



# Council

---

**Wednesday 4 September 2019**

**2.00 pm**

**Council Chamber, Town Hall,  
Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH**

**The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend**

---

## COUNCIL

---

**Wednesday 4 September 2019, at 2.00 pm  
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH**

**The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend**

### MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Tony Downing)  
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Gail Smith)

1	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Bob Pullin Richard Shaw	10	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Andy Bainbridge Vic Bowden Moya O'Rourke	19	<i>Nether Edge &amp; Sharrow Ward</i> Peter Garbutt Jim Steinke Alison Teal
2	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Bob McCann Chris Rosling-Josephs Sophie Wilson	11	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Roger Davison Barbara Masters Shaffaq Mohammed	20	<i>Park &amp; Arbourthorne Ward</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 &amp; Sharrow Vale Ward</i> Angela Argenzio Michelle Cook Kaltum Rivers	13	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; 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 Paul Turpin	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Mike Chaplin Tony Damms Jayne Dunn
6	<i>City Ward</i> Douglas Johnson Ruth Mersereau 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 &amp; Crosspool Ward</i> Tim Huggan Mohammed Mahroof Anne Murphy	16	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Julie Grocutt Francyne Johnson
8	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea Zahira Naz	17	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Terry Fox Pat Midgley Sioned-Mair Richards	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	18	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> Tony Downing Kevin Oxley Gail Smith	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> Alan Hooper Adam Hurst Mike Levery
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Paul Wood

---

John Mothersole

Chief Executive

---

Contact:

Paul Robinson, Democratic Services

Tel: 0114 2734029

[paul.robinson@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:paul.robinson@sheffield.gov.uk)

---

## **PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING**

---

The Council is composed of 84 Councillors with one-third elected three years in four. Councillors are democratically accountable to the residents of their Ward. The overriding duty of Councillors is to the whole community, but they have a special duty to their constituents, including those who did not vote for them

All Councillors meet together as the Council. Here Councillors decide the Council's overall policies and set the budget each year. The Council appoints the Leader and at its Annual Meeting will appoint Councillors to serve on its Committees. It also appoints representatives to serve on joint bodies and external organisations.

A copy of the agenda and reports is available on the Council's website at [www.sheffield.gov.uk](http://www.sheffield.gov.uk). You can also see the reports to be discussed at the meeting if you call at the First Point Reception, Town Hall, Pinstone Street entrance. The Reception is open between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm, Monday to Thursday and between 9.00 am and 4.45 pm. on Friday. You may not be allowed to see some reports because they contain confidential information. These items are usually marked \* on the agenda.

Members of the public have the right to ask questions or submit petitions to Council meetings and recording is allowed under the direction of the Chair. Please see the website or contact Democratic Services for further information regarding public questions and petitions and details of the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at council meetings.

Council meetings are normally open to the public but sometimes the Council may have to discuss an item in private. If this happens, you will be asked to leave. Any private items are normally left until last. If you would like to attend the meeting please report to the First Point Reception desk where you will be directed to the meeting room.

---

## **FACILITIES**

---

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in meeting rooms.

Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

---

**COUNCIL AGENDA  
4 SEPTEMBER 2019**

**Order of Business**

---

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting.

**3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS**

To receive any questions or petitions from the public, or communications submitted by the Lord Mayor or the Chief Executive and to pass such resolutions thereon as the Council Procedure Rules permit and as may be deemed expedient.

**4. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

4.1 Questions relating to urgent business – Council Procedure Rule 16.6(ii).

4.2 Supplementary questions on written questions submitted at this meeting – Council Procedure Rule 16.4.

4.3 Questions on the discharge of the functions of the South Yorkshire Joint Authorities for Fire and Rescue and Pensions – Section 41 of the Local Government Act 1985 – Council Procedure Rule 16.6(i).

(NB. Minutes of recent meetings of the two South Yorkshire Joint Authorities have been made available to all Members of the Council via the following link -

<http://democracy.sheffield.gov.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13165&path=0>)

**5. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "CONSULTING THE PUBLIC " - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR IAN AUCKLAND AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MOHAMMED MAHROOF**

That this Council:-

- (a) notes the request of the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee that the consultation period in respect of proposals for a clean air zone be extended beyond August, was declined by the Cabinet Member;

- (b) in contrast, welcomes the decision of Mayor Dan Jarvis to extend the period for consultation in respect of Bus Services, particularly noting yet another round of damaging service reductions taking place with effect from 1st September, and would urge especially passengers finding their service have disappeared, to make their opinions plain;
- (c) repeats the call (last made by the Liberal Democrat Group at the Council meeting in February 2019) for the Council to give notice to terminate the Sheffield Bus Partnership Agreement, as improved bus services will be an essential requirement if the Council is to secure cleaner, greener, safer travel, reducing the number of cars on the road and encouraging cycling and walking;
- (d) deplores the fact that the opportunities for involvement in decision making by citizens and Members have been much reduced by the current Administration;
- (e) accepts that it is not possible to be exactly prescriptive with regard to the time period for consultation exercises, but agrees that major consultations require a minimum period of 8 weeks and that 12 weeks should be considered desirable, in the interest of Truth, Trust, and Transparency;
- (f) declares that for the purposes of calculating the desired period for public consultation, the month(s) of August and the Christmas and New Year period, be disregarded;
- (g) further notes that Part 2 Article 3 of the Constitution of the Council "Citizens and the Council" makes no reference to the Right of Citizens to be consulted, and the Council duty to consult;
- (h) notes that the duty to consult may be prescribed by legislation specifically, or generally under Section 149 of the Equalities Act 2010, or from the common law duty of a public authority to act fairly, and the public law principle of legitimate expectation; and
- (i) calls on the Director of Legal and Governance to bring forward proposals to incorporate a "Citizens Right to be consulted" in Article 3, and address the other provisions in this Motion.

**6. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "RECOGNISING PALESTINE AS A FULL STATE" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR NEALE GIBSON**

That this Council:-

- (a) believes that there must be recognition of the rights of Palestinians to their own state, and thanks the petitioners for bringing this important issue to Full Council in July;

- (b) notes that 138 nations of the UN, out of 193 (71.5%), recognise Palestine as a state and in 2012 the UN General Assembly moved to do so - though this was blocked from full UN membership by the Security Council;
- (c) notes that the current UK Government appears to have no intention of recognising Palestine, and notes that this is in contrast to the Labour Party's commitment to recognise Palestine as a full state as part of the United Nations and under UK law;
- (d) believes that the recognition of Palestine as a state is one step towards a genuine two-state solution to the Israel-Palestine conflict;
- (e) believes there has to be a peace process and there has to be a right of the Palestinian people to live in peace and security as well as the right of Israel;
- (f) believes that whilst Sheffield is just one city, it is important to make this symbolic gesture to formally recognise Palestine as a full state, and hope that this will increase pressure on the UK Government to do likewise; and
- (g) requests that this Motion is submitted to the Foreign Office, the Prime Minister and the Leader of the Opposition.

**7. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "CHILDREN'S SERVICES IN SHEFFIELD IMPROVING AND RATED GOOD BY OFSTED" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACKIE DRAYTON AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR DAWN DALE**

That this Council:-

- (a) notes that following three weeks of inspection by Ofsted, they have noted that 'Children's Services in Sheffield are good';
- (b) notes that the report detailed that, despite 10 years of austerity, Sheffield had made steady progress since the last inspection in 2013, by working through our comprehensive improvement plan, that has children and young people at the heart of it:-
  - (i) securing significant additional corporate investment;
  - (ii) support from Senior Management and Leaders across all areas of the Council and Partner Organisations; and
  - (iii) as noted in the report, 'Corporate parenting is 'highly effective and emulates what a good parent should be' and that 'the local authority sense of corporate responsibility for children in care and care leavers is unambiguous' and senior

leaders provide proactive and committed corporate parenting; the report also highlights examples of practice that 'exemplifies excellence in corporate parenting';

- (c) notes that, in addition, the Council was commended for putting children at the centre of practice, with children and young people across the city benefiting from child focused staff and services and that the views of children and young people are valued at all levels, and the Local Authority has created an environment in which good social work is nurtured and celebrated, with a skilled and confident workforce;
- (d) notes that, although Ofsted highlighted many positive areas of practice, they also highlighted some areas that 'requires improvement to be good', which we identified in our self-assessment form sent to the Inspectors prior to their visit, but that the report also acknowledged in all those areas of concern senior management and leaders were aware of those weaknesses, had effective plans in place to mitigate risk and were taking action to improve each area of practice;
- (e) believes that this is a fantastic achievement, and all the more remarkable given increasing financial difficulties and increasing demand as more children and young people are coming into care with more complex needs, and thanks must go to the dedicated staff in children's services, all council staff, foster carers, adopters, our agency partners, the community sector, Councillors, and all corporate parents who work so hard to ensure our children and young people and their families are safe, happy, secure, and achieve their full potential; and
- (f) notes that under this Administration the aim is to continue to improve the service the Council provides and reach 'outstanding', and believes that by working together we will achieve this in the future.

**8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "VALUE FOR MONEY" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS JOHNSON AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR RUTH MERSEREAU**

That this Council:-

- (a) notes that, despite the destructive cuts inflicted by the policy of austerity, this Administration is still responsible for spending hundreds of millions of pounds each year;
- (b) believes this Administration should get the best value for money it can because, if money is wasted, this means cuts to other areas of spending, especially at a time when budgets are under pressure;

- (c) also believes that a failure to do routine work quickly and cheaply leads to inertia and a lack of action;
- (d) notes the following examples of work that this Council believes is over-priced:-
  - (i) £1m to install 500m of cycle lane on Trippet Lane;
  - (ii) a further £700,000 to install a crossing on West Street;
  - (iii) £3,500 to install just two cycle parking hoops;
  - (iv) £20,000 to clear graffiti at Porter Brook Pocket Park; and
  - (v) installation of park benches at £1,100 each; and
- (e) therefore calls on the Administration to examine areas of spending where more might be obtained for the Council's resources.

