

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 Monday 20 February 2023, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards)

THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Colin Ross)

- | | | | | | |
|---|---|----|---|----|---|
| 1 | <i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i>
Simon Clement-Jones
Richard Shaw
Sophie Thornton | 10 | <i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i>
Vic Bowden
Alan Woodcock | 19 | <i>Nether Edge & Sharrow Ward</i>
Nighat Basharat
Peter Garbutt |
| 2 | <i>Beighton Ward</i>
Kurtis Crossland
Bob McCann
Ann Woolhouse | 11 | <i>Ecclesall Ward</i>
Roger Davison
Barbara Masters
Shaffaq Mohammed | 20 | <i>Park & Arbourthorne</i>
Ben Miskell
Nabeela Mowlana |
| 3 | <i>Birley Ward</i>
Denise Fox
Bryan Lodge
Karen McGowan | 12 | <i>Firth Park Ward</i>
Fran Belbin
Abdul Khayum
Abtisam Mohamed | 21 | <i>Richmond Ward</i>
David Barker
Dianne Hurst |
| 4 | <i>Broomhill & Sharrow Vale Ward</i>
Angela Argenzio
Maleiki Haybe
Brian Holmshaw | 13 | <i>Fulwood Ward</i>
Sue Alston
Andrew Sangar | 22 | <i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i>
Dawn Dale
Peter Price
Garry Weatherall |
| 5 | <i>Burngreave Ward</i>
Talib Hussain
Mark Jones
Safiya Saeed | 14 | <i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i>
Alexi Dimond
Marieanne Elliot
Paul Turpin | 23 | <i>Southey Ward</i>
Mike Chaplin
Tony Damms
Jayne Dunn |
| 6 | <i>City Ward</i>
Douglas Johnson
Ruth Mersereau
Martin Phipps | 15 | <i>Graves Park Ward</i>
Ian Auckland
Sue Auckland
Steve Ayriss | 24 | <i>Stannington Ward</i>
Penny Baker
Vickie Priestley
Richard Williams |
| 7 | <i>Crookes & Crosspool Ward</i>
Tim Huggan
Ruth Milsom
Minesh Parekh | 16 | <i>Hillsborough Ward</i>
Christine Gilligan Kubo
Henry Nottage | 25 | <i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i>
Lewis Chinchin
Julie Grocutt
Janet Ridler |
| 8 | <i>Darnall Ward</i>
Mazher Iqbal
Mary Lea
Zahira Naz | 17 | <i>Manor Castle Ward</i>
Terry Fox
Sioned-Mair Richards | 26 | <i>Walkley Ward</i>
Ben Curran
Tom Hunt |
| 9 | <i>Dore & Totley Ward</i>
Joe Otten
Colin Ross
Martin Smith | 18 | <i>Mosborough Ward</i>
Tony Downing
Kevin Oxley
Gail Smith | 27 | <i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i>
Alan Hooper
Mike Levery
Ann Whitaker |
| | | | | 28 | <i>Woodhouse Ward</i>
Mick Rooney
Jackie Satur |

1. MINUTES SILENCE - DEATH OF COUNCILLOR ANNE MURPHY

- 1.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) reported with sadness, the death, on 23rd December 2022, of Councillor Anne Murphy who had served as a Member of the Council since 2014 and was Lord Mayor during the Municipal Year 2017/18.
- 1.2 Members of the Council observed a minute's silence in memory of Councillor Murphy, and, at the conclusion of the meeting, several Members of the Council spoke to pay tribute to her.

2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 2.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Mike Drabble, Craig Gamble Pugh, George Lindars-Hammond, Bernard Little, Maroof Raouf, Sophie Wilson, Cliff Woodcraft and Paul Wood.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 3.1 Councillor Tony Downing declared a personal interest in agenda item 6 (Housing Revenue Account Business Plan and Budget 2023-24) (item 6 of these minutes) on the grounds that he is a tenant of a Council house.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Lord Mayor's Communications

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) referred to the anniversary, on 24th February, of Russia's invasion of Ukraine, a major escalation of the Russo-Ukrainian War which began in 2014. She reported that on Thursday 23rd February, there would be a service in the Cathedral and also a photographic display, with the Service beginning at 6.30 p.m., and added that on Friday 24th February at 6.00 pm in the Winter Gardens, there would be a display of angels on a large tree, representing children that have died during the conflict. She stated that Members of the Council were welcome to attend either of these events and the Lord Mayor's office had issued email invites to that effect.

The Lord Mayor also reported that she had been incredibly privileged to travel to London recently to watch the London premiere of "Standing at the Skye's Edge", which had transferred from the Crucible Theatre to the National Theatre. She commented that the production was stunning and the London audience were absolutely wowed by it, giving it a standing ovation at the end. She added that the newspaper reviews generally considered it to be a Sheffield

success, and she wished to congratulate the Crucible Theatre and the people of Sheffield who inspired it.

4.2 Earthquake in Turkey and Syria

The Lord Mayor reported that, in attendance at the meeting, were a group of students from the University of Sheffield, who were members of the Turkish society. The students had operated a fundraising stall at the University Students' Union each day selling Turkish cakes, pastries and breads to raise funds for the Turkey/Syria earthquake emergency appeal. She commented that she and the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) had visited the stall during the week and that the stall had been well attended, with people buying the goods and making donations in support of the people of Turkey and Syria affected by the recent earthquake. The Lord Mayor stated that she had invited the students to come to the Council meeting to talk about the earthquake disaster which has affected Turkey and Syria, to outline what was happening back home in Turkey.

A representative from the University of Sheffield Turkish society spoke about the devastating impacts of the recent earthquakes in Turkey and Syria, and urged people to support the earthquake victims. She thanked the Lord Mayor for her kind invitation to attend and speak at the meeting.

She stated that the recent earthquakes in Turkey had devastated nearly 20% of the country and resulted in over 40,000 deaths, with that number continuing to increase, and had left hundreds of thousands of citizens injured and in urgent need of basic necessities such as food and water. The harsh freezing conditions was making life even more challenging for the survivors and urgent action was required in order to provide aid. Critical infrastructure in Turkey, such as hospitals, schools, roads, public buildings and industrial areas had suffered significant damage. Ongoing disruption to businesses and economic activity were adding to the instability. Those impacted had not only lost their homes, but also their hope, shattered by loss and trauma. Children had been trapped under debris for many hours, tragically some alongside deceased family members. Homeless refugees once again faced dislocation and the whole nation was in shock and pain, with the ever-present anxiety of potential future earthquakes on unbroken fault lines.

She stated that the help and support that had been received so far from the people of the United Kingdom was sincerely appreciated, but given the magnitude of the disaster, more support was required. As students from Turkey, they felt anxious being away from their loved ones, and in order to ease their worries and show solidarity, they had organised fundraising activities. As well as emergency support, continuing support would be needed in the longer term in order to rebuild the country, including safer buildings, better planned cities, better policies and well-educated citizens to implement these changes. Multi-layered cities with rich historic culture must be resurrected, such as Hatay, where members of different religions and ethnicities have lived together in peace for centuries, but where 80% of Hatay was heavily damaged, including its unique historic urban fabric. The population needed to heal from the traumas

while rebuilding their country.

She commented that it was vital to raise awareness about the situation in Turkey and in Syria and encourage people to donate to the relief efforts. There were several charities and organisations, such as Turkey Ministry Of Interior Disaster And Emergency Management Presidency (AFAD), UNICEF, British Red Cross and Save the Children, as well as many others, to where donations could be directed. Each of those organisations have been working on the ground in Turkey to provide critical aid to the earthquake victims. There was also the local community fundraising campaign, through the University of Sheffield Turkish Society. Donations would make a difference to the lives of those affected by the disaster.

She stated that, as the rebuilding of the country will take many years, it was hoped that long-term partnerships could be established between Turkish and British organisations, such as bridging local “angels” from both countries to provide emotional support to the affected communities and alleviate isolation. She suggested that Sheffield City Council may wish to consider adopting a sister city in the earthquake zone in the future to provide direct support and foster cultural aid exchange. The disaster required collective efforts and any support would be appreciated.

She concluded her contribution by reiterating that Turkey and Syria required urgent and continued support and she urged people to help the earthquake emergency appeal by donating to an organisation of their choice and spreading the word to their wider networks by sharing donation links and fundraising campaign information on social media and other communication channels. She also expressed appreciation for the Council’s support for the University’s fundraising campaign and its dissemination throughout Sheffield. Additionally, she requested the Council to help efforts to establish partnerships between local Turkish and British organisations.

The Lord Mayor thanked the students for attending the meeting, and stated that collections had been held by the political groups on the Council and a further collection would be made at this meeting, and these would be donated to the Disaster Emergencies Committee Earthquake Appeal with the Government having promised to provide match funding against funds raised from the public.

