

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 4 October 2023, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Colin Ross)
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Jayne Dunn)

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|--|----|---|
| 1 | <i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i>
Simon Clement-Jones
Richard Shaw | 10 | <i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i>
Craig Gamble Pugh
Robert Reiss
Alan Woodcock | 19 | <i>Nether Edge & Sharrow Ward</i>
Nighat Basharat
Ibby Ullah |
| 2 | <i>Beighton Ward</i>
Ian Horner
Ann Woolhouse | 11 | <i>Ecclesall Ward</i>
Roger Davison
Barbara Masters
Shaffaq Mohammed | 20 | <i>Park & Arbourthorne</i>
Ben Miskell |
| 3 | <i>Birley Ward</i>
Denise Fox
Bryan Lodge
Karen McGowan | 12 | <i>Firth Park Ward</i>
Fran Belbin
Abdul Khayum
Abtisam Mohamed | 21 | <i>Richmond Ward</i>
David Barker
Mike Drabble
Dianne Hurst |
| 4 | <i>Broomhill & Sharrow Vale Ward</i>
Angela Argenzio
Brian Holmshaw | 13 | <i>Fulwood Ward</i>
Sue Alston
Andrew Sangar
Cliff Woodcraft | 22 | <i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i>
Dawn Dale
Peter Price
Garry Weatherall |
| 5 | <i>Burngreave Ward</i>
Talib Hussain
Mark Jones
Safiya Saeed | 14 | <i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i>
Alexi Dimond
Marieanne Elliot
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>
Steve Ayris
Mohammed Mahroof | 24 | <i>Stannington Ward</i>
Penny Baker
Richard Williams |
| 7 | <i>Crookes & Crosspool Ward</i>
Tim Huggan
Ruth Milsom
Minesh Parekh | 16 | <i>Hillsborough Ward</i> | 25 | <i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i>
Julie Grocutt
Janet Ridler |
| 8 | <i>Darnall Ward</i>
Mazher Iqbal
Mary Lea
Zahira Naz | 17 | <i>Manor Castle Ward</i>
Terry Fox
Laura Moynahan
Sioned-Mair Richards | 26 | <i>Walkley Ward</i>
Tom Hunt
Bernard Little
Laura McClean |
| 9 | <i>Dore & Totley Ward</i>
Joe Otten
Colin Ross
Martin Smith | 18 | <i>Mosborough Ward</i>
Glynis Chapman
Tony Downing
Gail Smith | 27 | <i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i>
Alan Hooper
Mike Levery
Ann Whitaker |
| | | | | 28 | <i>Woodhouse Ward</i>
Alison Norris
Mick Rooney |

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ian Auckland, Lewis Chinchon, Kurtis Crossland, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Maleiki Haybe, Toby Mallinson, Nabeela Mowlana, Henry Nottage, Vickie Priestley, Maroof Raouf, Sophie Thornton, Sophie Wilson and Paul Wood.

2. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

- 2.1 There were no items of business identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the press and public.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

4. MEMBERSHIPS OF COUNCIL BODIES, REPRESENTATIVES TO SERVE ON OTHER BODIES AND RELATED ISSUES

- 4.1 At the commencement of item 5 on the agenda (Public Questions and Petitions and Other Communications), the Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) reported that the Council had received notification that 7 Councillors had resigned from the Labour Group and intended to form a new political group on the Council. He stated that there were no immediate implications for this Council meeting, other than the fact that the seating plan for the meeting had been adjusted. The Lord Mayor added that, in view of this change to its composition, the Council must consider proportionality implications in the membership of its committees and sub-committees as soon as practicable, and that it was expected that this would be done at the next meeting of the Council scheduled to be held on 1st November 2023. The Lord Mayor concluded by stating that, other than the routine changes proposed to be made under item 12 on the agenda (Memberships of Council Bodies and Representatives To Serve On Other Bodies), no further changes would be made to memberships of the Council's Committees until the Council next meets.
- 4.2 It was then RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Bryan Lodge and seconded by the Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross), that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.1, the order of business as published on the Council Summons be altered by taking item 12 on the agenda (Memberships of Council Bodies and Representatives To Serve On Other Bodies) at this point in the proceedings.
- 4.3 It was formally moved by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards and formally seconded by Councillor Ruth Milsom, that:-

(a) it be noted that, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its annual meeting held on 17th May 2023, the Monitoring Officer had authorised the following appointment(s), with effect from the date(s) shown:-

Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee - Councillor Tony Downing replaced Councillor Julie Grocutt as substitute member of the Committee, with effect from 21 September 2023; and

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

South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority - Councillor Laura McClean to replace Councillor Tony Damms.

4.4 After contributions from three Members, and following legal advice reported by the General Counsel, Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards proposed that paragraph (b) be withdrawn from her Motion. With the consent of both the seconder of the motion and of the meeting, paragraph (b) was withdrawn from consideration.

4.5 Whereupon it was RESOLVED: That it be noted that, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its annual meeting held on 17th May 2023, the Monitoring Officer had authorised the following appointment(s), with effect from the date(s) shown:-

Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee - Councillor Tony Downing replaced Councillor Julie Grocutt as substitute member of the Committee, with effect from 21 September 2023.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

5.1 Lord Mayor's Announcements

5.1.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) expressed thanks for contributions which had been made to his fundraising event for St. Luke's Hospice on 15th September, where he had walked 9 miles visiting several St. Luke's shops on route. He added that any further contributions could be made at today's Council meeting via the collection being passed around the Council Chamber.

5.1.2 The Lord Mayor also congratulated Councillor Dawn Dale who had completed a sponsored abseil down Sheffield Hallam University's Owen building on 30th September, also raising funds for St. Luke's Hospice.

5.2 Petitions and Public Questions

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) reported that questions would be taken at the meeting from seven members of the public. No petitions had been received.

5.2.1 Question from Sue Owen

Sue Owen asked the following question on behalf of Sheffield Campaign for Divestment from Companies that are Complicit with Human Rights Abuses in Palestine, which is part of the Sheffield Anti-Israeli Apartheid Coalition -

“The Labour Party has sought legal advice on the Economic Activity of Public Bodies (Overseas Matters) Bill and Richard Kermer, KC has concluded: “The implications for local democracy, for the proud history in our regions of campaigning for global human rights, for using our economic clout for the promotion of human rights, for free speech in this country and for compliance with our international law obligations, are potentially profound.”

In the light of the damage to local democracy that this bill would introduce, has Sheffield Council written a response to the consultation about the bill, and if yes, will you publish that response?”

