaining of straight kerb lines, which he said were not required by highways legislation or sought by other cities instead of trees.

Russell Johnson referred to information given concerning Weston Road memorial trees, and to the decision to save almost all of those trees. He asked whether the Leader of the Council would reconsider her decision to stay in office.

Graham Wroe referred to the December meeting of the Council and to his question concerning why many streets had not been swept, leaving many pavements dangerous with slippery wet leaves. He said that the Cabinet

Member for Environment and Streetscene had informed him that all streets were swept a minimum of 3 times a year and that Amey would respond to complaints within 14 days to deal with the problem. He said that having complained about 3 particularly bad roads, a month later they had not been swept.

He also made reference to a part of his question to which he said an answer had not been given concerning what the Council was doing to hold Amey to account and ensure it was providing people with a satisfactory service and said that he would now like a reply to this issue.

He stated that he believed the Amey contract was not good value for money and with the contract being “self-monitoring”, it appeared that the Council did not check to make sure work was done properly.

Sheldon Hall asked for clarification of paragraph 7.5.2 of the joint statement released by the Council and STAG (Sheffield Tree Action Groups) in December 2018 and concerning the status of an inquiry. He asked whether the statement was a tacit admission that the results of an independent inquiry would be damning and whether an independent inquiry might help to clear the air further.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, responded to the questions. With regard to the question concerning the number of trees to be replaced within the Streets Ahead contract being 17 and a half thousand trees, he made reference to a statement in the Sheffield Star from a representative of STAG that it was understood that the Council was not operating to such a target.

He said that it was a serious allegation that someone had deliberately misled the Chamber and he explained that the core investment period targets were met.

In relation to potholes and kerb lines, Councillor Dagnall stated that the Council wanted a highways infrastructure which could accommodate brilliant roads both for drivers and for people to participate in active travel, pavements on which people would not trip and valuable street trees. A kerb line was an integral part of a highway.

He said that with regard to the question concerning the Leader of the Council, if a person had doubt about the faith of people in the Leader, they could register as a candidate in the forthcoming local elections. He did not believe that the Council had put out false information with regard to the Weston Road memorial trees. However, when the facts changed in this case, the Council changed its approach and asked Amey to compromise in respect of the memorial trees, which it did and the policy was changed.

With regards to the questions concerning the clearing of leaves, Councillor Dagnall stated that he had asked for information from officers as regards Mr Wroe’s questions. There was not a record of a complaint having been received

from Mr Wroe about leaves and the last record of contact with him had been regarding gullies in July 2018. However, this latest contact might have been anonymous and he asked Mr Wroe to write to him with the details of the three streets in question so he was able to examine this matter further.

He said that if Amey had not met the performance target then there would be appropriate reductions. Of over 500 complaints that had been received in relation to leaves in the past few months, Amey had responded within 14 days. The English Highways survey showed that people were more satisfied with highways than before the programme began. The Council did hold Amey to account and it had unveiled a policy concerning highway trees, in which Amey would contribute significant sums to retaining many more trees.

He said that paragraph 7.5.2 of the joint statement of the Council and Amey was clear. There was a pledge to seek to implement the Streets Ahead programme and benefits for the City. The Council offered to hold mediated talks with STAG and to listen to the points they wished to make, including that regarding an inquiry. He said that he was not persuaded that an inquiry would be the best use of time and resources and instead it was agreed to produce a tree strategy in the first six months of 2019 and which looked at the long term future of street trees and which he believed was what people would like to see, together with the compromise which had resolved many issues and the wish to look forward.

3.2.2 Public Question Concerning Knife Crime

Kaltun Elmi expressed concern at the rise in knife crime in Sheffield and asked a question concerning the effect of austerity and the causes of an increase in knife crime.

Councillor Jim Steinke, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, commented that austerity was a subject on the agenda for this meeting of Council. He said that a presentation on the subject of knife crime had been made to Council and a scrutiny session and meeting of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee was to take place on 10 January concerning community responses to gun and knife crime. It was recognised that there were a range of contributory factors to knife crime, including poverty and austerity, and reductions in services.