4.3 Petitions and Public Questions

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) reported that six petitions and questions from six members of the public had been received prior to the published deadline for submission of petitions and questions for this meeting. Representations were to be made on behalf of the petitioners on four of the petitions and the other two petitions would be received in the absence of a speaker.

4.4 Petitions

4.4.1 Petition Requesting the Council's Support for the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons

The Council received a petition containing 62 signatures requesting the Council's support for the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by June Cattell and Hilary Smith.

June Cattell

Ms. Cattell stated that she was representing Sheffield Creative Action for Peace which is a group affiliated to Yorkshire CND. She commented that prior to presenting this petition, the group had sent a letter and email to all Members of the Council explaining the issue, a copy of the Nuclear Ban Communities pledge for Members to sign and a book-mark which was hoped would provide a continual reminder to campaign for the banning of nuclear weapons.

She commented that the petition called for Sheffield City Council to sign the pledge showing that this Council supports the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW) and calling on the British Government to also sign it. She reported that the pledge can also be signed by individual Councillors and added that all Members will have received a copy for them to sign and return.

Ms. Cattell stated that she was sure that everyone in the Council Chamber would be against nuclear weapons. Any one of the politicians or political groups on the Council could submit a notice of motion for the Council to discuss and vote on this important issue of banning nuclear weapons, and hopefully add the Council's name to the list of 27 other councils, including neighbouring authorities of Leeds and Manchester, who have already signed the petition for the banning of nuclear weapons, alongside the Welsh Assembly, the Scottish Parliament and our twin city, Bochum in Germany.

She stated that the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons is a significant milestone in the abolition of nuclear weapons. 122 countries (over two thirds of the world's nations) have voted to adopt the Treaty. 69 countries have now signed the Treaty and their governments have ratified it. Civil societies (ordinary people like us) throughout the world have also campaigned for it. United Nations treaties like the TPNW do have an impact and they can gradually change people's views and governments' views about nuclear weapons, just as they did in regards to chemical weapons. She added that, to its shame, Britain, like other nuclear states, did not even take part in the discussions at the United Nations.

Ms. Cattell stated that Sheffield has a proud history in anti-nuclear campaigning. In 1980 it declared itself a nuclear free zone, along with many other local authorities. There was even a postcard to celebrate it. Sheffield is also, to its credit, a member of Mayors for Peace, and signing the pledge is therefore entirely consistent with this.

She asked that Members of the Council sign the pledge as an individual, and that any of the political groups on the Council bring forward a motion so that you can, as a Council, sign the pledge and be able to say that Sheffield City Council is against nuclear weapons.

She added that this would be entirely consistent with public views. In 2021, a poll indicated that 59% of people favoured signing the TPNW and 77% of people supported a total ban on nuclear weapons.

Ms. Cattell concluded her representations by stating that everyone knows the horrors of nuclear war, such as occurred at Nagasaki, and therefore urged the Council to sign the pledge in the interests of protecting the citizens of Sheffield.

Hilary Smith

Ms. Smith stated that not signing the Treaty is not a neutral act. It would mean that you are content that there were no credible international initiatives to reduce and eliminate nuclear weapons, and that you were content that Britain was increasing its nuclear weapons capability. It would also ignore the views of the 122 countries which have signed the Treaty, of which many were located in the global south, and thus, ignoring the Treaty would represent old, imperialist attitudes. She commented that not supporting the Treaty ignores the fact that nuclear weapons take lives and ruin lives every day through the legacy of development, of testing and of use, and she added that this Treaty was the first to enact a credible plan for reparations and for remediation for those suffering the consequences. Ms. Smith stated that not supporting the Treaty means that you accept the reality that Sheffield people could not be protected in the event of a nuclear attack or accident, and that not signing the Treaty means that you are not interested in the fact that all nuclear weapons production, like all military production, is exempt from the Paris protocol on climate change.

Ms. Smith concluded her representations by stating that every political party claims to support multi-lateral nuclear disarmament, and that this is exactly what this Treaty does, as it engages all countries in carefully thought out processes, of firstly removing nuclear weapons from active readiness, through to their destruction. She commented that the UK should actively participate to listen and engage in the discussions about the work and development of the Treaty and stated that the people of Sheffield deserve the Council's active support in calling on the Government to do so.

The petition was referred to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Terry Fox) to respond. Councillor Fox thanked Ms. Cattell and Ms. Smith for submitting the petition and referred to a recent visit to the city by the Mayor and Deputy Mayor of Khmelnytskyi, Ukraine, who told the Council about the horrific circumstances being faced by citizens of Ukraine as part of the ongoing conflict with Russia, and this highlighted the horrors from deployment of military weapons of any form. Councillor Fox said that he was proud to spend some time with them and discuss the issues they were dealing with on a day-to-day basis. He added that, ultimately, this was a matter for the UK Government, but that the Council would be happy to receive and debate any Notice of Motion that was put

forward on the matter by one of the political groups on the Council, although it would now be several months until the next opportunity to do so. He urged the petitioners to continue with their campaign.

The Council noted the petition and response from Councillor Fox.

4.4.2 Petition Requesting the Council to Speed Up its Response to the Climate Change Emergency

The Council received an electronic petition containing 339 signatures, requesting the Council to speed up its response to the climate change emergency.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Geoffrey Cox, Chair of the South Yorkshire Climate Alliance. Mr Cox stated that the petition drew attention to this month being the fourth anniversary of Sheffield City Council declaring a climate emergency. He stated that this should have been an occasion to celebrate all the progress that had been made – four years of concerted effort on carbon reductions, four years of concerted effort on nature recovery, four years of concerted effort in engaging with the city's residents on what more needs to be done. Sadly, however, it had been four years where precious little concrete action had been taken. He commented that a clear agenda had been set out in the Arup Report in early 2021, but was not acted upon directly. A slim 10-point plan was unveiled 15 months ago, but had still not resulted in a single route map being produced, and no report had yet been produced on the meeting with the city's voluntary and community groups held at St Mary's Church a full three months ago. He stated that there had been plenty of words and promises, but no urgency whatsoever in delivery.

Mr. Cox commented that urgency was what the petition called for. The petitioners have seen how the city responded to an emergency in the case of the Covid pandemic, and believe that is the scale and pace of the response needed now to achieve the City's 2030 target – but, unfortunately, they don't see that urgency at all.

He added that the petitioners fully recognise that the Government has failed to produce the policies, the infrastructure and the funding needed to allow Sheffield and other councils to properly play their part in the response to the international climate emergency effort – and he reported that the Climate Alliance, along with other climate groups, will be making their voices heard at the national climate demonstration in London in April, on behalf of Sheffield and South Yorkshire, to make that exact point that the Government needs to give local authorities the tools with which to act.

Mr. Cox commented that he also needed to point out that other local authorities facing the same financial difficulties to Sheffield have done more. On several occasions, the Climate Alliance has drawn the Council's attention to the studies carried out by Friends of the Earth and by the Ashden Research Group on case studies of what other local authorities have done, showing good practice, and the Alliance again wishes to recommend those studies to the Council.

He concluded his representations by stating that the petition therefore calls on the City Council to accelerate its response to the climate emergency – and that this accelerated response needs to be in the form of concrete actions, not just words.

The petition was referred to Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Co-Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) to respond. Councillor Iqbal stated that he absolutely agreed that we must work together as a city to have any chance of achieving the scale and the pace of change that is required to meet the size of the challenge. He commented that Sheffield's CVP report, submission and a score of A- for 2022 demonstrates the wide range of mitigations and adaptation actions that the Council is taking in response to the climate emergency declaration

Councillor Iqbal acknowledged the frustrations that many people feel at the slow rate of progress. He confirmed that the Council was working to produce decarbonisation route maps, covering five themed areas this year and stated that a cross party task group had been established and met two weeks ago to help progress this. The five themed areas this year include Our Council, the Way We Travel, Energy, Business and Industry, and Housing. Councillor Iqbal added, however, that the fact remains that without game changing investment and financial support from central Government, the private sector and other funding sources, the Council's budget, as acknowledged by Mr. Cox, was totally inadequate to meet the resource for the action that is required.

He reported that the city-wide event held last November demonstrated the extensive support for taking climate action amongst a huge range of city partners, the public, and the private and voluntary sectors and he confirmed that the Council wished to harness that enthusiasm and expertise, and he hoped that all these potential partners would want to be involved in the development and delivery of the route maps for many years.

Councillor Iqbal concluded by expressing his thanks for the reaffirmation of the support of the South Yorkshire Climate Alliance in helping to make these changes happen and stated that he looked forward to continuing to work with the Alliance to address these urgent priorities.

The Council noted the petition and response from Councillor Iqbal.

