

# Agenda Item 10

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 6 September 2017, at 5.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

## PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Anne Murphy)  
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Magid Magid)

1	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Andy Nash Bob Pullin Richard Shaw	10	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Andy Bainbridge	19	<i>Nether Edge &amp; Sharrow Ward</i> Mohammad Maroof Alison Teal
2	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	11	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Roger Davison Shaffaq Mohammed Paul Scriven	20	<i>Park &amp; Arbourthorne</i> Julie Dore Ben Miskell Jack Scott
3	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	12	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Abdul Khayum Alan Law Abtisam Mohamed	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> Mike Drabble Dianne Hurst Peter Rippon
4	<i>Broomhill &amp; Sharrow Vale Ward</i> Michelle Cook Kieran Harpham Magid Magid	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 Chris Peace	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Mike Chaplin Tony Damms Jayne Dunn
6	<i>City Ward</i> Douglas Johnson Robert Murphy Moya O'Rourke	15	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Sue Auckland Steve Ayriss	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Penny Baker Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Crookes &amp; Crosspool Ward</i> Craig Gamble Pugh Adam Hanrahan Anne Murphy	16	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	25	<i>Stocksbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Keith Davis
8	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea Zahira Naz	17	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Lisa Banes Terry Fox Pat Midgley	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Dore &amp; Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	18	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Tony Downing Gail Smith	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> John Booker Adam Hurst Zoe Sykes
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Paul Wood



**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jim Steinke and Steve Wilson.

**2. SUSPENSION AND AMENDMENT OF COUNCIL PROCEDURE RULES**

- 2.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Peter Rippon, and formally seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that in order to implement changes to the operation of the full Council meeting in accordance with the outcome of the Review of Full Council Meetings Member Working Group, approval be given, for the duration of this meeting and (via suspension of Council Procedure Rule 4.1) the next two meetings, to certain revisions to the Council Procedure Rules, as set out in the schedule included with the agenda for this meeting, but with the substitution of the words “item of business” for the word “matter”, which appears once on page 3 of the schedule and three times on page 4.
- 2.2 Whereupon it was moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be approved with the exception of the rule relating to CPR 10.2 relating to a limit on the number of motions and altering the order of motions, which this Council believes favours the ruling group.
- 2.2.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the amendment (Councillor Douglas Johnson), the amendment as circulated at the meeting was altered by the insertion of the words “this Council believes” between the words “which” and “favours”.)
- 2.3 On being put to the vote, the altered amendment was negatived.
- 2.4 The original Motion was then put to the vote and carried as follows:-

<p>RESOLVED: That in order to implement changes to the operation of the full Council meeting in accordance with the outcome of the Review of Full Council Meetings Member Working Group, approval be given, for the duration of this meeting and (via suspension of Council Procedure Rule 4.1) the next two meetings, to certain revisions to the Council Procedure Rules, as set out in the schedule included with the agenda for this meeting, but with the substitution of the words “item of business” for the word “matter”, which appears once on page 3 of the schedule and three times on page 4.</p>
--

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

- 3.1 Declarations of Interests in the Business Considered at the Meeting
- 3.1.1 Councillor Jack Clarkson declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 14 - Notice of Motion regarding Review of Student Accommodation, due to him being a member of the Council’s Planning and Highways Committee.

- 3.1.2 Councillor Joe Otten (a) declared a personal interest, as a Friend of Dore and Totley Station, in Agenda Items 5 and 7 – Notices of Motion regarding Securing Better Transport for Sheffield and the North, and The Electrification of Midland Mainline, respectively and (b) indicated that, due to him being a member of the Council's Planning and Highways Committee, he would not participate in Agenda Item 14 - Notice of Motion regarding Review of Student Accommodation, in the interests of avoiding pre-determining his views on future applications for development of student accommodation.
- 3.1.3 Councillor Bryan Lodge declared personal interests in Agenda Items 5 and 7 – Notices of Motion regarding Securing Better Transport for Sheffield and the North, and The Electrification of Midland Mainline, respectively, due to him being an employee of Carillion and his wife being an employee of East Midlands Trains.
- 3.1.4 Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed declared a personal interest in Agenda Items 5 and 7 – Notices of Motion regarding Securing Better Transport for Sheffield and the North, and The Electrification of Midland Mainline, respectively, due to his son being an employee of Carillion.
- 3.1.5 Councillor Abdul Khayum declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 14 - Notice of Motion regarding Review of Student Accommodation, due to him being a private sector landlord.
- 3.1.6 During the debate on Agenda Item 6 - Notice of Motion regarding Tackling the Damage of Fixed-Odds Betting Terminals, reference was made to casinos and, as a result, (a) Councillor Tony Damms declared a personal interest due to him being an employee of A & S Leisure Group Ltd and (b) Councillor Paul Wood declared a personal interest due to his company being a supplier of services to Genting Casinos.
- 3.2 Councillor Steve Wilson – Declaration of Interest Made at the Council Meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2016
- 3.2.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) stated that she had been asked by Councillor Steve Wilson to clarify, on his behalf, due to his absence at this meeting, the declaration of interest that he made on two Notices of Motion considered by the Council at its meeting on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2016 in relation to Fracking. She reported that the minutes of that meeting indicate that Councillor Wilson had declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in those items of business on the grounds that he had undertaken work for a lobbying company, but that Councillor Wilson wishes to point out that his declaration was on the grounds that he had provided unpaid advice to a lobbying company, and has requested that the record of the declarations be amended accordingly.
- 3.2.2 The Council agreed that the record of Councillor Wilson's declarations on 2<sup>nd</sup> November 2016 be amended appropriately.

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

##### **4.1 Lord Mayor's Communications**

4.1.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Anne Murphy) commented on the success of the Special Olympics National Games which was held recently in the city, with around 2,600 athletes with intellectual disabilities participating in the Games, and she commended the dedication and work of the athletes, their coaches and the many volunteers who contributed so much to make the event such a resounding success.

4.1.2 The Lord Mayor also reported that she had recently written on behalf of the Council to the First Sea Lord and Chief of Naval Staff requesting that one of the Navy's next generation T26 Frigates be named after the city of Sheffield. She added that the Royal Navy's Commodore for Northern England would be visiting the city on 5<sup>th</sup> October, and she would update Members of the Council on any developments in relation to the naming request.

##### **4.2 Petitions**

###### **4.2.1 Petition Requesting Fencing around Football Pitches, Reignhead Farm Fields, Beighton**

The Council received a petition requesting fencing around Football Pitches, Reignhead Farm Fields, Beighton.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were received from Samantha Pickersgill, who informed the Council that there was a problem with dog fouling on the football pitches and this presented a health risk to people including players and volunteers at the MDS Falcons football club. Volunteers had to clean up the pitches before each game. The local community had been asked to clear up after their dogs and there were dog bins provided. However, whilst there were many responsible dog owners, others were not as responsible and also let their dogs roam whilst football matches were being played. The petition requested fencing around the football pitches to address the problem and for key-holders to be assigned.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure. Councillor Lea stated that the local Councillors for the area had also raised the issue with her. Some measures had already been taken in relation to the problems presented by dog fouling, including a greater number of bins and increased number of dog warden patrols. There were some unthinking dog owners and also many highly responsible dog owners.

Councillor Lea requested that the petitioners meet with her, local councillors and the relevant Council Officers to discuss the problems and to see what could be done.

4.2.2 Petition Requesting the Withdrawal of the Freedom of The City from Aung San Suu Kyi

The Council received a petition requesting the withdrawal of the Freedom of The City from Aung San Suu Kyi.