3.2.3 Public Questions Concerning Care and Support Charging Guidelines

Questions were submitted by John Rogers and asked on his behalf by Mr Slack concerning the implementation of the care and support statutory charging guidance, as follows:

Does the Council accept that their current implementation of Care and Support Statutory Charging Guidance is fair, acceptable, logical, etc, does it have any plans to review the formula?

Does the Council work with other councils/agencies to review the national

formula set by the Department of Health, is anything published in light of these discussions?

Does the Council think it is fair that many clients who receive means tested benefits are paying much more than affluent home owning clients with private incomes, etc?

Does it consider it needs to review its implementation of Disability Related Expenditure (DRE's) such as including internet usage which separately Adult Social Care demands clients must have access to?

Are figures published which inform how much is repaid to the Council in terms of financial contributions?

Would the Council consider a wholesale review of the formula, taking into account needs and views of its sick and disabled clients?

Councillor Chris Peace, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care responded to the questions. She stated that she would also provide answers to Mr Rogers in writing. She explained that a complex formula had been set by the Government. Whilst she believed that the Council's implementation of the Care and Support Statutory Charging Guidance was fair and logical, she did not think that the system nationally was fair. The policy which was applied was that people would only pay what they could afford and that was in line with the legislation.

There were no plans to conduct a review in full at present. However, feedback was welcomed from individuals and agencies. The Council did work with other local authorities to seek to influence matters (through the national Association of Financial Assessment Officers and the Association of Directors of Adult Social Services). Councillor Peace referred to two examples of where the Council had made representations, namely the minimum income guarantee for under 25s and the maximum lifetime contribution, which she said was in the Care Act but had not been implemented.

Councillor Peace said that with regard to the third question as set out above, she did not agree that it was the case [‘that many clients who receive means tested benefits are paying much more than affluent home owning clients with private incomes’]. She explained that there may be specific cases which should be examined further and suggested that any such case be brought to her attention. Each person was assessed according to their own financial means and expenses and those with higher incomes were required to pay more. She said that she had asked for further analysis on that point and, on average, people who rented a property were assessed as having to pay less than home owners.

She said that it was not the case that internet access was needed to access adult social care and there were a range of ways of doing so. Each person's circumstances were considered on a case by case basis and there was a robust system of review in place if someone disagreed with that assessment. Specific needs and exceptional circumstances in relation to internet access

would be considered on a case by case basis.

As regards the publication of figures, the Council's accounts included income from fees and charges and that also incorporated contributions and other income. Other local authorities sampled, including Leeds, South Yorkshire local authorities and Manchester, did not publish more detailed information in this regard. Barnsley and Rotherham had reviewed and changed the charging policy and had decided to increase income. Sheffield would not, at this point, be considering a review and the way in which the policy was implemented was both fair and fit for purpose. However, she said the Council did want feedback from individuals and agencies. The questions had also prompted her to discuss matters further with Council officers. She explained that the Council would take a cautious approach to any review concerning income.

Councillor Peace said that there were issues upon which she would be writing to the Secretary of State and commented that she believed there was need for the Government to look at social care as a whole. Nevertheless, under the national policy, the Council was applying local policy in as fair a way as possible.

3.2.4 Public Question Concerning Security

Anthony Farrell asked what reassurances the Council could give that everything reasonable was being done to prevent a terror attack being perpetrated in the City.

Councillor Jim Steinke, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety stated that he would respond to the question in writing.

3.2.5 Public Question Concerning War Graves Commission

Roy Billington asked whether the Council was paid by the War Graves Commission for war graves in Sheffield to be kept in order and how much funding was given.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure stated that she was not aware if any funding was received by the Council from the War Graves Commission. However, she would look into this further and provide a written answer.

