

Agenda Item 9

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

PRESENT

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

- | | | |
|--|--|--|
| 1 <i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i>
Simon Clement-Jones
Bob Pullin
Richard Shaw | 10 <i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i>
Andy Bainbridge | 19 <i>Nether Edge & Sharrow Ward</i>
Mohammad Maroof
Jim Steinke
Alison Teal |
| 2 <i>Beighton Ward</i>
Chris Rosling-Josephs
Sophie Wilson | 11 <i>Ecclesall Ward</i>
Roger Davison
Shaffaq Mohammed
Paul Scriven | 20 <i>Park & Arbourthorne</i>
Julie Dore
Ben Miskell
Jack Scott |
| 3 <i>Birley Ward</i>
Denise Fox
Bryan Lodge
Karen McGowan | 12 <i>Firth Park Ward</i>
Abdul Khayum
Alan Law | 21 <i>Richmond Ward</i>
Mike Drabble
Dianne Hurst
Peter Rippon |
| 4 <i>Broomhill & Sharrow Vale Ward</i>
Michelle Cook
Magid Magid
Kaltum Rivers | 13 <i>Fulwood Ward</i>
Sue Alston
Andrew Sangar
Cliff Woodcraft | 22 <i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i>
Dawn Dale
Peter Price
Garry Weatherall |
| 5 <i>Burngreave Ward</i>
Jackie Drayton
Talib Hussain
Mark Jones | 14 <i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i>
Lewis Dagnall
Cate McDonald
Chris Peace | 23 <i>Southey Ward</i>
Mike Chaplin
Tony Damms
Jayne Dunn |
| 6 <i>City Ward</i>
Douglas Johnson
Robert Murphy
Martin Phipps | 15 <i>Graves Park Ward</i>
Ian Auckland
Sue Auckland
Steve Ayris | 24 <i>Stannington Ward</i>
David Baker
Penny Baker
Vickie Priestley |
| 7 <i>Crookes & Crosspool Ward</i>
Mohammed Mahroof
Anne Murphy | 16 <i>Hillsborough Ward</i>
Bob Johnson
George Lindars-Hammond
Josie Paszek | 25 <i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i>
Francyne Johnson |
| 8 <i>Darnall Ward</i>
Mazher Iqbal
Mary Lea
Zahira Naz | 17 <i>Manor Castle Ward</i>
Lisa Banes
Terry Fox
Pat Midgley | 26 <i>Walkley Ward</i>
Olivia Blake
Ben Curran
Neale Gibson |
| 9 <i>Dore & Totley Ward</i>
Joe Otten
Martin Smith | 18 <i>Mosborough Ward</i>
David Barker
Tony Downing
Gail Smith | 27 <i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i>
John Booker
Adam Hurst
Mike Levery |
| | | 28 <i>Woodhouse Ward</i>
Mick Rooney
Jackie Satur
Paul Wood |

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Jack Clarkson, Keith Davis, Adam Hanrahan, Abtisam Mohamed, Colin Ross and Ian Saunders.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 Petitions (1)

3.1.1 Petition requesting the Council to urgently review the provision of MOT bays at the Taxi Test Centre

The Council received a petition containing 368 signatures requesting the Council to urgently review the provision of MOT taxi bays at the Taxi Test Centre.

There was no speaker to the petition.

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

3.1.2 Petition stating that Sheffield should be Carbon Neutral by 2030

The Council received a petition containing 368 signatures, stating that Sheffield should be Carbon Neutral by 2030.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Graham Wroe and another petitioner. They referred to the state of the climate report 2018 and to the warmest years on record having been in the past 22 years with warming being more extreme at the earth's poles. It was said that there were 12 years to act to reduce carbon emissions. Increasing temperatures had led to the increased occurrence of fire and drought leading to more fires, a reduction in forest and increased carbon emissions. They also described the effects of melting ice, warming water and the release of methane from melting permafrost. Climate change was also increasing at an expedient rate and once it had begun, there would be no stopping it. If this occurred, the effects would include food shortages, conflict over resources, extreme weather, and migration from uninhabitable areas. This was an emergency and rapid action was needed to decrease emissions. It would require systematic action from government and local government and to be treated as an emergency.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Development. Councillor Scott commented on the strength of feeling concerning man made climate change and it was known that climate

breakdown may be as little as 12 years away and which would have a profound effect on every aspect of people's lives, including flooding, fires, disruption to food supply and the natural world. He said that he believed climate change would define this century and it was the greatest social justice challenge.

He said that it was important that Sheffield was at the forefront of action relating to climate change and should now declare a climate emergency. However, whilst 2030 might be the target which the Council would set, he did not believe it would be right to set a target date for the City to become carbon at this point. A target was needed that was supported by an action plan, was credible and deliverable and one by which the organisations in the City would work together to get the right target. The condition of climate change presented a threat to humanity and was personal to people and families in different ways and there were real concerns about circumstances leading to war, flood famine and areas of the planet becoming uninhabitable.

Councillor Scott pointed to a link between climate change and inequality and said that action was also required in relation employment rights, poor housing, migration, justice, racism and poverty etc. He also commented that inequality and austerity was not compatible with taking urgent action with regards to climate change. He said that he was determined that Sheffield would lead and bring about a greener and fairer future.

3.2 Public Questions

3.2.1 Public Questions Concerning Climate Change

Rachael Hand stated that Sheffield Climate Alliance welcomed the declaration of a climate emergency and asked whether the Council could explain the how other institutions and citizens could contribute to change.

Dr David Jones asked what immediate actions the Council would take to reduce emissions and what would be the effect; and what was the best estimate for Sheffield's total annual emissions of CO₂ and other greenhouse gases.

Heather Hunt asked, if a motion was passed by the Council concerning a climate emergency, would the Council ensure clear communications with residents, including on its website and to keep people updated in postal communications.

Jenny Carpenter asked how the Council would ensure that decisions which it took contributed to countering climate change and would it seek funding for retrofitting of housing stock so that heating bills and carbon emissions could be reduced.

Robert Howarth stated that the refurbishment of housing was more carbon neutral than demolition and rebuild. He asked whether the Council would plan

for a large programme of refurbishment and new build under Council tenure and what were the practical steps that would be taken in this regard in 2019.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, responded to the questions. He stated that with regards to other partners in the City, the Green City Partnership Board had been established and this would enable discussions concerning climate change, and organisations on that Board could be said to have influence over the greatest proportion of emissions and they also had control of issues including their own employees and supply chains. He said that he recognised that such discussion was now of a more urgent nature and that both he and Councillor Lewis Dagnall were co-chairs of that Board so could ensure that conversations could be had with more speed.

He said that as regards immediate and urgent actions, a short time would be used to make sure that proposed actions were the right ones and were as challenging as possible. He said that he would write to Dr Jones with the current action plan, although he acknowledged that the actions set out for 2019 would need to be examined and he would welcome views of Dr Jones or other interested parties as well as the Partnership Board to make sure it was sufficiently robust and that it included other actions, as required.

Councillor Scott stated that the Council website would be utilised to publicise activity and a press release had already been produced and further work would also be done. He stated that people would have to make different types of changes and a broader and positive vision was needed in relation to climate change, including creating a fairer and greener city which was better for everyone and something which would inspire hope.

With regards housing, he understood that Council properties had been insulated as far as possible, and improved through investment made over the past 15 years in insulation and energy efficiency. However, private sector housing which was not in the control of the Council or a registered provider generally presented a challenge with regards insulation. Improvements were required in addition to more tools to help regulate the private rented sector, including a need for change brought about by national government.

Councillor Scott concluded that there was a definite sense of importance of climate change and in the declaration of a climate emergency and that the Council would wish to work with people, including those represented at this meeting, to take action and help avoid the potentially catastrophic impacts of climate change.

3.2.2 Public Question Concerning Electricity Supplier

Thomas Wills asked when the Council would ensure that its electricity was from a zero carbon supplier.

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Deputy Leader of the Council, stated that the Council was at present in the process of re-

procuring its electricity supplier. It did have a good energy mix at the present time, including the energy recovery facility for heat and power for some buildings in Sheffield. The impact on the environment would also be something to take account of in the Council's ethical procurement policy.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development stated that decentralised energy might also be part of the energy mix, together with renewable energy. He understood that within the Council's present energy supply, it included, where possible, renewable energy. However, the use of renewable sources was not guaranteed in the current arrangements. This would need to be reviewed, firstly so as to ascertain whether the current arrangements had worked and secondly, to make an assessment with regard to choices and consequences of looking at guaranteed renewable energy supply and the potential risk of disruption to supply and any back-up option. He said that renewable energy sources might also include nuclear energy. He said that whilst the use of renewable energy was an ambition for the Council, it was an intricate issue and difficult to give a guarantee at this time in relation to renewable energy.

3.2.3 Public Question Concerning Intolerant Rule of Law

Roger Doonan asked whether the Council would denounce repressive and intolerant values connected with imperialist authority and rule, which he said was present in the City. He called upon the Council to denounce imperialism, and delusions associated with it, in favour of greater tolerances.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that she would agree with the some of the comments made by Mr Doonan concerning oppressive regimes and she commented with regard to the approach of the leader of her own party with regard to oppressive regimes.

3.2.4 Public Question Concerning Ecclesfield Library

Victoria Bowden asked whether the Council planned to repair the roof of Ecclesfield Library, which was made of wooden shingle tiles, some of which had become displaced by extreme weather, before it deteriorated further. She asked whether there was a plan to replace the roofing to enable the trustees to plan with regard to finances and once the lease for the building was signed.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure, commented on the success of Associate Libraries. Most had signed leases although Ecclesfield had not yet done so. She said that she would find out what it was intended would be done with the roof of the Library prior to the signing of a lease and would inform Victoria Bowden accordingly.

3.2.5 Public Question Concerning the Adult Social Care Budget

A question was asked on behalf of Tanju Cakar concerning cuts to local government budgets, including for adult social care. It was stated that although the Council had sought to protect the adult social care budget, this would not

be sustainable and a question was asked as to what the Council would do to stop the cuts to social care and whether the Council would commit to using reserves to implement a no-cuts budget.

Councillor Chris Peace, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, stated that the cuts to adult social care were not sustainable. The Council prioritised adult social care and it would have to use some reserves largely due to the demand in adult social care. She commented that she was disappointed that there had not been a national response to this problem from Government, although the Council had made representations to the Government in this regard. The Government had produced a long term plan for the NHS but had not done so in respect of adult social care and it had also not produced a Green Paper for adult social care.

Councillor Peace said that the Council was working to build relationships with health partners. In cases where the local authority was not able to provide care, it was most likely to affect primary care and acute health services. Therefore, a way had to be found to manage the issues and this would include the use of a joint approach and pooled budgets. She commented that a national approach to these matters was required and also referred to the possibility of rescinding the Health and Social Care Act 2012.