## **9. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION**

Report of the Chief Executive on proposed changes to the Council's Constitution, primarily to bring the Officer Code of Conduct up to date.

## **10. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING**

To receive the record of the proceedings of the meeting of the Council held on 3rd July 2019 and to approve the accuracy thereof.

## **11. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES**

To consider any changes to the memberships and arrangements for meetings of Committees etc., delegated authority, and the appointment of representatives to serve on other bodies.

Chief Executive

Dated this 27 day of August 2019

**The next ordinary meeting of the Council will be held on 2 October 2019 at the Town Hall**



---

## ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

---

If you are present at a meeting of the Council, of its executive or any committee of the executive, or of any committee, sub-committee, joint committee, or joint sub-committee of the authority, and you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)** relating to any business that will be considered at the meeting, you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

You **must**:

- leave the room (in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct)
- make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of any DPI at any meeting at which you are present at which an item of business which affects or relates to the subject matter of that interest is under consideration, at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.
- declare it to the meeting and notify the Council's Monitoring Officer within 28 days, if the DPI is not already registered.

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your **disclosable pecuniary interests** under the new national rules. You have a pecuniary interest if you, or your spouse or civil partner, have a pecuniary interest.

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner undertakes.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period\* in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

\*The relevant period is the 12 months ending on the day when you tell the Monitoring Officer about your disclosable pecuniary interests.

- Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority –
  - under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
  - which has not been fully discharged.

- Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.
- Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) –
  - the landlord is your council or authority; and
  - the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -
  - (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
  - (b) either -
    - the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
    - if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

If you attend a meeting at which any item of business is to be considered and you are aware that you have a **personal interest** in the matter which does not amount to a DPI, you must make verbal declaration of the existence and nature of that interest at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. You should leave the room if your continued presence is incompatible with the 7 Principles of Public Life (selflessness; integrity; objectivity; accountability; openness; honesty; and leadership).

You have a personal interest where –

- a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing (including interests in land and easements over land) of you or a member of your family or a person or an organisation with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the Council Tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the Authority's administrative area, or
- it relates to or is likely to affect any of the interests that are defined as DPIs but are in respect of a member of your family (other than a partner) or a person with whom you have a close association.

Guidance on declarations of interest, incorporating regulations published by the Government in relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, has been circulated to you previously.

You should identify any potential interest you may have relating to business to be considered at the meeting. This will help you and anyone that you ask for advice to fully consider all the circumstances before deciding what action you should take.

In certain circumstances the Council may grant a **dispensation** to permit a Member to take part in the business of the Authority even if the member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest relating to that business.

To obtain a dispensation, you must write to the Monitoring Officer at least 48 hours before the meeting in question, explaining why a dispensation is sought and desirable, and specifying the period of time for which it is sought. The Monitoring Officer may consult with the Independent Person or the Council's Audit and Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from Gillian Duckworth, Director of Legal and Governance on 0114 2734018 or email [gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk).

This page is intentionally left blank



## Report to Council

---

**Report of:** Chief Executive

---

**Date:** 4 September 2019

---

**Subject:** Changes to the Constitution

---

**Author of Report:** Jason Dietsch (Head of Democratic and Member Services)  
Tel: 0114 273 4117

---

**Summary:**

This report provides details of proposed changes to the Constitution, primarily to bring the Officer Code of Conduct up to date.

---

**Recommendations:**

That the Council considers adopting the changes to the following Parts of the Constitution, as set out in the report and appendices:-

- (a) Part 4 – Scrutiny Procedure Rules;
- (b) Part 5 - Officer Code of Conduct; and
- (c) Part 7 – Management Structure and Statutory/Proper Officers

---

**Background Papers:** NONE

---

**Category of Report:** OPEN

## Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

<b>Financial and Commercial implications</b>
NO - Cleared by Anna Sanderson
<b>Legal implications</b>
YES – Cleared by Gillian Duckworth
<b>Equality of Opportunity implications</b>
NO – Cleared by Laurie Brennan
<b>Tackling Health Inequalities implications</b>
N/A
<b>Human rights implications</b>
N/A
<b>Environmental and Sustainability implications</b>
N/A
<b>Economic impact</b>
N/A
<b>Community safety implications</b>
N/A
<b>Human resources implications</b>
N/A
<b>Property implications</b>
N/A
<b>Area(s) affected</b>
None
<b>Relevant Scrutiny Committee if decision called in</b>
N/A
<b>Is the item a matter which is reserved for approval by the City Council?</b>
YES
<b>Press release</b>
NO

**1. Introduction**

- 1.1 This report provides details of proposed changes to the Council's Constitution, primarily to bring the Officer Code of Conduct up to date.

**2. Background**

- 2.1 To ensure that the Constitution is kept up to date, where changes are required these are submitted to Full Council for approval.
- 2.2 In addition, the Director of Legal and Governance, in consultation with the Lord Mayor, has delegated authority to make any minor and consequential drafting changes to the Constitution.

**3. Proposed Changes and Reasons**

3.1 Part 4 – Scrutiny Procedure Rules; and Part 7 – Management Structure and Statutory/Proper Officers

- 3.1.1 An update is required to be made to these two elements of the Constitution to reflect the fact that the role of Lead Scrutiny Officer in the Council now lies with the Head of Policy and Partnerships.
- 3.1.2 The proposed change to both documents is attached as Appendix A.

3.2 Part 5 - Officers' Code Of Conduct (Section 16)

- 3.2.1 Amendments are proposed to be made to the Officer Code of Conduct in Part 5 (Codes and Protocols) of the Constitution, resulting from changes to the Childcare Disqualification Regulations.
- 3.2.2 The introduction of the Childcare (Disqualification) and Childcare (Early Years Provision Free of Charge) (Extended Entitlement) (Amendment) Regulations 2018, removed the disqualification by association where childcare was provided in non-domestic settings. The proposed changes required to be made to Section 16 (Criminal Convictions/Barring) of the Officer Code of Conduct are shown in Appendix B to this report.
- 3.2.3 A report on the changes to the Regulations was submitted to the Audit and Standards Committee at its meeting held on 25<sup>th</sup> July 2019. The Committee endorsed the proposed changes to the Officer Code.

### 3.3 Part 5 - Officers' Code Of Conduct (General Update)

3.3.1 The Officers' Code of Conduct provides Council Officers with a set of minimum standards of behaviour to ensure that they perform their duties with integrity, honesty and impartiality. The Officers' Code of Conduct explains how officers should ensure that their conduct is always respectful to others, is never influenced by personal gain, and is always in line with the Council's policies and procedures, for example, health and safety policies, and ensuring that non-public information is always kept secure.

The Code has a total of 12 associated policies and procedures, which are included as appendices to the Code. The Director of Human Resources and Customer Services maintains and operates the Code, and a copy is included in the Council's Constitution.

3.3.2 Several of the associated policies and procedures, as contained in the Constitution, are out of date, and more recent versions are in operation. These are:-

- Appendix B (Policy Statement on Fraud and Corruption), which has been replaced by an Anti-Fraud and Corruption Policy Statement and Framework, including Anti-Bribery Policy and Procedures, dated May 2018, which were endorsed by the Audit and Standards Committee at its meeting held on 14<sup>th</sup> June 2018;
- Appendix D (Whistleblowing Policy), with the updated Policy, dated June 2018, having being endorsed by the Audit and Standards Committee at its meeting held on 12<sup>th</sup> April 2018;
- Appendix H (Social Networking Policy), where the current version was updated in July 2015 to incorporate several hyperlinks to Information Governance and Security Policies;
- Appendix K (Dignity and Respect at Work Policy), which has been supplemented by a Dignity and Respect at Work Procedure, dated November 2018, which had been approved in consultation with the trades unions in Autumn 2018.

It is proposed that the Constitution is updated to incorporate the Policies outlined above, which are already in operation. These updated policy documents will be published online, along with this agenda, and paper copies can be made available to Members on request.

3.2.3 In addition to the updates outlined in 3.2.3 above, Appendix G (Data Protection Policy) has recently been revised in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) and Data Protection Act 2018. This latest version, dated May 2019, has been approved in consultation with the trades unions.

3.2.4 In view of the inclusion, in Appendix B of the Officer Code of Conduct, of the Anti-Bribery Policy and Procedures, several minor changes are proposed to be made to the content of the Code itself in order to reference the Policy and Procedures.

3.2.5 The proposed changes to the Code (to reference the Anti-Bribery Policy and Procedures) are set out in Appendix C to this report, and the updated Data Protection Policy is Appendix D.



#### **4. Legal Implications**

- 4.1 Except where delegated by Council as indicated at paragraph 2.2, variations to the Constitution may only be made by Full Council.
- 4.2 Under section 9P of the Local Government Act 2000, the Council must prepare a constitution and keep it up to date. It must be available to the public and, under the Local Government Transparency Code 2015, be published on the Council's website. The proposed changes in this report will bring parts of the Constitution up to date to comply with the legislation.

#### **5. Financial Implications**

- 5.1 There are no financial implications.

#### **6. Equality of Opportunity Implications**

- 6.1 There are no equalities implications.

#### **7. Recommendations**

- 7.1 That the Council considers adopting the changes to the following Parts of the Constitution, as set out in the report and appendices:-
  - (a) Part 4 – Scrutiny Procedure Rules
  - (b) Part 5 - Officer Code of Conduct; and
  - (d) Part 7 – Management Structure and Statutory/Proper Officers

**Chief Executive**

This page is intentionally left blank

## PART 4 - SCRUTINY PROCEDURE RULES

## Extract from page 8 of the Rules, with tracked change

## 16. Call-In

The decision records in respect of all Executive meetings or Committees of the Executive; including decisions of the Council acting as Charitable Trustee, Area Committee Executive decisions, Individual Cabinet Member decisions and Officer Key Decisions will normally be published within two days of the meeting and copies will be made available to each member of the Council and to the statutory education representatives. Members wishing to call-in such a decision for scrutiny must do so by 4.00 p.m. up to 4 working days following notification of the Executive decision(s)

Any decision not called in for scrutiny by that deadline will come into force and may then be implemented.