3.2.6 Public Question Concerning Governance

Ruth Hubbard made reference to a petition concerning the Council's governance arrangements and the introduction of a committee system. She asked whether the Cabinet would reconsider its decision concerning how the City was run to move to a committee system. She also asked when the Leader of the Council would be able to meet with people representing the campaign. She commented that she had written to the Deputy Leader of the Council on 25 August 2018 and had not received a reply.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, referred to a question which had been put on this matter at the 7 November 2018 meeting of Council and at which she had responded that she would be prepared to meet to discuss wider issues, such as participation and engagement with people and it was her understanding that a meeting was being arranged.

3.2.7 Public Question Concerning Accommodation for Refugee Families

David Price asked whether a risk assessment had been carried out in relation to placing refugee families with children in the Earl Marshall guest house.

Councillor Jim Steinke, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety stated that an assessment was and should be made of all families going into bed and breakfast accommodation. If there had been any failures in that regard, it had been documented and accepted by the Council.

He said that in terms of the quality of accommodation, need requirements and vulnerability of people, he would suggest that this was discussed further at the forthcoming meeting with representatives of SYMAAG, whilst also bearing in mind that some matters would be of a confidential nature.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that no children on their own would be placed in bed and breakfast accommodation. The circumstances when they might be placed in such accommodation was as part of their family and where the family might have received Leave to Remain, then having been required to move out of a G4S Property. If in those cases there was no permanent accommodation available, no temporary emergency accommodation available and, no spaces in the emergency accommodation, and the family needed to move, as a last resort bed and breakfast accommodation would have to be used but the family would be supported throughout.

Councillor Drayton stated that there were not, at present, enough properties available. However, there was a process being undertaken address the issue. She said that the Council did not want to see families housed in bed and breakfast accommodation. However, there was, unfortunately, a need for emergency places, if necessary.

3.2.8 Public Question Concerning Myrtle Road

Paul Turpin referred to a petition which was submitted to Council requesting traffic-calming measures on Myrtle Road.

He asked whether a speed survey had been carried out on Myrtle/Midhill Road following the petition presented in October for a safer crossing for school children and what progress had been made on the issue. He also asked how many tickets had been issued for parking or idling engines outside schools since September and was the Council concerned about the culture of idling engines on Streets Ahead worksites.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, stated that there were national guidelines in relation to ticketing for idling outside of schools. Sheffield was the first big authority in the country to introduce such a scheme. He said that there was not a wish to fine people but the Council did seek to improve driver behaviour by people parking responsibly and turning off vehicle engines. He said that the number of fines issued was not in itself a measure of success, whereas to improve air quality around schools would be a measure of success. He did not believe any fines had, as yet, been issued for engines idling outside schools and there were specific related requirements. The Council did issue many fines each year to drivers parking irresponsibly. However, he did not have the precise information to hand.

In relation to Myrtle Road, Councillor Scott said that there had been a number of requests from local councillors to move this matter forward. A meeting was held with the lead petitioner in November and there was a plan being produced alongside a road safety audit. An order was being processed for a speed indicator device on Myrtle Road as a temporary measure and there was focus on improving road safety on Myrtle Road.

3.2.9 Public Question Concerning Austerity

Paul Turpin asked a question concerning austerity cuts.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded that the impact of austerity was an item on the agenda for this meeting of the Council and suggested that the questioner may wish to stay and listen to that item of business.

3.2.10 Public Questions Concerning Trade Union Law

Calvin Payne made reference to a question asked at the meeting of Council in September 2018 and concerning decision making relating to the use of Trade Union Law for arrest of individuals. He now asked whether Council officers or legal staff were involved in the decision making process with South Yorkshire Police in this regard and which he said led to wrongful arrests under anti-union law in the period November 2016 to February 2017.