In response, the Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Hunt) advised that the Council does not have a position on the Bill, which was not yet on the statute books. The Labour Party had not supported the Bill at its second reading and it was now in the Committee Stage before a third reading in the House of Commons and then further stages in the House of Lords.

He added that the Labour Party was clear that all public bodies must act without bias or selectivity when making ethical decisions on procurement and investment, but was concerned that the Bill risked significantly undermining support for groups around the world facing persecution, such as the Uyghur. The Labour Party have asked the Government to bring forward alternative proposals because they believe the Bill would place unprecedented restrictions on the ability of public bodies to express a view on policy, has potential widespread and negative impacts on local government pension funds, and was likely to be subject to repeated and extended legal challenges.

5.2.2 Question from Dylan Lewis-Creser

“What will the Council be doing to ensure that the benefits of Active Travel Neighbourhoods, as we've seen in Crookes & Walkley, are spread across the city, especially in areas in need of a social uplift?”

In response, Councillor Ben Miskell (Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) stated that the Council's Transport Strategy promoted local transport policies that were intended to provide safe and attractive travel choices for all, with a specific policy to enhance the multi-modal transport system which encourages sustainable travel choices

particularly for active travel.

He commented that the Council would continue to encourage sustainable travel choices and include schemes that met these aims within funding bids where appropriate. He added that he believed that Active Travel was about enhancing travel choices for people in how they move around the city, and he referred to the fact that the Council had been delivering many of these types of schemes in Sheffield for several years, including the introduction of Active Travel Neighbourhoods, with one of the first of these being in Broomhall. He stated that the Council wanted to have more sustainable, inter-connected communities throughout Sheffield and its future transport strategy that was due to be presented early next year, and the ongoing development of the Local Plan, will play a significant part in helping the Council to achieve that aim.

5.2.3 Question from Christina Rees

“I would like to know what the Council is planning to put in place to ensure that children walking to school who use a route along Nether Edge Road and Archer Lane can do so safely. I was dismayed to find there appears to be no mention of this in the report.

For over a year, the closure of Archer Lane created a wonderful way for children of all ages to reach their schools safely (Holt House, Carter Knowle, Mercia, High Storrs and King Ecgberts). If Archer Lane re-opens there will be no time for children to adjust and learn the extremely hazardous crossings at every junction, as the floodgates open once again. These traffic conditions will be even worse than previously, as Mercia now has its full quota of students.”

Ms. Rees added that Mercia currently has 900 students but by 2026 they hope to have 1200 students.

In response, Councillor Ben Miskell (Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) stated that road safety was a priority and the pedestrian crossings that had been introduced in Nether Edge would be retained as they have improved pedestrian journeys.

He added that when people in Nether Edge had been asked about the perceived impact on the safety of walkers and cyclists of the Active Travel measures, more responses had said that there had been a negative impact on people’s perception of safety of walkers and cyclists. However, the available information did not suggest the Nether Edge Active Travel Neighbourhood Project has had a significant impact on personal injury collisions. All but one of the pedestrian or cyclist casualties had occurred on Abbeydale Road, not Archer Lane.

5.2.4 Question from Simon Sylvester

“Being a resident of Archer Lane, I have experienced at first hand the provocative political campaigning regarding the Nether Edge Active Travel Neighbourhood.

Following the decision made by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to re-open Archer Lane, I viewed the webcast of the Committee meeting.

In their deliberations concerning the Nether Edge Active Travel Neighbourhood, Councillors make hardly any reference to the research commissioned by their own Committee.

Few Members take up the opportunity for debate during proceedings. It appears that private email messages received by councillors, and feedback from Party colleagues, all have greater influence than commissioned research.

Would you agree that the final decision to re-open Archer Lane was informed more by undisclosed Party interests than by presented evidence or informed debate?"

In response, Councillor Ben Miskell (Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) stated that the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order had allowed a range of measures to be trialled within the Nether Edge Active Travel Neighbourhood Area. In making decisions, Members had taken account of officer advice provided through reports, and community voices including from their conversations with constituents and through their Members' correspondence. After listening to, and balancing, the comments of impacted residents, Members had concluded that two elements of the scheme in Nether Edge and Sharrow were to be made permanent and the trial closure of Archer Lane was not to be carried forward.

He added that, as part of the trial closure of Archer Lane, the Council received a range of views expressed by residents and businesses in the Nether Edge area. Whilst there were comments that highlighted a positive experience, there were many people who provided negative views on their experience of the trial and asked the Council not to make the trial closure permanent. He stated that the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee does carefully consider feedback received before taking decisions and did so on this occasion in order to end the trial closure.

Councillor Miskell stated that the report submitted to the Committee does indicate that, whilst a road casualty trend cannot be established based upon just seven months of data, the information available to date does not suggest that Nether Edge as an Active Neighbourhood project has had a significant impact on personal injury collisions. He added that when people in Nether Edge were asked about their perceived impact on the safety of walkers and cyclists, their responses were quite varied, but more responses said that there had been a negative impact on people's perception of safety of walkers and cyclists. He stated that road safety was a clear priority for the Committee and the pedestrian crossings that were introduced in Nether Edge, as part of the trial, would be retained as they have had a significant impact on people in the area and the majority of people had welcomed their introduction. He added that people had said that the crossings had improved their journeys on foot,

with a number of people specifically mentioning that they had improved the safety of routes to local schools.

5.2.5 Questions from Lee Parkinson

“Councillors will be aware that the GMB union have launched an equal pay campaign in Sheffield. We note that the Deputy Leader has suggested women who think they may be being discriminated against ask for a regrade. Does the Council Leader believe it is the responsibility of individual women to resolve pay discrimination or the job of the Council leadership to ensure that Sheffield is operating a fair and transparent job evaluation scheme?”

When will the Leader commit to scrapping the rotten job allocation scheme that is discriminating against thousands of Sheffield women?”

In response, the Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Hunt) stated that he welcomed dialogue with the various trades unions who represent the Council’s workforce. When the GMB’s concerns about equal pay in the Authority had been raised with the Council last week, himself and the Deputy Leader had met with GMB representatives later that same day, as they recognised the importance of the matter. He commented that, arising from that meeting, the Council had requested further information from the Union and this had been received yesterday and would now be reviewed.

He commented that equal pay was a right, both morally and legally, and if the Council was to identify any issues, they would, of course, be addressed. This would be done in partnership with the trades unions and with staff and advice would be sought where required. He added that he appreciated that there would be staff who would have queries and concerns about this matter and may wish to raise these, and therefore, an email route had been established to facilitate this, awareness of which had been raised in various communications issued to Council employees. He advised that the Council would continue to encourage staff who may have queries or concerns to get in touch with HR or with their representatives so that these can be addressed.