Representations of behalf of the petitioners were made by Shahid Ali, who stated that there was a time when Sheffield people supported Aung San Suu Kyi for promoting democracy and human rights in Myanmar. However, he stated, she had now become complicit in possible crimes against humanity. The Freedom of the City was the highest honour that the City could bestow and it was something which she deserved at the time it was granted. However, her more recent actions were of concern, such as her silence on issues relating to the violation of human rights of the Rohingya people in Myanmar. The petition requested that the City Council withdraw the Freedom of the City from Aung San Suu Kyi and write to the Foreign Office and Myanmar Ambassador to the UK informing them of the action and to encourage them to fight for the rights of the Rohingya. A protest about the events in Myanmar would take place this day outside the City Hall.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council. Councillor Dore thanked the petitioners for bringing the tragic events which were occurring in respect of the Rohingya people in Myanmar to the Council's attention. She shared the sentiment expressed by the petitioners and by Shahid Ali in presenting the matter to Council. The Council had worked with the Burmese community and had indeed granted the honour of the Freedom of the City to Aung San Suu Kyi. The persecution of the Rohingya and abuses of human rights meant there was a sense of betrayal of the support which the Council had once given to Aung San Suu Kyi.

The Freedom of the City was granted by the full Council and as Leader of the Council it would not be right for her to commit the Council to action with regard to the withdrawal of that honour as it would be a decision of Council. She referred to a question on this issue which had also been submitted and said that she would begin cross party discussions with the other political groups on the Council so that a response could be made to the petition and to the other requests which had been made concerning representations to the Foreign office and Myanmar Ambassador to the UK. She thanked the petitioners for the invitation to attend the event outside of the City Hall and said that, although the Council meeting was taking place at the same time as the event, a representative would be attending from amongst the City Councillors.

4.3 Petition Requiring Debate

4.3.1 Petition Requesting a Night Café for the Homeless and Vulnerable

The Council received an electronic petition containing 7,538 signatures entitled "Night Café for the Homeless and Vulnerable". The Council's

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

“Services at night & weekends are none existent. With the help of local businesses and volunteers we would like to run a night cafe for the most vulnerable within our city and to finally bridge the gap between charities & services from closing to opening. The night cafe will also support services getting information out & help guide people to the right places and be a hub at weekends to act as further support for the outreach teams like street pastors and police to bring people instead of tying up emergency services.”

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Anthony Cunningham. He said that he believed that the situation was worsening for people who slept rough or were homeless. Something was needed at night time to provide a safe and supported place for people and the establishment of a night café would help to meet the need for 24 hour support and bridge the gap in services, support vulnerable people and lessen the need for so much assistance from the emergency services. He believed that this was something positive which the Council could do for homeless people and which had been promised.

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

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety responded to the petition. She said that, in July 2017, the Council had debated a petition concerning the establishment of a night shelter for homeless people. She referred to a private meeting which had been held with Mr Cunningham concerning support for homeless people at which there was discussion about a number of options to help support people who were vulnerable, on the streets or were homeless. However, there had not been a promise made at that meeting that a café would be established. The Council had consulted with other organisations, including charities and an event had been arranged by the charity Roundabout, and those organisations participating in that event were not supportive of the idea of a night café.

Councillor Dunn said that September was Recovery Month 2017 and there were honest accounts as part of that event by people who had been affected by addiction. She said that it was right that gaps in services at weekends were addressed. A Rough Sleeper Development Worker would begin in post shortly and it was intended that 24 hour support was made available for people. The Housing First service had housed 39 people to date and accommodation for a further seven people had been purchased in addition. St Wilfrid's was providing self-contained units for up to 20 people. She also referred to the Help Us Help initiative, which helped people who were rough sleepers or begged in Sheffield.

Councillor Dunn said that there were new services being put in place to support homeless people. Whilst she could understand why some people would think the idea of a night café was a good one, it was not something that would be supported by the Council. She said that the issues relating to rough sleeping would be considered by the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee and suggested that the petition was referred to the Committee for consideration.

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

It was important that the right professionals and experts were involved in providing services for some of the most vulnerable people in society and that the right support was provided to them. The significant amount of work by voluntary and charity organisations was also acknowledged. It was suggested that the matter was taken to the relevant Scrutiny Committee for further consideration.

The view was expressed that there was a need to look after vulnerable people at night and a night café may be a way of doing so and providing respite and relief to people who were affected by addiction, abuse or mental health or other health problems, such as post-traumatic stress disorder. An example was given of the All Night Café at Camberley, Surrey.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, responded to matters which were raised during the debate. She said that at the recent event hosted by Roundabout, a night café was not something which service users had requested. It was proposed that the matter would be referred to the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, when the issues could be considered in more detail, together with the appropriate evidence.

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

RESOLVED on the Motion of Councillor Jayne Dunn, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon: That this Council (a) notes the petition calling for a night café for the homeless and vulnerable, (b) notes that rough sleeping will be the subject of discussion at a meeting of the Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee in the near future and (c) accordingly, refers the petition to that Committee for consideration as part of that discussion.
---

(Note: During the course of the above item, the Lord Mayor requested that Mr Cunningham leave the meeting on the grounds that he was continuing to interrupt the proceedings. He did not return to the Council Chamber during the item and did not exercise a right of reply).

#### 4.4 Other petitions



4.4.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Save the Sheffield Elm

The Council received an electronic petition containing 3,223 signatures, requesting the Council to save the Sheffield Elm.

There was no speaker to the petition.

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

4.4.2 Petition requesting the Council to Bring Bus Travel Back Under the Control of the People of Sheffield

The Council received an electronic petition containing 27 signatures, requesting the Council to bring bus travel back under the control of the people of Sheffield.

There was no speaker to the petition.

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

4.4.3 Petition Requesting the Council to Stop Debating Tree Issues in Front of More Important Issues

The Council received an electronic petition containing 8 signatures, requesting the Council to stop debating tree issues in front of more important issues.

There was no speaker to the petition.

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

4.5 Public Questions

4.5.1 Public Question Concerning School Buses

Mike Lavery stated that school buses were provided by both Notre Dame and Stocksbridge High schools. Buses from Chapeltown and High Green were a combination of service bus and school bus and took 85 minutes to make the journey. The buses were overcrowded owing to bus drivers feeling that they had to pick up all children on the route. He said that he did not believe it was the schools' responsibility to fund the buses.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that the former commercial provider of the school bus service on this route, the Bright Bus Company, gave notice to the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (SYPTTE) that it was ceasing to

operate all its routes in South Yorkshire, which included many services across Sheffield, including Stocksbridge and Chapeltown to Notre Dame. The SYPTC and City Council had worked hard to ensure replacement provision so there was an opportunity to travel from Stocksbridge and Chapeltown to Notre Dame. However, pupils may have to change buses to complete their journey. She understood that these routes were commercial routes and she believed other bus companies had been contacted to see if they would take them on but none had come forward. It was unfortunate that young people now had to use more than one bus to make the journey. However, they were able to get to school. Councillor Drayton said that she would follow up the questions from Mr Levery and send him a written response.

#### 4.5.2 Public Question Concerning Anti-Social Behaviour

Mrs Harrison expressed concerns about the behaviour of a resident living in a block of flats, including activity in the early hours of the morning such as ringing of the door buzzer, fighting and arguments and drug use. The Police had become involved but she said that residents did not feel safe and wanted something to be done urgently.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety responded that the situation was not acceptable and that she would ask for someone to contact Mrs Harrison about the concerns that she had raised. She would also speak with the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care and could also meet with Mrs Harrison in person.

#### 4.5.3 Public Question Concerning the NHS

Deborah Cobbett said she was concerned about the NHS and the rapid changes in South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw, which she believed amounted to the destruction of the NHS. She referred to the Accountable Care System, which was to be in place by April 2018, in relation to which local councils were being side-lined as partners in the process. She said that process was rushed and there was a lack of democratic control.

She referred to a Council resolution in 2016 on the subject of the NHS and which expressed opposition to budget cuts. She asked what was being done to help improve clarity for the public and what the Council was doing to resist further cuts.

Councillor Cate McDonald, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care stated that the Council's position with regards to the NHS and Sustainability and Transformation Plans (STP) was clear. She said that STPs were a brand which had been discredited and there had been a change to the Accountable Care System. She did not support anything which would lead to the imposition of cuts to the NHS.

The Council would continue to work with the NHS to do the best for the people of Sheffield. A paper would be submitted to Cabinet concerning the Sheffield Accountable Care Partnership and, as part of that process, there

would be appropriate arrangements with respect to governance. She agreed that there was too little transparency and accountability in the health system and, in line with the resolution of December 2016, the Council would oppose cuts to the NHS.