Jeremy Peace stated that South Yorkshire Police had made a statement in February 2017 that the use of anti-trade union law had been agreed between South Yorkshire Police and the City Council and asked whether, as this resulted in unlawful arrests; it was time that an inquiry was held.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded that there was a difference of the application of the law and a decision to act on it and that only the Police could arrest people.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene stated that as regards an inquiry, answers had been given to questions asked earlier at this meeting of Council. Talks had been held

involving representatives of tree campaigners and the Council and the Council had listened to points made by representatives making a case for an inquiry. The issues raised concerning arrests were a matter for the Police and he understood it had been taken up with the Police.

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 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

4.2.1 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).

5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

5.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Dianne Hurst, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 5th December 2018, be approved as a true and accurate record.

6. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

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

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

Licensing Committee - Remove Councillor Neale Gibson, resulting in a vacancy on the Committee

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

River Stewardship Company - Councillor Andy Bainbridge to fill a vacancy

(c) it be noted that the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 10th December 2018, appointed Ryan Keyworth to the post of Director of Finance and Commercial Services, and that Mr Keyworth will start in post on 15th April 2019.

7. IMPACT OF AUSTERITY ON SHEFFIELD

- 7.1 Members of the Council received a presentation on the impact of austerity on Sheffield by Miatta Fahnbulleh, Chief Executive of the New Economics Foundation, Rachel Laurence, Director, Programmes & Practice of the New Economic Foundation and James Henderson, Director of Policy, Performance and Communications, Sheffield City Council.
- 7.2 James Henderson outlined in his presentation the impact of the austerity programme on Sheffield. The presentation considered the impact on public services, local government and the City Council in particular; on the people and communities of Sheffield; on jobs and the economy; and set out conclusions as to the overall implications of the austerity programme since 2010.
- 7.3 He explained that the Government's austerity programme had reduced the deficit, but new spending commitments in the 2018 Budget had increased spending, leaving a projected £19.8bn deficit in 2023-24. The impact of cuts across Government was and would remain uneven. For example, funding for legal aid had reduced by almost 40% since 2010 and the number of civil legal aid caseloads had fallen 645,000 in the same period.
- 7.4 Cuts had been uneven by the type of local authority and spending power cuts had impacted most on councils in more deprived areas, whereas increases (eg. social care funding) had been distributed more evenly.
- 7.5 Non-social care services had seen significant funding reductions and councils had sought to protect the most vulnerable in their areas. Social care now accounted for over 56% of total spend in Metropolitan councils. Sheffield City Council had seen a £430m reduction in its budget since 2011-12.
- 7.6 He said that welfare cuts had been ongoing since 2011/12 and were expected to continue into the 2020s and over £4bn of welfare cuts were due over the next five years. Tax and welfare changes had been unequal and were inversely correlated with deprivation.
- 7.7 The impact of welfare reform had been felt across Sheffield but was significantly higher in the more deprived wards. Poverty, particularly amongst children, had increased significantly since 2010. The number of children living in poverty had increased more quickly for some family types. Deprivation in Sheffield had become more polarised since 2010.
- 7.8 Sheffield City Region's GVA (Gross Value Added) per head had recovered since the recession but remained the lowest of the 'Core City' Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP) areas. Whilst average salaries in Sheffield had grown by 15%, that average masked significant income disparities in the City. Employment in Sheffield had grown since 2010 but the nature of work was changing, with increasing numbers of people in part-time employment.
- 7.9 James Henderson said in conclusion, that:

1. Austerity had had a significant impact on Sheffield's people, communities and public services.
 2. Austerity was not over, with further cuts to local government and welfare planned.
 3. The impact of austerity was uneven, falling more heavily on poorer places and people.
 4. The impact of austerity was cumulative and people felt the impact of multiple reductions in service delivery and across more than one year.
- 7.10 Miatta Fahnbulleh, Chief Executive of the New Economics Foundation, and Rachel Laurence, Director, Programmes & Practice of the New Economic Foundation, outlined in their presentation the effects of austerity and also the potential for change and for different approaches to economic change and inclusive economies.
- 7.11 Miatta Fahnbulleh stated that the New Economic Foundation (NEF) had argued for a radically different approach to the economy, including a different model and measures of economic success.
- 7.12 She commented that Local Government had borne a significant proportion of the cuts to public expenditure as part of the austerity programme and that the effects of austerity were becoming apparent. She said that the politics around austerity was changing. Austerity had suppressed GDP and would continue to compound structural weaknesses in the economy. There was a consensus that the economy did not work for everyone and economic growth now did not necessarily mean that people were better off, as evidenced by wage stagnation, rising costs of essentials and people borrowing to get by and the numbers of children living in poverty and rising inequalities.
- 7.13 She stated that she believed things had reached a point at which people would begin to think about change. There were three factors which would drive change, namely the economic reality; politics and political response; and disruption from environmental factors and climate change. The coming together of these factors would force people at national and local level to think about how to change the economy, so that it worked for people and the planet and there was an opportunity for local government to lead the way in this regard.
- 7.14 Miatta Fahnbulleh suggested that there were some issues and principles which needed to be considered, including, the environment; improving lives of people in communities; giving people a bigger stake and ownership of their local economy; a bigger role for businesses in contributing to social and environmental outcomes; decentralising more economic power to local government; and to engage with and empower local communities.
- 7.15 She said that there was a question of how this might be done i.e. how to create inclusive economies; and NEF had done work with other local authorities in this regard. She stated that there were some key building blocks to begin with. These included: clarity about what a strong local economy looked like and

economic, social and environmental outcomes; co-producing the local economy with local people; mapping investment money flows across the local economy so it can be made to deliver; working with other organisations with a vision for change in the local economy and use of procurement and local investment and supply chains; working with businesses and considering the business contribution to the local economy, jobs, infrastructure etc; and use of local finances.

7.16 Rachel Laurence outlined three concepts which were frequently discussed when talking to organisations. These were: defining what was the local and regional economy; increasing growth; and community wealth building.

7.17 She then summarised three approaches taken in the last few years which were practical approaches which councils could take. These included:

- community economic development to generate local economic activity, including technical and business support.
- fine tuning and considering certain questions to ask of any programmes of investment, development or infrastructure programmes; such as how it will distribute wealth in the community, and the extent to which there would be local jobs, local supply chains and local investment and ownership; or the secondary economic benefits of other sectors such as financial services.
- redesigning an economic strategy which brought investment into sectors that provide the most jobs and may be labour intensive.

7.18 Miatta Fahnbulleh summarised the presentation and emphasised the important role that local government might take in leading economic change, whilst recognising that it was a big undertaking. She said that the New Economics Foundation was keen to work with local authorities in this regard.

7.19 Members of the Council asked questions and commented upon the issues outlined in the presentations, as summarised below:

7.20 A comment was made that in focussing upon different measures of success, there was at the same time a need to bring about economic growth and increase tax revenue through high growth sectors as well as growth in local sectors. A remark was also made as to the reasons for people voting to leave the European Union.

7.21 An observation was made that a challenge in welfare reform was to make sure there was sufficient income for families and that there were some poor practices such as people 'working off the clock'. A question was posed as to what local authorities could do to encourage better employment practices and get real issues relating to austerity back on the agenda.