Councillor Hunt stated that pay policy, job evaluation, grading and equal pay, were a set of complex issues, and the Council will review its practice and take appropriate advice. He added that further discussions on the matter would be held at the joint union, elected members and management meeting which was to be held tomorrow.

5.2.6 Questions from Russell Johnson

1. *“The Town Hall plaque agreed by the Council celebrating the victory of Street Tree Campaigners is a small but significant part of SCC’s demonstration of remorse for the wrongs they perpetrated and is thus of course welcome. However, the possible cost included in a Committee paper of around £10K seems preposterous, particularly in view of the parlous financial position of the Council, even without being further damaged by possible equal pay costs.*

(a) What is the Council’s procurement procedure for this item?

- (b) *How is it progressing?*
- (c) *Would the Leader appreciate details of a suitable tailored plaque for £18.99 that I have located?*
- (d) *Will the Council commit to consultation on the proposed wording of the plaque with interested parties beyond the few selected people the Council chose to speak to in the aftermath of Lowcock?"*

In response, the Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Hunt) stated that the figure mentioned in the report submitted to the meeting of the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee in June was a maximum cost which factored in all potential related costs. This was done so that, if any unexpected factors arose, which is possible when dealing with a Grade 1 historic listed building, the financial resources would be available in order for the works to proceed on schedule.

He stated that the Council is keen for the plaque to be manufactured in Sheffield, using a local supplier, and added that it was proposed that the manufacturer of the Sheffield Legends Plaques, sited at the front of the Town Hall, would be used for the new plaque. He commented that the Council wished to ensure that the quality of the Street Tree plaque would be of an appropriate standard, and in keeping with other plaques that are present on and around the Town Hall building. However, he was confident that, as the plans develop in relation to the design and wording to be used in the plaque, the final cost would be much less than the £10K upper limit allocated for the works. He confirmed that the design process will involve asking the public for their views on potential designs. The plans to deliver the plaque for unveiling in March 2024 were on schedule and it would sit alongside the Kinder Trespass plaque located at the public entrance to the Town Hall building.

Councillor Hunt continued that good craftsmanship does cost money, but he would consider the cheaper plaque if Mr Johnson sent him details, but he felt it unlikely a cheaper plaque would meet the criteria the Council was looking for, and the quality that the public would expect, for such a significant plaque on a such a significant building.

2. *"The Internal Audit Report (Jan 2023 Policy Committee Report) concerning the Fargate Container Scandal was due by the first quarter of this financial year.*

- (a) *When will this be available for the public?*
- (b) *When it is published, are disciplinary actions against incompetent or inadequate Officers a possible or likely outcome? Is action against relevant Members for inadequate oversight a possibility? Will any appropriate sanctions that are applied be announced (anonymously of course)? If there appears to have been misfeasance, will action be taken?*
- (c) *How likely is a clawback of the 'Get Building Fund' (DLUHC) of the approx. £0.5m wasted in this bizarre debacle? Has this been budgeted for?"*

In response, the Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Hunt) stated that the

Council would publish the outcomes of the audit ahead of a forthcoming Audit and Standards Committee meeting, the timing of which would be a matter for the Committee to determine. He added that the Audit and Standards Committee would monitor the actions and recommendations arising from the audit. He advised that the Council would not comment on individual HR matters or processes that may arise and he stated that there has been no clawback claimed and no specific budget had been identified in that regard.

3. *“Following Lowcock, and the introduction of the modern committee system, the excited Sheffield public, myself included, expected to feel a breath of fresh air blowing through the foetid corridors of power at the Town Hall. One improvement promised was proper and timely dealing with complaints. Once again, the optimists’ hopes are being dashed.*

For example, I am aware of a complaint against the Council outstanding from April 2021, and one from May 2023 that has not even been acknowledged. I also know of a complaint regarding two Members’ breaches of their Code of Conduct that dates from April of this year, that is not proceeding in a timely manner.

- (a) *Would the Leader please explain the clear failings in this and other aspects of performance? Is he being distracted by schism in the local Labour Party?*
- (b) *Would the Leader commit to addressing effectively the continuing dysfunction regarding complaints and speeding up FOIR responses?”*

In response, the Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Hunt) stated that he is fully focused on improving the Council’s performance to make sure it is the best council it can be. He requested that if there were shortcoming and delays in responding then customers should let him know what they were so that they could be followed up.

He added that a full review of the systems and processes for responding to Freedom of Information requests and Subject Access requests was underway. This would include looking at the underpinning IT systems which track them. The Council would continue to publish its performance, and report improvements to the Audit and Standards Committee.

4. *“Regarding the Rose Garden Café Fiasco, I welcome the possibilities for community/Council joint working recently announced.*

- (a) *However, could the Leader explain why it has taken nineteen months to reach a possible solution that was clear many months ago?*
- (b) *Does the Leader agree with me that too often Elected Members fail to robustly question poor advice from Officers, and this appears to have been the case with this unfortunate saga?*
- (c) *What is the explanation for the obviously ridiculous SCC costing of restoring the Café to full use? Will there be any investigation of this apparent deception appearing to promote a particular and destructive agenda against the expressed public interest of those concerned with the Rose Garden Café?”*

In response, the Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Hunt) stated that a

Stage 1 feasibility study had been undertaken to understand options for the future of the Rose Garden café, including initial costings and anticipated works. The cost information which had been provided was only for feasibility, and several assumptions had been made. He said that these can be viewed in the Options Appraisal Costs report on the [Rose Garden Café page](#) on the Council's website. He added that the study was informed by the commissioned surveys that took place on the building, which were required to understand the extent of the structural works required and any potential solutions.

Councillor Hunt added that all options had been appraised and the outcome of this detailed exercise, which had taken some time, would be presented at an extraordinary meeting of the Charity Trustee Sub-Committee to be held on 18th October. He stated that, at all times, the Council was working in the public interest and added that the Council has ensured that the options appraisal has been undertaken in significant detail, to ensure that the recommendations met the Charity objectives and were viable.