3.2.6 Public Question Concerning War Graves Commission

Roy Millington referred to a question which had been asked at the 9 January meeting of Council concerning whether the Council was paid by the War Graves Commission for graves to be kept in order. He said that he had not yet received a written response to the question.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Parks and Leisure, stated that a letter had been produced in response to Mr Millington's questions and she was sorry he had not received it. She would make sure the letter was sent to him. She confirmed that the War Graves Commission did not provide funding to the Council. However, the Council's Parks and Countryside Service funded the War Graves Commission to care for war graves in respect of the York and Lancaster Regiment in France and the Royal British Legion cared for war graves in cemeteries in Sheffield.

3.2.7 Public Question Concerning Maternity Services

Ruth Milsom made reference to the South Yorkshire and Bassetlaw Clinical Commissioning Groups and local authorities considering how to respond to proposals in the Hospital Services Review. She asked what measures the Health Scrutiny Committee would be taking to make sure that Maternity Services would be kept at a safe level of provision.

Councillor Chris Peace, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, stated that a recent and very well attended meeting of Sheffield Save Our NHS demonstrated how much people were concerned about their health services. She said that the question concerned the Integrated Care System in South

Yorkshire and Bassetlaw and Hospital Care Review. She made reference to the recent urgent care review and to the commendable joint approach across organisations and political parties with regards the retention of the walk in centre and minor injuries unit, the plans for which were put on hold.

Councillor Peace said that the use of the scrutiny and political process was important and it was a matter for the Scrutiny Committee with regards to the action they might take. She said that she believed that there would be consideration of the issues raised and commented that there were also a number of other matters in the Hospital Services Review which were of concern. With regards maternity services, there were other issues in addition to health and medical care, such as support in the community for women who were pregnant and taking a holistic approach. Councillor Peace congratulated the campaign group on its work and said that there would continue to be dialogue with the campaign group regarding these matters.

3.2.8 Public Question Concerning Catering Services

Josephine Campling asked whether the Council would reduce the amount of meat it purchased and provide vegan options with the catering it provided and commissioned.

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Deputy Leader of the Council, said that the Council's catering provider had recently agreed to use compostable packaging. Vegan options were already provided for catering for events. She said that she would speak with the catering service further in relation to the provision of vegan meals, including in catering outlets for employees.

3.2.9 Public Question Concerning Housing Insulation

David Mason asked what the average U-value was for Council houses in Sheffield and what action was being taken to improve it and encourage landlords and homeowners to better insulate properties.

Councillor Jim Steinke, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community Safety, stated that he would provide a written response to the questions and he commented that the Council was actively encouraging landlords and home owners to better insulate their properties.

3.2.10 Public Questions Concerning Transport

Rosey Dunhey asked why the Council was prioritising investment in road schemes; why the targets of the Transport Strategy included improved accessibility by road to the city centre and Upper Don Valley and Lower Don Valley; new road links between Sheffield and Rotherham and improved road links between Sheffield and Manchester.

Heather Rostron asked what steps would be taken in 2019 to make people feel safe to cycle in Sheffield and a question in relation to a commitment by

IKEA to improve cycling provision.

Henry Budden asked when the Council would introduce clean air space in the City where polluting vehicles were restricted.

Frank Sheridan asked whether, beyond the clean air zone which encouraged changes from older to newer vehicles; the Council would introduce comprehensive road pricing using existing available powers in legislation.

Jo Millett asked what steps would be taken in 2019 to make it more comfortable and convenient for people to walk in Sheffield and what action the Council would take concerning pavement parking to improve conditions for walking.

Naomi asked when the Council would bring forward its intended workplace parking levy to discourage car use and liaise with businesses which provided car parking.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, responded to the questions. He said that buses also used the roads and it was critical to improve public transport, regardless of ownership or regulation arrangements relating to buses, and to make sure it was not adversely affected by vehicle congestion. More efficient junctions and the giving of priority to buses would help in this regard. He said that he would be able to share the modelling which had been done in this regard.

He said that, whilst he realised the Inner Ring Road had been controversial, the changes made would be better for pedestrians by reducing the number of road crossings pedestrians needed to make and the inclusion of segregated cycleways and a toucan crossing. There would also be a reduction in bus journey times and improved reliability and punctuality. The changes to the Inner Ring Road were being made not to create latent demand but to create a better integrated and efficient junction at a key location. The issue had been considered by a Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee and it was apparent that the Council needed to communicate more clearly the intentions with regard to the scheme.

Councillor Scott said that with regard to IKEA and cycling, there was some learning for the planning service regarding planning conditions and the Council had reviewed and tightened the process with regards conditions set as part of the planning process. This was an ongoing issue and there was continuing communication with Cycle Sheffield and IKEA with regards to the requirement relating to the planning condition relating to cycling and as part of delivering what was promised as part of the planning application for IKEA.

He said that with regards to pollution in the City Centre, the clean air zone which was proposed at the end of 2020 would have an effect on pollution elsewhere in the City as well within the inner ring road. However, the clean air zone was not the sum of the ambition for the City. It would bring about air which was legally compliant but not necessarily safe air. Therefore, more

would need to be done to prioritise active travel and to make sure walking, cycling and public transport were more attractive to people.

Councillor Scott said that with regards road charging, powers were available to the Council to instigate measures under the transport legislation. However, approval by the Secretary of State was also required. The most recent Secretaries of State had explicitly said they did not support the charging of car users. Therefore, the Council was not committing resources to pursuing that issue at this time.

With regard to the workforce parking levy, funding had been identified to begin a study. However, there were some barriers to overcome. He had visited Nottingham to see the impact and some of the benefits of a work place parking levy. The Council had committed to undertaking a study, which would take approximately 6 to 9 months to complete. He asked people to contact him if there were points which he had not fully addressed.

3.2.11 Public Questions Concerning Leaving the European Union

Neill Schofield asked a question concerning the effect on the construction industry of the UK leaving the European Union (EU) with no deal and also with regard to the effect on community safety and social cohesion and public safety and, in particular what the Council was doing to alert people and to mitigate issues that arose.

Councillor Jim Steinke, the Cabinet Member for Neighbourhoods and Community, stated that in relation to community safety, there had been discussions with the police and other organisations regarding what proportionate action might be taken in any event. There had been issues concerning hate crime at the time of the referendum concerning the membership of the EU. It was also important to make sure that matters were not exacerbated and any response would be considered and proportionate. It was also recognised that there was a chance that some groups may attempt to take advantage of tensions. He assured people that there were discussions taking place relating to these matters.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, stated that the building industry and house building would be adversely affected by the UK leaving the EU. A large proportion of building materials were imported from the EU and the supply of materials and labour might also be affected by shortages, with the possibility of the costs of construction increasing and an effect on the viability of home building. It was important that some protection was put in place with regard to the construction industry. The situation also affected the ability to undertake spatial planning with any confidence as to the future capacity of the market.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that public concerns were understood and it was important that people knew what the Council was doing in relation to the UK leaving the EU. An initial assessment had been done and in the immediate term, it was thought that there would be little or no

impact or short term disruption to service delivery. An internal officer working group was meeting each week and assessments would be updated as information became available. The wider issues were more difficult to assess because of uncertainty surrounding the UK leaving the EU.

Councillor Dore said that as regards the issues of community cohesion and the mechanics relating to Brexit, it had been announced that councils would receive some funding to help prepare and for Sheffield it amounted to £105K this year and the Council would release this funding in accordance with the ongoing assessments. The Local Resilience Forum, a multi-agency group, was also in place and the City Council actively participated in that group together with other statutory partners. The Sheffield City Region had considered the economic impact of withdrawal from the EU, including in relation to business and the construction industry and the potential effect with regards the workforce, supply chains and other matters. There was work being done in specific areas of the Council, and there would be co-ordinated activity across the Council. She recognised the public concern, including the possibility of a no-deal Brexit.

3.2.12 Public Question Concerning NHS

Mark James made reference to campaigns including with regard to supporting the fight to save the NHS and concerning the Orgreave truth and justice campaign and he asked a question concerning action and urgency and asking the Council to set a needs based budget, to fight cuts and not to get into situations where it was implementing bourgeois laws and arresting protesters.

Councillor Chris Peace, the Cabinet Member for Health and Social Care, stated that the Council supported the fight to save the NHS and this was paramount, including in relation to protest and in looking at policy. She believed the Council would have to consider some difficult choices. However, choices were also available in the application of values to the way the Council was run. She said that she would disagree with Prime Minister's assertion that austerity was over. The Council had adopted an early intervention approach and it did put fighting inequalities at the heart of policy.

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Deputy Leader of the Council, stated that there were concerns in relation to the setting of an illegal budget and she referred to the example of Northamptonshire County Council, which had seen the intervention of commissioners and an approach to closing services and use of capital in an attempt to balance the budget. Despite this, the situation in that local authority was not resolved. She said there was a need to call on the Government to offer fair funding to local authorities and Councils in the north of the country had taken a disproportionate level of cuts to local authorities. She commented that the situation as regards local government was one of financial crisis and the Government was not able to explain what money was required to deliver statutory services.

3.2.13 Public Question Concerning Quality Bus Contracts

Joe Diviney asked whether the Council would commit to using its powers to implement quality bus contracts to reduce fares to make it affordable and take public transport into public ownership.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, stated that with regards quality contracts, there existed powers for re-regulation in the Sheffield City Region and through working with the City Region Mayor and he said that, at this point in time, this was better for Sheffield than the option of quality bus contracts. He said that he believed that re-regulation was the right thing to do other than a nationalisation of services and the bus network being run for people and not profit.

3.2.14 Public Question Concerning Transgender People

Martha Foulds stated that a pub in the City had hosted a group firmly opposed to the rights of Transgender people and whose speakers described them in derogatory terms and supported similarly derogatory social media comments. She asked what action the Council would take to ensure that Trans people in Sheffield felt safe when visiting licensed venues in the City.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Transport and Development, said that he was proud that the question had been asked by Martha at this meeting and commented on her bravery and given the discrimination and bullying that people experienced. He said that there was a broader issue relating to dignity and respect for fellow citizens and the standards in place to protect people. The Council was clear that Trans rights were human rights and such rights will have been opposed, fought for and won. He referred to core ideals of fairness, inclusion and equality for everyone. He said the Council would not allow any licensed establishment to inflict indignity on any population or community. He said that he had asked officers in the Licensing Service to review how the Council supported Trans people and what training could be provided for licensed establishments.

He said that he knew there were a number of people that might feel isolated and scared and said that the Council saw them, valued them, stood with them and would do everything in its power to support and protect them. He commented that the progress to equal rights for all may be incremental and sometimes difficult but believed that it would happen and could be achieved together.

3.2.15 Public Questions Concerning Old Town Hall

Nigel Slack referred to the announcement that the Old Town Hall had been sold. He asked if the Council could tell the Sheffield public to whom it had been sold and give assurances that any redevelopment would respect the building and its place in Sheffield's history.