Five Members, including two from the relevant Scrutiny Committee, must give notice to call-in a decision for scrutiny. Notice of call-in must be submitted to the Director of Legal and Governance and Head of Policy and Partnerships Elections, Equalities and Involvement (as Lead Scrutiny Officer) who will record the date and time of receipt of such notice. Not more than two notices of call-in will be accepted for any individual decision, but other Members may be able to register an interest in the item with the relevant Scrutiny Committee Chair.

The relevant Scrutiny Committee to consider the decision is indicated on the front sheet of each report submitted to the Executive, Committee of the Executive or individual Cabinet Member. A proforma produced in respect of calling in a decision shall be signed by the five Members. Telephone calls, e-mail or fax messages from Members shall be accepted for call-in purposes but these shall be required to be supported by a signed statement from the Member(s) concerned before the item is considered by the Scrutiny Committee.

The statutory education representatives can call-in items relating to education functions using the same process as for members of the Council as set out above.

Any decisions that are called-in for scrutiny will, following consultation with the Chair and Deputy Chair of the relevant Scrutiny Committee, be placed on the agenda for the next available meeting of the Committee, or if necessary, an extraordinary meeting of the Scrutiny Committee will be called to consider the item.

The appropriate Executive Director, Head of Service and Cabinet Member will, as soon as practicable, be notified that the decision has been called in for scrutiny and of the date of the meeting at which the decision will be scrutinised.

## PART 7 – MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND STATUTORY/PROPER OFFICERS

Extract from page 23 of Part 7, with tracked change

<b>Local Government Act 2000</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Proper Officer</b>
Section 9FB	Officer designated to carry out the functions of Scrutiny Officer	Head of <u>Policy and Partnerships</u> <del>Elections,</del> <del>Equalities and Involvement</del>
<b>The Local Authorities (Standing Orders) (England) Regulations 2001</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Proper Officer</b>
Schedule 1, Part 2, Paragraphs 5 and 6	Officer responsible for receiving notification of proposed appointment or dismissal of certain officers, notifying executive members of that proposed appointment or dismissal and for receiving and notifying of objections to the proposed appointment or dismissal	Director of Human Resources
<b>Local Authorities (Referendums) (Petitions) (England) Regulations 2011</b>	<b>Description</b>	<b>Proper Officer</b>
Regulation 4(1)	Officer who publishes the number that is equal to 5 per cent of the number of local government electors for the authority's area	Director of Legal and Governance / Electoral Services Manager

## OFFICER CODE OF CONDUCT – SECTION 16 (CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS/BARRING)

### Extract from the Code of Conduct with tracked changes

#### 16.0 CRIMINAL CONVICTIONS/ BARRING

- 16.1 Before you started working for us, you must have told us about any unspent criminal convictions, formal cautions, warnings, reprimands, binding over or other orders, pending prosecutions or criminal investigations.

If you applied for a role, which involves working with children and vulnerable adults and your job is covered by the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 (Exceptions) Order 1975 as amended by the 2013 Amendment Order. You must have told us about all convictions, formal cautions, warnings, reprimands, binding over or other orders, pending prosecutions or criminal investigations that are not 'protected' as defined by the Rehabilitation of Offenders Act 1974 (Exceptions) Order 1975 as amended by the 2013 Amendment Order, before you started working for us.

For information on which convictions are protected visit [www.gov.uk/dbs](http://www.gov.uk/dbs) and <http://hub.unlock.org.uk/knowledgebase/filtering-cautions-convictions/>

If you do not have internet access or do not understand what this means to you please discuss this with your line manager.

You must tell us about :

- Cautions relating to [specified offences](#) as listed by Government
- Cautions given less than 6 years ago (where individual over 18 at the time of caution)
- Cautions given less than 2 years ago (where individual under 18 at the time of caution)
- Convictions relating to [specified offences](#) as listed by Government
- Convictions that resulted in a custodial sentence (regardless of whether served)
- Convictions given less than 11 years ago (where individual over 18 at the time of conviction)
- Convictions given less than 5.5 years ago (where individual under 18 at the time of conviction)
- Similar offences committed under the law of Scotland, Northern Ireland or laws relevant to the armed services.

- 16.2 If you are required, under the Act, to provide us with your Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS) Certificate, we will ask you to:-

- Complete a DBS Application Form
- Or give written permission for us to check your status on-line
- Or give permission for us to view your personal file of a previous/other role within the Council to check the outcome from a recent Enhanced DBS check.

You must bring in your DBS Certificate to show and discuss with us, when required

- 16.3 If you have been barred from working with children and/or vulnerable adults and you seek employment to do so, this is a criminal activity and against the law and you will be dismissed without notice and immediately reported to the Police Authority.
- 16.4 If your work involves driving, you must tell your manager about any driving offences, or pending driving offences.
- 16.5 If you use your own vehicle for Council Business and carry passengers, you must also tell your manager about any driving offences or pending driving offences.
- 16.6 When employed by us, you must tell your manager, if you have any criminal proceedings pending against you, if you are bound over, receive a conviction, formal caution, reprimand or warning.
- 16.7 Once employed by us, you must tell your manager immediately, if you know that you are on, or will appear on, one or both of the DBS barred lists.
- 16.8 If you do not tell us about these convictions, formal cautions, warnings, reprimands, binding over or other orders, pending prosecutions or criminal investigations, this may be treated as possible gross misconduct and might lead to disciplinary action – including the possibility of dismissal without notice.
- 16.9 If you work with young people or vulnerable adults and you believe that you are or might be thought of as a risk to these groups it is extremely important that you seek advice from your manager. If you do not disclose this, this may be treated as possible gross misconduct and might lead to disciplinary action – including the possibility of dismissal without notice.
- 16.10 If you work in a childcare role, as part of early or later years childcare provisions, or are directly involved in the line management of such provision, you must not be disqualified from working in such provision ~~either directly or 'by association'~~. Certain cautions, convictions, care orders may mean that you are automatically disqualified from such work. ~~You may also be disqualified by association if any member of your household has such a caution, conviction or order.~~
- 16.11 You must complete a childcare disqualification declaration in relation to yourself ~~and others, who live and work in your household,~~ and discuss with us when required.
- 16.12 You must tell your manager immediately, if you receive any convictions, cautions or other orders that may lead to your disqualification under the Childcare (Disqualification) Regulations 2009. ~~You must also notify them of any unspent or unprotected convictions, cautions or other orders relating to anyone living or working in your household that would also lead to your disqualification 'by association'.~~

**OFFICER CODE OF CONDUCT – SECTION 2 (PUBLIC DUTY, PRIVATE INTEREST, FRAUD AND THEFT) & LIST OF APPENDICES**

**Extract from the Code of Conduct with tracked changes**

**2.0 PUBLIC DUTY, PRIVATE INTEREST, FRAUD AND THEFT**

**(i) General**

- 2.1 Your duty as an employee and any interests outside your job must not conflict. If there is anything you are involved in outside of work which might affect your job, you must declare this to your manager. Read Declaration of Interests Policy (DO!) Appendix A
- 2.2 You must always do your job safely. To make sure you do not put the public, other employees or yourself at risk, you must follow Corporate and Directorate Health and Safety policies. You must also follow safe systems of work and any Codes of practice that apply to your job.
- 2.3 If you are a member of an organisation that:
- Is not open to the public
  - Requires formal membership and an oath of allegiance
  - Has any secrecy about its rules, the process of becoming a member, or conduct of members.
- 2.4 You must declare this in writing to your Head of Service or Director. See Declaration of Interests Policy **Appendix A**.
- 2.5 The Council has responsibility for the administration of public money. We emphasise to the public and to employees that we think honesty and that having proper control of finances is very important.
- 2.6 The Council is committed to the fight against fraud, whether an employee, a contractor, or a member of the public has committed the fraud.
- 2.7 You must not use the fact that you are a Council employee to obtain, gain directly or indirectly - for yourself, any business associates, your friends or your family. This is covered in the Council's Anti-Bribery Policy in Appendix B.
- 2.8 As the Council is committed to the prevention and detection of fraud, we have a policy statement on Fraud and Corruption. This is shown in **Appendix B**.
- 2.9 We also have a Gifts and Hospitality Policy and Code of Practice. This is shown in **Appendix C**.

- 2.10 In addition to these two policies, we have a Whistleblowing Policy and Procedure, so that you can report any fraud or corruption more easily. This is shown in **Appendix D**.
- 2.11 If you are using public funds, you must use them responsibly, and you must keep within the law. You must make sure that we use our resources sensibly and legally, and that the community gets value for money.
- 2.12 You must keep to the rules within the Council's Standing Orders and Financial Framework. The Standing Orders are available on the Council's Internet site.
- 2.13 If you:
- Commit fraud against the Council, or any person or organisation, or try to.
  - Steal from the Council, or any person or organisation, or try to.
- 2.14 This will be considered misconduct and may be considered gross misconduct. This includes deliberately putting false information on time sheets, subsistence claims or mileage claims.
- 2.15 If you have concerns that someone is stealing, committing fraud or behaving in a way that might be unethical, you must report this to your manager, or someone named in the Whistleblowing Policy and Procedure. This procedure is shown in **Appendix D**.
- 2.16 We know that it is not always easy to report on the behaviour of other people. We will give you full support if you raise concerns. If you wish to remain anonymous, we will make every effort to respect this.
- 2.17 We know there are two sides to a story, and we will ensure hearings are fair.
- 2.18 Sometimes allegations will turn out to be wrong. If you deliberately make false or malicious allegations, this will be treated as misconduct.