4.4.3 Petitions Regarding the Proposed Designation within the Draft Sheffield Plan of Certain Sites in Beighton as Travellers and Industrial Sites

The Council received (a) an electronic petition containing 263 signatures, opposing the proposed industrial and traveller sites in the Draft Sheffield Plan, on Eckington Way, (b) an electronic petition containing 654 signatures, opposing the proposed traveller site on Eckington Way, (c) an electronic petition containing 635 signatures, requesting the Council to change the decision to place an industrial site in the Draft Sheffield Plan behind Springwell Grove and (d) an electronic petition containing 2,823 signatures, requesting the Council to

remove the proposed travellers site in the Draft Sheffield Plan from Beighton, and relocate it to a more suitable location in the city.

There were no speakers for the petitions referred to in (a) and (b) above, but in relation to the petitions referred to in (c) and (d) above, representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Michael Chilton.

Michael Chilton said he wanted to take this opportunity to address full Council on the concerns around the proposed site off Eckington Way that has been designated for industrial use and a Travellers' site in the Draft Local Plan. He stated that, having spent the time talking to residents in the immediate communities, he knew this was a particularly charged issue, but one that did need to be addressed. He wished to make it clear, for those persons that may not be familiar with Eckington Way and the surrounding road network, that this issue was primarily about traffic and congestion in the area. Anyone travelling through the area could see this for themselves. He did, however, recognise that some may have misunderstood the intention of the petitions, which was never to indicate that the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities should not have appropriate sites, but to raise concerns about whether this particular site was appropriate and on the lack of consultation surrounding it, both for the GRT community and the wider community.

Mr. Chilton commented that he was sure that everyone recognised that the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities still face discrimination in our society, but that reinforces just why consultation was so important, and we need to make sure we get these decisions right, which he did not believe had happened here. This was clearly reflected in the Council's own 2019 report that highlighted the Redmires traveller site and the praise it had received from all involved, including the Traveller community, and Mr. Chilton added that the aim should be to repeat that success across the city on similar sites, but that had not happened with this proposal.

He stated that he had spoken to local residents who had told him how simple ten-minute journeys had now become half an hour or more as they tried to negotiate the traffic on and around Eckington Way, often crawling along just to get to the shops. This should not be happening. He added that the last completed studies into the traffic and air pollution around the area were nearly a decade old and therefore there was a need to recognise that we cannot base current planning developments using out of date data. What he and the thousands of concerned residents who have signed the petitions want to see is new studies undertaken in both these areas and a proper substantial proposal to deal with the traffic problems before this site is earmarked for any kind of development.

In concluding his representations, Mr. Chilton stated that it was disappointing to hear that the three Beighton Councillors did not take the opportunity to object or amend this site last year when they found out about it in July, nor did they take the opportunity to act at the full Council meeting on 14th December, when they had the chance to do so. He added that this whole issue could have been avoided had this happened and we could be focusing on the positives of the

Local Plan rather than this site. He hoped that common sense would now prevail and suitable alternatives could be found for this development which would not compound traffic in an area where it was already suffering considerable pressure.

He wished to thank full Council for the opportunity to speak and looked forward to how we can find solutions going forward.

The four petitions were referred to Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Co-Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) to respond.

Councillor Iqbal said that the Council's Labour Group believes that, not only as a council but as a city, we should be proud to celebrate the rich histories and diverse culture of the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities and provide traveller sites in full consultation with those communities. He then referred to the comments made by the petitioner regarding the Beighton Ward Councillors, and stated that he had seen an email which one of the Ward Councillors had sent to local residents, in which it stated that the local Ward Councillors had not been involved in drawing up the plans regarding the proposed traveller site on Eckington Way, and that it was clear there had been an overall lack of communication and consultation from those who had put the plans together. Councillor Iqbal firmly believed that to be a misleading statement and very unhelpful. He reported that a cross party working group had been meeting for the past two years, comprising Councillors from all political groups on the Council, offering the opportunity for everyone to be able to put forward their point of view. He said that the working group had worked on developing the Plan over the past two years, and that it was this Council that agreed that the Local Plan should go out for consultation and the only amendment proposed by the Liberal Democrat Group was around hot food takeaways.

Councillor Iqbal thanked the petitioners for submitting the petitions. In relation to the petitions regarding proposed Site Allocation SES03 – land off Eckington Way - in the Draft Sheffield Plan, he reported that the proposal was to allocate 5.35 hectares of the site for Industry and 1.5 hectares as a Traveller Site. The Draft Plan makes clear that the industrial use would be limited to those uses that can be carried out in a residential area without causing harm to the residential amenity of the area. He stated that the Plan had not been finalised yet. Indeed, the consultation period on the Draft Plan would close today (20th February), and the issues raised in the petitions will therefore be taken into account along with other comments submitted as part of the public consultation process.

Councillor Iqbal commented that it was clear there were significant concerns about the impact this proposal would have on already high traffic levels and congestion in the area, and he reported that further transport modelling work was being undertaken to look at the impact on traffic levels and to assess whether any adverse impacts can be adequately mitigated.

He also noted the concern of residents of Springwell Grove about the potential for any new industrial buildings to overshadow their homes. He stated that, at

this stage, it was worth highlighting to the petitioners that matters such as design, landscaping and site access would be matters to be considered as part of any subsequent planning application, but that any planning application would only follow if the allocation is confirmed in the final adopted Plan. Officers do, however, advise that a significant environmental buffer strip would be needed as part of a detailed design to separate the housing from the proposed uses.

He wished to also emphasise that the Council has a legal duty to meet the housing needs of Gypsies and Travellers. The Plan must provide enough land to meet future employment needs. He stated that all the issues will be reappraised in light of the consultation comments and any new evidence, and he added that an alternative site (or sites) would need to be provided if the proposed site SES03 was to be removed.

Councillor Iqbal confirmed that following the completion of the public consultation exercise on the Draft Sheffield Plan, officers will review all the comments that have been made (including the petitions) and will advise Members on whether any amendments to the Plan should be proposed. Any amendments would be submitted to the Government alongside the Draft Sheffield Plan. He stated that he would be happy to visit the site and meet with the petitioners following the conclusion of the public consultation exercise.

He concluded his response by stating that any proposed amendments would be considered by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee, taking into account recommendations to be made by the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, and that the final decision would be taken by full Council. Prior to then, the cross party working group will start to meet regularly again, starting in early March, to consider the issues highlighted from the consultation and to develop recommendations for consideration by the Policy Committees.

The Council noted the four petitions and response from Councillor Iqbal.

4.5 Public Questions

4.5.1 Question From Paul Wade

Paul Wade stated that his question related to safety in the pedestrianised areas of Fargate and The Moor, commenting that he had observed cyclists riding through those areas at great speed, which represented a safety risk, particularly for young children and the elderly, and he asked when will the Council promote the safety of pedestrians in these areas by introducing measures to stop cyclists travelling at speed in those locations?

In response, Councillor Joe Otten (Chair of the Waste and Streetscene Policy Committee) stated that it wasn't clear from the content of the written question submitted by Mr. Wade that his safety concerns related to cyclists, and instead he had prepared a response relating to hostile vehicle mitigations and the measures put around the city to prevent terrorist attacks using vehicles within pedestrian areas. He would therefore arrange for a response to Mr. Wade's

question to be provided to him in writing and published on the Council's website.

4.5.2 Question From Abdul Raheem

Abdul Raheem referred to the Council's proposals in relation to its introduction of a clean air zone in Sheffield, and asked why the Council was not being considerate to the struggles of working-class people. He stated that Rotherham Council's proposals differed from Sheffield Council's proposals and a non-compliant vehicle would not be charged for being driven in Rotherham but would be charged for being driven in Sheffield. He added that the Government allowed local authorities to choose the type of clean air zone to be introduced and he queried why Sheffield City Council had chosen to target working-class people already struggling from the impact of the covid pandemic.

Mr. Raheem also referred to the situation regarding the licensing of Hackney Carriages and asked that the Council seek evidence from vehicle dealerships, as there was currently a shortage in vehicle availability due to supply chain issues resulting from the pandemic which was impacting on the manufacturing industry, and he expressed concern that numbers of Hackney Carriage vehicles operating in the city would reduce significantly as a result of this. He suggested that the Council should follow the example in Leeds and Bradford where saloon cars were being allowed to operate as Hackney Carriages, and which would assist Sheffield's taxi drivers to continue to work and support their families. He commented that the clean air zone charges would mean an additional cost of £3,600 per annum, which he could not afford, especially in view of the current cost of living crisis where the cost of energy, mortgages and food were becoming more expensive.

Mr. Raheem concluded by asking the Council to be considerate to its working class citizens, and he expressed concern that the clean air zone charges would further impact on the future viability of the city centre.