He also asked the following questions:

Whether the Castlegate conservation area would be in place before the sale completed as this would afford significant extra safeguards for the building.

Did the Council intend to enforce the 'urgent' repairs to the building to secure it as weatherproof, as the limited work that had been going on was seen by heritage groups as inadequate for the long term.

Would the Council take a prudent approach and continue with preliminaries for the Compulsory Purchase of the building, in case the sale or the new developer's plans failed.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal stated that the Council was not the buyer or the seller of the Old Town Hall. He said that he was optimistic that a solution would be found with regards to the building. The plans for the redevelopment of Castlegate were announced two years ago and there was a Regeneration Board and representation by Friends Groups and others. The kick-start for that area had brought a significant amount of investor activity and including funding from Government for the digital incubator and investment concerning improvement to the route between Castlegate and Victoria Quays.

He said that as regards the Conservation Area, the sale had taken place before the Conservation Area designation was in place. However, he also noted that through the planning process and the Old Town Hall's listed building status, he was confident that the building would meet the relevant requirements. Meetings had taken place with the Friends of the Old Town Hall and that group had been concerned to ensure repairs were carried out by the owner of the building. A survey was undertaken which identified £1 million of works required to the building. It had been a challenge to get the building owner to do the necessary work and a Court Order had been obtained to carry out the survey work. The landowner had been contacted as a result and urgent repairs to the building had been done in the last two weeks.

Councillor Iqbal said that a Compulsory Purchase Order (CPO) was a legal order which took some time to progress with significant cost and that option would be pursued only if there was no alternative option for the building. At present, there was a solution in the private sector and it would be difficult to pursue the option of a CPO. He said that he was optimistic about the future for the Old Town Hall building and also for that area of the City.

3.2.16 Public Question Concerning the UK leaving the EU

Nigel Slack asked what was the Council's response to the Governments threats to bring the Army onto the streets in the eventuality of a 'no deal' Brexit?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council responded that the prospect of a no deal Brexit engendered a feeling of complete and utter despair and also showed, if a government was preparing for the Army to be on the streets, why a no deal Brexit could not happen.

3.2.17 Public Questions Concerning Streets Ahead Programme

Isobel O’Leary asked whether the Council would join her in congratulating Amey employees who had employed simple and cheap engineering methods to restore pavements and kerbs to areas around trees which had previously been due to be felled. She asked for an explanation as to why investigations and engineering solutions already paid for in the Streets Ahead contract had not been used before and why many trees had unnecessarily been felled.

Calvin Payne asked a question concerning wrongful arrest in 2016 and a Freedom of Information request which he said showed the Council’s involvement and knowledge of the use of Trade Union law. He made specific reference to an email concerning the legal implications of Section 241 of the Trade Union Act. He asked whether the legal department had taken on board the statement of the Leader of the Council concerning opposition to the use of Trade Union law.

Christine King referred to issues including wrongful arrest, security and surveillance, a high value contract and initially heavily redacted contract and a value for the number of trees to be felled which had differed. She stated that it was increasingly apparent that many trees did not need to be felled. She asked, given these issues, why was it described as ‘a distraction’ to seek to understand how and why all of this had happened.

Alan Story made reference to an article in the Financial Times on 13 December and he asked what risk assessment had been carried out regarding the expected sale of Amey PLC to Greybull Capital for the workers, people and trees of Sheffield.

Mark Smith referred to the arrests of people who had protested in relation to street trees with many having been proved wrongful arrest and to legal costs. He said that it was known that a lot of the felling of trees had not been as a last resort and asked for reconsideration of the decision not to hold an inquiry.

A question was asked on behalf of Chris McAndrew concerning private finance initiatives and reference made to the Sir Robert Hadfield Wing at the Northern General and to costs being above the value of services provided. He asked a question in relation to the contract with Amey and the costs and accounts for that contract.

Russell Johnson asked which provided the most benefit for people, mature healthy street trees providing environmental and health benefits or insisting on no minor kerb deviations that were used in other cities and were not required by legislation.

Adrian Hallam made reference to offers made by Yorkshire Water to part fund measures relating to drainage and asked the Council to reconsider returning to the offers made by Yorkshire Water to part fund measures to reduce the amount of water and the cost of processing storm water through the sewer and where this might have a bearing on resolving issues regarding trees and

kerbs.

Heather Mitchell referred to an incident in February 2017 involving people protesting in relation to the felling of a tree and to a statement by a police officer concerning the use of Section 241 of the Trade Union and Labour Relations Act in relation to people on private land and which it was said had been agreed by the South Yorkshire Police and the Council. She asked the following questions:

Who in Sheffield City Council agreed to the use of Section 241 Trade Union and Labour Relations Act against people on private land?

If this was not the Leader of the Council, was the Leader informed and asked for approval?

If the decision was approved by an officer without the Leader's approval, why did this happen?

What process was used by the Council to agree with South Yorkshire Police to the use of the above powers on private land?

Helen McIlroy asked whether the Leader and Chief Executive of the Council would accept an invitation from the People's Audit to walk on some streets in the City to discuss and open a dialogue about the monitoring and scrutiny of the standard of work done by Amey.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, responded to the questions. He said that there had been a process of mediation in 2018, prior to Christmas and the view of the Bishop of Sheffield, who had chaired the process, was that substantial progress had been made. He said he had been pleased to join campaigners and Amey workers to see the new work which Amey was doing and resulting from the change in approach. He said that by a process of discussion and dialogue, a way forward had been found which allowed the City to receive the investment in highways sought by the Council and to respond to concerns regarding highways trees.

Councillor Dagnall said that with regard to the questions concerning benefits of street trees and kerb lines, he had contacted Mr Johnson and had answered the questions. He said that section 2 of the joint position statement between the Council, Amey and the STAG (Sheffield Tree Action Groups) Steering Committee referred to the benefits of street trees to people in the City; and section 7.2.1 referred to the temporary relaxation of kerb specification and as part of a phased approach. This showed that the Council was allowing kerb deviations to accommodate the new approach regarding trees.

He said that with regard to the possibility of an inquiry, the Council was not persuaded that an inquiry was what the City needed at this time.

Councillor Dagnall stated that in respect of the arrest of protesters, decisions

regarding arrest were for the police to take and the police had an appropriate means to challenge those decisions as the individuals concerned had done. He said he welcomed the fact that a settlement with the police had been reached and that people had received compensation and which would hopefully resolve matters and also allow the City to move on.

He said that the Council understood that Amey remained committed to the Streets Ahead programme, as was the City Council and the Department for Transport and which would transform highways maintenance for the next generation. He said that whilst he appreciated the interest in the issues concerning the matters reported in the Financial Times, as far as the Council was concerned, Streets Ahead would continue.

Councillor Dagnall referred to the question concerning Yorkshire Water and he requested that he be sent the details of the offer by them to enable him to discuss the issue with Council officers and to review the situation. He said there was a need to achieve the investment in the highway to receive funding from the Department for Transport and as part of the highways maintenance programme and that other ideas may not always be compatible with that.

He said that there was a separation of powers of the Council and the Police. There was opportunity to take matters up with the Independent Office of Police Complaints and in addition, people could write to the Police and Crime Commissioner to raise issues. He reiterated that he had welcomed that people had reached an agreed settlement with the Police in relation to unlawful arrests.

Councillor Olivia Blake, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Deputy Leader, said that with regards to PFI and the Hadfield Building and cost of the Amey contract, it was troubling that a number of PFI projects in the NHS had caused significant cost to the public purse because they may have had to be remedied in some way. The Council had some arrangements through PFI apart from the contract with Amey, including one for an office building and PFI schools. The model of funding for many public sector investments had used PFI. The Conservative and Labour parties had said that PFI would not be used as a model in future. It was important to look at the best way of doing things in future.

There was a different sort of arrangement for the highways contract in Sheffield, contrasted with the Hadfield Building referenced in the question, whereby the cost at the end of the Amey contract was already known. Payments were made quarterly. The cost was £2.2 billion originally. However, this had reduced to £1.95 billion. Much of the funding was from the Government in the form of PFI credits. Councillor Blake said that she would provide further information to the questioner in writing.

Councillor Lewis Dagnall, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Streetscene, stated that the Economic and Environmental Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee examined the Streets Ahead Programme and delegates, including the People's Audit had been involved and had presented

ideas to the Committee. Questions were also answered about the programme, including with regard to holding Amey to account. He understood there was dialogue with the People's Audit with which the Council would be pleased to continue.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council stated that she would be pleased to walk down any of the roads in the City.

3.3 Petitions (2)

Petition Requesting Free Travel for Young Carers

The Council received an electronic petition containing approximately 2,038 signatures, requesting free travel for young carers in Sheffield.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Laura Selby and two young carers, both of whom described how they cared for members of their family, including their siblings and supported their parents. Their families had a range of medical conditions and other needs, including cancer, mental ill health, autism, severe asthma, arthritis and learning difficulties.

This situation was sometimes considerably stressful to the young carers because they felt the pressure on them to make sure everything was okay and this could also be very tiring. Their caring responsibilities were in addition to them studying for A levels.

There were approximately seven thousand young carers in Sheffield and the petition of 2,038 signatures was started by Louise Haigh MP and requested free travel for young carers in Sheffield. Some cities already provided free travel for young carers. There were many costs associated with illness and disabilities that families had, including extra travel going shopping and for medical appointments, which could be expensive and families might not be able to afford public transport.

The petitioners stated that young people should also be given the chance to take a break from caring and to enjoy a social life. Carers saved the local authority and government a considerable amount and were not eligible to receive carers' allowance. Enabling them opportunity to travel using free public transport would help to deal with the stress of being a young carer and to keep themselves well. A pilot for leisure and travel for young carers was run during the summer and a report was also available with the findings from the pilot and to support the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Transport and Development. Councillor Scott thanked the petitioners for presenting the petition and describing their own circumstances. He said it was important that the Council listened carefully to the experiences of young carers. He said that he understood the need and recognised the practical issues that had been outlined by the young carers, including extra travel

because of caring, shopping and medical appointments. It was also important that young people could go out, relax and socialise and caring responsibilities could make this harder. He said that the Council did want to support young carers and as had been stated, young carers saved the Council money. He said that it was understood why free travel for young carers would be fairer.

Councillor Scott said that work would be done with bus and travel operators and with the PTE to make sure there was provision which was fair and which worked for the young carers and for others. It was important to work together on this matter and therefore meetings would be arranged to make sure all the issues were properly understood and to include Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that previously, a Pledge had been developed with young carers, which covered a range of matters important to young carers and she suggested that transport and travel might also be considered as part of the Pledge. She also pointed to the work of carers' organisations, including in helping to give a voice to young carers.

4. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "DECLARING A CLIMATE EMERGENCY" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACK SCOTT AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MICHELLE COOK

4.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of Councillor Martin Phipps and seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.1, the order of business as published on the Council Summons be altered by taking item 6 on the agenda (Notice of Motion regarding "Declaring A Climate Emergency") as the next item of business.

4.2 It was moved by Councillor Jack Scott, and seconded by Councillor Michelle Cook, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that climate change and sustainability are amongst the biggest issues of the 21st century and the effects of manmade and dangerous climate change are already manifestly occurring;
- (b) notes that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) detail that we are already seeing the consequences of a 1°C of global warming through more extreme weather, rising sea levels and diminishing Arctic sea ice, among other worrying changes;
- (c) notes that this Administration has previously categorised climate change as the biggest social justice issue of this century which requires bold, radical action, and last year implemented the Green City Strategy - setting the goal of becoming a zero carbon city by 2050, showing our city's commitment towards making our contribution towards the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement;

- (d) recognises the critical role that cities have to play in delivering a zero carbon future and that whilst the present Government have, in this Council's opinion, been woefully inadequate at rising to the scale of the climate change challenge, city leaders can take innovative solutions to address many of the causes and impact of climate change on a systemic level;
- (e) recalls that the city has already undertaken a number of innovative and bold initiatives that are aimed at reducing our impact on the climate and reducing our city's carbon emissions, but recognises that limiting global warming cannot be achieved by a single organisation or a technological silver bullet, and requires changes to how we all live, work and play and believes every citizen has a role to play in securing a climate safe future;
- (f) further notes that, in recognition of this, the Administration established a Green City Partnership Board, with representation from key city stakeholders including our universities, the private sector and community and voluntary organisations, including the Sheffield Climate Alliance, with the agreed purpose of ensuring that Sheffield can achieve the Green City Strategy objectives and deliver a low carbon, resilient and sustainable city;
- (g) notes that, over the period 2013/14 to 2016/17, the Council has reduced its annual CO₂ emissions by 19%, and that this Administration has also initiated schemes to reduce carbon emissions throughout the city, such as:-
 - (i) as a landlord with over 40,000 homes, Sheffield City Council has invested in improving the fabric and insulation of our homes and installed high-efficiency gas central heating boilers in the majority of homes, and as a result, our homes have increased their SAP11 (Standard Assessment Procedure) energy rating from 64 out of 100 in 2005 to 71 in 2016-17;
 - (ii) use of hydrogen fuel-cell electric vehicles as part of its vehicle fleet since 2017, noting that the vehicles use the wind powered mini-grid hydrogen refuelling station at the Advanced Manufacturing Park;
 - (iii) continued development of the district heat network, turning local waste into electricity and heat for the city, with up to 45MW of heat produced and supplied to over 140 buildings connected to the District Energy Network; in addition, the facility generates up to 21 MW of electricity to the National Grid, which is enough to power 25,000 homes;
 - (iv) using new technology where available, including 66,800 new LED streetlights;

- (v) our Ethical Procurement approach ensures that the Council's suppliers do everything they can to reduce their carbon footprint;
 - (vi) as well as reducing carbon, we are committed to improving the city's air – we are looking at implementing a Clean Air Zone in the city centre, tackling the most polluting vehicles, and we are the first large city to introduce anti-idling measures to stop people leaving their engines running outside schools; and
 - (vii) our transport strategy is seeking to make sustainable modes of transport the number one choice for people in Sheffield;
- (h) notes that the IPCC report identifies cities as one of four critical global systems that can accelerate and upscale climate action, but recognises this will require major transitions in how both mitigation and adaptation are undertaken and, therefore, we need to consider the opportunities the city has to deliver on a revised commitment, as there is only a limited advantage to be gained in setting a target without clear deliverable actions that will enable us as a city to achieve this;
- (i) believes that, as a city, we have made considerable progress in carbon reduction but we need to go further still in light of the IPCC's special report on Global Warming of 1.5°C, published in October 2018, which confirmed the catastrophic consequences of manmade climate change and urgent need to act;
- (j) therefore declares unequivocally that our city, country and planet are facing a CLIMATE EMERGENCY;
- (k) notes that as a result of this call for action, the Green City Partnership Board will be exploring how Sheffield should respond to the IPCC report, both in terms of actions as well as reviewing our existing commitment to become a zero carbon city by 2050; and
- (l) supports this Administration's commitment to report back to Full Council within 6 months, with a more ambitious date for the city to become zero carbon, accompanied by an action plan setting out the required work to deliver a new goal through all relevant strategies and plans, and would entirely and actively welcome the involvement of the cross-party scrutiny system in shaping and overseeing this vital work.

4.3 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of the following words at the end of paragraph (g)(vii) as follows:-

“; and believes a comprehensive, efficient, affordable, integrated, reliable, expanding and low-carbon bus service is a necessary condition

to tackling the climate emergency, and such a service must integrate fully with tram and train services”;

2. the addition of new paragraphs (h) to (k) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (h) to (j) as new paragraphs (l) to (n):-

(h) notes the Liberal Democrat commitments to legislate with:-

(i) a Zero Carbon Act which would commit Britain to be a net zero carbon emitter;

(ii) a Green Transport Act to tackle the public health crisis of air pollution;

(iii) a Green Buildings Act to introduce a zero carbon homes standard and tackle fuel poverty;

(iv) a Nature Act in order to protect and restore bio-diversity, and pay farmers public money for public goods; and

(v) a Zero Waste Act to introduce legally binding targets for cutting waste;

(i) notes that 1.5°C of warming is most likely to occur around 2040 and therefore believes we need to take radical action to decarbonise well before this time at local, national and global levels of governance;

(j) notes that, for Sheffield to be carbon neutral by 2030, it will require broad political consensus and public support for radical policymaking proposals;

(k) believes that citizen involvement should be central to climate action decision-making in order to demonstrate consensus and community support, and that the zero carbon Sheffield by 2030 target also requires an evidence-based approach that is informed by experts;

3. the deletion of original paragraphs (k) and (l) and the addition of new paragraphs (o) to (t) as follows:-

(o) requests the Administration to make plans for a Citizen’s Assembly to inform Sheffield City Council (SCC) policymaking on Council-wide decarbonisation plans, and for the Citizen’s Assembly to have an explicit agenda to explore the achievable pathways (set of policies) to zero carbon by 2030 and inform SCC of the preferred pathway(s), decided by consensus;

(p) directs the Chief Executive to report back within one month with a proposed timetable, independent discussion facilitators and experts to help lead evidence-based and unbiased dialogue among Citizen’s Assembly participants; and that SCC should decide how the Citizen’s

Assembly will interact with the Green City Partnership Board;

- (q) notes the concerns raised across the country into the exploration of shale gas and recent earthquakes attributed to fracking across the UK;
- (r) notes that the ten local authorities that make up Greater Manchester will write into their planning policies a 'presumption' against any request to drill for shale gas and that the Greater Manchester Region have adopted a region-wide policy of opposition to fracking;
- (s) calls for Sheffield City Council to write into its planning policies a 'presumption' against any request to drill for shale gas; and
- (t) calls for all local authorities in the Sheffield City Region to commit to a policy of opposition to fracking.

4.4 It was then moved by Councillor Martin Phipps, seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (l) and the addition of new paragraphs (l) and (m) as follows:-

- (l) supports this Administration's commitment to report back to Full Council within 6 months, pledging to make plans to bring forward the Council's existing target to be a zero carbon city from 2050 to 2030 at the latest, setting out the actions the Council needs to take to meet this revised target, and entirely and actively welcoming the involvement of the cross-party scrutiny system in shaping and overseeing this vital work; and
- (m) asks this Administration to make an immediate decisive contribution towards this vital target by ensuring that the forthcoming procurement of the Council's electricity supply is entirely drawn from renewable sources.

4.5 After contributions from five other Members, with Councillor Jack Scott having foregone his right of reply in order to allow a contribution from the fifth speaker, the amendment moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar was put to the vote and was carried, except for paragraph (h) of part 2 of the amendment and paragraphs (o) and (p) of part 3 of the amendment, which were negatived. Furthermore, the new paragraphs were carried on the basis that they were to be additional to the motion and that the original paragraphs (k) and (l) were not to be deleted, as had been proposed within part 3 of the amendment.

4.5.1 The votes on the amendment moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For part 1, paragraphs (i), (j) and (k) of part 2, and paragraphs (q) to (t) of part 3 of the amendment (72) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook,

Kaltum Rivers, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps, Mohammed Mahroof, Anne Murphy, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Andy Bainbridge, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Gail Smith, Mohammad Maroof, Jim Steinke, Alison Teal, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Jayne Dunn, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley, Francyne Johnson, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Mike Levery, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

- Against part 1, paragraphs (i), (j) and (k) of part 2, and paragraphs (q) to (t) of part 3 of the amendment (1) - Councillor John Booker
- Abstained from voting on part 1, paragraphs (i), (j) and (k) of part 2, and paragraphs (q) to (t) of part 3 of the amendment (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid).
- For paragraph (h) of part 2 of the amendment (19) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery.
- Against paragraph (h) of part 2 of the amendment (49) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) and Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Anne Murphy, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Abdul Khayum, Alan

Law, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Mohammad Maroof, Jim Steinke, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Jayne Dunn, Francyne Johnson, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Abstained from voting on paragraph (h) of part 2 of the amendment (6) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal.

For paragraphs (o) and (p) of part 3 of the amendment (24) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, Alison Teal, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery.

Against paragraphs (o) and (p) of part 3 of the amendment (49) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Tony Downing) and Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Sophie Wilson, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Michelle Cook, Jackie Drayton, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Anne Murphy, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Andy Bainbridge, Abdul Khayum, Alan Law, Lewis Dagnall, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Lisa Banes, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Mohammad Maroof, Jim Steinke, Julie Dore, Ben Miskell, Jack Scott, Mike Drabble, Dianne Hurst, Peter Rippon, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Jayne Dunn, Francyne Johnson, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Paul Wood.

Abstained from voting on paragraphs (o) and (p) of part 3 of the amendment (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid).