**(ii) Financial Inducements, Gifts and Hospitality**

- 2.19 You must never accept a financial payment, bribes or inducement from any individual, body, or organisation. For example: payments or inducements from contractors, developers, or consultants. [This is covered in the Council's Anti-Bribery Policy in Appendix B.](#)
- 2.20 To take financial payments or inducements is against the law. It is an offence under Section 117 of the Local Government Act 1972.
- 2.21 You must refuse any gift or hospitality offered to you or your family that others may think could influence you.
- 2.22 You may accept gifts of small value such as pens, diaries and calendars.



- 2.23 For further guidance on gifts, hospitality and inducements, you can read the Gifts and Hospitality Policy and Code of Practice. This is shown in **Appendix C**.
- 2.24 Any gifts or hospitality you have been offered, whether you have turned them down or accepted them, must be recorded. If you are unsure of the process of recording goods and hospitality in your service area, seek advice from your manager.

***(iii) Employee Declarations of Financial and other interests***

- 2.25 You have a legal duty to declare any financial or other interest in an existing or proposed contract. See Declaration of Interests Policy (DOI) Appendix A.
- 2.26 If the Council gives support in the community, through financial help or other help, you must make sure that any advice you give is fair and balanced. You must make sure that there is no conflict of interest.
- 2.27 You are free to use all Council services. If you do so, you will not be treated more or less fairly because you work for the Council.
- 2.28 Members of the public expect you to be fair and treat people equally, no matter who you are delivering services to.
- 2.29 You must make sure you don't do anything in your job that might make people think you are being unfair or biased.
- 2.30 You must not try and obtain services in a different way to the public because you work for the Council. This includes putting pressure on colleagues to get services.
- 2.31 If you think there might be a conflict of interest, you must look at the Declarations of Interest Policy (DOI), **Appendix A**. If you are not sure, you should ask your manager to help you.
- 2.32 The Monitoring Officer will review any declarations that have been made every year. If the Monitoring Officer needs to make declarations, the Chief Executive will review them every year.
- 2.33 The Director of Human Resources is responsible for making sure all the Employment Policies, Practices and Procedures that the Council has are kept to.
- 2.34 Every Head of Service, Director and Executive Director is responsible for monitoring their employees activities, making sure they have kept to this Code and any other Codes and made declarations when they need to. Any monitoring will comply with all relevant laws.

## 19.0 APPENDICES

- A Declaration of Interests Policy
- B ~~Policy Statement on Anti-Fraud and Corruption~~ Policy Statement and Framework (including the Anti-Bribery Policy & Procedures)
- C Gifts and Hospitality Corporate Policy and Code of Practice
- D Whistleblowing Policy and Procedure
- E Information Governance and Security Policy
- F ICT Acceptable Use Policy
- G Data Protection Policy
- H Social Networking Policy
- I Other employment related to activities – fees
- J Politically Restricted Posts
- K Dignity and Respect at Work Policy
- L Alcohol, Drug and Substance Misuse Policy

## Data Protection Policy



Sheffield City Council processes personal data on a daily basis. Data protection law requires the Council, its employees and authorised users, to process personal data fairly, lawfully and securely at all times. This policy sets out the key activities and responsibilities the Council need to adhere to.

14 May 2019

Release

Version 2.1

### Document Review

Title	Name(s) / Board	Role / Responsibility
Policy owner	Mark Gannon	Director Business Change and Information Solutions
Change requests to	Mark Jones	Senior Information Management Officer
Key stakeholder review	Information Governance Working Group	Portfolio representatives to contribute and implement information governance policy, procedures and best practice
	General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) Working Group	Portfolio representatives to ensure procedures align with new data protection requirements with GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018

### Document approval

Authorising Body	Date of acceptance
Information Governance Board	08 <sup>th</sup> June 2018
Local Negotiating Committee	14 <sup>th</sup> May 2019
HR Policy Forum	22 <sup>nd</sup> May 2019

### Version History

Version	Issue Date	Comments / Summary of changes
1.0	12/06/2014	Policy to replace the Handling Personal Information Policy (2002). Policy added to Officers' Code of Conduct (Appendix G) in July 2015
1.1-1.3	18/04/2018, 25/05/2018	Policy review and refresh for General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) and Data Protection Act (2018)
2.0	08/06/2018	Minor change following IGB comments
2.1	14/05/2019	Minor change following LNC re. training refresh times

### Review

Review Date	June 30 <sup>th</sup> 2020
-------------	----------------------------

## 1. Introduction and Definitions

Sheffield City Council processes personal data to carry out its duties to make decisions and provide public services. Personal data is defined in law, but in essence it is information that identifies a living person (the subject of the data) or can make them more identifiable.

**“Personal data”** includes, but is not exclusive to: name, address, date of birth, email address, telephone number, unique reference numbers (e.g. NHS number, National Insurance number, Vehicle Registration Number), financial details (e.g. bank details, transactions, arrears, etc.).

Personal data also includes **“Special Category Data”**, which is sensitive personal data, covering for example: ethnicity, religious beliefs, political opinions, sexuality, physical and mental health conditions, genetic and biometric data, as well as data of criminal offences and convictions.

The term **“processing”** is also defined in law and refers to any operations involving personal data such as collection, recording, organisation, storage, alteration, retrieval, consultation, use, disclosure, combination, erasure or destruction.

All the personal data processed for or on behalf of the City Council must be processed in accordance with data protection law: the European Union’s General Data Protection Regulations and the UK’s Data Protection Act that both came into effect on May 25<sup>th</sup> 2018.

The intention of this policy is to identify the key principles, activities and responsibilities that all our employees have to adhere to as well as all the people who are authorised to process personal data to carry out council business. For the purpose of this policy, **authorised users** includes Councillors, contractors, suppliers, agency workers, partnership workers (like NHS, police employees), and volunteers.

## 2. Policy Requirements

Data protection law sets out a number of key principles, so that the processing of personal data shall be:

- 1 ....Processed **fairly, transparently** and **lawfully**
- 2 ... Processed **only** for specified and **not incompatible purposes**
- 3 ... **Adequate, relevant** and **necessary** for the purpose
- 4... **Accurate** and, where necessary, **kept up-to-date**
- 5 ... Not kept **longer** than **necessary** for the purpose
- 6 ....Keep **secure** by **technical/organisational** means
- 7 ....and the Council should demonstrate compliance (**Accountability**)

**Further obligations and rights in the “Applied GDPR”**

- all **Data Subjects’ rights** are subject to ICO enforcement
- Transfer personal data outside EEA only if **privacy** protected

To comply with the above principles, the City Council will

- Register as a Data Controller with the Information Commissioner’s Office ([Data Protection Register](#) – No. Z6548192) and register the details of the Council’s Data Protection Officer.
- Undertake Data Privacy Impact Assessments where required and ensure sign off by the Data Protection Officer before new processing takes place.
- Follow the Code of Practices, recommendations and guidance produced by the Information Commissioner, as the UK’s supervisory body, and the European Union Data Protection Board, to process personal data in line with the principles above (e.g. Record of Processing Activities, Privacy by Design, Data Protection Impact Assessments, Retention Schedules, etc.).
- Ensure all employees have completed the Council’s Information Management e-learning, or attended a taught course, and watched the Cyber Security training videos within the first six weeks of starting with the Council or their role that involves the processing of personal data.
- Employees refresh their information management training every two years, unless they work in social care or public health whereby they are required to complete an annual refresh to support the NHS Digital Data Protection and Security Toolkit submission.
- Ensure all **authorised users** that process personal data have completed the same training as Council employees, unless they can prove they have completed the equivalent training at their respective organisations in the last 6 months.
- Write and publish appropriate privacy notices to make it clear what personal data we need to process, the reasons why, whether collecting the data is optional or not, and what we intend to do with the data (storage, retention, sharing).
- Maintain an Information Asset Register to support the Record of Processing Activity (ROPA’s).
- Tell people if we have to share their personal data with other 3rd parties to deliver a service and, if necessary, record if consent is needed and has been given, refused or withdrawn
- Inform people of their rights to request access to the personal data we hold about them, and their rights to ask for their data to be corrected or deleted or the processing restricted, and to act upon those requests promptly and within the agreed timescales.

- Only collect the personal data we need, the minimum necessary.
- Only use personal data for the purposes for which it was collected, unless it can be used without contravening the law (e.g. using anonymised or pseudonymised data, historical research and statistics, crime detection and prevention, etc.).
- Take all reasonable steps to secure the personal data being processed and to apply controls to support access on a need to know basis.
- Retain personal data for only as long as we need to and to delete or destroy personal data in a timely and secure manner in line with the Council's Document and Records Management Policy and Retention Schedule.
- Ensure contractual clauses, data processing agreements and information sharing agreements are in place when Council information is being shared or processed by external third parties.
- To log and investigate all reported personal data breaches and to notify the Information Commissioner within the statutory timescales and the affected data subjects accordingly in line with the Council's Information Security Incident Standard Operating Procedure.

### **3. Policy Implementation**

Employees and authorised users are responsible for their actions when handling personal data.

Heads of Service (or their equivalent) are responsible for ensuring the relevant processes and procedures are in place within their service areas and are followed when personal data is processed.

Directors to address any information governance issues identified in the Annual Governance Statement (Section I).

Executive Directors to ensure their Portfolio complies with this policy.

### **4. Data Protection Officer**

The Data Protection Officer role is a legal requirement to monitor internal compliance, inform and advise an organisation's of its data protection obligations, provide advice on Data Protection Impact Assessments and to act as a contact point for data subjects and the supervisory authority (the Information Commissioner's Office).

The Council's Data Protection Officer is currently Mark Jones, Business Change and Information Solutions, and can be contacted by email at [DataProtectionOfficer@sheffield.gov.uk](mailto:DataProtectionOfficer@sheffield.gov.uk)

## **5. Compliance**

Failure to comply with data protection law can have significant consequences and could affect the health and well-being of the individuals whose data is being processed, the reputation of the Council potentially resulting in public mistrust, fines, legal action and lost business opportunities.

All employees and authorised users are expected to adhere to the principles of this policy and data protection law in general, and where there is a suspicion or evidence to the contrary, disciplinary proceedings may be taken.