#### 4.5.4 Public Question Concerning Proposed Micro Pub, Cross Hill, Ecclesfield

James Kay referred to the proposed Micro Pub, Cross Hill, Ecclesfield and asked several questions in relation to the planning process, as follows:-

1. Why were the parking guidelines outlined in the Unitary Development Plan not enforced in the planning decision?
2. Why did the Council not record Planning Committee meetings as a matter of course?
3. Was it normal practice for planning officers to act on an anonymous telephone call for a statement made in a report?
4. Why did the Chair of the Planning Committee meeting stop the vote before abstentions were called for when the counted vote at that point was three in favour and four against.
5. Was it appropriate for a member of the Committee to participate and vote on an item then they were also on the Licensing Committee?

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Planning and Development, responded to the questions and explained that his role as the Cabinet Member was in relation to strategic planning and development matters, whereas the Planning and Highways Committee had delegated decision making powers in relation to planning matters. He would therefore not address the detail of issues at the Committee as part of his response at this point. Nonetheless, he said that he was aware of the Planning Committee meeting to which Mr Kay had referred and he had been assured that Members of the Committee had followed the correct procedures.

Councillor Curran suggested to Mr Kay that a meeting was arranged to discuss further the matters which he had raised and said that he would contact Mr Kay accordingly. In relation to recording of meetings and webcasting, he said that a cross party Member Working Group was looking at the issue and he hoped that a way could be found to make that work.

#### 4.5.5 Public Question Concerning Myanmar

Kaltun Elmi thanked the Council for its support for the Rohingya Muslims, which she said were being persecuted by the army in Myanmar. She asked whether the Council would consider revoking the Freedom of the City of Sheffield granted to Aung San Suu Kyi, as she had not condemned the treatment of the Rohingya and incidents of rape and murder. She also asked

that Councillors join people on the steps of the City Hall to show solidarity with the Rohingya people and to call upon the UK Government to impose sanctions on the Government of Myanmar.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, referred to her earlier response to the petition on this matter, which had been submitted to this meeting. The Council was meeting under new arrangements and there were items to be debated, so she did not feel that the meeting should be paused for Members to attend the event outside the City Hall on this occasion. However, the issue would be discussed as she had outlined and if there was another occasion on which Members could attend an event concerning the issue of Myanmar, then that would be something which could be done.

Responding to an earlier comment by the questioner concerning personal safety at meetings, Councillor Dore said that she apologised if anybody felt unsafe due to behaviour in the Council meeting, either as a visitor or as a councillor. She said that she hoped the Member Working Group would consider the issue of safety as part of its programme of work.

#### 4.5.6 Public Question Concerning Engagement

Alan Kewley stated that for some people, meetings held in the Town Hall were potentially daunting. He referred to other opportunities for people to engage informally with the Council, such as ward forums and to a neighbourhood working model. He asked when the Council would fulfil the engagement plan to enable people to discuss issues locally and express their opinions and how people would be consulted about its effectiveness.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety stated that she had met with Mr Kewley recently. She said that the ideas which had been considered in 2013 relating to locality management were now considered to be out of date. It was also felt that councillors should be in the community more. She and her Cabinet Adviser had visited Rotherham and the Commissioners at Rotherham had retained the issue of public engagement under their control.

The Council was looking at a neighbourhood model, which was more organic in nature, involved speaking with people and would not necessarily be characterised by the establishment of structures or meetings.

#### 4.5.7 Public Question Concerning the Living Wage

Peter Davies stated that the trades unions' understanding of the Council's policy concerning the living wage was that the Council would do all that it could to make sure that companies delivering public sector contracted work would pay the living wage. He said, with regard to the Household Waste Recycling Contract, that Veolia was refusing to pay the real living wage. He asked whether the will of the Council and its intention to meet expectations with regards the living wage had now disappeared.

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Deputy Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Finance, responded that the Council did encourage contractors to pay the living wage. The Household Waste Recycling Contract was subcontracted and was not a contract directly let by the Council. The Council was open to working with contractors to achieve the living wage as soon as possible, although there were limitations.

#### 4.5.8 Public Question Concerning the Council Pay Strategy

Peter Davies referred to proposals for a pay strategy and a four year pay restraint on increments for Council employees. He said that the number of employees on high grades was increasing and employees had already had a cut in their standard of living. He asked how the Council was able to justify dismissals and reengagement of thousands of its workers in order to get a further pay cut imposed.

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Deputy Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Finance stated that the Council's pay strategy was subject to consultation at the present time and to negotiations with the Trades Unions, which were seeking the views of their members through a ballot. The negotiations were ongoing and she said that she would not wish to comment further on the detail of those negotiations at this point in time. Councillor Blake said that she would be pleased to meet and discuss the matters further with Mr Davies.

#### 4.5.9 Public Question Concerning Webcasting and Arrangements for Council Meetings

Nigel Slack referred to new arrangements for Council meetings and he asked a question in relation to the progress of webcasting of meetings and as to why it was only being considered, when he said there had been a commitment to introduce webcasting two years ago. He asked for clarification with respect to the wording included on the Council agenda relating to notices of motion submitted to Council, which was as follows:

“The following 4 items of business are Notices of Motion submitted in line with the outcome of the Review of Full Council Meetings Member Working Group. 2 further Notices of Motion are included on the agenda as items of business 13 & 14, as these were submitted at variance to the decision of the Working Group.”

He also asked whether it was possible for the minutes of the Working Group to be published.

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Finance, responded that a trial video recording was being produced of this meeting of Council and it was important that such a recording was of a sufficient quality and that it was affordable. Councillor Blake requested the Chief Executive to outline a response in relation to the constitutional changes.

The Chief Executive explained that the cross party Member Working Group had concluded to limit the number of notices of motion to four at each meeting. The number of motions allocated to each political group was two to the Labour group; one to the Liberal Democrat Group and one to the UKIP and Green groups on alternate months.

For this meeting of Council, four notices of motion were received in line with those arrangements and two others were also received. At that point, within the Council procedure rules, there was not a power to exclude notices of motion from the agenda based on the number received and therefore all six were included. The explanation included on the agenda sought to provide clarity about those motions which had been received in line with the conclusions of the Working Group and those which had not.

#### 4.5.10 Public Question Concerning Streets Ahead

Nigel Slack stated that Streets Ahead had recently published a Newsletter in August 2017, in which it was stated that Amey had "Resurfaced 693 miles of road". He asked whether the Council could remind people of the total mileage due to be resurfaced by the contract and how that was planned to be achieved within the 'core investment period' of the contract.

He commented that the newsletter did not have the word 'tree' anywhere in it. He asked if Council knew whether this is because trees were unimportant to Streets Ahead or if this was simply trying to avoid embarrassment.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, stated that there were approximately 100 miles of carriageway still to be completed as part of the core investment period of the Streets Ahead programme. Amey was working to complete to programme and was deploying additional resource at its own cost.

As regards the Amey Newsletter, Councillor Lodge confirmed that the Council did consider street trees to be important and that trees were being replaced for future generations.

#### 4.5.11 Public Question Concerning Mistaken Information

Nigel Slack stated that there appeared to be mistaken information from the 'Environment' portfolio, including what he said was contradictory information in relation to the filming of members of the public engaged in peaceful protest.

He referred to notices displayed by Amey, which he said misrepresented the details of the injunction. Information on the Council's website put it slightly differently; and his question included what the injunction had stated.

He asked, firstly whether both statements were wrong in law, because any charge of contempt would require a hearing in court, and he said that they

verged on being attempts to subvert a person's right to protest through their intimidatory phrasing and plain threats about the consequences of unintended actions. Secondly, he asked the Council to refer this portfolio to the relevant scrutiny or indeed standards committee, to urgently review the seeming lack of openness and honesty as described by the Code of Conduct.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, responded and said that he did not agree with Mr Slack's interpretation of the situation with regard to 'mistaken information'. In reference to an article in the Yorkshire Post, dated 24 August 2017 to which Mr Slack had provided a link in his written question, Councillor Lodge said that previous information had been used in the article and comment been not been sought from the Council for that article.