- 4.6 The amendment moved by Councillor Martin Phipps was then put to the vote and was negatived.
- 4.7 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 climate change and sustainability are amongst the biggest issues of the 21st century and the effects of manmade and dangerous climate change are already manifestly occurring;
- (b) notes that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) detail that we are already seeing the consequences of a 1°C of global warming through more extreme weather, rising sea levels and diminishing Arctic sea ice, among other worrying changes;
- (c) notes that this Administration has previously categorised climate change as the biggest social justice issue of this century which requires bold, radical action, and last year implemented the Green City Strategy - setting the goal of becoming a zero carbon city by 2050, showing our city's commitment towards making our contribution towards the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement;
- (d) recognises the critical role that cities have to play in delivering a zero carbon future and that whilst the present Government have, in this Council's opinion, been woefully inadequate at rising to the scale of the climate change challenge, city leaders can take innovative solutions to address many of the causes and impact of climate change on a systemic level;
- (e) recalls that the city has already undertaken a number of innovative and bold initiatives that are aimed at reducing our impact on the climate and reducing our city's carbon emissions, but recognises that limiting global warming cannot be achieved by a single organisation or a technological silver bullet, and requires changes to how we all live, work and play and believes every citizen has a role to play in securing a climate safe future;
- (f) further notes that, in recognition of this, the Administration established a Green City Partnership Board, with representation from key city stakeholders including our universities, the private sector and community and voluntary organisations, including the Sheffield Climate Alliance, with the agreed purpose of ensuring that Sheffield can achieve the Green City Strategy objectives and deliver a low carbon, resilient and sustainable city;
- (g) notes that, over the period 2013/14 to 2016/17, the Council has reduced its annual CO₂ emissions by 19%, and that this Administration has also initiated schemes to reduce carbon emissions throughout the city, such

as:-

- (i) as a landlord with over 40,000 homes, Sheffield City Council has invested in improving the fabric and insulation of our homes and installed high-efficiency gas central heating boilers in the majority of homes, and as a result, our homes have increased their SAP11 (Standard Assessment Procedure) energy rating from 64 out of 100 in 2005 to 71 in 2016-17;
- (ii) use of hydrogen fuel-cell electric vehicles as part of its vehicle fleet since 2017, noting that the vehicles use the wind powered mini-grid hydrogen refuelling station at the Advanced Manufacturing Park;
- (iii) continued development of the district heat network, turning local waste into electricity and heat for the city, with up to 45MW of heat produced and supplied to over 140 buildings connected to the District Energy Network; in addition, the facility generates up to 21 MW of electricity to the National Grid, which is enough to power 25,000 homes;
- (iv) using new technology where available, including 66,800 new LED streetlights;
- (v) our Ethical Procurement approach ensures that the Council's suppliers do everything they can to reduce their carbon footprint;
- (vi) as well as reducing carbon, we are committed to improving the city's air – we are looking at implementing a Clean Air Zone in the city centre, tackling the most polluting vehicles, and we are the first large city to introduce anti-idling measures to stop people leaving their engines running outside schools; and
- (vii) our transport strategy is seeking to make sustainable modes of transport the number one choice for people in Sheffield; and believes a comprehensive, efficient, affordable, integrated, reliable, expanding and low-carbon bus service is a necessary condition to tackling the climate emergency, and such a service must integrate fully with tram and train services;
- (h) notes that the IPCC report identifies cities as one of four critical global systems that can accelerate and upscale climate action, but recognises this will require major transitions in how both mitigation and adaptation are undertaken and, therefore, we need to consider the opportunities the city has to deliver on a revised commitment, as there is only a limited advantage to be gained in setting a target without clear deliverable actions that will enable us as a city to achieve this;
- (i) believes that, as a city, we have made considerable progress in carbon reduction but we need to go further still in light of the IPCC's special

- report on Global Warming of 1.5°C, published in October 2018, which confirmed the catastrophic consequences of manmade climate change and urgent need to act;
- (j) therefore declares unequivocally that our city, country and planet are facing a CLIMATE EMERGENCY;
 - (k) notes that as a result of this call for action, the Green City Partnership Board will be exploring how Sheffield should respond to the IPCC report, both in terms of actions as well as reviewing our existing commitment to become a zero carbon city by 2050;
 - (l) supports this Administration's commitment to report back to Full Council within 6 months, with a more ambitious date for the city to become zero carbon, accompanied by an action plan setting out the required work to deliver a new goal through all relevant strategies and plans, and would entirely and actively welcome the involvement of the cross-party scrutiny system in shaping and overseeing this vital work;
 - (m) notes that 1.5°C of warming is most likely to occur around 2040 and therefore believes we need to take radical action to decarbonise well before this time at local, national and global levels of governance;
 - (n) notes that, for Sheffield to be carbon neutral by 2030, it will require broad political consensus and public support for radical policymaking proposals;
 - (o) believes that citizen involvement should be central to climate action decision-making in order to demonstrate consensus and community support, and that the zero carbon Sheffield by 2030 target also requires an evidence-based approach that is informed by experts;
 - (p) notes the concerns raised across the country into the exploration of shale gas and recent earthquakes attributed to fracking across the UK;
 - (q) notes that the ten local authorities that make up Greater Manchester will write into their planning policies a 'presumption' against any request to drill for shale gas and that the Greater Manchester Region have adopted a region-wide policy of opposition to fracking;
 - (r) calls for Sheffield City Council to write into its planning policies a 'presumption' against any request to drill for shale gas; and
 - (s) calls for all local authorities in the Sheffield City Region to commit to a policy of opposition to fracking.

4.7.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Shaffaq Mohammed, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue

Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery voted for paragraphs (a) to (e), (g) to (k) and (m) to (s), and abstained from voting on paragraphs (f) and (l) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded;

2. Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a) to (d), (i), (j) and (m) to (s), voted against paragraph (h), and abstained from voting on paragraphs (e), (f), (g), (k) and (l) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

3. Councillor John Booker voted for paragraphs (f), (g)(i) to (g)(iv), (g)(vi), (g)(vii), (h) and (q) to (s), and voted against paragraphs (a) to (e), (g)(v) and (i) to (p) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

5. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN & HRA BUDGET 2019/20

5.1 RESOLVED: On the motion of the Lord Mayor (Councillor Magid Magid) and seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.1, the order of business as published on the Council Summons be altered by taking item 5 on the agenda (Housing Revenue Account Business Plan and Budget 2019/20) as the next item of business.

5.2 It was moved by Councillor Jim Steinke, seconded by Councillor Paul Wood, that the following recommendations made by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 16th January 2019 in relation to the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan and Budget 2019/20, be approved:-

“RESOLVED: That Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 6th February 2019 that:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2019/20, as set out in the appendix to the report, is approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget 2019/20, as set out in the appendix to the report, is approved;
- (c) rents for Council dwellings, including temporary accommodation, are reduced by 1% from April 2019 in line with requirements in the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016;
- (d) garage rents for garage plots and garage sites will remain unchanged for 2019/20;
- (e) the community heating standing charge will increase by 20p per week for 2019/20;
- (f) the sheltered housing service charge will remain unchanged for 2019/20;

- (g) burglar alarm charges will remain unchanged for 2019/20; and
- (h) service charges for furnished accommodation will remain unchanged for 2019/20.”

5.3 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Penny Baker, and formally seconded by Councillor Sue Auckland, as an amendment, that the recommendations made by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 16th January, 2019, concerning the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan and HRA Budget 2019/20, be approved with the addition of new paragraphs (i) and (j) as follows:-

- (i) notes that Sheffield City Council holds a number of ‘sundry’ properties within the HRA housing stock which is a stock of non-traditional houses yet to be investigated for use as social housing;
- (j) requests that officers review the existing policy on ‘sundry’ properties, with a view to:-
 - (i) surveying the portfolio of sundry properties for their suitability for conversion into social housing; and
 - (ii) proposing an investment plan to bring as many of these properties back into use as social housing as soon as possible.

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

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

RESOLVED: That:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2019/20, as set out in the appendix to the report, is approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget 2019/20, as set out in the appendix to the report, is approved;
- (c) rents for Council dwellings, including temporary accommodation, are reduced by 1% from April 2019 in line with requirements in the Welfare Reform and Work Act 2016;
- (d) garage rents for garage plots and garage sites will remain unchanged for 2019/20;
- (e) the community heating standing charge will increase by 20p per week for 2019/20;
- (f) the sheltered housing service charge will remain unchanged for

- 2019/20;
- (g) burglar alarm charges will remain unchanged for 2019/20;
 - (h) service charges for furnished accommodation will remain unchanged for 2019/20;
 - (i) it be noted that Sheffield City Council holds a number of 'sundry' properties within the HRA housing stock which is a stock of non-traditional houses yet to be investigated for use as social housing; and
 - (j) officers be requested to review the existing policy on 'sundry' properties, with a view to:-
 - (i) surveying the portfolio of sundry properties for their suitability for conversion into social housing; and
 - (ii) proposing an investment plan to bring as many of these properties back into use as social housing as soon as possible.

6. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

- 6.1 A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated.
- 6.2 Supplementary questions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4), questions relating to urgent business (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6ii) and questions relating to the discharge of the functions of the South Yorkshire Joint Authorities for Fire and Rescue and Pensions (under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6i), were not able to be asked before the meeting terminated at 5.30 p.m..

7. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "OPPOSITION TO GOVERNMENT PLANS TO REMOVE DEPRIVATION AND POVERTY FROM COUNCIL FUNDING FORMULA" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR OLIVIA BLAKE AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR ROBERT JOHNSON

- 7.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Olivia Blake, and formally seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that this Council:-
- (a) notes that the Government have set out proposals for a new funding formula and further changes to the distribution of business rates, which would mark one of the biggest shake-ups of council funding in living memory;
 - (b) notes that the proposed changes include the recommendation that grant

allocations should no longer be weighted to reflect the higher costs of poverty and deprivation;

- (c) believes that this would be disastrous for urban, and predominately Labour-run, authorities and once again mean that poorer areas are bearing the greatest brunt of austerity at the expense of wealthier areas;
- (d) notes the condemnation of Leaders of urban councils who have written to Ministers to complain that under the “grossly unfair and illogical” proposals, potentially tens of millions of pounds would be switched to rural and suburban council areas;
- (e) notes that, at present, the distribution of revenue resource grants to councils is weighted to support poor areas due to deprivation being acknowledged as a driver of higher than average demand for social care, housing, and other neighbourhood services, as well as recognising that poorer areas are less able to raise taxes locally;
- (f) notes, however, the Government’s proposal would remove deprivation from the foundation formula that covers funds for waste disposal, public transport, libraries, leisure, planning, homelessness and recreation, which together amount to about 30% of a council’s budget, with, instead, funding distributed purely on a population basis – with an added weighting for the costs of rurality;
- (g) believes that the Government cannot justify how services such as waste collection, street cleaning, homelessness, public transport and libraries are needed solely on the basis of population numbers no matter where people live, and that it is well established and understood that the cost of providing services increases in more deprived areas – due, in part, to extra demand on services and as residents are less able to finance their needs themselves;
- (h) notes that Metropolitan districts in England have already suffered the sharpest real terms cuts since 2010 – with, on a nation-wide average, a reduction in revenue spending power of 33.9% compared with county councils seeing a reduction of 22.1% over the same period;
- (i) believes that the changes are a shameless attempt by this Government to prop up financially struggling authorities and declining services in Tory heartlands, with an estimated 76% of Conservative MPs representing constituencies covered by county councils, with Government Ministers bowing to pressure from the Conservative-dominated County Councils Network (CCN) to change the grants system - by agreeing with the CCN argument that its members are unfairly allocated less money per head of population than inner-city areas;
- (j) notes the recent Centre for Cities report which found that cities have borne nearly three-quarters (74%) of all real-terms local government

funding cuts in the last decade despite being home to just 54% of the population - the equivalent to a reduction of £386 per city dweller since 2009/10, compared to £172 per person living elsewhere;

- (k) notes that report also stated that this is even much more pronounced in the North of England, with average spending reduced by 20% compared to 9% for those cities in the South West, East of England and South East, excluding London;
- (l) further notes that, as outlined by a Sheffield City Council report in January, government spending cuts have impacted most on councils in more deprived areas and yet the Government are, shockingly, looking to make this worse still;
- (m) notes that the Government's proposed changes would be to the serious detriment of urban, economically and socially disadvantaged areas, which also mainly happen to be Labour-run council areas, and believes it is a national scandal that, since 2010, governments have looked after their own affluent communities while leaving struggling communities to bear the greatest cuts; and
- (n) believes, quite simply, it is nothing less than naked class war and that like any war, there are casualties: from the homeless to damaged childhoods to women fleeing violence – and that we need a Labour government now more than ever to ensure that these abhorrent and ideological attacks on local authorities like Sheffield cease immediately.