7.22 A question was put as to what specifically could be done locally and as to what changes the Council should make.

- 7.23 In response to the above points, Miatta Fahnbulleh said that growth in itself would not deliver for communities. It was acknowledged that the reasons for outcome of the Brexit vote were complex. There were structural problems in the economy and austerity had compounded existing problems, such as wage stagnation for a proportion of the population. She said it was recognised that there were genuine problems in the economy and it was important to focus on real issues. Politics would demand change and there would be contributions at both national and local levels.
- 7.24 As regards what could be done, she said there was some exciting work in Sheffield e.g. work with local institutions and the coming together of a common vision and initiatives including local procurement. Further thinking might be done as to how to 'sweat' investment in the local economy, creative approaches to business support and building links between community enterprises to other small and medium enterprises. There was also a question of who owned the economy and the use of the Council's procurement and investment powers to create co-operatives.
- 7.25 James Henderson responded that the City Partnership Board had developed the inclusive economy framework and the Council had produced the ethical procurement policy. Whilst there was a lot to do and build upon, the City was starting from a reasonable position. There would be reflection on what had been said in the presentations at this meeting.
- 7.26 A comment was made that austerity was a political choice and it was difficult to be optimistic with regards to the Government's approach and a drive to not spend in communities and reduce benefits. A question was asked concerning the uncertainty as to how Brexit might affect circumstances locally for local communities and how local communities would move on from it.
- 7.27 An observation was made as to examples of where work had been done with businesses such as Boeing and McLaren investing in the City and the Council as regards supply chains. There had also been successful initiatives such as in relation to ethical procurement and the apprenticeship programme.
- 7.28 A further comment was made that there was more that could be done concerning the creation of a balanced range of local employment for people regardless of where they lived. Planning powers as they were at this time did not always help to develop balanced economic activity at a local level or facilitate activities and certain resources and powers were required. There were also issues in relation to a City Region deal.
- 7.29 A statement was made concerning the City Region and options of working more closely with other local authorities, such as proposed in a Yorkshire wide devolution deal. A question was asked about such a regional deal and leveraging powers and funding from government, learning lessons from other regions. A question was asked about the effect of Brexit or a no deal scenario and its economic impact.
- 7.30 Rachel Laurence responded that working on a small scale through local and

micro activity might not achieve such a scale of change as larger investments but there was a challenge as to how the economy as a whole could function well in peoples lived experience.

- 7.31 What might be explored in a definition of 'local' was not necessarily a geographic balance of employment but a better distribution of jobs amongst more ordinary people. It was not a zero sum gain between two communities but was instead the distribution of jobs, income and wealth distributed to ordinary people and the retention of wealth within the economy of the area.
- 7.32 A comment was made concerning the effect on cities of the austerity programme and increasing child poverty. Thought could be given to what was being done, and what more could be done, to stabilise the economy and make it more sustainable. There had also been significant damage to the economy through the actions of previous governments and which adversely affected the local economy's ability to recover from events such as recession.
- 7.33 It was noted that the Council was bringing contracts back in-house, where possible, so as to improve services and there was a benefit in money remaining in the city economy. It was important that procurement was ethical and the Council would continue to review policy so as to make sure of the best social value and value in the supply chain. The Council was also working with small and medium businesses and it spent a significant proportion of expenditure with local suppliers and small businesses.
- 7.34 Comment was made that there was also more that could be done as regards co-operatives and with regard to the use of the Council's spending power and work was being done in that regard.
- 7.35 It was stated that there was a real impact of austerity on people, such as use of foodbanks and the Council was looking at how in the future it would be able to continue to provide support for vulnerable families.
- 7.36 A question was raised as to what comprised good employment, including something which gave people meaning and identity and comment made that focus might be given to what comprised good meaningful employment.
- 7.37 A question was asked as to whether there were measures other than GVA/GDP to reflect issues such as poverty and growth and that benefited all people in an inclusive economy.
- 7.38 A comment was made that the City was divided with five wards in which over fifty percent of children lived in poverty and different solutions were required to deal with such problems.
- 7.39 A further comment was made about seizing the potential in local communities and investing and improving people's livelihoods at the same time as developing a strong economy and growth.

- 7.40 It was noted that, at the same time as activity to draw in big investments in the City, there were also small initiatives in communities which had developed through a programme of incubation and which helped to build local resilience. A question was posed as to how change would be possible in the context of austerity and scale of financial cuts experienced.
- 7.41 Miatta Fahnbulleh commented that, whilst it was difficult after a period of austerity, it was possible to find space to do things within what the City already had and in which the Council or its partners were already investing and to maximise the outcomes of investment.
- 7.42 RESOLVED: That the Council notes the information now reported in relation to the impact of austerity on the City of Sheffield, and thanks Miatta Fahnbulleh, Rachel Laurence and James Henderson for their presentation.