He said that the wording in the notices did not misrepresent the Court Order. He added that he did not wish for anyone to get in trouble in relation to protests and that the notices were in place and that individuals would make their own informed decision on such matters.

In relation to the question relating to the Code of Conduct, Councillor Lodge said that a complaint could be made through the Standards procedure and a response would be made following the assessment of allegations by the Council's Monitoring Officer in consultation with an Independent Person.

#### 4.5.12 Public Question Concerning Direct Action

Nigel Slack referred to campaigns which had involved direct action against wrong but lawful situations, including the Kinder Trespass, Samuel Holberry and the Chartists, the Battle of Cable Street, Charlottesville; and the Suffragettes. He said that the first two of these were commemorated by plaques in Sheffield the last was commemorated by the six female members of the Council's Cabinet and the other female Councillors on the Council.

He said that prominent Cabinet Members were now saying all direct action against 'lawful' situations is unacceptable and the Council was willing to forward that argument in court cases and asked at what point would Council consider direct action in support of a sincerely held and passionate belief that a situation, whilst lawful, was just plain wrong becomes a citizens duty?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded that the question which Mr Slack had asked contained some subjective language in referring to direct action against 'wrong' and there was a question as to whether a 'wrong' was something determined by an individual or the collective. There might be occasions when it was a personal choice to take direct action.

Councillor Dore said that she had participated in protests in relation to several issues, including in relation to Government austerity, on picket lines or in relation to support for the steel industry. Whilst she did support people's right to take direct action, she personally had not taken action which was

illegal or which had led to her arrest. However, that had not prevented her from taking direct action to bring about change.

#### 4.5.13 Public Question Concerning Devolution

Nigel Slack referred to a post on social media from the Business Editor of The Star, which suggested the devolution deal was unlikely to go ahead, with Barnsley and Doncaster refusing to sign. He asked: what was Council's latest understanding of the current position?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that with regard to the suggestion that a devolution deal would not go ahead, she was not aware of Doncaster and Barnsley Councils not signing the deal, as the process was not yet at that point and the final detail was not known. The next stage in the process was for the Sheffield City Region to consult in accordance with the findings of the Judgement following the Judicial Review. The matter would then be put to the Secretary of State and Parliament and elections for the elected mayor for the City Region were scheduled for 2018. Councillor Dore acknowledged that there was a relatively short timescale for a decision on the devolution deal prior to further Parliamentary consideration of the issue.

#### 4.5.14 Public Questions Concerning Street Trees

(Note: A member of the public, Sally Goldsmith referred to the felling of an Alder tree and in relation to which Councillor Bryan Lodge undertook to provide a written response upon receipt of the question in writing.)

Russell Johnson asked why the Council was spending money to hire private detectives to monitor citizens and as to the intention of such activity.

Dave Dillner asked what had happened to the section of the Tree Strategy regarding street trees, which people had been told was imminent two years ago.

Mr Buxton stated that the five year tree management strategy was an integral part of the Streets Ahead contract and he asked which provisions applied to the contract and why a Freedom of Information request had been referred to the Information Commissioner's Office. Secondly, he asked what would happen if the Council decided to deny Amey permission to fell a tree and thirdly, whether there were 14 funded engineering solutions written into the Streets Ahead contract.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, responded to the questions. He said that overt filming took place to record people and there was no right to privacy in a public place. In circumstances such as a blockade of a depot, evidence could be gathered and data would be disposed of when it was no longer required.

He said that if the Council was to say that Amey could not fell a tree, it would



be the Council's responsibility. A change to the arrangements would require liaison between the Department for Transport, banks, Amey and the Council.

With regard to the question concerning the Freedom of Information request, Councillor Lodge asked if Mr Buxton would put the matter in writing, so that he was able to respond.

Councillor Lodge said that there was a strategy for Trees and Woodlands which was primarily concerned with parks trees and not highway trees. The highway related Tree Management Strategy would be revised at the end of the core investment period of the Streets Ahead programme and into the life cycle phase of the programme. Work was progressing on the remainder of the programme. There were some four million trees in Sheffield and approximately 36 thousand highways trees.

**5. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "SECURING BETTER TRANSPORT FOR SHEFFIELD AND THE NORTH" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACK SCOTT AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR OLIVIA BLAKE**

5.1 It was moved by Councillor Jack Scott, and seconded by Councillor Olivia Blake, that this Council:-

- a) welcomes the confirmation by the Government that high-speed services will run into Sheffield Midland station, and notes that the Labour Group have always championed the benefits of a city centre location for HS2 as this is where the greatest economic impact, transport benefits and job creation will be delivered;
- (b) applauds the leadership, determination and hard work of the Council Leader, Councillor Julie Dore, in securing a HS2 city centre location, which will bring the maximum benefits for the whole of South Yorkshire;
- (c) affirms that a city centre location is vital to ensuring Sheffield is well placed to maximise the benefits of HS2, and allows for the integration of HS2 with HS3, but believes this must extend to the north as well as to the south;
- (d) highlights that whilst we welcome the fact that HS2 Ltd have committed to funding a junction, this Administration will be seeking further commitments from the Government to ensure that the connection north of Sheffield is funded to enable high speed connections out of Midland and up to places like Leeds and Newcastle;
- (e) notes that despite the hugely positive news that HS2 will be coming to the centre of Sheffield, the Government have cancelled the electrification of the Midland Mainline which was due to be electrified by 2023; the Government have decided that 'bi-mode' trains - which can switch from electric to diesel power – will instead be introduced;

- (f) believes that this move is outrageous and will deny Sheffield faster, greener, more reliable train journeys which would have been a big boost to our economy and would have led to significantly improved air quality, another key aspiration of this Administration, particularly given the Government's woefully inadequate Air Quality Plan;
- (g) believes that the Government's decision to cancel the electrification of the Midland Mainline is even more outrageous, given that the Government are continuing with Crossrail 2, a new London rail line, which will cost around £30 billion - denoting that whilst there is extra money for the south, the north continues to get neglected under this Government;
- (h) notes that despite this significant setback, it is encouraging that HS2 Ltd said they would ensure that Sheffield was HS2-ready so it could benefit from a spur into the city centre off the main line, being, therefore, unaffected by the Government's decision regarding the lack of electrification on the existing line from Sheffield to Kettering, and that this Administration will continue to hold HS2 Ltd to account to ensure this happens;
- (i) believes that as a nation we are too London-centric and too centralised; and that much more needs to be done to empower all England's regions; figures from the think-tank Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) show that funding per head in London for transport is £3,400 compared to just £427 per head in the north, and in total the north would have seen £59 billion more for transport if funded the same as London, and therefore, support is given to calls from Andy Burnham, Mayor of Greater Manchester, for this to be addressed urgently; and
- (j) states that the disparity between transport in the north of England and London must now be addressed and reiterates comments made by Council Leader, Councillor Julie Dore, prior to the transport summit in Leeds, that the Government must:-
  - (i) commit to making an integrated transport network across the whole of the north and especially a commitment to a Northern Powerhouse Rail; and
  - (ii) commit to upgrades that will make an immediate difference – particularly reversing their decision to cancel the electrification of the Midland Mainline.