7.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, and formally seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (c), (d), (l), (m) and (n); the re-lettering of original paragraphs (e) to (k) as new paragraphs (c) to (i); and the addition of new paragraphs (j) and (k) as follows:-

- (j) believes the Labour-run Sheffield City Council should be reaching out to other local authorities who are concerned about the fairer funding review and encourage them to take part in the ongoing consultation seeking views on the approach to measuring the relative needs and resources of local authorities; and
- (k) believes that this Administration is turning this important funding issue into a class-war and does not take into account that this major policy change by the government affects areas across the country, and therefore requires a more cooperative and collaborative approach to lobby central government together to achieve a fairer funding settlement for local government.

7.3 On being put to the vote, the amendment was negatived.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that the Government have set out proposals for a new funding formula and further changes to the distribution of business rates, which would mark one of the biggest shake-ups of council funding in living memory;
- (b) notes that the proposed changes include the recommendation that grant allocations should no longer be weighted to reflect the higher costs of poverty and deprivation;
- (c) believes that this would be disastrous for urban, and predominately Labour-run, authorities and once again mean that poorer areas are bearing the greatest brunt of austerity at the expense of wealthier areas;
- (d) notes the condemnation of Leaders of urban councils who have written to Ministers to complain that under the “grossly unfair and illogical” proposals, potentially tens of millions of pounds would be switched to rural and suburban council areas;
- (e) notes that, at present, the distribution of revenue resource grants to councils is weighted to support poor areas due to deprivation being acknowledged as a driver of higher than average demand for social care, housing, and other neighbourhood services, as well as recognising that poorer areas are less able to raise taxes locally;
- (f) notes, however, the Government’s proposal would remove deprivation from the foundation formula that covers funds for waste disposal, public transport, libraries, leisure, planning, homelessness and recreation, which together amount to about 30% of a council’s budget, with, instead, funding distributed purely on a population basis – with an added weighting for the costs of rurality;
- (g) believes that the Government cannot justify how services such as waste collection, street cleaning, homelessness, public transport and libraries are needed solely on the basis of population numbers no matter where people live, and that it is well established and understood that the cost of providing services increases in more deprived areas – due, in part, to extra demand on services and as residents are less able to finance their needs themselves;
- (h) notes that Metropolitan districts in England have already suffered the sharpest real terms cuts since 2010 – with, on a nation-wide average, a reduction in revenue spending power of 33.9% compared with county councils seeing a reduction of 22.1% over the same period;
- (i) believes that the changes are a shameless attempt by this Government to prop up financially struggling authorities and declining services in Tory heartlands, with an estimated 76% of Conservative MPs representing constituencies covered by county councils, with

Government Ministers bowing to pressure from the Conservative-dominated County Councils Network (CCN) to change the grants system - by agreeing with the CCN argument that its members are unfairly allocated less money per head of population than inner-city areas;

- (j) notes the recent Centre for Cities report which found that cities have borne nearly three-quarters (74%) of all real-terms local government funding cuts in the last decade despite being home to just 54% of the population - the equivalent to a reduction of £386 per city dweller since 2009/10, compared to £172 per person living elsewhere;
- (k) notes that report also stated that this is even much more pronounced in the North of England, with average spending reduced by 20% compared to 9% for those cities in the South West, East of England and South East, excluding London;
- (l) further notes that, as outlined by a Sheffield City Council report in January, government spending cuts have impacted most on councils in more deprived areas and yet the Government are, shockingly, looking to make this worse still;
- (m) notes that the Government's proposed changes would be to the serious detriment of urban, economically and socially disadvantaged areas, which also mainly happen to be Labour-run council areas, and believes it is a national scandal that, since 2010, governments have looked after their own affluent communities while leaving struggling communities to bear the greatest cuts; and
- (n) believes, quite simply, it is nothing less than naked class war and that like any war, there are casualties: from the homeless to damaged childhoods to women fleeing violence – and that we need a Labour government now more than ever to ensure that these abhorrent and ideological attacks on local authorities like Sheffield cease immediately.

7.4.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery voted for paragraphs (a), (b), (e) to (h) and (j) to (l), and against paragraphs (c), (d), (i), (m) and (n) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

2. Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a) to (h) and (j) to (m), and abstained from voting on paragraphs (i) and (n) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "GUARANTEEING NO MORE CUTS AND NO MORE FARE INCREASES" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR IAN AUCKLAND AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR RICHARD SHAW

8.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, and formally seconded by Councillor Richard Shaw, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that the Sheffield Bus Partnership has failed the citizens of Sheffield by not improving services and keeping fares low which has led to:-
 - (i) cuts to services available to the general public;
 - (ii) extortionate fare increases, forcing people to use their cars over public transport as a cheaper and more accessible option; and
 - (iii) a lack of public confidence in the reliability of the bus service, which is also contributing to decreasing passenger numbers; noting that punctuality of bus services has reduced, down to 84% from 87% over the past three years;
- (b) is concerned that increased car use will add to air pollution in the city centre if fewer people are using more energy efficient bus services;
- (c) is concerned that cuts to bus services are preventing people from getting to work, school, run errands and attend medical appointments;
- (d) notes that, under the Bus Services Act 2017, the Sheffield City Region Mayoral Combined Authority has the power to enact bus franchising and was agreed in the original 2015 Sheffield devolution deal;
- (e) believes that bus franchising will be a long-term solution to these problems, allowing bus operators and local authorities to work collaboratively to improve bus services and realise untapped growth potentials in regional and rural areas;
- (f) acknowledges the excellence of remaining municipal bus operators, and accepts the potential of a return of municipal enterprise in public transport services; however, notes that this would require new legislation, together with the assumption of substantial liabilities, risk and costs beyond that needed for a franchise approach; and
- (g) resolves to:-
 - (i) call on this Administration to protect passengers from further fare increases, cuts to routes and unreliable services by using any available means, which could include, but not necessarily be limited to:-
 - (A) giving notice to immediately terminate the Bus Partnership

Agreement;

- (B) enlisting the support of South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive;
 - (C) an active media campaign; and
 - (D) a review of existing bus priority measures in order to deliver a more reliable, greener and efficient bus service;
- (ii) support the introduction of a statutory bus quality contract in Sheffield;
 - (iii) give notice to terminate Sheffield City Council's membership of the Sheffield Bus Partnership immediately;
 - (iv) call on the Sheffield City Region Mayor to progress bus franchising under the powers of the Bus Services Act 2017; and
 - (v) send copies of this motion to all the other parties to the Bus Partnership Agreement.

8.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Sophie Wilson, and formally seconded by Councillor Andy Bainbridge, 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) agrees with comments from former Liberal Democrat Minister for Transport, the Rt. Hon. Norman Baker, that the Sheffield Bus Partnership Agreement was, at the time, "good news for the City"; and that the partnership directly led to the exclusive Better Bus Area grant of £18.3 million to further improve Sheffield's bus offer just a year later;
- (b) notes that the recent Bus in Crises report found that, nationally, bus services are under sustained pressure, with council funding almost halved since 2010;
- (c) further notes that budgets to subsidise routes were reduced by another £20m last year and 188 services were cut, according to the Campaign for Better Transport, and that local authorities across England and Wales had taken £182m away from supported bus services over the decade, affecting more than 3,000 bus routes;
- (d) believes that councils had been put in an impossible position due to actions from successive governments since 2010 and the resulting funding squeeze;
- (e) notes that South Yorkshire transport activity is principally resourced through a Levy contributed by the four districts and that, as partners' budgets have come under increasing pressure, the Levy has been

reduced, noting that since April 2010, the Levy across South Yorkshire has fallen by £38.9m (41% down) from £94.7m to £55.8m for the financial year 2018/19, and further notes that Sheffield Liberal Democrat councillors supported these reductions;

- (f) recalls the formation of the Coalition Government in 2010 and the onslaught of cuts that Sheffield has suffered from, which were wholly unopposed by the local Liberal Democrat Group, despite all the evidence that showed the damage they were doing to Sheffield;
- (g) notes that despite these unprecedented cuts, which this Council believes were politically motivated, the Partnership has helped to ensure that city bus day and weekly tickets are still lower today in 2018 than they were in 2015, and that operators have invested heavily in modern technology, such as contactless ticket technology on almost every bus, free wifi, and USB ports in the new vehicles and the introduction of 117 greener and low emission buses;
- (h) believes that this Administration is doing everything possible to ensure that buses can pass through the city as efficiently as possible, and supports the planned improvements on the inner ring road, which will mean buses are able to pass through significantly more quickly, improving punctuality and reliability for numerous services;
- (i) notes that this Administration opposed government plans which have stripped local authorities of their ability to set-up and run their own municipal bus operators, and notes that Labour have promised to reverse this nationally;
- (j) recognises that control of the bus service is one of the powers available to the Sheffield City Region Mayor, and recalls that the opportunity to re-regulate bus services in the city was one of the reasons why this Council agreed to support the devolution deal; and
- (k) notes that, in November 2018, this Council called on the Sheffield City Region Mayor to bring forward re-regulation of the bus service.