5. *“Regarding personal apologies arising out of Lowcock identified harms.*
- (a) *Please would the Leader attempt to explain the increased rigidity demonstrated by the Council in refusing to accept victims’ reasonable wishes in respect of apologies that were supposed to be ‘personal’?*
 - (b) *Does the Leader accept that the current ‘doubling down’ is not in the spirit of the remorse and desire for change embodied in the lengthy and remarkable public apology issued in June of this year by the Chief Executive and himself?*
 - (c) *Will he recommit to honesty, openness and a sensitive approach to the victims of Council behaviours?”*

In response, the Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Hunt) stated that in the report, referred to earlier in the meeting, which accompanied the Council's public apology for the street trees dispute, which was submitted to the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee in June, a clear process was set out for individuals who had suffered harm during the dispute to request personal apologies from the Council for its actions during the time of the street trees dispute. He added that the Council agreed to do this in recognition of the range of harms that were caused to people who were involved in the dispute, which were articulated in the Lowcock report. He stated that the process was set out in an annexe to the report and had been designed to take into account the individual's wishes and their circumstances. This included the option for the individual to be provided with their apology either verbally or in writing, and for them to set out any specific issues that they are seeking an apology for, and to suggest who should make the apology. He confirmed that this was the process that the Council was following, and it had not deviated from it.

Councillor Hunt added that the Council's commitment to the recommendations set out in the Lowcock report remain wholehearted, and that progress was being made across a range of different actions that are outlined in that report, including on the individual apology process. He concluded by stating that a report would be submitted to a meeting of the Strategy and Resources Policy

Committee in the near future outlining progress on how those recommendations are being met.

(NOTE: The question which had been submitted by Eileen Howarth but which had not been asked at the meeting due to her absence, would receive a written response from the Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Hunt) and be published on the website.)

6. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

6.1 Urgent Business

With the permission of the Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross), Councillor Mike Chaplin asked the following question relating to urgent business, under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6(ii):-

“Considering the Prime Minister’s announcement earlier today about the cancellation of HS2 and announcements on several other transport projects, what will the impact be on Sheffield?”

In response, Councillor Ben Miskell (Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) reported that this announcement at the Conservative party conference in Manchester of the cancellation of the northern leg of HS2 followed on from the previous announcement by the Government to cancel the eastern leg which would also have been of benefit for Sheffield and the wider region. He believed that most people would agree with the South Yorkshire Mayor, Oliver Coppard, that the move was a catastrophe for the country in its ambitions to deliver growth.

Councillor Miskell advised that the Prime Minister’s announcement of “Network North” consisted of a collection of transport schemes that were either already in progress or where local authorities in the region had already been working on for several years, such as the Don Valley Line. He added that he welcomed the Government’s support for the Council’s plans for the reopening of passenger services to Stocksbridge, Deepcar and Oughtibridge, where the Council wished to see a tram train connecting to an expanded tram network, and a single project alongside the Barrow Hill line, which would open tram train stops in Darnall, Woodhouse and Beighton. There had also been announcements about services to Manchester and the Hope Valley Line, where work had started two years ago.

Councillor Miskell added that he remained determined to see the reintroduction of the direct train service to Manchester Airport. He also expressed frustration that the Government was opting to make announcements at party conference, instead of working collaboratively with northern leaders to deliver infrastructure projects.

6.2 South Yorkshire Joint and Combined Authorities

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

6.3 Written Questions

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

7. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "MORE CASH IN PEOPLE'S POCKETS AT CHRISTMAS" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR FRAN BELBIN AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR LAURA MCCLEAN

7.1 It was moved by Councillor Fran Belbin, and seconded by Councillor Laura McClean, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that the Conservatives have wreaked havoc on our economy, and notes that mortgage rates are soaring, economic growth is flat and working people are paying the price;
- (b) notes that the UK is forecast to have the highest inflation of any major economy this year which means rising prices, higher bills and less money in your pocket;
- (c) notes that prices of food and non-alcoholic beverages rose by 13.6% in the year to August 2023;
- (d) notes recent research by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation which found that 5.7 million low-income households are having to cut down or skip meals because they don't have enough money for food;
- (e) notes that lots of people across Sheffield are struggling as prices and bills continue to rise;
- (f) notes that wintertime can be an expensive time for lots of people, especially families;
- (g) believes that a cash-first approach is an effective, direct way to provide financial help that trusts people to make the best choices for them;

- (h) notes that in July 2023, the Strategy and Resources Committee unanimously approved a spending plan for the Household Support Fund in 2023/24, based on detailed cohort analysis of people who are most affected by rising prices and bills, which included direct awards such as;
 - (1) providing food vouchers worth £15 per week to children and families in need during school holidays; and
 - (2) providing payment to 6,316 households who are receiving Housing Benefit and/or Council Tax Support, but do not receive one of the qualifying benefits, and as such, have not received the Cost-of-Living Payment;
- (i) notes, however, that there are also children who are in receipt of Universal Credit but who are ineligible for Free-school-meal due to the low threshold (income of £7,400) and that consideration needs to be given to how this cohort, expected to be around 4,000 children, can best be supported; and
- (j) request that Strategy and Resources Policy Committee look at fully costed proposals to help put cash in people's pockets at Christmas, increasing and extending direct awards to those who most need it, with a report to Strategy and Resources setting out further options as soon as possible.

7.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Ian Horner, and seconded by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

- 1. the addition of a new paragraph (g) as follows, and the re-lettering of all further paragraphs accordingly:-
 - (g) notes that a lack of access to transport can exacerbate poverty due to difficulties getting to work and school on time, along with increasing isolation and loneliness, condemns the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority's upcoming reduction in bus services, and notes that the Bus Service Improvement Plan submitted by Dan Jarvis in October 2021 was rejected by the Government due to a 'lack of ambition', compared to West Yorkshire MCA which received £70m;
- 2. The addition [after the original paragraph (h), re-lettered as a new paragraph (i)] of a new paragraph (j) as follows:-
 - (j) notes that in July 2023, a successful Liberal Democrat motion requested the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee allocate £600k in additional Cost of Living funding for Citizens Advice Bureau and Local Area Committees, and calls on the Committee to consider this funding on its work programme without delay;

3. The addition [after the original paragraph (i), re-lettered as a new paragraph (k)] of new paragraphs (l) and (m) as follows:-

- (l) notes that the majority of these ~4,000 children would be supported by a policy which introduced free school meals for all primary students, and notes with deep disappointment that:-
 - (i) despite pressure from mayors, MP's and the National Education Union, the Labour Party has failed to commit to this relatively low cost measure; and
 - (ii) both the proposer and seconder, along with their Labour Group colleagues, failed to endorse this policy at the last meeting of the Council;
- (m) believes that, as long as the Labour Party fails to commit to providing free school meals to all primary school students and abolishing the two child benefit cap, they have no credibility on the Cost of Living crisis, and resolves that the Council write to both Keir Starmer and Rishi Sunak, urging them to commit to these policies;

7.3 It was then moved by Councillor Alexi Dimond, and seconded by Councillor Angela Argenzio, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

- 1. the addition, at the end of paragraph (e), of the words "and so recognises that tackling poverty is a year-round activity and not just for Christmas".
- 2. the deletion, from paragraph (j), of the words "at Christmas".
- 3. the addition of a new paragraph (k) as follows:-
 - (k) as part of this work, requests that Strategy and Resources Policy Committee consider investigating mainstreaming the work on income maximisation initiated by Gleadless Valley Councillors in their Local Area Committee by the provision of advice work services.