5.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Martin Smith, and seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the replacement, in paragraph (b), of the words "the Council Leader,

Councillor Julie Dore” by the words “many people from the private and public sector”; and

2. the addition of a new paragraph (j) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraph (j) as a new paragraph (k):-

(j) regrets that continuing disagreement between Labour-controlled councils in South Yorkshire has called into question the election of the Sheffield City Region mayor which is depriving our region of a strong voice on strategic transport issues such as the electrification of Midland Mainline, whereas cities such as Manchester and Liverpool are already beginning to reap the benefits of devolution;

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

1. the deletion of paragraphs (a) to (e) and the addition of new paragraphs (a) to (e) as follows:-

(a) notes the new HS2 Route will result in the loss of hundreds of homes in the city region and a reduction in services stopping in Sheffield City Region compared to the original proposal;

(b) believes that if the Government and Administration were serious about the Northern Powerhouse Rail, their top priority would be improved rail links between northern cities rather than faster journeys to London;

(c) notes the proposal from HS2 will not provide the benefits of “substantially reduced journey times” or “release space on the conventional rail network for new commuter, regional and freight services”, the statements used as justification for Sheffield City Council supporting the concept of High Speed Rail;

(d) notes that no high-speed track will be laid in the city of Sheffield, and believes that the proposal is effectively a high-speed bypass cutting through the City Region;

(e) is not surprised that, considering the spiralling costs of HS2 (up from £32 billion to £55 billion), other rail investments, such as electrification of Midland Mainline, are being stopped to save money;

2. the addition of the following words at the beginning of paragraph (f) - “believes electrification of the Midland Mainline would have brought many of the benefits of HS2 at a fraction of the cost and disruption to the area, and”;

3. the deletion of paragraph (h) and the addition of new paragraphs (h) to (n) as follows:-

- (h) notes that despite reportedly spending £190,000 of council tax payers' money, the Administration failed to persuade HS2 to site a station at Sheffield Victoria and believes that the proposed site of Sheffield Midland Station will not provide the economic benefits, capacity and connectivity improvements that a Sheffield Victoria option claimed;
  - (i) notes the Administration's proposal failed to win the support of other South Yorkshire Councils and caused animosity with other areas of the City Region, and believes that this has thereby damaged the close working relationship necessary for effective devolution;
  - (j) notes that current proposals include no improvement to journey times between Sheffield and Leeds;
  - (k) notes that there are currently further delays to rail improvements between Sheffield and Manchester;
  - (l) notes that the proposed Tram/Train service between Sheffield and Rotherham is significantly delayed and vastly over budget;
  - (m) believes that this Administration has shown itself to be incompetent with regards to improving our city's rail services; and
  - (n) apologises to passengers who regularly have to deal with overcrowding and poor services on local routes;
4. the re-lettering of original paragraphs (i) and (j) as new paragraphs (o) and (p).

5.4 Following debate on the matter under consideration, and a right of reply from Councillor Jack Scott, the amendment moved by Councillor Martin Smith was put to the vote and negated.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the confirmation by the Government that high-speed services will run into Sheffield Midland station, and notes that the Labour Group have always championed the benefits of a city centre location for HS2 as this is where the greatest economic impact, transport benefits and job creation will be delivered;
- (b) applauds the leadership, determination and hard work of the Council Leader, Councillor Julie Dore, in securing a HS2 city centre location,

which will bring the maximum benefits for the whole of South Yorkshire;

- (c) affirms that a city centre location is vital to ensuring Sheffield is well placed to maximise the benefits of HS2, and allows for the integration of HS2 with HS3, but believes this must extend to the north as well as to the south;
- (d) highlights that whilst we welcome the fact that HS2 Ltd have committed to funding a junction, this Administration will be seeking further commitments from the Government to ensure that the connection north of Sheffield is funded to enable high speed connections out of Midland and up to places like Leeds and Newcastle;
- (e) notes that despite the hugely positive news that HS2 will be coming to the centre of Sheffield, the Government have cancelled the electrification of the Midland Mainline which was due to be electrified by 2023; the Government have decided that 'bi-mode' trains - which can switch from electric to diesel power – will instead be introduced;
- (f) believes that this move is outrageous and will deny Sheffield faster, greener, more reliable train journeys which would have been a big boost to our economy and would have led to significantly improved air quality, another key aspiration of this Administration, particularly given the Government's woefully inadequate Air Quality Plan;
- (g) believes that the Government's decision to cancel the electrification of the Midland Mainline is even more outrageous, given that the Government are continuing with Crossrail 2, a new London rail line, which will cost around £30 billion - denoting that whilst there is extra money for the south, the north continues to get neglected under this Government;
- (h) notes that despite this significant setback, it is encouraging that HS2 Ltd said they would ensure that Sheffield was HS2-ready so it could benefit from a spur into the city centre off the main line, being, therefore, unaffected by the Government's decision regarding the lack of electrification on the existing line from Sheffield to Kettering, and that this Administration will continue to hold HS2 Ltd to account to ensure this happens;
- (i) believes that as a nation we are too London-centric and too centralised; and that much more needs to be done to empower all England's regions; figures from the think-tank Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) show that funding per head in London for transport is £3,400 compared to just £427 per head in the north, and in total the north would have seen £59 billion more for transport if funded the same as London, and therefore, support is given to calls from Andy Burnham, Mayor of Greater Manchester, for this to be

addressed urgently; and

- (j) states that the disparity between transport in the north of England and London must now be addressed and reiterates comments made by Council Leader, Councillor Julie Dore, prior to the transport summit in Leeds, that the Government must:-
  - (i) commit to making an integrated transport network across the whole of the north and especially a commitment to a Northern Powerhouse Rail; and
  - (ii) commit to upgrades that will make an immediate difference – particularly reversing their decision to cancel the electrification of the Midland Mainline.

5.6.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) and (c) to (j) of the Motion, and voted against paragraph (b) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

2. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (f), (g), (i) and (j) of the Motion, and voted against paragraphs (a) to (e) and (h) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

**6. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "THE ELECTRIFICATION OF MIDLAND MAINLINE" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR IAN AUCKLAND AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR JOE OTTEN**

6.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Peter Rippon and seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.1, the order of business as published on the Council Summons be altered by taking item 7 on the agenda (Notice of Motion Regarding the Electrification of Midland Mainline) as the next item of business, in view of its subject matter being similar to the previous item of business considered at the meeting.

6.2 It was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, and seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, that this Council:-

- (a) regrets the Government's decision to scrap plans announced in 2012 by former Deputy Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon Nick Clegg, to electrify the Midland Mainline to Sheffield;
- (b) believes that the decision by Transport Secretary, the Rt. Hon. Chris Grayling MP, to announce his support for Crossrail 2 adds insult to

injury and demonstrates that this Government has abandoned its commitment to the Northern Powerhouse;

- (c) is disappointed that research by Institute For Public Policy Research (IPPR) North shows Yorkshire and the Humber will get £190 per head of transport spending from 2016/17 onwards compared to £220 in the North East, £680 in the North West and £1,940 in London;
- (d) believes that investment in transport connections across the north of England is vital to the goal of rebalancing the economy and bringing more investment and jobs to the north;
- (e) further notes Transport for the North's independent research published in 2016 in the Northern Powerhouse Independent Economic Review which shows how new investments including 'HS3' could unlock up to £97 billion and create 850,000 new jobs by 2050;
- (f) notes that, to date, 85,000 people have signed a petition calling on the Government to boost transport spending in the north;
- (g) notes delays to the Hope Valley capacity scheme, which was due to commence in May 2017 for completion by September 2018;
- (h) calls upon the Transport Secretary to:-
  - (i) reverse the decision to scrap the electrification of the Midland Mainline;
  - (ii) approve the commencement of the Hope Valley capacity scheme;
  - (iii) pledge his immediate backing for the Northern Powerhouse Rail programme; and
  - (iv) give Transport for the North the same powers as those enjoyed by Transport for London so that it can also raise private finance towards its own transport priorities; and
- (i) directs that a copy of this Motion be sent to the Secretary of State for Transport.