8.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Rob Murphy, and formally seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (g)(iv) and the substitution of a new paragraph (g)(iv) as follows:-

- (g)(iv) note the manifesto commitment of the Sheffield City Region Mayor in May 2018 to 'use regulatory powers', and the call from this Council on 7th November 2018 to him to 'bring forward reregulation of the bus service', and calls again for the Mayor to progress bus franchising under the powers of the Bus Services Act 2017; and

8.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor Penny Baker, and formally seconded by Councillor Sue Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted

be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (h) to (j) as follows:-

- (h) agrees with Clive Betts MP that the cost of public transport was a "real problem" in the City and that "it's a history over the last few decades of well above inflation fare rises whilst services have deteriorated all the time";
- (i) condemns recent fare increases as ultimately a futile strategy, only increasing bus company revenue and profits in the short term, further noting that, according to Matt Davis, Managing Director, Stagecoach Yorkshire, "where these costs are passed on to passengers through fares, every 8% increase in costs leads to a potential 5.6% fall in passenger numbers. Also, every 10% reduction in service frequency results in an estimated 5% drop in patronage"; and
- (j) notes comments recently made by the Labour Party Leader, the Rt. Hon. Jeremy Corbyn, MP, that "Passengers now face a toxic mix of rising fares, cuts to services and reduced access" and "For too long the bus industry has put profit for a few before millions of passengers", further notes that it is for councils to choose which bus operations to support in their area, and believes this that Administration continues to support fare increases and service cuts.

8.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Sophie Wilson was put to the vote and was carried.

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

8.6 The amendment moved by Councillor Rob Murphy was put to the vote and was carried on the basis that the new paragraph was to be an additional paragraph to the Substantive Motion.

8.7 The amendment moved by Councillor Penny Baker was put to the vote and was carried, except for paragraph (j) which was negatived.

8.7.1 (NOTE: Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (h) and (i), and abstained from voting on paragraph (j) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) agrees with comments from former Liberal Democrat Minister for Transport, the Rt. Hon. Norman Baker, that the Sheffield Bus Partnership Agreement was, at the time, "good news for the City"; and

- that the partnership directly led to the exclusive Better Bus Area grant of £18.3 million to further improve Sheffield's bus offer just a year later;
- (b) notes that the recent Bus in Crises report found that, nationally, bus services are under sustained pressure, with council funding almost halved since 2010;
 - (c) further notes that budgets to subsidise routes were reduced by another £20m last year and 188 services were cut, according to the Campaign for Better Transport, and that local authorities across England and Wales had taken £182m away from supported bus services over the decade, affecting more than 3,000 bus routes;
 - (d) believes that councils had been put in an impossible position due to actions from successive governments since 2010 and the resulting funding squeeze;
 - (e) notes that South Yorkshire transport activity is principally resourced through a Levy contributed by the four districts and that, as partners' budgets have come under increasing pressure, the Levy has been reduced, noting that since April 2010, the Levy across South Yorkshire has fallen by £38.9m (41% down) from £94.7m to £55.8m for the financial year 2018/19, and further notes that Sheffield Liberal Democrat councillors supported these reductions;
 - (f) recalls the formation of the Coalition Government in 2010 and the onslaught of cuts that Sheffield has suffered from, which were wholly unopposed by the local Liberal Democrat Group, despite all the evidence that showed the damage they were doing to Sheffield;
 - (g) notes that despite these unprecedented cuts, which this Council believes were politically motivated, the Partnership has helped to ensure that city bus day and weekly tickets are still lower today in 2018 than they were in 2015, and that operators have invested heavily in modern technology, such as contactless ticket technology on almost every bus, free wifi, and USB ports in the new vehicles and the introduction of 117 greener and low emission buses;
 - (h) believes that this Administration is doing everything possible to ensure that buses can pass through the city as efficiently as possible, and supports the planned improvements on the inner ring road, which will mean buses are able to pass through significantly more quickly, improving punctuality and reliability for numerous services;
 - (i) notes that this Administration opposed government plans which have stripped local authorities of their ability to set-up and run their own municipal bus operators, and notes that Labour have promised to reverse this nationally;
 - (j) recognises that control of the bus service is one of the powers available

to the Sheffield City Region Mayor, and recalls that the opportunity to re-regulate bus services in the city was one of the reasons why this Council agreed to support the devolution deal;

- (k) notes that, in November 2018, this Council called on the Sheffield City Region Mayor to bring forward re-regulation of the bus service;
- (l) notes the manifesto commitment of the Sheffield City Region Mayor in May 2018 to 'use regulatory powers', and the call from this Council on 7th November 2018 to him to 'bring forward reregulation of the bus service', and calls again for the Mayor to progress bus franchising under the powers of the Bus Services Act 2017;
- (m) agrees with Clive Betts MP that the cost of public transport was a "real problem" in the City and that "it's a history over the last few decades of well above inflation fare rises whilst services have deteriorated all the time"; and
- (n) condemns recent fare increases as ultimately a futile strategy, only increasing bus company revenue and profits in the short term, further noting that, according to Matt Davis, Managing Director, Stagecoach Yorkshire, "where these costs are passed on to passengers through fares, every 8% increase in costs leads to a potential 5.6% fall in passenger numbers. Also, every 10% reduction in service frequency results in an estimated 5% drop in patronage".

8.8.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery voted for paragraphs (b), (c), (j), (k), (m) and (n), and against paragraphs (a), (d) to (i) and (l) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

2. Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (b), (c), (e), (k), (l), (m) and (n), voted against paragraphs (a), (d) and (h), and abstained from voting on paragraphs (f), (g), (i) and (j) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)

9. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "A CLIMATE EMERGENCY" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MARTIN PHIPPS AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR ALISON TEAL

9.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Martin Phipps, and formally seconded by Councillor Alison Teal, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC's) Special Report, published in October 2018, which describes the enormous harm that a 2°C rise in observed global mean surface temperatures above

pre-industrial levels is likely to cause, but also tells us that a limit of 1.5°C may still be possible with ambitious action from national and local government, the private sector and local communities;

- (b) notes that carbon emissions result from both production and consumption;
- (c) notes that many cities around the world, including Bristol, Nottingham, Brighton, Bradford, Manchester and London, are responding by declaring a 'Climate Emergency' and committing resources to address this;
- (d) notes that this Council has already published a Green City Strategy, which aims to set out a course of ensuring Sheffield is a zero-carbon city by 2050;
- (e) believes that cities are uniquely placed to lead the world in reducing carbon emissions, as they are in many ways easier to decarbonise than rural areas – for example because of their capacity for heat networks and mass transit systems;
- (f) believes that local governments are well placed to make the case for climate action to national governments but also believes that local governments should not wait for their national governments to change their policies;
- (g) therefore, declares a 'Climate Emergency';
- (h) pledges to make plans to bring forward the Council's existing target to be a zero carbon city from 2050 to 2030;
- (i) asks this Administration to make a decisive contribution towards this vital target by ensuring that the forthcoming procurement of the Council's electricity supply is drawn from renewable sources;
- (j) directs the Chief Executive to produce a report to Council within six months on the actions the Council needs to take to meet this revised target; and
- (k) resolves to send a copy of this motion to all Sheffield MPs and the Secretary of State for the Environment.

9.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Neale Gibson, and formally seconded by Councillor Jack Scott, 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 climate change and sustainability are amongst the biggest issues of the 21st century and the effects of manmade and dangerous climate change are already manifestly occurring;

- (b) notes that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) detail that we are already seeing the consequences of a 1°C of global warming through more extreme weather, rising sea levels and diminishing Arctic sea ice, among other worrying changes;
- (c) notes that this Administration has previously categorised climate change as the biggest social justice issue of this century which requires bold, radical action, and last year implemented the Green City Strategy - setting the goal of becoming a zero carbon city by 2050, showing our city's commitment towards making our contribution towards the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement;
- (d) recognises the critical role that cities have to play in delivering a zero carbon future and that whilst the present Government have, in this Council's opinion, been woefully inadequate at rising to the scale of the climate change challenge, city leaders can take innovative solutions to address many of the causes and impact of climate change on a systemic level;
- (e) recalls that the city has already undertaken a number of innovative and bold initiatives that are aimed at reducing our impact on the climate and reducing our city's carbon emissions, but recognises that limiting global warming cannot be achieved by a single organisation or a technological silver bullet, and requires changes to how we all live, work and play and believes every citizen has a role to play in securing a climate safe future;
- (f) further notes that, in recognition of this, the Administration established a Green City Partnership Board, with representation from key city stakeholders including our universities, the private sector and community and voluntary organisations, including the Sheffield Climate Alliance, with the agreed purpose of ensuring that Sheffield can achieve the Green City Strategy objectives and deliver a low carbon, resilient and sustainable city;
- (g) notes that, over the period 2013/14 to 2016/17, the Council has reduced its annual CO₂ emissions by 19%, and that this Administration has also initiated schemes to reduce carbon emissions throughout the city, such as:-
 - (i) as a landlord with over 40,000 homes, Sheffield City Council has invested in improving the fabric and insulation of our homes and installed high-efficiency gas central heating boilers in the majority of homes, and as a result, our homes have increased their SAP11 (Standard Assessment Procedure) energy rating from 64 out of 100 in 2005 to 71 in 2016-17;
 - (ii) use of hydrogen fuel-cell electric vehicles as part of its vehicle fleet since 2017, noting that the vehicles use the wind powered

- mini-grid hydrogen refuelling station at the Advanced Manufacturing Park;
- (iii) continued development of the district heat network, turning local waste into electricity and heat for the city, with up to 45MW of heat produced and supplied to over 140 buildings connected to the District Energy Network; in addition, the facility generates up to 21MW of electricity to the National Grid, which is enough to power 25,000 homes;
 - (iv) using new technology where available, including 66,800 new LED streetlights;
 - (v) our Ethical Procurement approach ensures that the Council's suppliers do everything they can to reduce their carbon footprint;
 - (vi) as well as reducing carbon, we are committed to improving the city's air – we are looking at implementing a Clean Air Zone in the city centre, tackling the most polluting vehicles, and we are the first large city to introduce anti-idling measures to stop people leaving their engines running outside schools; and
 - (vii) our transport strategy is seeking to make sustainable modes of transport the number one choice for people in Sheffield;
- (h) notes that the IPCC report identifies cities as one of four critical global systems that can accelerate and upscale climate action, but recognises this will require major transitions in how both mitigation and adaptation are undertaken and, therefore, we need to consider the opportunities the city has to deliver on a revised commitment, as there is only a limited advantage to be gained in setting a target without clear deliverable actions that will enable us as a city to achieve this;
- (i) believes that, as a city, we have made considerable progress in carbon reduction but we need to go further still in light of the IPCC's special report on Global Warming of 1.5°C, published in October 2018, which confirmed the catastrophic consequences of manmade climate change and urgent need to act;
- (j) therefore declares unequivocally that our city, country and planet are facing a CLIMATE EMERGENCY;
- (k) notes that as a result of this call for action, the Green City Partnership Board will be exploring how Sheffield should respond to the IPCC report, both in terms of actions as well as reviewing our existing commitment to become a zero carbon city by 2050; and
- (l) supports this Administration's commitment to report back to Full Council within 6 months, with a more ambitious date for the city to become zero carbon, accompanied by an action plan setting out the required work to

deliver a new goal through all relevant strategies and plans, and would entirely and actively welcome the involvement of the cross-party scrutiny system in shaping and overseeing this vital work.