This page is intentionally left blank



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 3 July 2019, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

## PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Tony Downing)  
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Gail Smith)

1	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Bob Pullin Richard Shaw	10	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Andy Bainbridge Vic Bowden Moya O'Rourke	19	<i>Nether Edge &amp; Sharrow Ward</i> Peter Garbutt Jim Steinke Alison Teal
2	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Bob McCann Sophie Wilson	11	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Roger Davison Barbara Masters	20	<i>Park &amp; Arbourthorne</i> Julie Dore Ben Miskell
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 &amp; Sharrow Vale Ward</i> Angela Argenzio Kaltum Rivers	13	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; 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 Paul Turpin	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Mike Chaplin Tony Damms Jayne Dunn
6	<i>City Ward</i> Douglas Johnson Ruth Mersereau 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 &amp; Crosspool Ward</i> Tim Huggan Mohammed Mahroof Anne Murphy	16	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Julie Grocutt Francyne Johnson
8	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea Zahira Naz	17	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Terry Fox Pat Midgley Sioned-Mair Richards	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i> Colin Ross Martin Smith	18	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> Tony Downing Kevin Oxley Gail Smith	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> Alan Hooper 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 Michelle Cook, Shaffaq Mohammed, Joe Otten, Chris Rosling-Josephs and Jack Scott.

## **2. WESTFIELD HEALTH**

- 2.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) reported that exactly one hundred years ago this day the organisation now known as Westfield Health was founded.
- 2.2 He briefly outlined the history and evolution of the Organisation through the period prior to the introduction of the NHS and the period since, and stated that Westfield Health has had a hugely positive legacy in the city in terms of making a healthy difference to the quality of life of Sheffield residents since 1919.
- 2.3 The Lord Mayor concluded by stating that, in recognition of its centenary and positive contribution to the local community, a special token of appreciation will be presented from the city to Westfield Health, and this will be presented in due course.
- 2.4 Mr. Graham Moore, Chairman of Westfield Health, responded by expressing his thanks and gratitude to the Council for its support and encouragement of Westfield Health over the years, and for its plans to recognise Westfield's centenary.

## **3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

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

## **4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS**

### **4 Petitions**

- 4.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Support the Labour Party in Recognising Palestine as a Sovereign State, as part of the United Nations, and to Pass a Motion to this Effect

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition containing 1692 signatures, requesting the Council to support the Labour Party in recognising Palestine as a sovereign state, as part of the United Nations, and to pass a motion to this effect.

Representations of behalf of the petitioners were made by Julie Pearn who

stated that the UK Parliament had made a decision in 2014 to recognise Palestine as an independent sovereign state and the petition called upon the Council to immediately implement that decision. She said that 138 nations recognised the state of Palestine and then commented on actions of Israel allegedly in contravention of international law.

It was believed that such public recognition would be a powerful statement which others might emulate. She made reference to the tradition of humanitarianism and internationalism in Sheffield and the role that the Council had played in relation to issues, such as in the ending of apartheid in South Africa recognition of Somaliland. The Council was requested to immediately recognise an independent Palestinian state; to make that recognition public both nationally and internationally and to undertake appropriate communications; to carry out an urgent review (in line with policies relating to ethical procurement and investment) of any business dealings with companies involved in enabling the mistreatment of Palestinians; and to undertake an information campaign to explain its decision and to educate the public in relation to this issue.

#### 4.2 Public Questions Concerning Palestine

A number of questions were asked by members of the public on the subject of Palestine, as follows:

Peter Jones referred to the Council's ethical investment principles and asked if it was agreed that the Council would seek to ensure that South Yorkshire Pensions should divest from companies which profited from military and other action against civilian populations such as in Yemen and in Palestine.

Kaltun Elmi asked firstly whether the Council would condemn the demolition of Palestinian schools. Secondly, she asked whether the Council would agree that the Israeli government should be condemned for the arrest and imprisonment of children in Palestine.

John Morgan asked whether the Council believed that the Palestinian dancers performing at Tramlines should be acknowledged as enhancing an already strong brand which represented Sheffield's inclusive outward looking reputation.

Sarah Johnson asked whether the Council would support Labour Party policy in recognising a sovereign state of Palestine and encourage other core cities to follow Sheffield's lead.

Angela Martin asked whether the Council agreed that supporting a two state solution, without recognising Palestine as a sovereign state was tantamount to allowing Israel to annex land that was internationally and legally recognised as being Palestinian.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Olivia Blake (Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance). Public questions relating to this

topic were also referred to Councillor Blake.

Councillor Blake thanked the petitioners and stated that she believed that it was right to recognise the rights of Palestinian people to their own sovereign state and which was recognised by 137 nations and the United Nations General Assembly had also sought to do so in 2012 but this was blocked through the Security Council. She referred to Labour Party policy in relation to this issue. It was also acknowledged that such recognition would be a step toward a genuine two state solution and a process towards peace for Palestine and Israel. She also referred to the need to support self-determination for people in their own sovereign states.

Councillor Blake said that the Council's Administration would present a notice of motion at the first opportunity in relation to the recognition of Palestine as a sovereign state and that all councillors should have an opportunity to speak and to vote on the matter and have input to the debate. Whilst Sheffield was just one city, it could make a symbolic gesture in this regard and seek to put pressure on the Government to also recognise Palestine. Councillor Blake said that whilst she had responded on behalf of the Leader of the Council, she would also request that the Leader respond to some of the questions in writing.

In regard to South Yorkshire Pensions Authority, Councillor Blake stated that she would be pleased to write to the Pensions Authority and to outline concerns and questions put by Mr Jones. She also made reference to notices of motion previously considered by the Council with regards the sale of arms to Saudi Arabia in connection with the conflict in Yemen.

She said that she condemned the demolition of schools and that education was a right and not a privilege and it should be protected. It was also horrifying that children were being kept from their families and released without charge.

As regards Palestinian dancers performing at Tramlines, Councillor Blake stated that this would be recognised as enhancing Sheffield's strong brand relating to Sheffield's inclusive and outward looking reputation.

Councillor Blake said that she believed the Council should take a stand with regard to the issues raised and that Palestine should be recognised as a sovereign state. She said that a written response would be made to the question regarding the potential for Israel to annex land in Palestine.

#### 4.3 Public Questions

##### 4.3.1 Public Question Concerning School Streets

E Jones Marriott asked a question concerning whether the Council would consider plans for school streets or living streets in Sheffield.

Councillor Bob Johnson, the Cabinet Member for Transport and

Development, stated that the Council was looking at launching a number of pilot schemes for school streets, play streets and living streets and he would encourage people to come forward so they might be included in any future plan. This was an initiative that was to be done in conjunction with clean air zones and the Council was determined to take an action in areas around schools as one of its priorities.

#### 4.3.2 Public Question Concerning Injunction

Justin Buxton asked whether the decision to pursue the renewal and extension of the injunction was signed off by elected members or had it been made by officers. He asked whether the Leader of the Council was still happy with the decision and the financial and reputational cost to the Council. He also made reference to an investigation by the Forestry Commission into the street tree felling programme in Sheffield.

#### 4.3.3 Public Question Concerning Trade Union Law

Justin Buxton made reference to a response to a question by the Leader of the Council in November 2016 concerning the use of Trade Union Law to arrest protesters. He referred to emails from the Council requesting the police to arrest protesters using Trade Union Law and he asked whether the Leader of the Council was in charge of the Council.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change, responded that the matters raised had been considered exhaustively and answers had been provided to the issues on several occasions and he referred the questioner to the record of questions and answers in the minutes of previous meetings of Council to clarify matters. He said that he was pleased about the progress which had been made in bringing the community together to find a more sustainable way forward in relation to the managing street trees.

#### 4.3.4 Public Questions Concerning Works to Street Trees

Dave Dillner made reference to a comment made by the Cabinet Member concerning the Council upholding to rule of law. He commented that making false accusations to the Police was a criminal offence and he asked, firstly whether the Cabinet Member would join with him in condemning those responsible for falsely accusing citizens of pulling on ropes of workmen in trees; studding trees with broken glass, nails and chains and oiling tree trunks. He said that no evidence had been produced to substantiate the accusations. Secondly, he asked if the Council would be prepared to work with him to find the source of the accusations.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change, stated that allegations of a criminal offence should be reported to the police.

#### 4.3.5 Public Questions Concerning Injunction

Russell Johnson made reference to the movement towards an urban tree management policy for the City and stated that in that context, an extension of the High Court Injunction was unnecessary and inflammatory. He asked for confirmation that the Council intended to express faith in the new arrangements and to save public money by stating that no such extension would be sought. He also referred to a response previously made on this subject concerning a decision relating to any injunction and as to whether it was a legal or political decision.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change, stated that the first issue relating to a legal decision had been discussed before and he made reference to previous responses given. The second issue was substantially the same as a question recently asked at a meeting of Cabinet. He said that the Council was seeking to create the conditions which would make an injunction unnecessary and to build a consensus in relation to an approach with regards street trees and he was glad that progress was being made in that regard.

#### 4.3.6 Public Questions Concerning Carbon Reduction and Climate Change

Richard Souter stated that transport accounted for an increasing proportion of the City's emissions. He asked what measures the Council was putting in place to reduce transport emissions to meet a net zero target by 2030.

Celia Mather stated that following the declaration of a 'climate emergency', it had been suggested by the Sheffield Climate Alliance that there were immediate steps the Council could take, including renewable electricity, training, policy reports to include environmental implications and ensuring that the Pensions Authority would divest from fossil fuels. She asked which of those steps had begun to be taken.

Chris Broome commented that government policy to prioritise economic growth made adequate action to improve the environment and reduce emissions virtually impossible. He asked whether councillors understood that if they had courage to condemn the system within which they were supposed to cooperate, then many campaigners would welcome and support such a stance.