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

- (a) welcomes the confirmation by the Government that high-speed services will run into Sheffield Midland station, and notes that the Labour Group have always championed the benefits of a city centre location for HS2 as this is where the greatest economic impact,

transport benefits and job creation will be delivered;

- (b) applauds the leadership, determination and hard work of the Council Leader, Councillor Julie Dore, in securing a HS2 city centre location, which will bring the maximum benefits for the whole of South Yorkshire;
- (c) affirms that a city centre location is vital to ensuring Sheffield is well placed to maximise the benefits of HS2, and allows for the integration of HS2 with HS3, but believes this must extend to the north as well as to the south;
- (d) highlights that whilst we welcome the fact that HS2 Ltd have committed to funding a junction, this Administration will be seeking further commitments from the Government to ensure that the connection north of Sheffield is funded to enable high speed connections out of Midland and up to places like Leeds and Newcastle;
- (e) notes that despite the hugely positive news that HS2 will be coming to the centre of Sheffield, the Government have cancelled the electrification of the Midland Mainline which was due to be electrified by 2023; the Government have decided that 'bi-mode' trains - which can switch from electric to diesel power – will instead be introduced;
- (f) believes that this move is outrageous and will deny Sheffield faster, greener, more reliable train journeys which would have been a big boost to our economy and would have led to significantly improved air quality, another key aspiration of this Administration, particularly given the Government's woefully inadequate Air Quality Plan;
- (g) believes that the Government's decision to cancel the electrification of the Midland Mainline is even more outrageous, given that the Government are continuing with Crossrail 2, a new London rail line, which will cost around £30 billion - denoting that whilst there is extra money for the south, the north continues to get neglected under this Government;
- (h) notes that despite this significant setback, it is encouraging that HS2 Ltd said they would ensure that Sheffield was HS2-ready so it could benefit from a spur into the city centre off the main line, being, therefore, unaffected by the Government's decision regarding the lack of electrification on the existing line from Sheffield to Kettering, and that this Administration will continue to hold HS2 Ltd to account to ensure this happens;
- (i) believes that as a nation we are too London-centric and too centralised; and that much more needs to be done to empower all England's regions; figures from the think-tank Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) show that funding per head in London for



transport is £3,400 compared to just £427 per head in the north, and in total the north would have seen £59 billion more for transport if funded the same as London, and therefore, support is given to calls from Andy Burnham, Mayor of Greater Manchester, for this to be addressed urgently; and

- (j) states that the disparity between transport in the north of England and London must now be addressed and reiterates comments made by Council Leader, Councillor Julie Dore, prior to the transport summit in Leeds, that the Government must:-
  - (i) commit to making an integrated transport network across the whole of the north and especially a commitment to a Northern Powerhouse Rail; and
  - (ii) commit to upgrades that will make an immediate difference – particularly reversing their decision to cancel the electrification of the Midland Mainline.

6.4 Following debate on the matter under consideration, the amendment was put to the vote and carried.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the confirmation by the Government that high-speed services will run into Sheffield Midland station, and notes that the Labour Group have always championed the benefits of a city centre location for HS2 as this is where the greatest economic impact, transport benefits and job creation will be delivered;
- (b) applauds the leadership, determination and hard work of the Council Leader, Councillor Julie Dore, in securing a HS2 city centre location, which will bring the maximum benefits for the whole of South Yorkshire;
- (c) affirms that a city centre location is vital to ensuring Sheffield is well placed to maximise the benefits of HS2, and allows for the integration of HS2 with HS3, but believes this must extend to the north as well as to the south;
- (d) highlights that whilst we welcome the fact that HS2 Ltd have committed to funding a junction, this Administration will be seeking further commitments from the Government to ensure that the connection north of Sheffield is funded to enable high speed connections out of Midland and up to places like Leeds and Newcastle;

- (e) notes that despite the hugely positive news that HS2 will be coming to the centre of Sheffield, the Government have cancelled the electrification of the Midland Mainline which was due to be electrified by 2023; the Government have decided that 'bi-mode' trains - which can switch from electric to diesel power – will instead be introduced;
- (f) believes that this move is outrageous and will deny Sheffield faster, greener, more reliable train journeys which would have been a big boost to our economy and would have led to significantly improved air quality, another key aspiration of this Administration, particularly given the Government's woefully inadequate Air Quality Plan;
- (g) believes that the Government's decision to cancel the electrification of the Midland Mainline is even more outrageous, given that the Government are continuing with Crossrail 2, a new London rail line, which will cost around £30 billion - denoting that whilst there is extra money for the south, the north continues to get neglected under this Government;
- (h) notes that despite this significant setback, it is encouraging that HS2 Ltd said they would ensure that Sheffield was HS2-ready so it could benefit from a spur into the city centre off the main line, being, therefore, unaffected by the Government's decision regarding the lack of electrification on the existing line from Sheffield to Kettering, and that this Administration will continue to hold HS2 Ltd to account to ensure this happens;
- (i) believes that as a nation we are too London-centric and too centralised; and that much more needs to be done to empower all England's regions; figures from the think-tank Institute for Public Policy Research (IPPR) show that funding per head in London for transport is £3,400 compared to just £427 per head in the north, and in total the north would have seen £59 billion more for transport if funded the same as London, and therefore, support is given to calls from Andy Burnham, Mayor of Greater Manchester, for this to be addressed urgently; and
- (j) states that the disparity between transport in the north of England and London must now be addressed and reiterates comments made by Council Leader, Councillor Julie Dore, prior to the transport summit in Leeds, that the Government must:-
  - (i) commit to making an integrated transport network across the whole of the north and especially a commitment to a Northern Powerhouse Rail; and
  - (ii) commit to upgrades that will make an immediate difference – particularly reversing their decision to cancel the electrification of the Midland Mainline.

6.5.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Andy Nash, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Adam Hanrahan, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Roger Davison, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) and (c) to (j) of the Substantive Motion, and voted against paragraph (b) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

2. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (f), (g), (i) and (j) of the Substantive Motion, and voted against paragraphs (a) to (e) and (h) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

**7. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "TACKLING THE DAMAGE OF FIXED-ODDS BETTING TERMINALS" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MAZHER IQBAL**

7.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Julie Dore, and formally seconded by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, that this Council:-

- (a) reiterates support for previous Council resolutions calling on the Government to give local authorities the powers they need to respond to concerns from their local communities and stop the proliferation of Fixed Odds Betting Terminal (FOBT) machines and betting shops;
- (b) notes that each betting outlet can provide four FOBT machines which offer casino style content, including games such as roulette, at up to £100 a spin, which can be wagered every 20 seconds;
- (c) further notes there are now more than 35,000 FOBTs offering casino content on British high streets, illustrating this is a nation-wide issue, and that there are also more than twice as many betting shops in the 55 local authority areas with the highest levels of deprivation compared with the most affluent 115, which are equivalent by population;
- (d) notes the nationwide campaign by leading charities and religious groups to reduce the stakes on category B2 Fixed Odds Betting Terminals in betting outlets from £100 to £2 per spin, and notes that this is something which the Government's own Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), which regulates the gambling industry, is examining;
- (e) further notes that a recommendation from the DCMS was due in the summer and that the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport (the Rt. Hon. Karen Bradley MP) has expressed frustration in Parliament about the delays;
- (f) is dismayed by recent reports that the Chancellor has scrapped the

review due to fears that cutting the stake to £2 would cost the Treasury in lost tax revenue;

- (g) believes it is outrageous that the Government would make the decision on this basis and agrees with comments by Carolyn Harris MP, Chair of the all-party parliamentary group on fixed-odds betting terminals - "It is morally bankrupt to allow this situation to go on because of a misunderstanding of the economics of FOBTs. Britain will be financially better off if we take action on these machines."
- (h) wholeheartedly supports the campaign to reduce the maximum stake of FOBT to £2;
- (i) demands better planning powers to restrict the localised proliferation of bookmakers, who are currently opening multiple premises in clusters to facilitate more machines, in accordance with the wishes of the local community; and
- (j) directs that a copy of this motion be sent to the Government to convey Sheffield's full support for reducing the cap to £2 and to demand better planning powers for local authorities to deal with this.

7.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Sue Auckland, and seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (h) to (j) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (h) to (j) as new paragraphs (k) to (m):-

- (h) believes this is a direct consequence of the Gambling Act 2005, introduced by the last Labour Government, which removed the need for operators to prove unmet demand;
- (i) notes the comments of the Labour MP, Tom Watson, who stated the Labour Party 'dropped the ball' over the 2005 Gambling Act;
- (j) recalls the previous Labour Administration's support for Sheffield to be the home of the UK's first "Super-Casino" despite opposition from the community;

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

- (k) notes this is the fifth time members of the Labour Group have brought a motion to Council on this nationwide issue in three years;
- (l) notes that the Council states, in its "Statement of Principles" under the Gambling Act 2005, that it "recognises how important this sector of the entertainment industry is within the city" and that "well-run businesses will get the support of the Council"; and

- (m) therefore requests the Administration to bring forward a report to the Council within six months on such changes to the Statement of Principles as are appropriate to address the concerns now raised.