9.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Gail Smith, and formally seconded by Councillor Mohammed Mahroof, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (l) to (u) as follows:-

- (l) notes the Liberal Democrat commitments to legislate with:-
 - (i) a Zero Carbon Act which would commit Britain to be a net zero carbon emitter;
 - (ii) a Green Transport Act to tackle the public health crisis of air pollution;
 - (iii) a Green Buildings Act to introduce a zero carbon homes standard and tackle fuel poverty;
 - (iv) a Nature Act in order to protect and restore bio-diversity, and pay farmers public money for public goods; and
 - (v) a Zero Waste Act to introduce legally binding targets for cutting waste;
- (m) notes that 1.5°C of warming is most likely to occur around 2040 and therefore believes we need to take radical action to decarbonise well before this time at local, national and global levels of governance;
- (n) notes that, for Sheffield to be carbon neutral by 2030, it will require broad political consensus and public support for radical policymaking proposals;
- (o) believes that citizen involvement should be central to climate action decision-making in order to demonstrate consensus and community support, and that the zero carbon Sheffield by 2030 target also requires an evidence-based approach that is informed by experts;
- (p) requests the Administration to make plans for a Citizen's Assembly to inform Sheffield City Council (SCC) policymaking on Council-wide decarbonisation plans, and for the Citizen's Assembly to have an explicit agenda to explore the achievable pathways (set of policies) to zero carbon by 2030 and inform SCC of the preferred pathway(s), decided by consensus;
- (q) directs the Chief Executive to report back within one month with a proposed timetable, independent discussion facilitators and experts to help lead evidence-based and unbiased dialogue among Citizen's Assembly participants; and that SCC should decide how the Citizen's Assembly will interact with the Green City Partnership Board;

- (r) notes the concerns raised across the country into the exploration of shale gas and recent earthquakes attributed to fracking across the UK;
- (s) notes that the ten local authorities that make up Greater Manchester will write into their planning policies a 'presumption' against any request to drill for shale gas and that the Greater Manchester Region have adopted a region-wide policy of opposition to fracking;
- (t) calls for Sheffield City Council to write into its planning policies a 'presumption' against any request to drill for shale gas; and
- (u) calls for all local authorities in the Sheffield City Region to commit to a policy of opposition to fracking.

9.4 It was then formally moved by Councillor John Booker, and formally seconded by Councillor Rob Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (l) to (p) as follows:-

- (l) believes that declaring a "Climate Emergency" is similar to the Brexit "Project Fear" campaign, and that this type of approach helps no one come to a positive outcome in any debate or action;
- (m) (i) contends that if the Green Party hopes to turn Sheffield into a zero carbon city by 2030, they must state the facts and figures of how this will be achieved and (ii) believes that investing in renewable energy should be supported if it can deliver electricity at competitive rates, but that British families must not be pushed into fuel poverty by politicians enforcing expensive and failing fuel policies;
- (n) notes the push towards hybrids, plug-in hybrids and electric cars, which do their bit to reduce tailpipe emissions, but extra electricity needs to be produced at our power stations, and further notes that (i) electric cars actually increase pollution in places like China, which produces the largest proportion of lithium-ion battery cells and, more importantly, their precursor materials, (ii) the critical element is the anode, often made of graphite, and the average electric car uses 110 pounds of graphite, as do laptops and smartphones to a much lesser degree, and (iii) China supplies much of that demand, but graphite production causes significant pollution in the country;
- (o) further believes that hydro power is part of the solution in relation to renewable energy in Sheffield and the country, and that, with our five rivers running through Sheffield, it would be wonderful to see modern waterwheels and the like once again gracing our waterways; and
- (p) also believes that (i) all resources are precious and should not be abused or used inappropriately, (ii) all balanced people believe in a clean and sustainable environment for all to co-exist in, (iii) from the industrial revolution to the present day, momentous changes have taken

place, mostly for the better, and (iv) for these improvements to keep moving forward, personal doctrines and ideologies must be moved aside.

- 9.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Neale Gibson was put to the vote and was carried.
- 9.6 The amendment moved by Councillor Gail Smith was put to the vote and was carried, except for paragraphs (l), (p) and (q) which were negatived.
- 9.7 The amendment moved by Councillor John Booker was put to the vote and was negatived.
- 9.7.1 (NOTE: Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (m)(ii) and (o), and abstained from voting on paragraphs (l), (m)(i), (n) and (p) of the amendment, and asked for this to be recorded.)
- 9.8 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 climate change and sustainability are amongst the biggest issues of the 21st century and the effects of manmade and dangerous climate change are already manifestly occurring;
- (b) notes that the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) detail that we are already seeing the consequences of a 1°C of global warming through more extreme weather, rising sea levels and diminishing Arctic sea ice, among other worrying changes;
- (c) notes that this Administration has previously categorised climate change as the biggest social justice issue of this century which requires bold, radical action, and last year implemented the Green City Strategy - setting the goal of becoming a zero carbon city by 2050, showing our city's commitment towards making our contribution towards the 2015 Paris Climate Agreement:-
- (d) recognises the critical role that cities have to play in delivering a zero carbon future and that whilst the present Government have, in this Council's opinion, been woefully inadequate at rising to the scale of the climate change challenge, city leaders can take innovative solutions to address many of the causes and impact of climate change on a systemic level;
- (e) recalls that the city has already undertaken a number of innovative and bold initiatives that are aimed at reducing our impact on the climate and reducing our city's carbon emissions, but recognises that limiting global warming cannot be achieved by a single organisation or a technological

silver bullet, and requires changes to how we all live, work and play and believes every citizen has a role to play in securing a climate safe future;

- (f) further notes that, in recognition of this, the Administration established a Green City Partnership Board, with representation from key city stakeholders including our universities, the private sector and community and voluntary organisations, including the Sheffield Climate Alliance, with the agreed purpose of ensuring that Sheffield can achieve the Green City Strategy objectives and deliver a low carbon, resilient and sustainable city;
- (g) notes that, over the period 2013/14 to 2016/17, the Council has reduced its annual CO₂ emissions by 19%, and that this Administration has also initiated schemes to reduce carbon emissions throughout the city, such as:-
 - (i) as a landlord with over 40,000 homes, Sheffield City Council has invested in improving the fabric and insulation of our homes and installed high-efficiency gas central heating boilers in the majority of homes, and as a result, our homes have increased their SAP11 (Standard Assessment Procedure) energy rating from 64 out of 100 in 2005 to 71 in 2016-17;
 - (ii) use of hydrogen fuel-cell electric vehicles as part of its vehicle fleet since 2017, noting that the vehicles use the wind powered mini-grid hydrogen refuelling station at the Advanced Manufacturing Park;
 - (iii) continued development of the district heat network, turning local waste into electricity and heat for the city, with up to 45MW of heat produced and supplied to over 140 buildings connected to the District Energy Network; in addition, the facility generates up to 21 MW of electricity to the National Grid, which is enough to power 25,000 homes;
 - (iv) using new technology where available, including 66,800 new LED streetlights;
 - (v) our Ethical Procurement approach ensures that the Council's suppliers do everything they can to reduce their carbon footprint;
 - (vi) as well as reducing carbon, we are committed to improving the city's air – we are looking at implementing a Clean Air Zone in the city centre, tackling the most polluting vehicles, and we are the first large city to introduce anti-idling measures to stop people leaving their engines running outside schools; and
 - (vii) our transport strategy is seeking to make sustainable modes of transport the number one choice for people in Sheffield;

- (h) notes that the IPCC report identifies cities as one of four critical global systems that can accelerate and upscale climate action, but recognises this will require major transitions in how both mitigation and adaptation are undertaken and, therefore, we need to consider the opportunities the city has to deliver on a revised commitment, as there is only a limited advantage to be gained in setting a target without clear deliverable actions that will enable us as a city to achieve this;
- (i) believes that, as a city, we have made considerable progress in carbon reduction but we need to go further still in light of the IPCC's special report on Global Warming of 1.5°C, published in October 2018, which confirmed the catastrophic consequences of manmade climate change and urgent need to act;
- (j) therefore declares unequivocally that our city, country and planet are facing a CLIMATE EMERGENCY;
- (k) notes that as a result of this call for action, the Green City Partnership Board will be exploring how Sheffield should respond to the IPCC report, both in terms of actions as well as reviewing our existing commitment to become a zero carbon city by 2050;
- (l) supports this Administration's commitment to report back to Full Council within 6 months, with a more ambitious date for the city to become zero carbon, accompanied by an action plan setting out the required work to deliver a new goal through all relevant strategies and plans, and would entirely and actively welcome the involvement of the cross-party scrutiny system in shaping and overseeing this vital work;
- (m) notes that 1.5°C of warming is most likely to occur around 2040 and therefore believes we need to take radical action to decarbonise well before this time at local, national and global levels of governance;
- (n) notes that, for Sheffield to be carbon neutral by 2030, it will require broad political consensus and public support for radical policymaking proposals;
- (o) believes that citizen involvement should be central to climate action decision-making in order to demonstrate consensus and community support, and that the zero carbon Sheffield by 2030 target also requires an evidence-based approach that is informed by experts;
- (p) notes the concerns raised across the country into the exploration of shale gas and recent earthquakes attributed to fracking across the UK;
- (q) notes that the ten local authorities that make up Greater Manchester will write into their planning policies a 'presumption' against any request to drill for shale gas and that the Greater Manchester Region have adopted a region-wide policy of opposition to fracking;

- (r) calls for Sheffield City Council to write into its planning policies a 'presumption' against any request to drill for shale gas; and
- (s) calls for all local authorities in the Sheffield City Region to commit to a policy of opposition to fracking.

9.8.1 (NOTE: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Bob Pullin, Richard Shaw, Mohammed Mahroof, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Paul Scriven, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Gail Smith, David Baker, Penny Baker, Vickie Priestley and Mike Levery voted for paragraphs (a) to (e), (g) to (k) and (m) to (s), and abstained from voting on paragraphs (f) and (l) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded; and

2. Councillors Kaltum Rivers, Douglas Johnson, Robert Murphy, Martin Phipps and Alison Teal voted for paragraphs (a) to (d), (i), (j) and (m) to (s), voted against paragraph (h), and abstained from voting on paragraphs (e), (f), (g), (k) and (l) of the Substantive Motion, and asked for this to be recorded.)

10. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION: TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE HEALTH AND WELLBEING BOARD

10.1 RESOLVED: That this Council approves the changes to the Terms of Reference of the Health and Wellbeing Board, as set out in the report of the Chief Executive now submitted, and authorises consequential amendments to be made to the Council's Constitution.

11. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

11.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Rippon, seconded by Councillor Dianne Hurst, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 9th January 2019, 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 Dianne Hurst, that Councillor Michelle Cook be nominated to serve as a Company Director of Groundwork South Yorkshire, filling a vacancy.