7.4 After contributions from five other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Fran Belbin, the amendment moved by Councillor Ian Horner was put to the vote and was carried, but in part. Parts 1 and 3 of the amendment were carried, and Part 2 of the amendment was lost.

7.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 33 Members; AGAINST - 30 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 8 Members. Although Green Group Members voted for, they voted against Part 2 of the amendment.)

7.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Alexi Dimond was then put to the vote and was carried, but in part. Parts 1 and 2 of the amendment were carried, and

Part 3 of the amendment was lost.

- 7.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 39 Members; AGAINST - 31 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member. Although Labour Group Members voted against, they voted for Part 1 of the amendment; 2. Although Cllrs Tony Damms, Denise Fox, Terry Fox, Dianne Hurst, Bryan Lodge & Garry Weatherall voted for, they voted against Part 3 of the amendment.)
- 7.6 The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that the Conservatives have wreaked havoc on our economy, and notes that mortgage rates are soaring, economic growth is flat and working people are paying the price;
- (b) notes that the UK is forecast to have the highest inflation of any major economy this year which means rising prices, higher bills and less money in your pocket;
- (c) notes that prices of food and non-alcoholic beverages rose by 13.6% in the year to August 2023;
- (d) notes recent research by the Joseph Rowntree Foundation which found that 5.7 million low-income households are having to cut down or skip meals because they don't have enough money for food;
- (e) notes that lots of people across Sheffield are struggling as prices and bills continue to rise and so recognises that tackling poverty is a year-round activity and not just for Christmas;
- (f) notes that wintertime can be an expensive time for lots of people, especially families;
- (g) notes that a lack of access to transport can exacerbate poverty due to difficulties getting to work and school on time, along with increasing isolation and loneliness, condemns the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority's upcoming reduction in bus services, and notes that the Bus Service Improvement Plan submitted by Dan Jarvis in October 2021 was rejected by the Government due to a 'lack of ambition', compared to West Yorkshire MCA which received £70m;
- (h) believes that a cash-first approach is an effective, direct way to provide financial help that trusts people to make the best choices for them;
- (i) notes that in July 2023, the Strategy and Resources Committee unanimously approved a spending plan for the Household Support Fund in 2023/24, based on detailed cohort analysis of people who are most

affected by rising prices and bills, which included direct awards such as:-

- (i) providing food vouchers worth £15 per week to children and families in need during school holidays; and
 - (ii) providing payment to 6,316 households who are receiving Housing Benefit and/or Council Tax Support, but do not receive one of the qualifying benefits, and as such, have not received the Cost-of-Living Payment;
- (j) notes, however, that there are also children who are in receipt of Universal Credit but who are ineligible for Free-school-meal due to the low threshold (income of £7,400) and that consideration needs to be given to how this cohort, expected to be around 4,000 children, can best be supported;
- (k) notes that the majority of these ~4,000 children would be supported by a policy which introduced free school meals for all primary students, and notes with deep disappointment that:-
- (i) despite pressure from mayors, MP's and the National Education Union, the Labour Party has failed to commit to this relatively low cost measure; and
 - (ii) both the proposer and seconder, along with their Labour Group colleagues, failed to endorse this policy at the last meeting of the Council;
- (l) believes that, as long as the Labour Party fails to commit to providing free school meals to all primary school students and abolishing the two child benefit cap, they have no credibility on the Cost of Living crisis, and resolves that the Council write to both Keir Starmer and Rishi Sunak, urging them to commit to these policies; and
- (m) requests that Strategy and Resources Policy Committee look at fully costed proposals to help put cash in people's pockets, increasing and extending direct awards to those who most need it, with a report to Strategy and Resources setting out further options as soon as possible.

7.6.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 70 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member. Although Labour Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (g), (k) and (l) of the Substantive Motion.)

8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "FINANCING SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL AFTER THE NEXT GENERAL ELECTION" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BERNARD LITTLE AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CHRISTINE GILLIGAN KUBO

8.1 It was moved by Councillor Bernard Little, and seconded by Councillor Brian Holmshaw, that this Council:-

(a) notes:-

- (i) since 2010 Sheffield City Council has delivered £475 million of savings to off-set budget cuts, leaving £856 less per household to spend, compared to 2010-11 in real terms;
- (ii) more Councils have forecast income less than their forecast expenditure in 2024/25 and are considering issuing a Section 114 notice;
- (iii) Unison's head of local government says "*Council finances are in the direst of states*" and "*the squeeze on local budgets means that services either vanish or are scaled down dramatically*"; and
- (iv) South Yorkshire NHS Integrated Care Board says "*People living in the most deprived parts of South Yorkshire will live on average 19 years more in poor health compared to those living in the least deprived areas*";

(b) looks forward to the "Taxing Wealth Report" by Prof. Richard Murphy of Sheffield University Management School, which is expected to show:

- (i) our public services are underfunded, local businesses struggle and many people are at crisis point;
- (ii) the 1% of the most wealthy and high earners are considerably undertaxed and there is significant scope to increase the tax paid by these groups; and that
- (iii) funding for the Green New Deal is readily available, investment in public services and the broader economy can be raised and there is no need for any politician to claim "there is no money left" because there is a wide range of choices on how to raise the funding that is needed; and
- (iv) cumulatively, the recommendations have a total tax-raising potential of £83.3 billion per annum to date;

(c) believes that neither the Conservative or a potential Labour-led Government has a plan to ensure Councils are properly funded to deliver front-line services to the public;

- (d) resolves to ask the relevant Policy Committees to consider placing on their work programmes consideration of the following:-
 - (i) backing income-generating schemes like the Employers' Workplace Parking Levy, and review parking fees and charges, to help fund public transport, road safety and active travel measures;
 - (ii) investigating establishing a wholly-owned Council company to help deliver the Council's objectives and raise income to deliver reliable services for Sheffield residents, e.g. gardening, household repairs, heating system servicing and replacement and retrofit works; and
 - (iii) every opportunity for investing in renewable energy projects on Council land and buildings to generate energy and income; and
- (e) further resolves that the Council write to both Keir Starmer and Rishi Sunak, calling for the proper funding of Councils to deliver local services and to implement the recommendations of the Taxing Wealth Report to date, and consider any future recommendations.