Logan Robin referred to the report by the Tyndall Centre and commented that it did not include particular actions or breakdown by sector in relation to emission reductions. He asked for timescales relating to decisions regarding reductions in emissions and as to the process by which decisions would be made.

Jenny Patient stated that, to reach net-zero carbon, the insulation of homes would be essential. Ten years ago, the Council had reported that 52 percent of homes in Sheffield were 'hard to treat' in that these homes could not be adequately insulated through loft and cavity wall insulation. She asked what

the strategy would be for the Council to insulate all homes and what the cost and timescale would be to bring all homes up to at least a SAP B rating.

Zoe Roberts asked how the Council planned to develop measures and policy to ensure that Sheffield remained within the carbon budget as outlined in the Tyndall Report and whether there was, or it was planned to establish, a cross party working group on the matter.

Responses were given to the questions relating to carbon reduction and climate change as part of item 5 on the agenda: *Responding to the Climate Emergency – Developing a Carbon Budget for Sheffield*.

#### 4.4 Petition Requiring Debate

##### Petition Seeking a Referendum on Whether the Council Should be Run in a Different Way by One or More Committees made up of Elected Councillors

The Council received an electronic petition containing 7754 signatures, seeking a referendum on whether the Council should be run in a different way by one or more Committees made up of elected Councillors.

The Council's Petitions Scheme required any petition containing over 5,000 signatures to be the subject of debate at the Council meeting. The wording of the qualifying petition was as follows:-

"We, the undersigned, being local government electors for the area of Sheffield City Council, to whom this petition is addressed, seek a referendum on whether the Council should be run in a different way by one or more committees made up of elected councillors".

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Ruth Hubbard. She stated that the petition sought a change in the model of governance to a modern committee system rather than the strong leader model which was currently operated by the Council.

She said that the aspiration for local governance which reflected the way people wished to live and work together and care for each other. This was not a peripheral issue and it was something that did matter to people in the city.

Ruth Hubbard said that the people's petition was launched on 24 August 2018 and once a valid petition representing five percent of the electorate was submitted, the Council would have to hold a referendum on a change of governance to a committee system and it would also have to remain neutral. A first batch of signatures had been submitted to the Council. At this time, a total of over nineteen thousand signatures had been received and it was intended that the final number of signatures would be greater than the required verification number. This would be the biggest petition on such a matter in the country.

There had been many conversations with a wide range of people throughout the city in relation to this issue and Ruth Hubbard made reference to some of the people to whom campaigners had spoken.

She stated that a change in governance would require examination of a number of issues, including what made a good decision, collaboration, ensuring better representation and scrutiny. It was not intended to recreate the previous committee based model of local authority governance. This matter concerned having governance arrangements which worked for Sheffield and all of its large and diverse communities. There was no 'off-the-shelf' solution but, where local authorities had changed to a committee system, the design of those systems had reflected particular priorities. For example, a desire to create better cross party working and better working with communities, stakeholders, business and other partners. It was recognised that there was no perfect system. Local Councils which had changed had done so for better local democracy and had reported improvement. Cheshire East and Scarborough had recently changed governance arrangements.

Ruth Hubbard commented that she had been pleased to have had an open discussion recently with the Deputy Leader of the Council. However, she said that she was disappointed with the Council's response during the year and this matter had been consistently raised at Council. She commented on the potential costs of a referendum on the matter. She said that people were signing the petition because they wanted change and to end the strong leader model of governance. She called upon the Council to take the opportunity presented by the petition to grasp the issue and to make a decision to move to a committee system. If a decision was not made at this point, and when a completed petition was submitted, there would not be the opportunity for the Council to make a decision to change and a statutory referendum would be required. She said that this was a change which people wanted and called upon the Council to change to a modern committee system. The petition also presented an opportunity to claim Sheffield as a city of democracy and to make that meaningful.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.1(b), the Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance responded to the petition, following which the Shadow Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance spoke on the matter.

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance, thanked the petitioners for bringing the issue to Council. She stated that becoming a councillor was a chance to serve the community and it was something of which she was proud and could not be taken for granted.

There was a wish for every councillor to have a role whereby they could make most difference to people and the present system did present opportunities to do so. Councillors were champions in their communities and were appointed to committees which regulated functions including licensing



and planning; and councillors represented the Council on outside bodies. The administration was formed by the largest political party and the opposition held them to account and cross party scrutiny committees considered decisions that were made. The Cabinet and Scrutiny system was introduced by the government to improve accountability, not to stifle it.

Councillor Blake made reference to the 2012 referendum concerning a change to a mayoral model of governance and in which sixty five percent of people backed the current system. However, it was clear from the petition that the Council should take the opportunity to consider how to improve public engagement and the Council was committed to doing everything it could in that regard. This included consideration of the best model for the future. There was a need to look at the full range of issues relating to engagement as it would not be right to put in place a new system without knowing how it might address those issues as raised by the petition.

She said that she would also welcome an opportunity to work with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee to look at how this might be done and the matter would also be debated at a political group level. She looked forward to working with campaigners to consider issues and to make sure there was the best system for democracy in which every councillor was able to play a part, representing the community and to ensure that the public could engage and have input into the work of the Council.

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

Comment was made about the style of governance in the Council and concern expressed as to people becoming distanced from it. Remarks were also made about the changes made to Council meetings and as to the level of scrutiny in the Council. It was felt that, whilst local councillors could get involved, such opportunities had reduced over time.

It was thought that the petition and debate concerning governance was about opening up democracy and councillors being part of the decision making process. Whilst a change in governance model might not provide a solution to all the issues, it did provide an opportunity including for more cross party working.

The debate was welcomed and was considered to show the strength of democracy in the City and in contrast to other countries, the UK was a democratic country which enabled people to organise and develop a case and to debate. The scale of challenges for the City also meant that there needed to be experiments in deliberative and participative democracy, such as a Citizens Assembly. This was about the democratic processes in place in addition to the Council's formal model of governance.

People in the City were saying that that they would wish for the Council to work with them and the Council had tried to do that with Community

Assemblies and something such as that might be developed further in order to engage with people. Councillors worked hard in their communities and were aware of issues and problems and that some people need more help and support than others, including the extent to which they might feel able to engage in debate. The Council needed to work with people, find out what they wanted and how power might be devolved

The committee model of governance was fair and representative. It would bring greater transparency and better decision making and cross party collaboration and was more inclusive and democratic. Backbench councillors would have a role on committees which were established proportionate to the political composition of the Council and a committee model would also lend itself to a multi-party council.

Comment was made that the previous committee system was not a good way of working and the new model of executive arrangements was intended to give transparency so people knew who made decisions and could hold them to account. Those in a scrutiny role would be active in their role and, when it was well done, scrutiny properly engaged councillors to undertake different ways of working. There were examples of good practice in relation to scrutiny, such as pre-decision scrutiny and the use of task and finish working groups. It should be a critical friend to ensuring the voice of the public was heard and carried out by independent minded councillors to drive improvement.

The proposals for a committee model of governance would not necessarily mean returning to the model previously used by local authorities but a different model which allowed the public to engage. Some councils had chosen to adopt a committee structure and some had established a model of governance which included overview and scrutiny.

Many people had signed the petition and the petition organisers had spoken with many people. The Council could accept that people wanted a change in the system and put in place a system of governance which was open and transparent. A committee system was considered to allow more debate and accountability than a cabinet model.

Other local authorities with a committee model of governance gave delegated powers to chairs of committees to make decisions. Scrutiny could hold people to account and there were examples of it doing so. Sometimes decisions had to be made quickly including in conjunction with partner organisations such as the police and some delegated authority would be needed to do that. It was also thought that there was currently significant opportunity for public involvement at meetings of Council and at other meetings and it was also important to listen to public concerns.

The Cabinet model was considered to be the least-worst option when changes were made in 2000, when compared to alternative options of an elected mayor or city manager. At that time, Cabinet, Scrutiny and devolution were key component. It was commented that the Cabinet

component had become stronger and a better decentralised system and scrutiny system was needed. A modern committee system was needed which was the right one for this time and one which reached out to people.

Comment was made that regardless of the committee or cabinet model, the party with the most number of seats would take decisions. Whilst a committee system would be different to a cabinet model, it would not necessarily more or less democratic, although more members would be involved.

Comment was made that the role of scrutiny chairs had previously been given to opposition councillors, which had been an important element. A new system was required and Community Assemblies had involved local councillors in decision making for their respective communities.

Scrutiny Committees had been conducted in a democratic way and members were regarded as equals and had their say with the work of those committees being a collective effort. Task and finish groups in scrutiny was also used to enable work to be done.

Within the cabinet and scrutiny model, there was opportunity for decisions to be called in. Scrutiny also enabled councillors to work differently and reduced the party political dimension which had been a feature of the previous committee system.

The lead petitioner, Ruth Hubbard, exercised a right of reply and stated that a valid petition would be submitted and that would trigger a referendum on this matter. Over eighty percent of people to whom campaigners had spoken with wanted to sign the petition. She commented that there had been many good point of discussion during the debate by Council and said that she was disappointed that the debate had not occurred during the year.

Ruth Hubbard said that, with regards to scrutiny and the views expressed about whether scrutiny worked or not and with regard to good practice in scrutiny, reports from government and from think tanks and research studies had expressed the view that scrutiny could not work well in a rigid whipping environment as in Sheffield. There were decisions to be made about what scrutiny arrangements might be implemented in a modern committee system and that might incorporate an integrated scrutiny function or the inclusion of one or two scrutiny boards.

She referred to Select Committees in Parliament and to the appointment of members of the opposition to chair them and said that, under the Localism Act, it was local communities who were the check and balance for local authorities. She said that she did not believe in scrutiny in which the Council inspected itself and also said that the party divisions were apparent in the minutes of scrutiny committee meetings and that she was not aware of one decision which had been significantly modified or overturned by scrutiny in the Council.

Almost all of the local authorities which had changed to the committee system had sought to make sure that it was cost neutral and that would involve less bureaucracy and there were also so evaluations of what those councils had done. She also emphasised that councils were not moving back to the old committee system previously operating in local authorities. Such a change was something that was possible at a local level.