In response, Councillor Joe Otten (Chair of the Waste and Streetscene Policy Committee) stated that the questions regarding the clean air zone would need to be answered by the Co-Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, but he would answer the questions regarding taxis. He stated that he recognised the concerns raised over the cost of hackney carriages and that the taxi trade had made this clear to the Waste and Streetscene Policy Committee. In response, the Policy Committee, at its meeting on 15th February, had revised the Council's Hackney Carriage Vehicle Policy to allow for rear loading vehicles to be used, which were substantially cheaper, and to extend the age of vehicles from first registration, from five years to seven and a half years. It was expected that those two changes combined would substantially increase the range of vehicles that Hackney Carriage drivers would be able to buy and use that would be of Euro 6 standard and be able to be operated in the clean air zone without incurring charges.

Councillor Otten also recognised the danger, as pointed out by Mr. Raheem, that if large numbers of Hackney Carriage vehicles were not replaced, with

drivers not willing to pay the charges, a significant loss of the fleet may result, and he commented that the Council had agreed to introduce a clean air zone scheme that did not include private vehicles but would include taxis, light-goods vehicles and buses, and he did wonder in hindsight whether this placed a particularly high burden on just a relatively few vehicles to achieve the clean air targets that the city needed to achieve.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Co-Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) added that the Government had been successfully taken to Court on three occasions by Client Earth, an international environmental campaign group, seeking clean air improvements in the UK and, in response to the Court's rulings, the Government had hurriedly issued a policy without consulting local authorities. This had led to different options being taken by individual local authorities. He commented that Sheffield City Council had decided to choose an option which would not charge private vehicles and motorbikes. Councillor Iqbal reported that the exemption of private vehicles had been referenced by the Green Group within one of its amendments proposed at today's meeting, and he commented that if anyone were to ask any local authority around the country, it would be clear that the amount of financial support provided by the Government to local councils to implement clean air zones, was inadequate. He added that, if the financial support was adequate, the Waste and Streetscene Policy Committee may not have needed to meet last week to consider how the Hackney Carriage Vehicle Policy could be revised in order to help address the needs of taxi drivers.

Councillor Iqbal reported that the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee had established a cross-party group of Members to meet on a weekly basis to consider issues that were emerging in relation to the clean air zone, such as the ones mentioned by Mr. Raheem, and he confirmed that one of the major issues was not only the affordability, but also the lack of availability, of new hackney carriage vehicles, and he confirmed that there was now a watching brief by Councillors on this matter.

Councillor Iqbal added that there was a public health emergency, with poor air quality levels across the city, and air pollution exceeding Government limits, and the introduction of the clean air zone would be the quickest way to reduce those harmful levels. He stated that the Labour Group on the City Council had been lobbying the Government, asking it to improve the financial support it was making available, in order to assist the self-employed and small businesses across the city who were having to find additional resources at a time when the cost of living was also increasing significantly.

He concluded his response by indicating that information was available on the Council's website in relation to the clean air zone and the support that was available.

4.5.3 Question From Julie Pearn

Prior to inviting Julie Pearn to ask her question, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) invited the Interim Director of Legal and Governance to

speak, and he advised the questioner that some of the preamble to the written question submitted by Ms. Pearn raises issues which were, arguably, contrary to the Council's adopted definition of antisemitism and he suggested that Ms. Pearn should therefore limit her contribution to just asking her question.

Julie Pearn commented that Sheffield Labour Friends of Palestine welcome the twinning agreement recently signed between Sheffield City Council and the Ukrainian city of Khmelnytskyi, and fully supports the City Council showing this stand for international law and degree of empathy and international solidarity to a people who are victims of military aggression and invasion, resulting in creation of refugees, assaults on children, etc. She stated that the same level of empathy should be extended to other victims of military aggression, invasion, bombing and ethnic cleansing, and wished to remind the Council that an invitation to twin was made by the Mayor of Nablus in April 2019 and that the Council has not even acknowledged that invitation.

She asked can we please have advice from the Council as to how we may get a reciprocal response from the City to the Mayor of Nablus' invitation and achieve a twinning relationship, an aim which is supported by individuals and organisations all over Sheffield?

In response, the Leader of the Council (Councillor Terry Fox) referred to PalFest Sheffield, a festival of friendship and solidarity with Palestine which had taken place a couple of years ago and which had celebrated the rich and diverse culture of the region. He commented that he hadn't been aware of the offer from the Mayor of Nablus, but that, when he was looking at the invitation received from Khmelnytskyi, it had become evident that the Council had no clear policy regarding town twinning, and this was something that was now being addressed. He reported that during the time he had been Leader of the Council, there had been a number of offers received for town twinning which he had wanted to be considered under a proper process, which allowed for input from all Members of the Council. He stated that a clear policy was now emerging and would be submitted to the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee for approval within the next few months. Councillor Fox said that out of common decency, he would make sure that a response would be sent to the Mayor of Nablus, and he stated that he welcomed the Mayor's offer.

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) added that the Reverend Hugh Thomas had contacted her after the city had twinned with Khmelnytskyi, saying that he could remember the Nablus offer being submitted and had sent her the information about it, which she believed was when former Councillor Magid Magid was Lord Mayor of Sheffield, but that it appeared that no action had been taken at that time.

4.5.4 (NOTES: 1. The questions which had been submitted by Carrie Hedderwick and Ruth Hubbard, but which had not been asked at the meeting due to their absence, would receive a written response from the Chairs of the relevant Policy Committees and be published on the website; and

2. Two of the three questions relating to the deployment of wireless masts for

5G use in Sheffield, which had been submitted by Michael Mullin, but which had not been asked at the meeting due to his absence, would receive a written response from the Chair of the relevant Policy Committee and be published on the website. The other question, which related directly to a named officer of the Council, was not accepted by the Lord Mayor as she deemed it to be disrespectful to that named officer.)

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

5.1 Urgent Business

With the permission of the Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards), Councillor Ben Miskell asked the following questions relating to urgent business, under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6(ii):-

Following the shocking murder of Brianna Ghey, what is Sheffield City Council's Community Safety Team and South Yorkshire Police doing to provide extra support, reassurance, and protection to the trans community?

Will the Committee Chair ensure that a meeting will be convened with the trans and LGBT+ community, the City Council and senior South Yorkshire Police officers in order to provide assurance and also ensure that support and safety is provided?

In response, Councillor Richard Williams (Chair of the Communities, Parks and Leisure Policy Committee) expressed his shock regarding the murder of Brianna Ghey, especially as the perpetrators are so young.

He also reported that at this time, the Council was not aware of the final outcome of the police investigation, so was unable to comment further on this particular case.

He stated that Sheffield City Council, South Yorkshire Police and our partners, work together to make sure the city is a welcoming and safe place for local people and visitors to enjoy. The Safer Sheffield Partnership has a statutory duty to address and reduce community safety issues in the city and one of our key priorities is to protect vulnerable people.

He added that the Government had introduced the Serious Violence Duty on 31st January 2023. This duty was intended to create the right conditions for authorities to collaborate and communicate, using existing partnerships where possible, to share information and take coordinated action to tackle serious violence.

Councillor Williams stated that he would be happy to meet with representatives of the transgender community alongside representatives from South Yorkshire Police, who had already indicated that they would be happy to do so, and he would report back on the outcome.

In response to a supplementary question from Councillor Miskell, Councillor Williams confirmed that he would also be happy to attend a meeting of the Hate Crime Board.

5.2 South Yorkshire Joint and Combined Authorities

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

5.3 Written Questions

A schedule of questions to Chairs of Policy Committees, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated. Supplementary questions, under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4, were asked and were answered by the appropriate Policy Committee Chairs.

6. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN AND HRA BUDGET 2023-24

6.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that, in accordance with Council Procedure Rules 4 (Suspension and Amendment of Council Procedure Rules) and 11 (Motions which may be moved without notice), Council Procedure Rule 17.6 be suspended to remove the 25-minute time limit for this item of business and a new time limit of 40-minutes be set for the item.

6.2 It was moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and seconded by Councillor Terry Fox, that, in accordance with the resolution passed by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee at its meeting held on 7th February 2023 relating to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan and HRA Budget 2023-24, it be –

RESOLVED: That:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2023-24, as set out in the Financial Appendix to the report, be approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget 2023-24, as set out in the Financial Appendix to the report, be approved;
- (c) rents for council dwellings be increased by 7% from April 2023, in line with the Regulator of Social Housing's Rent Standard;
- (d) rents for temporary accommodation be increased by 7% for 2023-24;

- (e) garage rents for garage plots and garage sites be increased by 7% from April 2023;
- (f) the sheltered housing charge be increased by 7% for 2023-24;
- (g) the burglar alarm charge be increased by 7% for 2023-24;
- (h) the furnished accommodation charge be increased by 7% for 2023-24;
- (i) the Hardship Fund be increased by a further £300,000 for 2023/24, to £450,000; and
- (j) no increase be made to the community heating charge at this time.