8.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Tom Hunt, and seconded by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (b) and the addition of a new paragraph (b) as follows:-

- (b) notes the forthcoming report by Prof. Richard Murphy of Sheffield University Management School, but that without knowing what the report will say, or what its recommendations will be, we cannot comment upon its contents.

8.3 It was then moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, and seconded by Councillor Barbara Masters, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraph (b) and the re-lettering of paragraph (c) as a new paragraph (b).
2. The addition of new paragraphs (c) to (f) as follows:-
 - (c) believes that directly raising tax on individuals is the wrong approach to funding key public services, and instead favours taxing the enormous profits of organisations benefiting from the Cost of Living crisis such as water companies, oil and gas companies, and banks;
 - (d) notes that in 2022, BP reported profits of £21.8bn and Shell reported profits of £32.2bn, while families struggled to pay their energy bills, and calls for a proper, one-off windfall tax on the super-profits of oil and gas producers and traders;

- (e) believes that a Workplace Parking Levy would not target the 1%, but instead would create disincentives for businesses to locate in the City Centre and would pass costs on to consumers;
 - (f) notes the significant increase in the repairs backlog following the insourcing of the housing repairs service, and expresses doubt over whether a wholly owned Council company would meet the Council's best value duty;
- 3. the re-lettering of original paragraph (d) as a new paragraph (g) and the deletion of sub-paragraphs (i) and (ii) from that paragraph.
 - 4. the re-lettering of original paragraph (e) as a new paragraph (h) and the deletion of the words "and to implement the recommendations of the Taxing Wealth Report to date, and consider any future recommendations" from that paragraph.
- 8.4 After contributions from five other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Bernard Little, the amendment moved by Councillor Tom Hunt was put to the vote and was carried.
- 8.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 53 Members; AGAINST - 10 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 2 Members.)
- 8.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar was then put to the vote and was carried.
- 8.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 24 Members; AGAINST - 9 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 31 Members.)
- 8.6 The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) notes:-

- (i) since 2010 Sheffield City Council has delivered £475 million of savings to off-set budget cuts, leaving £856 less per household to spend, compared to 2010-11 in real terms;
- (ii) more Councils have forecast income less than their forecast expenditure in 2024/25 and are considering issuing a Section 114 notice;
- (iii) Unison's head of local government says "*Council finances are in the direst of states*" and "*the squeeze on local budgets means that services either vanish or are scaled down dramatically*"; and

- (iv) South Yorkshire NHS Integrated Care Board says *“People living in the most deprived parts of South Yorkshire will live on average 19 years more in poor health compared to those living in the least deprived areas”*;
- (b) notes the forthcoming report by Prof. Richard Murphy of Sheffield University Management School, but that without knowing what the report will say, or what its recommendations will be, we cannot comment upon its contents;
- (c) believes that neither the Conservative or a potential Labour-led Government has a plan to ensure Councils are properly funded to deliver front-line services to the public;
- (d) believes that directly raising tax on individuals is the wrong approach to funding key public services, and instead favours taxing the enormous profits of organisations benefiting from the Cost of Living crisis such as water companies, oil and gas companies, and banks;
- (e) notes that in 2022, BP reported profits of £21.8bn and Shell reported profits of £32.2bn, while families struggled to pay their energy bills, and calls for a proper, one-off windfall tax on the super-profits of oil and gas producers and traders;
- (f) believes that a Workplace Parking Levy would not target the 1%, but instead would create disincentives for businesses to locate in the City Centre and would pass costs on to consumers;
- (g) notes the significant increase in the repairs backlog following the insourcing of the housing repairs service, and expresses doubt over whether a wholly owned Council company would meet the Council’s best value duty;
- (h) resolves to ask the relevant Policy Committees to consider placing on their work programmes consideration of every opportunity for investing in renewable energy projects on Council land and buildings to generate energy and income; and
- (i) further resolves that the Council write to both Keir Starmer and Rishi Sunak, calling for the proper funding of Councils to deliver local services.

8.6.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 63 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 2 Members. Although Labour Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (c) and (i) of the Substantive Motion and abstained from voting on paragraphs (d) to (h) of the Substantive Motion. Although Green Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (b), (d), (f) and (g) of the Substantive Motion.)

9. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "PREVENTING ANOTHER BIRMINGHAM" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MIKE LEVERY AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED

9.1 It was moved by Councillor Mike Levery, and seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council:-

- (a) notes with concern several recent high-profile Section 114 notices, particularly in Birmingham;
- (b) notes that Government funding has squeezed councils' budgets over recent years, although, as with Birmingham, in Sheffield there are other factors;
- (c) notes that of the £70m reserves set aside in 2021/22 to cover overspends and balance future budgets:-
 - (i) the Co-Operative Executive, during the final year of the strong leader model, used £19.8m to cover the 21/22 budget overspend, and £15m to balance the 22/23 budget; and
 - (ii) since then, under the committee system and no overall control, £5m was used to cover the 22/23 budget overspend, and no reserves were used to balance the 23/24 budget, leaving approximately £30m to cover future deficits;
- (d) believes that:-
 - (i) had the spending profile of 21/22 been repeated in 22/23, the remaining reserves would have been exhausted; and
 - (ii) this outcome would have forced the Council to draw on the £12.8m of un-earmarked reserves, which would have been insufficient to balance the Council's budget for 23/24, and the Council would have been required to investigate further financial resources;
- (e) believes the introduction of the committee system and Liberal Democrat involvement has led to significantly improved financial management, as evidenced above;
- (f) however, there are Budget Improvement Plans (BIPs) not delivered within Policy Committee Budgets and notes in particular the:-
 - (i) Education, Children and Families Committee, for which 55% of the Committee's BIPs are not deliverable this year; and
 - (ii) Housing Revenue Account, within which £3.1m of the account's £19.7m savings are not deliverable this year, including £1.5m of

savings improving void rent loss and £0.9m savings in disrepair management, despite a 23% increase in the repairs budget;

- (g) notes that construction inflation is compromising the Stock Increase Programme, and believes the Council must consider alternative approaches to increasing affordable housing, including closer work with Housing Associations; and
- (h) therefore, resolves that the Council implement:-
 - (i) a relentless focus on delivering this year's budget and BIP initiatives;
 - (ii) a commitment for all budgets from the start of 2025/26 to include no undeliverable BIPs;
 - (iii) a budget setting and BIP process that clearly identifies the quarter in 2024/25 that each BIP will impact, and the part year savings clearly identified if not at the start of the financial year; and
 - (iv) a clear plan on how BIP savings will be delivered.