She commented that she would agree in relation to citizens' assemblies and other ways of thinking and which indicated the strength of democracy in the city.

Ruth Hubbard stated that if the Council did not make a decision on this matter, a petition would be submitted at the end of August. The task for Council to pass a motion to change its model of governance or a referendum would happen, which she said would result in a vote to change to a committee system.

Councillor Olivia Blake responded to issues raised during the debate. She acknowledged the range of issues discussed during the debate and stated that a large part of the petition was about cross party working. She said that the Council was not authoritarian and that there was good democracy in Sheffield and the presence of a good civil society in the City and that should be respected and acknowledged by Members. Scrutiny was very important and it had also brought about change such as with regards to the closure of the walk in centre, which had shown cross party working at its best.

Councillor Blake acknowledged that there were lots of challenges and issues in relation to the matters raised by the petition and debate and which needed to be considered. The Council wished to increase transparency and engagement and to continue to have the debate and take the work forward and to make sure that what was in place worked for the people of Sheffield and that councillors, as representatives of the people, were able to do their job to the best of their ability.

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

#### Proposal 1

It was moved by Councillor Olivia Blake and seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that:-

The matter be referred to the Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance to work cross party and with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, to bring a report back, following that engagement, to full Council within a period no later than 6 months' time.

#### Proposal 2

It was moved by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones and seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that:-

The action requested by the petitioners be supported and a report be brought forward to a future meeting of full Council, which may, by reason of timing, be an extraordinary meeting, to take a decision on a change of governance arrangements.

On being put to the vote, the above motion was not carried.

The votes on proposal 2 were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For Proposal 2 (33) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Gail Smith) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Angela Argenzio, Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Tim Huggan, Mohammed Mahroof, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Paul Turpin, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Kevin Oxley, Peter Garbutt, Alison Teal, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Alan Hooper and Mike Levery.

Against Proposal 2 (42) - Councillors Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Anne Murphy, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, Sioned-Mair Richards, Ben Miskell, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Julie Grocutt, Francyne Johnson, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Abstained from voting on Proposal 2 (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing).

### Proposal 3

It was moved by Councillor Martin Phipps and seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, that:-

The matter be referred to an emergency meeting of the full Council for a motion on adopting a modern committee system.

On being put to the vote, the above motion was not carried.

Proposal 1 was then put to the vote and was carried as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the Sheffield People's Petition; and
- (b) refers the matter to the Cabinet Member for Finance, Resources and Governance to work cross party and with the Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee, to bring a report back, following that engagement, to full Council within a period no later than 6 months' time.

The votes on proposal 1 were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

- For Proposal 1 (43) - Councillors Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Anne Murphy, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Moya O'Rourke, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Abtisam Mohamed, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, Sioned-Mair Richards, Ben Miskell, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Julie Grocutt, Francyne Johnson, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.
- Against Proposal 1 (25) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Gail Smith) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Bob McCann, Tim Huggan, Mohammed Mahroof, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Kevin Oxley, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson, Alan Hooper and Mike Levery.
- Abstained from voting on Proposal 1 (9) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) and Councillors Angela Argenzio, Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Paul Turpin, Peter Garbutt and Alison Teal.

## **5. RESPONDING TO THE CLIMATE EMERGENCY - DEVELOPING A CARBON BUDGET FOR SHEFFIELD**

- 5.1 The Council received a presentation from Dr Jaise Kuriakose, from the Tyndall Centre for Climate Change and Research and Mark Whitworth, interim Head of Sustainability, Sheffield City Council. Dr Kuriakose outlined that to respond to climate change, action was required to hold the increase in global average temperature to well below 2 degrees Celsius and to pursue efforts to limit the temperature increase to 1.5 degrees Celsius. Carbon budgets set policy for restricting Co2 emissions from energy use in electricity, heating, transport and industry.

The report of the Tyndall Centre had been circulated to Members, together with a report of the Executive Director, Place. It set out climate change targets for Sheffield and provided advisory budgets for carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) emissions, from the energy system for 2020 to 2100. Those targets were derived from the commitments enshrined in the 2015 Paris Agreement.

The Tyndall Centre's approach took international carbon budgets and then split them down to national (UK) and sub-national levels (city or city-region). The resultant 'Carbon budget' was the maximum carbon dioxide (CO<sub>2</sub>) associated with energy use in Sheffield that could be emitted to meet this commitment. This commitment was then translated into: a long-term carbon budget for Sheffield; a sequence of recommended five-year carbon budgets; and a date of 'near zero'/zero carbon for the city.

Based on that analysis, for Sheffield to make its 'fair' contribution towards the Paris Climate Change Agreement, the report made recommendations, which Dr Kuriakose outlined in his presentation.

- 5.2 Responses were made to questions from members of the public, as follows:

Regarding measures being put in place to reduce emissions to meet the net zero target and the increasing proportion of emissions being from transport, it was understood that the proportion of emissions from Transport had increased to 28 percent. In relation to electricity, through national grid decarbonisation and an increase in renewables, there had been decrease in the amount of carbon produced from energy generation.

The Council was in consultation and working in conjunction with City region in preparing a bid for the Department of Transport which was for the transforming cities fund to support buses, walking and cycling infrastructure investment and which would support the reduction of carbon emissions in the city. As identified in the recent transport strategy, more work needed to be undertaken in the light of the declaration of a climate emergency regarding how the Transport Strategy would respond to the findings from the Tyndall Centre and subsequent work.

With regard to the Tyndall report and details of the actions in terms of reductions and how they will be decided, at this stage, the report had only

just been received so the actions in terms of how those savings might be delivered had yet to be worked through. That would be part of the process around developing a plan and working through the citizens' assembly and with stakeholders to develop those proposals.

In connection with the initial steps that the Council could take immediately, as outlined by the Sheffield Climate Alliance, and as to whether any steps had been taken regarding those suggestions, the support of the Sheffield Climate Alliance was acknowledged and dialogue could also be made at regular meetings including the Climate Alliance or in writing. As regards energy, the Council had switched its electricity supply to a fully renewable tariff.

In relation to developing a carbon literacy programme, the Government was looking to nationally roll out a programme that had been successfully developed in Manchester. The Council was having conversations as to how Sheffield might be involved in that, including as a pilot and also the opportunities to use that approach in Sheffield.

Further in relation to sustainable transport there had been other cycle investment infrastructure investment in areas such as Portobello and also with the new heart of the city in Tudor Square along with other infrastructure as part of those developments.

Proposals that had been put forward relating to a Citizens' Assembly would be part of the solution in making sure that there was engagement across the city from wide range of people as well as taking a fully inclusive approach to developing the plan.

In respect of the question regarding net zero carbon insulation and as to what would be the cost and timescales and the partners for an insulation programme to bring buildings up to SAP B, that information was not to hand. However, given the scale of the challenge and some of the opportunities to de-carbonise, this was something that needed to be explored.

For the Council's housing stock, 40 thousand homes in the city have been insulated in a programme to bring those homes up to some equivalent of SAP Part C.

- 5.3 Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Streetscene and Climate Change, responded to the question concerning a cross party working group and said there need to be different forms of democracy, including the deliberative form of the citizen's assembly, an ongoing dialogue between elected representatives and the people they represent, different parties setting out different visions and putting these to people and the Council's cross party Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Committee which could keep track of the work being done.

He said that the questions from the public also helped to set out the debate as to how the City could be set on a trajectory where it would not spend its



carbon budget within the next six years and would instead become carbon neutral. It was thought that the approach should include having a Citizens Assembly and identifying the different sectors in the City and the reductions they would need to make.

- 5.4 Questions were asked and comments made by Members of the Council in relation to the report and presentation, and responses were given, as summarised below:

Questions were asked in relation to the approach to the carbon emissions budget and targets, emissions from shipping and aviation; reducing single use plastic and school initiatives; the extent to which there was a plan of action and proposals, such as in respect of transport, solar energy and insulation.

Responses were made that shipping and aviation within carbon budgets was dealt with at a national level and any increase in carbon use would have an impact on local carbon budget. It was important to have discussions with the government regarding plans concerning emissions from aviation and shipping. Collaboration and engagement would be required with stakeholders due to the scale of shipping and aviation.

It was very important to move away from the use of single-use plastic and there were a range of benefits and opportunities. Looking at such problems collectively and working across the city was fundamental as was engagement of every sector to help contribute and initiatives such as with single use plastics working through schools were part of that picture.

Avoiding single use plastics meant fewer emissions from industry which manufactured plastics, transporting plastic to the end users and in waste and recycling. More understanding was needed as to the different types of plastics, which were essential and as to the manufacturing process.

There would be a process to work through when the carbon budget had been identified in understanding where opportunities were within the city and which might vary from one location to another. In terms of actions, some of the approaches which are outlined in the question would be explored together with what the opportunities were and if there were pressing issues that needed to be addressed. Local knowledge was vital in achieving the maximum reduction in emissions and that that should be open to commercial partners, NGOs, Third Sector, academia and policymakers all of which had to be engaged and included and all would have their own action to deliver.

Questions were asked regarding energy efficient buses and a public transport system, integrated with other modes of transport; obtaining a picture of what the future might look like and relating issues to the public; the Tyndall Centre speaking with businesses and an explanation of the concept of 'grandfathering' and why it was seen as a good idea.

With regards what the zero carbon city looks like, work by other cities

included transition to both electric vehicles including electric buses, electricity from renewable sources and a reduction in the number of vehicle movements in the city and other roads, such as motorways, so it was a local issue and also something to discuss with national government and other agencies. Part of the work to be done was to understand the impact and changes. The Tyndall Centre had been supporting organisations in relation to Greater Manchester to develop understanding.

That understanding needed to be put in a form that people understood including what they might do to contribute towards reducing the carbon footprint. The City was starting from a good base and there were good examples from a range of organisations that were already delivering and supporting activities. Working with businesses was an important part of the city's approach.