6.3 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Fran Belbin, and seconded by Councillor Denise Fox, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (k) to (q) as follows:-

This Council:-

- (k) regrets that the report plans to reduce the Stock Increase Programme (SIP) to 2,310, from the previous target of 3,100 new council homes by 2029 as set by the previous Labour administration, and believes that all options – including prudential borrowing, re-capitalisation/re-profiling, and different ownership models - must instead be considered to not only retain the figure of 3,100 but to go further still;
- (l) believes that tenants need to be much more engaged and empowered within decision-making and service delivery, and welcomes Labour's proposals to develop Housing Advisory Panels, bringing together all residents and linked directly into the Local Area Committees (LACs) and including a greater working relationship with all Registered Private Providers of Social Housing (Housing Associations), to make the Council more responsive and accountable to local needs;
- (m) believes that the Council should not accept a sub-standard repairs service, and that radical action is needed to deliver what is required, and, therefore, believes that investing more now to upgrade homes is not only the right thing to do for tenants, but will ultimately prove cost effective in bringing down the long-term repairs bill;
- (n) believes that the Council needs to be working in anticipation of a new change of government within the next 18 months, and a new Decent Homes standard this could bring; which will certainly require improvements to tackle damp and mould and ensure homes are warm and heated affordably;
- (o) notes that the Council is investing in existing homes to make sure that tenants live in warm and safe homes, including £62 million being spent to

retrofit homes, including decarbonisation and bringing all homes up to at least EPC C Energy standard, helping residents to save on energy costs and contributing to net zero targets; and believes that, whilst this is hugely welcome, the total spend on Heating, Energy and Carbon Reduction should ideally be more ambitious and that options including securing external funding, recapitalisation, reprofiling and prudential borrowing, should be considered with the aim of increasing investment to £100 million, and that the additional investment must complement a programme of skills and job development;

- (p) believes the Council is faced with a stark choice between two options – either be ambitious with investment and deliver for Sheffield, or accept a managed decline with less council homes delivered to a poorer standard, and believes that only the former is an acceptable proposition for the city; and
- (q) believes that, in contrast with the current Government, the Council will always prioritise support for neighbourhoods and put housing needs at the top of our agenda to produce the strong, thriving neighbourhoods that Sheffield deserves.

6.4 It was then moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Sophie Thornton, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of the following text after the words “RESOLVED: That”, and that the original paragraphs (a) to (j) be re-lettered as new paragraphs (o) to (x):-

This Council:-

- (a) thanks all the officers who have worked hard to formulate the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) business plan;
- (b) notes that this HRA business plan and budget is the first to have been put together under the new committee system, that all members of the Housing Policy Committee have been involved in this process and that regular briefings have taken place between the Chair, Deputy Chair and Spokesperson on the proposals;
- (c) believes that increasing the city’s affordable housing provision is crucial to tackling the Cost of Living crisis, reducing the numbers of people suffering from homelessness, and ensure that Sheffield remains an excellent place to live;
- (d) condemns the continuance of the Right to Buy scheme and the extension of the scheme to housing association tenants last year by the Government, believes that the scheme massively disincentivises the building of new social homes and has led to many former social homes later becoming private rented sector homes, and supports the national Liberal Democrat policy of devolving control of Right to Buy to local authorities;

- (e) notes the unfortunate reduction in the Stock Increase Programme target from 3,100 to 2,310, as a result of extremely high building cost inflation, and believes that the severe inflation of £2.4m on the Newstead site before construction has begun is illustrative of the challenges facing new build projects;
- (f) believes that increasing Council stock is not the only way to increase affordable housing provision in the city, and believes that with the regrettable reductions in the Stock Increase Programme, the Council must think imaginatively to provide affordable housing, which may involve:-
 - (i) considering how the Council's general fund could contribute to, or reduce the cost of, new homes and increased use of Sheffield Housing Company for affordable housing new build delivery; and
 - (ii) increasing the SIP target through shared ownership schemes such as the Owlthorpe scheme, which would provide affordable housing while reducing maintenance and financing charges to the HRA;
- (g) believes that previous Council administrations between May 2011 and May 2021 have not been up to the task of delivering affordable housing, as:-
 - (i) between 2019 and 2022, there was an estimated shortfall in affordable housing delivery of 2,251 units;
 - (ii) between 2016 and 2020, affordable housing units in the city suffered a net reduction, as completions were outstripped by right to buy sales; and
 - (iii) due to the failings in the Council's Housing Repair Service since insourcing, the current void rate is 3.4%, equating to roughly 1,300 homes – more than the reduction in the Stock Increase Programme target;
- (h) believes that while increasing council housing stock is crucial, the fastest way to improve the social housing provision in the city is to bring vacant council properties into a suitable state to be let, increasing capital investment to improve quality of existing homes to reduce high cost repairs and that cutting housing repairs to fund housebuilding is a false economy;
- (i) further notes that the continued high void rate places further pressure on the HRA budget through the loss of £1.2m in Council Tax payments on empty properties;
- (j) believes that improving the Housing Repair Service is central to ensuring that our tenants are not put in danger from overdue gas inspections, out

of control damp and mould, and delayed fire safety repairs;

- (k) therefore welcomes the proposed increase in budget for the Housing Repairs Service, but notes that this must be met with improved results on customer satisfaction and reducing repair call volumes and voids;
- (l) reaffirms its support for the creation of an Alternative Disrepair Resolution Scheme (which will allow tenants to receive full compensation for disrepair claims) and its support of council tenants to directly employ contractors if a repair has been delayed, and urges the Housing Policy Committee to consider these proposals favourably when they come to Committee;
- (m) welcomes the positive engagement that has taken place with our Tenants' and Residents' Associations, and encourages the Housing Policy Committee to continue extending tenant engagement where possible;
- (n) believes that there are no easy answers when it comes to increasing affordable housing in the city, and that all parties must work together over the next year to tackle the housing crisis through proposals that are imaginative but realistic, and therefore resolves that:-

6.5 After contributions from ten other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Douglas Johnson, the amendment moved by Councillor Fran Belbin was put to the vote and was carried.

6.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 71 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Although Liberal Democrat Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraph (n) of the amendment. Although Councillor Lewis Chinchon voted for, he abstained from voting on paragraph (n) and voted against paragraph (q) of the amendment.)

6.6 The amendment moved by Councillor Penny Baker was then put to the vote and was carried, but in part. Paragraphs (a) to (c) and (e) to (n) of the amendment were carried, and paragraph (d) of the amendment was lost.

6.6.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 38 Members; AGAINST - 34 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Although Green Group Members and Councillor Lewis Chinchon voted for, they voted against paragraph (d) of the amendment.)

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

RESOLVED: That:-

This Council:-

- (a) thanks all the officers who have worked hard to formulate the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) business plan;
- (b) notes that this HRA business plan and budget is the first to have been put together under the new committee system, that all members of the Housing Policy Committee have been involved in this process and that regular briefings have taken place between the Chair, Deputy Chair and Spokesperson on the proposals;
- (c) believes that increasing the city's affordable housing provision is crucial to tackling the Cost of Living crisis, reducing the numbers of people suffering from homelessness, and ensure that Sheffield remains an excellent place to live;
- (d) notes the unfortunate reduction in the Stock Increase Programme target from 3,100 to 2,310, as a result of extremely high building cost inflation, and believes that the severe inflation of £2.4m on the Newstead site before construction has begun is illustrative of the challenges facing new build projects;
- (e) believes that increasing Council stock is not the only way to increase affordable housing provision in the city, and believes that with the regrettable reductions in the Stock Increase Programme, the Council must think imaginatively to provide affordable housing, which may involve:-
 - (i) considering how the Council's general fund could contribute to, or reduce the cost of, new homes and increased use of Sheffield Housing Company for affordable housing new build delivery; and
 - (ii) increasing the SIP target through shared ownership schemes such as the Owlthorpe scheme, which would provide affordable housing while reducing maintenance and financing charges to the HRA;
- (f) believes that previous Council administrations between May 2011 and May 2021 have not been up to the task of delivering affordable housing, as:-
 - (i) between 2019 and 2022, there was an estimated shortfall in affordable housing delivery of 2,251 units;
 - (ii) between 2016 and 2020, affordable housing units in the city suffered a net reduction, as completions were outstripped by right to buy sales; and
 - (iii) due to the failings in the Council's Housing Repair Service since insourcing, the current void rate is 3.4%, equating to roughly 1,300 homes – more than the reduction in the Stock Increase Programme target;