8. HEALTH AND WEALTH: DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT FOR SHEFFIELD 2018

- 8.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Peter Rippon and seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 5.5 be suspended and the termination of the meeting be extended by a period of up to 30 minutes, to 6.00 p.m. maximum.
- 8.2 The Council received a presentation by Greg Fell, Director of Public Health, concerning the Director of Public Health Annual Report for Sheffield 2018. The report focused on the relationship between health, work and the economy. It considered how good work and an inclusive economy could make a significant contribution to improvement in Sheffield's health and wellbeing and how, in turn, good health represented a key requirement for future prosperity.
- 8.3 Greg Fell summarised the key messages within the Annual report, as follows:
- 8.4 The economy is everything that happens in Sheffield; a healthy population and productive economy are linked; good jobs are good for health; many have been left behind by the way the economy works and inequality in health outcomes were related to economic inequalities; to change how we measure growth; and "sweat our assets" - an approach to an inclusive economy.
- 8.5 The presentation examined a health summary for Sheffield, including how it compared with other places in England by various indicators such as life expectancy and cause of death, behaviour risk factors, child health, inequalities and the wider determinants of health.
- 8.6 Mr Fell outlined three key recommendations, made in the Annual Report, as follows:-
- Sheffield City Council, Sheffield City Partnership and Sheffield City Region should align and embed action into their economic strategies to enable and encourage all local employers to recognise their role in providing good

work and ensuring that the most disadvantaged in our society are not left behind in their ambitions.

- Sheffield City Partnership, as part of developing a strategy for an inclusive economy, should consider how best to use the resources currently available to the City, to incentivise implementation of the strategy; and
- Sheffield City Partnership should facilitate the public, private and voluntary anchor institutions of Sheffield to develop a collective strategy to secure and progress their contribution to an inclusive economy, underpinned by supportive strategies for each sector.

8.7 Members of the Council asked questions and commented upon issues raised by the Director of Public Health's Annual Report and presentation and these, together with the responses to them, are summarised below:

8.8 A comment was made concerning employment and the effects of inequality, insecure employment and bad jobs; and the importance of defining what a good job looked like and people having the opportunity to representation in the workplace by a union.

8.9 A comment was made concerning mental health awareness and solutions and a question asked as to what the health services and the Council could do to support people with mental health conditions to stay in work. Health support may not fit around peoples working lives, sometimes causing them to leave employment which in turn contributed to a decline in their health and loss of good employees. What could be done to support people and towards early intervention that might allow an individual to stay in work so that their skills stayed within the economy.

8.10 A comment was made with regard to the decline in improvement of infant mortality rates. Austerity had also disproportionately affected women and the health of people who were poorer and poverty was associated with problems such as obesity and poor employment and a question was asked in relation to the impact of austerity on infants.

8.11 Greg Fell stated that austerity was not a good thing for communities. In relation to infants, it was known that the Council was broadly doing the right thing through the 'best start' strategy. Effort also needed to be focussed upon smoking cessation, obesity and pregnancy. Whilst midwives did commendable work in tackling smoking in pregnancy, tackling some problems was not something which they could be expected to do alone. There was probably a link between some conditions such as obesity and the effects of austerity but it was not possible to say austerity was directly responsible for infant deaths.

8.12 In relation to mental health, the NHS long term plan was published on 8 January and there was also supposed to be significant investment in mental health treatment. The issue of toxic working environments should also be examined as it was a cause of mental ill health. Mental health first aid approaches were in place in many organisations, but it was also necessary to

look at causes of poor mental health. There was also an onus on employers to invest in treatment so as to keep people in work and improve people's productivity. In relation to working environments, there might be an element of personal responsibility for people (as consumers), for example in relation to choosing to shop in real shops, rather than using online retail.