7.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Sue Auckland was put to the vote and negatived.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) reiterates support for previous Council resolutions calling on the Government to give local authorities the powers they need to respond to concerns from their local communities and stop the proliferation of Fixed Odds Betting Terminal (FOBT) machines and betting shops;
- (b) notes that each betting outlet can provide four FOBT machines which offer casino style content, including games such as roulette, at up to £100 a spin, which can be wagered every 20 seconds;
- (c) further notes there are now more than 35,000 FOBTs offering casino content on British high streets, illustrating this is a nation-wide issue, and that there are also more than twice as many betting shops in the 55 local authority areas with the highest levels of deprivation compared with the most affluent 115, which are equivalent by population;
- (d) notes the nationwide campaign by leading charities and religious groups to reduce the stakes on category B2 Fixed Odds Betting Terminals in betting outlets from £100 to £2 per spin, and notes that this is something which the Government's own Department of Culture, Media and Sport (DCMS), which regulates the gambling industry, is examining;
- (e) further notes that a recommendation from the DCMS was due in the summer and that the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport (the Rt. Hon. Karen Bradley MP) has expressed frustration in Parliament about the delays;
- (f) is dismayed by recent reports that the Chancellor has scrapped the review due to fears that cutting the stake to £2 would cost the Treasury in lost tax revenue;
- (g) believes it is outrageous that the Government would make the decision on this basis and agrees with comments by Carolyn Harris MP, Chair of the all-party parliamentary group on fixed-odds betting terminals - "It is morally bankrupt to allow this situation to go on

because of a misunderstanding of the economics of FOBTs. Britain will be financially better off if we take action on these machines.”

- (h) wholeheartedly supports the campaign to reduce the maximum stake of FOBT to £2;
- (i) demands better planning powers to restrict the localised proliferation of bookmakers, who are currently opening multiple premises in clusters to facilitate more machines, in accordance with the wishes of the local community; and
- (j) directs that a copy of this motion be sent to the Government to convey Sheffield’s full support for reducing the cap to £2 and to demand better planning powers for local authorities to deal with this.

**8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING THE LABOUR PARTY’S POSITION ON "BREXIT" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACK CLARKSON AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR KEITH DAVIS**

8.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Peter Rippon and seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 5.5 (as revised earlier at this meeting), the termination of the meeting (at 8.00 p.m.) be delayed by a period of time sufficient to enable the mover and seconder of item 8 on the agenda (Notice of Motion Regarding the Labour Party’s Position on Brexit) to speak to that Motion.

8.2 It was moved by Councillor Jack Clarkson, and seconded by Councillor Keith Davis, that this Council:-

- (a) (i) believes that the Labour Party, by changing its stance to adopt a soft "Brexit" as their party policy, will undermine "Brexit" talks, (ii) notes that the Labour Party now intends to keep Britain in the Single Market and continue with 'open door' EU immigration for at least four more years, which they claim is for an 'interim' period only, (iii) believes that this change of policy is rowing back on their previous Brexit position, especially after the Leader, the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Corbyn MP, stated that the UK had to leave the Single Market to fulfil the Brexit vote and (iv) further believes that many Labour voters will feel betrayed by the Party, due to it changing its stance on Brexit;
- (b) is concerned that Jeremy Corbyn has admitted that he has no idea as to how long the "interim" phase would last, meaning a risk that freedom of movement would carry on, contributions to the EU's budgets would continue, and EU judges’ involvement in the UK would remain;
- (c) is appalled that the Shadow Secretary of State for Exiting the European Union, the Rt. Hon. Sir Keir Starmer, MP, has suggested that the Labour Party would leave the door open for staying in the

Single Market, which this Council believes is in direct conflict with how the people of this country voted to leave the European Union;

- (d) believes that, in respecting the referendum result, the Labour Party adopted a Euro-sceptic position to leave the Single Market and the Customs Union, and further believes that this reversal and change in policy will disgust many of the Party's members; and
- (e) further believes that (i) the Labour Party has no vision whatsoever as to what Britain should look like outside the European Union, and whether they should leave or remain in the Single Market and (ii) that many of the Party's own MPs are mystified as to the Party's position, with continued internal wrangling and disagreements between Jeremy Corbyn and its grass roots members, which shows to the electorate that the Labour Party say one thing and then do another.

8.3 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Ben Curran, and formally seconded by Councillor Jackie Drayton, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) believes that, in a bid to be relevant again, UKIP are spreading misinformation about Labour's position on withdrawal from the EU;
- (b) notes that the Labour Party has stated that they will fight for a Brexit deal that protects jobs, the economy and rights and that, in order to avoid a 'cliff-edge' for the economy as we leave the EU, Labour would seek a time-limited transitional deal on the same basic terms we currently enjoy;
- (c) notes that this means Labour are seeking to remain in a customs union with the EU and within the Single Market during a strictly limited transitional period; meaning the UK would abide by the common rules of both for a temporary period;
- (d) believes that this is a decision taken in the national interest and it would provide much needed certainty for British businesses and consumers; recognising that it is highly unlikely that bespoke transitional arrangements can be negotiated and established by March 2019 as the Government contend;
- (e) believes that, despite UKIP scaremongering to the counter, Labour recognise that a transitional period must be time-limited and that it cannot become an indefinite arrangement; instead acting as an essential bridge toward a lasting new progressive partnership with the EU based on our shared values and history;
- (f) believes that the final Brexit deal must retain the benefits of the Customs Union and the Single Market and that how this is ultimately achieved is secondary to outcome - remaining within a customs union

and seeking a changed Single Market relationship are possible end destinations for Labour, but this must be part of negotiations;

- (g) contends that transitional arrangements will not frustrate or reverse the process of leaving the EU but rather this is a sensible and responsible way to protect jobs and the economy and ensure that Britain and the EU reach a mutually beneficial final deal;
- (h) believes that additional time is needed to resolve the incredibly complex question of the Northern Ireland border and that the Northern Ireland Peace Process, above all else, must be ensured; and
- (i) believes that Labour's position is a strong counter to the fanciful arguments by the Government and UKIP that bespoke transitional arrangements can be negotiated, agreed and established in the next 18 months; rather, in the words of the General Secretary of the Trade Union Congress, Frances O'Grady, "Labour are clearly the grown-ups in the room"; and that the Conservative and UKIP ideologically blinkered approaches are reckless in the extreme.

8.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Adam Hanrahan, and formally seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (a) to (d), the addition of new paragraphs (a) to (f) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraph (e) as a new paragraph (g):-

- (a) notes the ongoing creative ambiguity of Labour's policy on Brexit, whereby a transitional period to a hard Brexit is being spun as a soft Brexit;
- (b) believes that whatever clear policy, if any, Labour eventually adopts on Brexit, will betray a great many voters, on one side or the other, taken in by creative ambiguity;
- (c) notes that Vote Leave did not campaign to leave the Single Market, rather that it promoted Switzerland and Iceland as having, as European Free Trade Association (EFTA) members, a desirable alternative to EU membership;
- (d) notes that Single Market membership was not on the ballot paper in June 2016, and believes that many leave voters, voted in the belief that it would be possible to remain in the Single Market, simply because this would be in the interests of the UK and of the EU;
- (e) condemns what this Council believes is the Orwellian reinterpretation of the 2016 vote by the Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Theresa May MP, Nigel Farage MEP and the Leader of the Labour Party, the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Corbyn MP, in defiance of the national interest, to exclude remaining a member of the Single Market;