- (g) believes that while increasing council housing stock is crucial, the fastest way to improve the social housing provision in the city is to bring vacant council properties into a suitable state to be let, increasing capital investment to improve quality of existing homes to reduce high cost repairs and that cutting housing repairs to fund housebuilding is a false economy;
- (h) further notes that the continued high void rate places further pressure on the HRA budget through the loss of £1.2m in Council Tax payments on empty properties;
- (i) believes that improving the Housing Repair Service is central to ensuring that our tenants are not put in danger from overdue gas inspections, out of control damp and mould, and delayed fire safety repairs;
- (j) therefore welcomes the proposed increase in budget for the Housing Repairs Service, but notes that this must be met with improved results on customer satisfaction and reducing repair call volumes and voids;
- (k) reaffirms its support for the creation of an Alternative Disrepair Resolution Scheme (which will allow tenants to receive full compensation for disrepair claims) and its support of council tenants to directly employ contractors if a repair has been delayed, and urges the Housing Policy Committee to consider these proposals favourably when they come to Committee;
- (l) welcomes the positive engagement that has taken place with our Tenants' and Residents' Associations, and encourages the Housing Policy Committee to continue extending tenant engagement where possible;
- (m) believes that there are no easy answers when it comes to increasing affordable housing in the city, and that all parties must work together over the next year to tackle the housing crisis through proposals that are imaginative but realistic, and therefore resolves that:-
- (n) the HRA Business Plan report for 2023-24, as set out in the Financial Appendix to the report, be approved;
- (o) the HRA Revenue Budget 2023-24, as set out in the Financial Appendix to the report, be approved;
- (p) rents for council dwellings be increased by 7% from April 2023, in line with the Regulator of Social Housing's Rent Standard;
- (q) rents for temporary accommodation be increased by 7% for 2023-24;
- (r) garage rents for garage plots and garage sites be increased by 7% from April 2023;

- (s) the sheltered housing charge be increased by 7% for 2023-24;
- (t) the burglar alarm charge be increased by 7% for 2023-24;
- (u) the furnished accommodation charge be increased by 7% for 2023-24;
- (v) the Hardship Fund be increased by a further £300,000 for 2023/24, to £450,000;
- (w) no increase be made to the community heating charge at this time.

This Council:-

- (x) regrets that the report plans to reduce the Stock Increase Programme (SIP) to 2,310, from the previous target of 3,100 new council homes by 2029 as set by the previous Labour administration, and believes that all options – including prudential borrowing, re-capitalisation/re-profiling, and different ownership models - must instead be considered to not only retain the figure of 3,100 but to go further still;
- (y) believes that tenants need to be much more engaged and empowered within decision-making and service delivery, and welcomes Labour's proposals to develop Housing Advisory Panels, bringing together all residents and linked directly into the Local Area Committees (LACs) and including a greater working relationship with all Registered Private Providers of Social Housing (Housing Associations), to make the Council more responsive and accountable to local needs;
- (z) believes that the Council should not accept a sub-standard repairs service, and that radical action is needed to deliver what is required, and, therefore, believes that investing more now to upgrade homes is not only the right thing to do for tenants, but will ultimately prove cost effective in bringing down the long-term repairs bill;
- (aa) believes that the Council needs to be working in anticipation of a new change of government within the next 18 months, and a new Decent Homes standard this could bring; which will certainly require improvements to tackle damp and mould and ensure homes are warm and heated affordably;
- (bb) notes that the Council is investing in existing homes to make sure that tenants live in warm and safe homes, including £62 million being spent to retrofit homes, including decarbonisation and bringing all homes up to at least EPC C Energy standard, helping residents to save on energy costs and contributing to net zero targets; and believes that, whilst this is hugely welcome, the total spend on Heating, Energy and Carbon Reduction should ideally be more ambitious and that options including securing external funding, recapitalisation, reprofiling and prudential borrowing, should be considered with the aim of increasing investment to

£100 million, and that the additional investment must complement a programme of skills and job development;

- (cc) believes the Council is faced with a stark choice between two options – either be ambitious with investment and deliver for Sheffield, or accept a managed decline with less council homes delivered to a poorer standard, and believes that only the former is an acceptable proposition for the city; and
- (dd) believes that, in contrast with the current Government, the Council will always prioritise support for neighbourhoods and put housing needs at the top of our agenda to produce the strong, thriving neighbourhoods that Sheffield deserves.

6.7.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 73 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Although Liberal Democrat Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraph (aa) of the Substantive Motion. Although Councillor Lewis Chinchen voted for, he abstained from voting on paragraph (aa) and voted against paragraph (dd) of the Substantive Motion.)

7. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "DRIVING FORWARD THE HERITAGE STRATEGY FOR SHEFFIELD" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JANET RIDLER AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR TOM HUNT

7.1 At this point in the proceedings (5.20 p.m.), the time for terminating the meeting (5.30 p.m.) was approaching, meaning that all unfinished business would be voted on without debate. Prior to the commencement of this item of business, it was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, that in accordance with Council Procedure Rules 4 (Suspension and Amendment of Council Procedure Rules) and 11 (Motions which may be moved without notice), the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 5.5 be suspended and the termination of the meeting be extended by 30 minutes. On being put to the vote, the motion was negated.

7.2 It was then moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, that in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 9.1, the order of business as published on the Council Summons be altered by taking item 8 (Notice of Motion Regarding "The Local Plan in Beighton") as the next item of business. On being put to the vote, the motion was negated.

7.3 It was moved by Councillor Janet Ridler, and seconded by Councillor Tom Hunt, that this Council:-

- (a) believes the Heritage Strategy for Sheffield is unique in being a community-led strategy, created from the ground up by grass roots organisations;

- (b) notes that this Council has been involved in driving the Heritage Strategy forward since its earliest stages, welcoming the completed Strategy in January 2021, and subsequently joining the Heritage Partnership Board in February 2021 as a first step towards implementation;
- (c) believes that the aim of a Heritage Strategy is to protect and enhance a city's heritage and invigorate interest and development; believing that Sheffield's heritage is defined in its widest sense including not only physical assets such as historic buildings and structures, archaeological sites, historic townscapes and landscapes, scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, but also museums and art galleries and their collections, archives, libraries, public art, natural habitats, people and communities, spoken stories and much more;
- (d) further, believes that Sheffield's unique heritage is particularly inclusive, embracing the customs, traditions and skills developed locally, such as the 107 languages spoken, radicalism, anti-slavery campaigning, music, our working men's clubs, and Sheffield as the Home of Football;
- (e) notes the importance of Heritage to our city and recognises its social, environmental, educational and well-being benefits and its economic potential;
- (f) celebrates and champions Sheffield's diverse heritage;
- (g) notes that Sheffield hosts the largest Heritage Open Days festival in the country;
- (h) believes that the Heritage sector is an important source of economic prosperity and growth with a total GVA (Gross Value Added) of £36bn, supporting over 500,000 jobs nationally;
- (i) also believes that the impact of Heritage as a means to stimulate investment is evident in the huge success of the Kelham Island development and the redevelopment of the City Centre;
- (j) further, believes adopting the Heritage Strategy for Sheffield will demonstrate the Council's strategic approach and commitment to Heritage, and that having this strategic approach will greatly improve the Council's ability to attract external funding for a wide range of heritage projects;
- (k) notes that this city's heritage does not belong to the city council, but to the people of Sheffield; and
- (l) resolves, therefore, to ask the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee to add the Heritage Strategy for Sheffield to its work programme and request that, within the next 3 months, the Committee calls upon the Sheffield Heritage Partnership Board to report on progress and co-develop a programme of actions which will drive forward the

implementation of the Heritage Strategy for Sheffield.

7.4 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Barbara Masters, and seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of new paragraphs (j) to (n) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (j) to (l) as new paragraphs (o) to (q):-
 - (j) believes that strong partnership between local business, the Council and heritage organisations is vital to Sheffield's economic future, and especially welcomes the third aim of the Heritage Strategy to build on the contribution of Sheffield's heritage to the city's economic wellbeing;
 - (k) notes the adoption by the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee of the Sheffield Culture Collective Strategy last September, and the work currently being undertaken to develop a full city Culture Strategy, and welcomes the critical role this will play in securing future Arts funding for Sheffield;
 - (l) believes that there are many cases where the City's industrial and craft heritage have been neglected, such as the loss of industrial heritage and craft trades for housing development in Kelham Island, and the continuing threat to heritage as demonstrated by the recent demolition of the Plough Inn, the continuing neglect of the Old Town Hall and Crown Court, and the repeated delays to the Castlegate site, and actively supports local listing of heritage assets;
 - (m) believes that previous administrations have failed to develop and implement a coherent and economically viable plan for the Graves building, and requests that the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee considers adding this issue to its work programme;
 - (n) notes that the Council has left many buildings it owns which are of heritage value to fall into a poor state of repair, such as Birley Spa Bath House and the Rose Garden Café, and believes that the Council must invest more in proactive maintenance in order to protect heritage buildings in its possession;
2. the addition of a new paragraph (r) as follows:-
 - (r) believes that the recently listed John Lewis building is another critically important Heritage asset, believes that it is incredibly important to ensure that the right decision is taken on its future and to avoid poor project outcomes such as those seen in the Fargate Container project, and requests that the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee considers whether public consultation on any proposal would be beneficial to achieve this.