An explanation was provided of the concept of Grandfathering, which referred to past or recent emissions. The average of the annual emissions from 2011 to 2016 was used and compared to the UK emissions. Using more recent figures would make the approach not applicable but it did work broadly in the UK and within that timeframe. This approach was also tested by looking at a range of other local authorities with different characteristics, relating to population, income distribution, economic activity etc.

Questions were asked concerning climate change and the local plan for housing, including infrastructure such as water, energy and transport on potential brownfield or greenfield development sites; whether information for Sheffield's emissions by sector were based on actual data; the actions which the Council could take which would have maximum impact; provision of parking spaces and the need for immediate action.

The work to develop the evidence base and in relation to opportunities would need to take into account some of the issues raised relating to new housing development. For example, the Council was already engaged in work to look at opportunities for use of hydrogen and options for new developments if natural gas was phased out; and similarly for opportunities to de-carbonise.

Action was needed on all different levels in relation to transport and to think differently about the mobility of passengers and goods, how we deliver goods and engage with business to bring about innovative models and solutions.

The data regarding Sheffield's emission by sector came from the government Department of Business, Energy and Industry Strategy and was publically available.

In terms of what Sheffield could do to reduce the emissions, there might be activity such as installing solar panels or wind turbines, although it was the National Grid emissions that dictated the emissions from the electricity sector. There might also be engagement with the distribution network operators and National Grid along with renewable energy installations. The Council had some control in relation to fuels burned within the city boundary

and discussions could be held with business and industry about action to reduce emissions. Collaborating with others was probably the best way forward.

In relation to how we make decisions now and actions that need to start immediately, there was engagement with the University of Sheffield in relation to using the United Nations sustainable development goals and how they might be applied in appraising decisions or looking at strategies and how they contribute to those international goals and translating those to a local level to understand what they mean for the city and its citizens. There was also a need for a conversation internally about developing some of that thinking and the sort of measures which needed to be put in place to enable decisions now to be cognisant of the climate emergency as well as developing a plan that starts to mobilise some of the additional actions that were needed.

Questions were asked concerning air quality and related measures and monitoring; whether the rise in Co2 might as much be a result of global warming; and with regard to prioritising steps to reduce carbon emissions over economic growth.

In relation to clean air and alongside the current consultation on the clean air zone, there was work being done with the University on a wider deployment of sensors around the City to build up a better picture and understanding and give a better position from which to respond. There was also a project with community volunteers building and installing sensors and further work was being done to check data from that project with the University's data.

Proposals relating to the clean air zone were expected to have wider impacts and benefits. There was also infrastructure change required to be delivered through programmes such as the transforming cities fund, for which a bid had been submitted. There was also work on issues including wider resilience and adapting to change as well as mitigating impact on the environment.

The earth had witnessed climate change before but it was a question of the extent and the magnitude of the change that was happening. The increase in the level of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere and the change in temperature that was being seen now was unprecedented. The effects of that change were still being evaluated but there was a cascading effect where one failure would lead to a further failure and the impact was severe in terms of the effect on biodiversity, life, health and the economy etc. and was set in the context of a large human population and civilisation.

There was a release of carbon dioxide because of the ice melting and the increase of concentration of carbon dioxide was actually contributing to warming and that melted some of the ice and released permafrost and methane. So, there was a cascade effect which accelerated the warming and was considered to be quite severe, if all of the different effects were considered.

In relation to the prioritisation of reducing carbon emissions over economic growth, such a question might be addressed and debated in a wider forum such as the citizens' assembly. Understanding the potential wider effects as outlined and also having a bigger picture around what the city could do and the related implications was part of that debate.

Questions were asked concerning cycling and the contribution of journeys made by cycling to the city becoming carbon neutral; and the percentage of carbon emissions for which the Council was responsible.

Further questions were asked regarding whether the quickening of change would affect the carbon budget; the significance of limiting temperature growth to 1.5 degrees Celsius; and if there should also be a focus on other pollutants; and local procurement.

Additional questions were put concerning whether other greenhouse gases such as methane should also be considered; and if there should be initiatives to grow the local food economy, including new business start-ups in the agricultural sector in rural areas and action in relation to overgrown allotments.

Questions were asked as to how we might measure success in the way progress was measured; and it was important to recognise other environmental crises, such as species depletion and soil depletion and other events which might happen such as floods, droughts, food shortages and health issues and how this might be built into decision making.

Responses were made to the above questions, as follows:

It was explained that information relating to the Transport Strategy was based upon the Department for Transport propensity to cycle tool. The aspiration was to increase the share of journeys made by cycle to the city centre from approximately 3 percent to 15 percent. For the city as a whole, the aspiration was from approximately 2 percent to 12 percent.

The estimated reduction in CO<sub>2</sub> of that shift, as portion of the road transport share was estimated at between 1 and 3 percent of road transport. This presented part of the challenge in relation to transport as there was unlikely to be a neat solution based on modal shift to any mode. The issue was probably not about facilitating more transport by any mode but how the city could be planned so people could travel less by any mode.

The model recommended reviewing the carbon budget on a five yearly basis to take changes into account, including if the situation was worsening or to understand the effect of national or international action, such as for aviation or shipping. The current budget was between 1.5 and 1.7 degrees and it was probably not realistic to achieve 1.5. It was important to keep up to date the relevant science and climate modelling and changing policies according to the science at the time.

As to whether this should be limited to CO<sub>2</sub> or include all greenhouse gases, whilst this idea had been considered, one reservation was that the six greenhouse gases had different physical and chemical properties and so it would not be recommended to combine them. National government had a greenhouse gas target. How the gases interact in the atmosphere and affected the temperature was different for different gases and gases had a different lifetime and the rate of emission could vary between the different gases. It was therefore considered important to look at CO<sub>2</sub>, which was the majority of all greenhouse gases, and to tackle CO<sub>2</sub> and the related energy system. However, other greenhouse gases, such as nitrous oxide, also needed to be taken into consideration and reduced as much as possible.

National Government was signed up to the Kyoto Agreement and reported within a framework and on a production basis and the carbon budget for Sheffield was also on a production basis. There was not a clear methodology developed yet on a consumption basis but that needed to be developed as well. The model used was an energy carbon emissions model and whilst it did not include land use and land use changes and the emissions from storage and capture from trees or from other vegetation, there was a need to look at that.

With respect to other issues, such as changes including species depletion and some of the other impacts that were already being experienced, conversations should be had as part of the citizen's assembly and to have the evidence to understand the risks and clarity in relation to the science, together with the opportunities for Sheffield and to act so as to take the City's share of the global commitment.

On behalf of the Council, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) thanked Dr Jaise Kuriakose and Mark Whitworth for their presentation and for responding to Members' questions.

- 5.5 (NOTE: During the discussion on the above item of business, it was -  
RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Mark Jones and seconded by Councillor Mike Drabble, 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.)

## **6. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING**

- 6.1 RESOLVED: That the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 12<sup>th</sup> June 2019 be approved as a true and accurate record, subject to the following alterations:-
- (a) the addition to the recorded votes set out in paragraph 6.4.1, of the names of Councillors Mohammed Mahroof and Barbara Masters to the two lists of Members voting for the amendment, and the correction of the votes of Councillor Simon Clement-Jones to show that he voted for

the amendment;

- (b) the addition to the recorded votes set out in paragraph 6.6.1, of (i) the names of Councillors Denise Fox and Francyne Johnson to the two lists of Members voting for the Motion, (ii) the name of Councillor Ian Auckland to the list of Members voting for paragraphs (b), (c)(ii) to (iv) and (vi) of the Motion and to the list of Members voting against paragraphs (a) and (c)(i) and (v) of the Motion and (iii) the names of Councillors Angela Argenzio and Kaltum Rivers to the two lists of Members abstaining from voting on the Motion;
- (c) the addition to the recorded vote set out in paragraph 7.6.1, of the names of Councillors Abdul Khayum and Josie Paszek to the list of Members voting against the amendment;
- (d) the addition to the recorded vote set out in paragraph 8.6.1, of the names of Councillors Olivia Blake and Adam Hurst to the list of Members voting against the amendment; and
- (e) the addition to the recorded votes set out in paragraph 8.8.1, of the name of Councillor Ian Auckland to the two lists of Members voting against the Substantive Motion, and the correction of the votes of Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed to show that he voted against the Substantive Motion.

## **7. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES**

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

- (a) it be noted that, with effect from 2<sup>nd</sup> July, 2019 (i) Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed stood down as Leader of the Liberal Democrat Group on the Council and (ii) Councillor Penny Baker became Interim Leader of the Group, and Councillor Simon Clement-Jones became Interim Deputy Leader of the Group, until further notice;
- (b) approval be given to the following changes to the memberships of Committees, Boards, etc.:-

Overview & Scrutiny Management Committee	- Councillors Julie Grocutt and Sioned-Mair Richards to fill vacancies
Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee	- Councillor Mike Chaplin to replace Councillor Bryan Lodge, and remove Councillor Roger Davison and create a vacancy
Economic and Environmental Wellbeing	- Councillor Bryan Lodge to replace Councillor Mike Chaplin

Scrutiny and Policy  
Development Committee

Safer and Stronger  
Communities Scrutiny and  
Policy Development  
Committee

- Councillor Peter Price to fill a vacancy

Licensing Committee

- Councillor Roger Davison to fill a vacancy

Senior Officer Employment  
Committee

- Councillor Simon Clement-Jones to fill a  
vacancy

Appeals and Collective  
Disputes Committee

- Councillor Simon Clement-Jones to fill a  
vacancy

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

Transport 4 All

- Councillor Douglas Johnson be appointed  
to serve on the Body

## **8. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

8.1 A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated.

8.2 Supplementary questions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4), questions relating to urgent business (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6ii) and 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 16.6i), were not able to be asked before the meeting terminated (as agreed earlier at the meeting, when suspending the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 5.5) at 6.00 p.m..

This page is intentionally left blank