9.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Zahira Naz, and seconded by Councillor Mary Lea, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of the following content at the end of paragraph (b) – “and in particular:-
 - (i) notes that since 2010 Sheffield has suffered from 13 years of austerity from the Coalition and Conservative governments;
 - (ii) notes that this Council's funding has been cut by 29%, or £856 per resident in real terms since 2010, compared to the national average of 20% and £581 per resident; and
 - (iii) believes government needs to step-up and provide fairer funding, and as a Council we should continue being vocal in our demands;
2. the deletion of paragraph (c) and the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-
 - (c)(i) notes that the Council has always balanced its budget; and
 - (ii) notes that the Co-Operative Executive, when developing proposals for 2022/23, faced immediate challenges brought about by the covid pandemic and what this Council believes to be the woeful government settlement, most acutely in social care;
3. the deletion of paragraph (e) and the addition of a new paragraph (e) as

follows:-

(e) believes that the Council must spend every pound carefully, prudently and transparently;

4. the deletion of paragraph (f) and the addition of a new paragraph (f) as follows:-

(f) believes that all BIPs as part of the 2024/25 budget must be deliverable, and also:-

(i) notes that the Medium-Term Financial Analysis (MTFA) highlights particular areas of pressure; high-cost placements for children in care, temporary accommodation, homelessness, and adult social care;

(ii) notes that nationally more children than ever are in the care system and their outcomes are getting worse, believes that the Government needs to support them significantly better and reduce cost of care packages, and notes that locally we are already working to ensure that the right costs for placements are being met and high-cost placements are being reviewed;

(iii) notes the continuing impact of the pandemic, with the high cost of care packages put in place during this time having a significant impact carrying into 2023/24; and

(iv) believes that the homelessness support provided by Government is woefully inadequate, noting that the Council is spending nearly £6million to bridge the gap between the amount accommodation costs to procure and the amount recovered via housing benefit;

5. the substitution of “2024/25” for “2025/26” in sub-paragraph (h)(ii).

9.3 It was then moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and seconded by Councillor Angela Argenzio, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition, at the end of paragraph (c)(ii), of the words “and thanks officers throughout the Council for their work in addressing very challenging budgets”.

2. the deletion of paragraph (d).

3. the addition of a new paragraph (d) as follows:-

(d) believes the committee system in No Overall Control has led to better and more robust decision-making;

4. the substitution, in paragraph (e), of the words “the Council being in No Overall Control” for the words “Liberal Democrat involvement”.
5. the deletion, in paragraph (f), of all the words after “Policy Committee Budgets”.
6. the deletion of paragraph (h) and the addition of a new paragraph (h) as follows:-
 - (h) looks forward to ongoing, cross-party budget monitoring and budget-setting over the course of this financial year.

9.4 After contributions from four other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Mike Levery, the amendment moved by Councillor Zahira Naz was put to the vote and was carried, but in part. Parts 1, 2, 4 and 5 of the amendment were carried [Part 2 to be an additional paragraph, not a replacement paragraph], and Part 3 of the amendment was lost.

9.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 39 Members; AGAINST - 24 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 2 Members. Although Liberal Democrat Group Members voted against, they voted for sub-paragraph (iii) of Part 1 of the amendment. Although Green Group Members voted for, they voted against Part 3 of the amendment and against that part of Part 2 of the amendment that proposed the deletion of paragraph (c).)

9.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was then put to the vote and was carried, but in part. Parts 1, 2 and 5 of the amendment were carried, and Parts 3, 4 and 6 of the amendment were lost.

9.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 41 Members; AGAINST - 22 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 2 Members. Although Labour Group Members voted for, they voted against Parts 3 and 4 of the amendment and abstained on Part 6 of the amendment. Although Liberal Democrat Group Members voted against, they voted for Part 1 of the amendment.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes with concern several recent high-profile Section 114 notices, particularly in Birmingham;
- (b) notes that Government funding has squeezed councils’ budgets over recent years, although, as with Birmingham, in Sheffield there are other factors, and in particular:-
 - (i) notes that since 2010 Sheffield has suffered from 13 years of

- austerity from the Coalition and Conservative governments;
- (ii) notes that this Council's funding has been cut by 29%, or £856 per resident in real terms since 2010, compared to the national average of 20% and £581 per resident; and
 - (iii) believes government needs to step-up and provide fairer funding, and as a Council we should continue being vocal in our demands;
- (c) notes that of the £70m reserves set aside in 2021/22 to cover overspends and balance future budgets:-
- (i) the Co-Operative Executive, during the final year of the strong leader model, used £19.8m to cover the 21/22 budget overspend, and £15m to balance the 22/23 budget; and
 - (ii) since then, under the committee system and no overall control, £5m was used to cover the 22/23 budget overspend, and no reserves were used to balance the 23/24 budget, leaving approximately £30m to cover future deficits, and thanks officers throughout the Council for their work in addressing very challenging budgets;
- (d)(i) notes that the Council has always balanced its budget; and
- (ii) notes that the Co-Operative Executive, when developing proposals for 2022/23, faced immediate challenges brought about by the covid pandemic and what this Council believes to be the woeful government settlement, most acutely in social care;
- (e) believes the introduction of the committee system and Liberal Democrat involvement has led to significantly improved financial management, as evidenced above;
- (f) believes that all BIPs as part of the 2024/25 budget must be deliverable, and also:-
- (i) notes that the Medium-Term Financial Analysis (MTFA) highlights particular areas of pressure; high-cost placements for children in care, temporary accommodation, homelessness, and adult social care;
 - (ii) notes that nationally more children than ever are in the care system and their outcomes are getting worse, believes that the Government needs to support them significantly better and reduce cost of care packages, and notes that locally we are already working to ensure that the right costs for placements are being met and high-cost placements are being reviewed;
 - (iii) notes the continuing impact of the pandemic, with the high cost of

care packages put in place during this time having a significant impact carrying into 2023/24; and

- (iv) believes that the homelessness support provided by Government is woefully inadequate, noting that the Council is spending nearly £6million to bridge the gap between the amount accommodation costs to procure and the amount recovered via housing benefit;
- (g) notes that construction inflation is compromising the Stock Increase Programme, and believes the Council must consider alternative approaches to increasing affordable housing, including closer work with Housing Associations; and
- (h) therefore, resolves that the Council implement:-
 - (i) a relentless focus on delivering this year's budget and BIP initiatives;
 - (ii) a commitment for all budgets from the start of 2024/25 to include no undeliverable BIPs;
 - (iii) a budget setting and BIP process that clearly identifies the quarter in 2024/25 that each BIP will impact, and the part year savings clearly identified if not at the start of the financial year; and
 - (iv) a clear plan on how BIP savings will be delivered.