7.5 It was then moved by Councillor Brian Holmshaw, seconded by Councillor Angela Argenzio, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraphs (b), (g) and (l), and the re-lettering of paragraphs (c), (d), (e), (f), (h), (i), (j) and (k) as new paragraphs (b) to (i); and
2. the addition of new paragraphs (j) to (r) as follows:-
 - (j) notes the positive tone of this motion, congratulates the volunteers at Joined Up Heritage Sheffield on their long standing efforts to place heritage at the centre of our cultural landscape and applauds the long-overdue emphasis finally being placed on the power of heritage to do good in the city;
 - (k) welcomes the significant shift in attitude towards heritage since the Cabinet Member described heritage disparagingly as a “barrier to development” in 2019;
 - (l) believes that Sheffield City Council needs to:-
 - (i) abandon its risk-averse approach to heritage in the city and embrace the environmental, social, cultural and economic benefits of heritage in all its forms; and
 - (ii) nurture better working relationships with the Heritage Lottery Fund, Historic England and other large-scale national and regional funding bodies, as an essential part of being able to fund the type of heritage projects the city has missed out on over the years;
 - (m) requests that the Governance Committee look at the place of heritage within the committee system within their Governance Review;
 - (n) requests that whichever committee is responsible for heritage considers establishing a cross-party task and finish working group to work with Sheffield Heritage Partnership Board, and make recommendations to the relevant Policy Committees or to this Council on the implementation of the grassroots Joined Up Heritage Sheffield Heritage Strategy;
 - (o) recommends that if a task and finish working group is established, that its programme of work includes looking at the possibilities for:-
 - (i) providing financial and organisational support for the work of the Sheffield Heritage Open Days volunteers who, with

over 130 free walks, talks, tours and exhibitions across the Sheffield region between 9 – 18 September 2022, have made the festival one of the biggest and best in the country; and

- (ii) employing additional SCC conservation staff, community heritage officers and planning enforcement officers to support the implementation of the heritage strategy;
- (p) affirms support for the inspiring Harmony Works project team in their bid for national public funds to move the Music Hub to a heritage building in Castlegate in the heart of the city;
- (q) recommends that relevant Committees should use the mechanism of the Corporate Opportunities Register to identify and put in funding bids and establish partnerships to support heritage in the city; and
- (r) requests that the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee adds the future of the city's paused Conservation Areas, such as the one at Castlegate, to its work programme, as this Council believes they can bring positive economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, together with heritage funding, to the communities they serve.

7.6 Following a right of reply from Councillor Janet Ridler, the amendment moved by Councillor Barbara Masters was put to the vote and was carried.

7.6.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 70 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Although Labour Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (l) to (n) in Part 1 of the amendment.)

7.7 The amendment moved by Councillor Brian Holmshaw was then put to the vote and was carried, but in part. Part 1 of the amendment was lost, and Part 2 of the amendment was carried.

7.7.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 12 Members; AGAINST - 33 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 24 Members. Although Labour Group Members voted against, they voted for paragraphs (j) and (l) to (r) in Part 2 of the amendment. Liberal Democrat Group Members abstained from voting on paragraphs (l) to (o) and (r) in Part 2 of the amendment, but voted for paragraphs (j), (k), (p) and (q) in Part 2 of the amendment, and voted against Part 1 of the amendment.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes the Heritage Strategy for Sheffield is unique in being a community-led strategy, created from the ground up by grass roots organisations;
- (b) notes that this Council has been involved in driving the Heritage Strategy forward since its earliest stages, welcoming the completed Strategy in January 2021, and subsequently joining the Heritage Partnership Board in February 2021 as a first step towards implementation;
- (c) believes that the aim of a Heritage Strategy is to protect and enhance a city's heritage and invigorate interest and development; believing that Sheffield's heritage is defined in its widest sense including not only physical assets such as historic buildings and structures, archaeological sites, historic townscapes and landscapes, scheduled monuments, registered parks and gardens, but also museums and art galleries and their collections, archives, libraries, public art, natural habitats, people and communities, spoken stories and much more;
- (d) further, believes that Sheffield's unique heritage is particularly inclusive, embracing the customs, traditions and skills developed locally, such as the 107 languages spoken, radicalism, anti-slavery campaigning, music, our working men's clubs, and Sheffield as the Home of Football;
- (e) notes the importance of Heritage to our city and recognises its social, environmental, educational and well-being benefits and its economic potential;
- (f) celebrates and champions Sheffield's diverse heritage;
- (g) notes that Sheffield hosts the largest Heritage Open Days festival in the country;
- (h) believes that the Heritage sector is an important source of economic prosperity and growth with a total GVA (Gross Value Added) of £36bn, supporting over 500,000 jobs nationally;
- (i) also believes that the impact of Heritage as a means to stimulate investment is evident in the huge success of the Kelham Island development and the redevelopment of the City Centre;
- (j) believes that strong partnership between local business, the Council and heritage organisations is vital to Sheffield's economic future, and especially welcomes the third aim of the Heritage Strategy to build on the contribution of Sheffield's heritage to the city's economic wellbeing;
- (k) notes the adoption by the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee of the Sheffield Culture Collective Strategy last September,

and the work currently being undertaken to develop a full city Culture Strategy, and welcomes the critical role this will play in securing future Arts funding for Sheffield;

- (l) believes that there are many cases where the City's industrial and craft heritage have been neglected, such as the loss of industrial heritage and craft trades for housing development in Kelham Island, and the continuing threat to heritage as demonstrated by the recent demolition of the Plough Inn, the continuing neglect of the Old Town Hall and Crown Court, and the repeated delays to the Castlegate site, and actively supports local listing of heritage assets;
- (m) believes that previous administrations have failed to develop and implement a coherent and economically viable plan for the Graves building, and requests that the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee considers adding this issue to its work programme;
- (n) notes that the Council has left many buildings it owns which are of heritage value to fall into a poor state of repair, such as Birley Spa Bath House and the Rose Garden Café, and believes that the Council must invest more in proactive maintenance in order to protect heritage buildings in its possession;
- (o) further, believes adopting the Heritage Strategy for Sheffield will demonstrate the Council's strategic approach and commitment to Heritage, and that having this strategic approach will greatly improve the Council's ability to attract external funding for a wide range of heritage projects;
- (p) notes that this city's heritage does not belong to the city council, but to the people of Sheffield;
- (q) resolves, therefore, to ask the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee to add the Heritage Strategy for Sheffield to its work programme and request that, within the next 3 months, the Committee calls upon the Sheffield Heritage Partnership Board to report on progress and co-develop a programme of actions which will drive forward the implementation of the Heritage Strategy for Sheffield;
- (r) believes that the recently listed John Lewis building is another critically important Heritage asset, believes that it is incredibly important to ensure that the right decision is taken on its future and to avoid poor project outcomes such as those seen in the Fargate Container project, and requests that the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee considers whether public consultation on any proposal would be beneficial to achieve this;
- (s) notes the positive tone of this motion, congratulates the volunteers at Joined Up Heritage Sheffield on their long standing efforts to place heritage at the centre of our cultural landscape and applauds the long-

- overdue emphasis finally being placed on the power of heritage to do good in the city;
- (t) welcomes the significant shift in attitude towards heritage since the Cabinet Member described heritage disparagingly as a “barrier to development” in 2019;
 - (u) believes that Sheffield City Council needs to:-
 - (i) abandon its risk-averse approach to heritage in the city and embrace the environmental, social, cultural and economic benefits of heritage in all its forms; and
 - (ii) nurture better working relationships with the Heritage Lottery Fund, Historic England and other large-scale national and regional funding bodies, as an essential part of being able to fund the type of heritage projects the city has missed out on over the years;
 - (v) requests that the Governance Committee look at the place of heritage within the committee system within their Governance Review;
 - (w) requests that whichever committee is responsible for heritage considers establishing a cross-party task and finish working group to work with Sheffield Heritage Partnership Board, and make recommendations to the relevant Policy Committees or to this Council on the implementation of the grassroots Joined Up Heritage Sheffield Heritage Strategy;
 - (x) recommends that if a task and finish working group is established, that its programme of work includes looking at the possibilities for:-
 - (i) providing financial and organisational support for the work of the Sheffield Heritage Open Days volunteers who, with over 130 free walks, talks, tours and exhibitions across the Sheffield region between 9 – 18 September 2022, have made the festival one of the biggest and best in the country; and
 - (ii) employing additional SCC conservation staff, community heritage officers and planning enforcement officers to support the implementation of the heritage strategy;
 - (y) affirms support for the inspiring Harmony Works project team in their bid for national public funds to move the Music Hub to a heritage building in Castlegate in the heart of the city;
 - (z) recommends that relevant Committees should use the mechanism of the Corporate Opportunities Register to identify and put in funding bids and establish partnerships to support heritage in the city; and

- | |
|---|
| (aa) requests that the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee adds the future of the city's paused Conservation Areas, such as the one at Castlegate, to its work programme, as this Council believes they can bring positive economic, social, environmental and cultural benefits, together with heritage funding, to the communities they serve. |
|---|

7.8.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 69 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Although Liberal Democrat Group Members voted for, they abstained on paragraphs (u) to (x) and (aa) of the Substantive Motion. Although Green Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (b), (g) & (q) of the Substantive Motion.)