- (f) welcomes any resistance to Jeremy Corbyn within the Labour Party;
- 8.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Ben Curran was put to the vote and carried.
- 8.6 The amendment moved by Councillor Adam Hanrahan was then put to the vote and negatived.
- 8.7 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, in a bid to be relevant again, UKIP are spreading misinformation about Labour's position on withdrawal from the EU;
- (b) notes that the Labour Party has stated that they will fight for a Brexit deal that protects jobs, the economy and rights and that, in order to avoid a 'cliff-edge' for the economy as we leave the EU, Labour would seek a time-limited transitional deal on the same basic terms we currently enjoy;
- (c) notes that this means Labour are seeking to remain in a customs union with the EU and within the Single Market during a strictly limited transitional period; meaning the UK would abide by the common rules of both for a temporary period;
- (d) believes that this is a decision taken in the national interest and it would provide much needed certainty for British businesses and consumers; recognising that it is highly unlikely that bespoke transitional arrangements can be negotiated and established by March 2019 as the Government contend;
- (e) believes that, despite UKIP scaremongering to the counter, Labour recognise that a transitional period must be time-limited and that it cannot become an indefinite arrangement; instead acting as an essential bridge toward a lasting new progressive partnership with the EU based on our shared values and history;
- (f) believes that the final Brexit deal must retain the benefits of the Customs Union and the Single Market and that how this is ultimately achieved is secondary to outcome - remaining within a customs union and seeking a changed Single Market relationship are possible end destinations for Labour, but this must be part of negotiations;
- (g) contends that transitional arrangements will not frustrate or reverse the process of leaving the EU but rather this is a sensible and responsible way to protect jobs and the economy and ensure that Britain and the EU reach a mutually beneficial final deal;

- (h) believes that additional time is needed to resolve the incredibly complex question of the Northern Ireland border and that the Northern Ireland Peace Process, above all else, must be ensured; and
- (i) believes that Labour's position is a strong counter to the fanciful arguments by the Government and UKIP that bespoke transitional arrangements can be negotiated, agreed and established in the next 18 months; rather, in the words of the General Secretary of the Trade Union Congress, Frances O'Grady, "Labour are clearly the grown-ups in the room"; and that the Conservative and UKIP ideologically blinkered approaches are reckless in the extreme.

## **9. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

### **9.1 Urgent Business**

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

### **9.2 Supplementary Questions**

- 9.2.1 A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated.
- 9.2.2 Supplementary questions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4) were not able to be asked before the meeting terminated (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 5.5, as revised earlier at this meeting) after three hours duration.

### **9.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities**

- 9.3.1 Questions relating to the discharge of the functions of the South Yorkshire Joint Authorities for Fire and Rescue and Pensions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6i), were not able to be asked before the meeting terminated (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 5.5, as revised earlier at this meeting) after three hours duration.

## **10. ANNUAL SCRUTINY REPORT 2016-17**

- 10.1 The Council received an Annual Report, which provided an overview of scrutiny activity undertaken by each of the Scrutiny and Policy Development Committees during the 2016/17 Municipal Year, and proposed activity for 2017/18.
- 10.2 **RESOLVED:** That the Annual Report of the Scrutiny and Policy Development Committees 2016/17 be noted.

**11. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING**

- 11.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 5<sup>th</sup> July 2017 be approved as a true and accurate record.

**12. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES**

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

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

Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee - Councillor Ian Saunders to replace Councillor Karen McGowan.

Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee - Councillor Jackie Satur to replace Councillor Dianne Hurst.

Allotments and Leisure Gardens Advisory Group - Councillor Zahira Naz to replace Councillor Tony Downing; Councillor Douglas Johnson to fill a vacancy

Corporate Parenting Board - Councillor Colin Ross to replace Councillor Martin Smith

(b) it be noted that Margaret Kilner has replaced Helen Rowe as a HealthWatch observer on the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, with effect from 18<sup>th</sup> July 2017;

(c) the membership of the Monitoring and Advisory Board (Adult Services) be revised to comprise Councillors Steve Ayris, Michelle Cook, Cate McDonald and Peter Rippon; and

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

Environment Agency – Yorkshire Regional Flood and Coastal Committee - Councillor Paul Wood to replace Councillor Karen McGowan.

Sheffield Health and Social Care Foundation Trust – Council of Governors - Councillor Adam Hurst to serve a 2<sup>nd</sup> term of office ending 04/09/2020.

Sheffield Teaching Hospitals - Councillor Adam Hurst to replace  
NHS Foundation Trust Councillor Mary Lea

**13. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "THE IMPORTANCE OF CONSTITUTION" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS JOHNSON AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR ALISON TEAL**

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

- (a) believes in the rule of law;
- (b) notes that the UK has a long and proud tradition of organising society on rules of law and not on arbitrary decree; and that constitutions and agreed rules of procedure are essential for democracy to function;
- (c) notes the Review of Full Council Meetings Members Working Group has had several constructive meetings about improving the operation of Full Council, including through broadcasting, and will continue to work up options; and
- (d) believes, therefore, in the need to safeguard democracy by scrutinising proposed changes to the Council's own constitution very carefully and ensuring that any changes comply with the constitution itself.

13.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Olivia Blake, and formally seconded by Councillor Craig Gamble Pugh, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (d) and the addition of new paragraphs (d) and (e) as follows:-

- (d) notes that the changes in meeting times of Full Council and other operational matters are the outcomes of a cross-party Member working group looking at improving decision making and public engagement, and that the new changes are only being trialled on a temporary period; and
- (e) reaffirms the Administration's assertion that any changes to the constitution will only take place in accordance with the constitutional process, and only with the backing of the relevant cross party Member working group.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-
-------------------------------

- (a) believes in the rule of law;
- (b) notes that the UK has a long and proud tradition of organising society on rules of law and not on arbitrary decree; and that constitutions and agreed rules of procedure are essential for democracy to function;
- (c) notes the Review of Full Council Meetings Members Working Group has had several constructive meetings about improving the operation of Full Council, including through broadcasting, and will continue to work up options;
- (d) notes that the changes in meeting times of Full Council and other operational matters are the outcomes of a cross-party Member working group looking at improving decision making and public engagement, and that the new changes are only being trialled on a temporary period; and
- (e) reaffirms the Administration's assertion that any changes to the constitution will only take place in accordance with the constitutional process, and only with the backing of the relevant cross party Member working group.

**14. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "REVIEW OF STUDENT ACCOMMODATION" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR DOUGLAS JOHNSON AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR ROBERT MURPHY**

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

- (a) notes the report to Cabinet on 18 December 2013 on the Student Accommodation Strategy that warned of the risk that the provision of more purpose-built student accommodation will lead to over-supply and older blocks falling empty;
- (b) notes that the Council's planning policy CS41 on "Creating mixed communities" requires a mix of tenures and sizes in large blocks of student accommodation and seeks to avoid over-saturation of student accommodation;
- (c) however, notes that many recent planning applications for very large blocks of student accommodation have been passed even where not compliant with policy CS41; and
- (d) therefore calls on the Administration to carry out an urgent re-assessment of the supply of and demand for student accommodation.

14.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Ben Curran, and formally seconded by Councillor Moya O'Rourke, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (c) and (d) and the addition of new paragraphs (c) to (f) as follows:-

- (c) notes that planning decisions are taken by the Planning and Highways Committee or by officers acting under delegated authority and, therefore, are not in the control of the Council's Executive;
- (d) notes that planners must make decisions in line with the National Planning Policy Framework which encourages purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA);
- (e) notes the Administration's commitment to using the Local Plan to ensure local policy is tightened up in this area; and
- (f) endorses the Administration's aim that as a requirement of the new Local Plan, all new PBSA developments are capable of conversion to residential accommodation, thereby adding flexibility to the market.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the report to Cabinet on 18 December 2013 on the Student Accommodation Strategy that warned of the risk that the provision of more purpose-built student accommodation will lead to over-supply and older blocks falling empty;
- (b) notes that the Council's planning policy CS41 on "Creating mixed communities" requires a mix of tenures and sizes in large blocks of student accommodation and seeks to avoid over-saturation of student accommodation;
- (c) notes that planning decisions are taken by the Planning and Highways Committee or by officers acting under delegated authority and, therefore, are not in the control of the Council's Executive;
- (d) notes that planners must make decisions in line with the National Planning Policy Framework which encourages purpose-built student accommodation (PBSA);
- (e) notes the Administration's commitment to using the Local Plan to ensure local policy is tightened up in this area; and
- (f) endorses the Administration's aim that as a requirement of the new Local Plan, all new PBSA developments are capable of conversion to

residential accommodation, thereby adding flexibility to the market.

- 14.4.1 (NOTE: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a), (b) and (f) of the Substantive Motion, and abstained from voting on paragraphs (c) to (e) of the Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

This page is intentionally left blank