9.6.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 33 Members; AGAINST - 30 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 2 Members. Although Labour Group Members voted against, they voted for paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (f), (g) and (h) of the Substantive Motion. Although Liberal Democrat Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (b)(i) and (ii), (d) and (f) of the Substantive Motion.)

10. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "PROTECTING SHEFFIELD FROM DANGEROUS DOGS" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR TOM HUNT AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MIKE CHAPLIN

10.1 It was moved by Councillor Tom Hunt, and seconded by Councillor Mike Chaplin, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the efforts of responsible dog owners in Sheffield who train their dogs properly resulting in well behaved dogs which offer companionship and enhance our communities;
- (b) notes the positive contribution made by responsible dog breeders which enable owners to select healthy well-adjusted dogs;

- (c) however, believes we cannot ignore the appalling evidence and increasing number of dog related incidents and the harm they cause - to children and adults, as well as pets, wildlife and livestock;
- (d) notes that nationally around 9,000 people a year are admitted to hospital with severe dog bites - up from 7,500 in 2017 - costing the NHS an estimated £71 million;
- (e) notes with alarm the recent horrific dog attacks in Sheffield and around the country;
- (f) believes we have seen too many devastating injuries from dogs, with shocking life-changing injuries sustained for both adults and young children;
- (g) notes that South Yorkshire Police have seen the number of dog related incidents double in five years and in the first three months of 2023 they found that XL Bullies accounted for 25% of aggressive dogs seized;
- (h) believes that dangerous dogs put our dedicated, hardworking Sheffield City Council staff and key workers, including homecare assistants and postal workers, at risk and in needless danger; and

therefore this Council:-

- (i) condemns illegal dog breeding and puppy farming; and
- (ii) calls on the Government to implement the ban on XL bullies without delay.

10.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Joe Otten, and formally seconded by Councillor Sue Alston, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (i) to (l) as follows:-

- (i) recognises that ambiguity around the definition of the XL bully and similar dogs, with or without a ban, poses additional challenges for dog control and animal care officers, alongside additional demands on the service as more potentially dangerous animals are likely to be rejected by their owners;
- (j) condemns the illegal and barbaric practice of dog fighting, which contributes to the criminal breeding of highly aggressive dogs;
- (k) highly appreciates the good work by dog rescue charities to find homes for unwanted dogs, often working with dogs with difficult behaviour;
- (l) welcomes the new kennelling strategy agreed by the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee, which will improve the conditions which dogs under the Council's care are kept in, and deliver a cost saving of £54k per year;

- 10.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and formally seconded by Councillor Martin Phipps, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-
1. the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows, and the re-lettering of all further paragraphs accordingly:-
 - (c) thanks dog shelters, charities and rescuers for their work caring for rescue dogs, and finding and supporting suitable new owners for them, and encourages those looking for a new dog to rehome a rescue;
 2. the addition [after the original paragraph (g), re-lettered as a new paragraph (h)] of a new paragraph (i) as follows:-
 - (i) believes that the rise in figures shows that more needs to be done to address unethical dog breeders, and to ensure that dogs are raised in a suitable environment by responsible owners;
 3. the addition of a new sub-paragraph (iii) in the “therefore this Council” section, as follows:-
 - (iii) calls on the Government to implement two-tier dog-licensing [breeding and non-breeding], licensing of all animal breeders and dog owners, and subsidised spaying and neutering, to ensure more responsible care of all dogs, not just selected breeds.
- 10.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Joe Otten was put to the vote and was carried unanimously.
- 10.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was then put to the vote and was carried, but in part. Parts 1 and 2 of the amendment were carried, and Part 3 of the amendment was lost.
- 10.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 65 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Although Labour Group and Liberal Democrat Group Members voted for, they voted against Part 3 of the amendment.)
- 10.6 The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and was carried unanimously:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the efforts of responsible dog owners in Sheffield who train their dogs properly resulting in well behaved dogs which offer companionship and enhance our communities;
- (b) notes the positive contribution made by responsible dog breeders which

enable owners to select healthy well-adjusted dogs;

- (c) thanks dog shelters, charities and rescuers for their work caring for rescue dogs, and finding and supporting suitable new owners for them, and encourages those looking for a new dog to rehome a rescue;
- (d) however, believes we cannot ignore the appalling evidence and increasing number of dog related incidents and the harm they cause - to children and adults, as well as pets, wildlife and livestock;
- (e) notes that nationally around 9,000 people a year are admitted to hospital with severe dog bites - up from 7,500 in 2017 - costing the NHS an estimated £71 million;
- (f) notes with alarm the recent horrific dog attacks in Sheffield and around the country;
- (g) believes we have seen too many devastating injuries from dogs, with shocking life-changing injuries sustained for both adults and young children;
- (h) notes that South Yorkshire Police have seen the number of dog related incidents double in five years and in the first three months of 2023 they found that XL Bullies accounted for 25% of aggressive dogs seized;
- (i) believes that the rise in figures shows that more needs to be done to address unethical dog breeders, and to ensure that dogs are raised in a suitable environment by responsible owners;
- (j) believes that dangerous dogs put our dedicated, hardworking Sheffield City Council staff and key workers, including homecare assistants and postal workers, at risk and in needless danger; and

therefore this Council:-

- (i) condemns illegal dog breeding and puppy farming; and
- (ii) calls on the Government to implement the ban on XL bullies without delay;
- (k) recognises that ambiguity around the definition of the XL bully and similar dogs, with or without a ban, poses additional challenges for dog control and animal care officers, alongside additional demands on the service as more potentially dangerous animals are likely to be rejected by their owners;
- (l) condemns the illegal and barbaric practice of dog fighting, which contributes to the criminal breeding of highly aggressive dogs;
- (m) highly appreciates the good work by dog rescue charities to find homes

- for unwanted dogs, often working with dogs with difficult behaviour; and
- (n) welcomes the new kennelling strategy agreed by the Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee, which will improve the conditions which dogs under the Council's care are kept in, and deliver a cost saving of £54k per year.

11. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

- 11.1 **RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY:** On the motion formally moved by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards and formally seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, that the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 6th September 2023 be approved as a true and accurate record.