- 8.13 A question was asked about changing the measure of growth to be more compatible with the Report's recommendations as set about above.
- 8.14 Greg Fell responded that there were a range of alternative measures of economic productivity. There were also other measures, such as the 'happy city index', which was a range of broader measures of wellbeing and included social measures. The City Partnership Board had looked to using a wider range of measures.
- 8.15 A question was asked concerning two of the Annual Report recommendations which were thought to be outside of the Council's jurisdiction and as to how these might be achieved.
- 8.16 Greg Fell responded that the Annual Report related to the City as a whole and not the Council alone and the Council was a member of the Partnership Board and actively contributed to the City Region. There might be moral, if not contractual, leverage between organisations and the report attempted to set a narrative. He suggested that the Report's recommendations were not particularly controversial. However, the report did give a number of reasons as to why those particular actions were a good idea.
- 8.17 A question was asked as to whether the Council had a measurable and positive impact in relation to public health. A question was also posed as to how the results relating to the numbers of physically active adults might be improved.
- 8.18 A question was asked concerning good quality employment. A further question was put as to how problems might be addressed, including smoking and those associated with BMI (Body Mass Index) and in relation to infant mortality.
- 8.19 A question was posed about how to ensure that poor health did not affect the economic potential of people aged over 50 years.
- 8.20 Greg Fell stated that some of healthy life metrics were still improving and the level of infant mortality was improving but the rate of improvement was slowing. The circumstances were better in Sheffield compared to other core cities and might be viewed in the context of austerity and the economic circumstances. In Sheffield, for example, smoking prevalence was 17 percent and there was an ambition to reduce that further to 10 percent by 2022. There were areas in which the City was improving and also other issues in relation to which there was work to be done, including air quality, health checks and cardio-vascular diseases.

- 8.21 As regards healthy life expectancy for people aged 50 and over, some conditions may not lead to someone having to stop working altogether, although these may cause restrictions or make it harder for some individuals. This was an area to be considered further as the working age population became older and in making sure there was the right kind of work, appropriate for what people were able to do. There was also a broader issue relating to re-skilling people for another career and given increased automation in the workplace.
- 8.22 A question was asked in relation to air quality and the planning process and gas generation/turbine units in particular and as to whether any such major development in an area with existing poor air quality should be submitted to the Director of Public Health as part of a process for considering planning applications.
- 8.23 Greg Fell said that he had met this day with the Council's Chief Planning Officer about that subject and there was work being done to systematise that process. He stated that for major applications a public health opinion would always be sought. There was an issue in relation to a definition of a 'major' application and in that minor applications could have a cumulative impact, so it had been agreed to address those issues, so that there was a link between the planning process and public health and appropriate advice could be given.
- 8.24 A comment was made about economic growth and a question was asked concerning the impact of bullying in the workplace and its effect on mental health.
- 8.25 A question was asked concerning the progress of recommendations from the previous year's Annual Report concerning adverse childhood experiences.
- 8.26 A question was asked concerning childhood obesity and encouraging people to buy fresh food and use fresh ingredients at an early age and for families.
- 8.27 Greg Fell acknowledged the importance of encouraging children to obtain skills to enable them to use fresh produce and ingredients. Affordability was an issue, although there were also myths in that regard. There was also work in relation to a food strategy and with institutions, including schools, the Council and in hospitals, to reduce sugar content in foods.
- 8.28 In relation to Adverse Childhood Experiences (ACE), significant work had been done to quantify how many people had adverse childhood experiences. However, at this point in time, the quality of the data was a problem. Work was also being done to consider what an ACE informed school or mental health care looked like for children and adults and in allowing people to talk about their experiences. This would be brought together to form an ACE strategy for Sheffield.
- 8.29 Many people had not benefitted from the way the economy had functioned. In relation to income, whilst it had increased, there was a worsening gap between best and worst and it was the relative which mattered as well as the absolute

and this gap did matter in relation to health and wellbeing outcomes.

- 8.30 RESOLVED: That this Council notes the information contained in the Director of Public Health's report, expresses support for the three recommendations outlined in the report for improving the health of the local population, and thanks him for his presentation.