8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "THE LOCAL PLAN IN BEIGHTON" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR KURTIS CROSSLAND AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR GAIL SMITH

8.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Kurtis Crossland, and formally seconded by Councillor Gail Smith, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the approval of the emerging Local Plan to go forward to public consultation, given at the December meeting of Full Council, however:-
 - (i) regrets that the process of developing the emerging Local Plan has been held back by numerous delays on the part of previous Council administrations between May 2011 and May 2021; and
 - (ii) believes that, as a result of delays to the emerging Local Plan, this Council has been left unable to oppose controversial housing developments such as the site at Hollin Busk Road, which was recommended by Full Council to be removed from the Local Plan as a Housing Site on the 14th of December, and despite this, plans for the development of 75 houses were approved at a Planning Committee meeting on the 10th of January;
- (b) believes that local residents know what is best for their own communities, and as such, welcomes the numerous representations, feedback, and petitions from members of the public concerning allocations and policies in the emerging Local Plan;
- (c) regrets that engaged local democracy is only now possible at this relatively late stage, and regrets that Local Area Committees and local councillors have had limited formal input into the plan development process;
- (d) believes that local residents of South East Sheffield have made their voices clear on the issue of the site east of Eckington Way (referred to in

the Emerging Local Plan as site SES 03), which has been allocated for use as a 'General Employment and Traveller Site', and notes that a petition opposing the proposed site has received 2,773 signatures as of the 8th of February;

- (e) notes that democratic discussion of how the Council should discharge its duty to provide Gypsy and Traveller accommodation can regrettably sometimes attract discriminatory and racist views and therefore condemns in the strongest terms all forms of racism and discrimination against Gypsy, Traveller, Roma, and Travelling Showpeople communities, and especially any use of discriminatory stereotypes within political campaigning;
- (f) notes there has been significant concerns raised about the suitability of the site for use as industrial employment and traveller pitches, for the following reasons:-
 - (i) congestion on Eckington Way is a significant issue, as:-
 - (A) the site is very close to the Crystal Peaks shopping centre and Drakehouse Retail Park;
 - (B) there have been 13 collisions on the road and roundabout in the last five years, 5 of them serious;
 - (C) Ward members regularly receive complaints from constituents regarding the large volume of congestion on Eckington Way; and
 - (D) the site's proposed use for employment and travelling showpeople, with Eckington Way as its only access point, would significantly add to congestion on this street; and
 - (ii) the site is not appropriate for industrial or traveller development, as:-
 - (A) it is in very close proximity to current residential development, which is likely to be adversely affected by an industrial and traveller site through noise and pollution;
 - (B) the site is on a Green Belt boundary, is of a substantially similar quality to the site adjacent which is included in the Green Belt (both were rated 13/20 in the 2020 Green Belt Review), and is only delineated from the section within the Green Belt by a footpath;
 - (C) a high pressure gas pipe is present on the site, which raises safety concerns around its proposed use as an industrial site;

- (D) it is possible that the site may be protected as Grade 3a farming land at a future date, putting the Council in noncompliance with its legal obligation to provide Gypsy and Traveller accommodation; and
 - (E) industrial land use adjacent to housing has previously been shown to disturb the local community, such as at the Abbey Glen site nearby, where hundreds of residents have campaigned against the smell and noise created by the laundry service's industrial activities; and
 - (g) therefore resolves that officers are requested to include a reappraisal of SES 03 as an industrial and traveller site in the Local Plan, taking into account the views of this Council and the responses to the consultation, when officers present the 'schedule of suggested amendments' to the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee and subsequently to Full Council, as agreed on 14th December 2022.
- 8.1.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the Motion (Councillor Kurtis Crossland), the Motion as published on the agenda was altered by (1) the removal of 10 words from paragraph (e) of the Motion – with those words also having been removed from the published record, at the request of the Council's Monitoring Officer, on the grounds that they were likely to identify an individual and (2) the replacement, in paragraph (f) of the Motion, of the words "believes that the site in question is not suitable for use as" by the words "notes there has been significant concerns raised about the suitability of the site for use as".)
- 8.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Karen McGowan, and formally seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (f) to (k) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (f) and (g) as new paragraphs (l) & (m):-
- (f) believes that, not only as a council but as a city, we should be proud to celebrate the rich histories and diverse cultures of the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, and provide traveller sites in full consultation with Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities;
 - (g) notes that the site allocation list for Beighton, and the whole of the South-East, was put to councillors on 11th July 2022;
 - (h) believes that this whole process was completely transparent and notes that, following these briefings and discussions within political groups, the whole Council met on 14th December 2022 to vote on the Local Plan, and all parties – Labour, Liberal Democrat, Conservative and Green – approved the plans;
 - (i) notes that the Local Plan was delivered cross-party, and notes that were

any traveller site removed from the current Plan, an alternative site would need to be found in order to meet recognised need;

- (j) notes that while an alternative site, instead of site SES 03, may be required, it would not be appropriate to determine this until the public consultation has completed – and Members need to consider all representations (including from the gypsy and traveller community) as well as any further evidence, around all sites in the city;
- (k) believes that the Local Plan is for all of Sheffield – all of its people and different communities, without prejudice – and that this Council needs to balance all considerations in the final approved report, including issues around traffic mitigation, supporting infrastructure, environmental protection, the standard of homes, and economic growth;

8.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Alexi Dimond, and formally seconded by Councillor Henry Nottage, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraphs (a) to (d) and (f) and (g) and the re-lettering of paragraph (e) as a new paragraph (a); and
2. the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (h) as follows:-
 - (b) notes that following the Race Equality Commission, and in the past, Sheffield Council has committed to working towards becoming an anti-racist city;
 - (c) believes that, as the two biggest parties in the Council, both Labour and the Liberal Democrats have a responsibility to this commitment and should not be campaigning against one of the most marginalised and demonised groups in the UK;
 - (d) notes that the Labour Party's nominated candidate for the Beighton Ward has set up a petition against the proposed traveller site in Beighton, and believes this is a cynical attempt to win votes in the local election;
 - (e) affirms that the Council has a legal and moral obligation to provide traveller sites in Sheffield;
 - (f) notes that no objections to the proposed site in Eckington were made at Full Council when the draft local plan was unanimously agreed in December 2022;
 - (g) notes that many areas of Sheffield have high levels of traffic and pollution, and believes that, if councillors were really concerned about this, they would support measures to reduce car use in favour of public transport, such as a Workplace Parking Levy, better bus routes and introducing more parking schemes, and

more effective enforcement of parking schemes and policies that already exist; and

- (h) notes that Labour and Liberal Democrat Councillors have previously supported traffic-increasing developments, such as Meadowhall expansion, the IKEA shopping centre, free parking at Christmas and to exclude private cars from the Clean Air Zone.

8.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Karen McGowan was put to the vote and was carried.

8.4.1 The votes on the amendment were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For paragraphs (f) and (k) of the Amendment (70) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards), the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) and Councillors Richard Shaw, Sophie Thornton, Bob McCann, Kurtis Crossland, Ann Woolhouse, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Safiya Saeed, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Tim Huggan, Minesh Parekh, Ruth Milsom, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Fran Belbin, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Alexi Dimond, Marieanne Elliot, Paul Turpin, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Henry Nottage, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, Kevin Oxley, Gail Smith, Peter Garbutt, Nighat Basharat, Ben Miskell, Nabeela Mowlana, David Barker, Dianne Hurst, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Williams, Lewis Chinchin, Julie Grocutt, Janet Ridler, Ben Curran, Tom Hunt, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery, Ann Whitaker, Mick Rooney and Jackie Satur.

Against paragraphs (f) and (k) of the Amendment (0) - Nil

Abstained from voting on paragraphs (f) and (k) of the Amendment (0) - Nil

- | | |
|---|---|
| For paragraphs (g) to (j) of the Amendment (45) | - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) and Councillors Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Safiya Saeed, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Minesh Parekh, Ruth Milsom, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Fran Belbin, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Alexi Dimond, Marieanne Elliot, Paul Turpin, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Henry Nottage, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, Peter Garbutt, Nighat Basharat, Ben Miskell, Nabeela Mowlana, David Barker, Dianne Hurst, Dawn Dale, Peter Price, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Lewis Chinchin, Julie Grocutt, Janet Ridler, Ben Curran, Tom Hunt, Mick Rooney and Jackie Satur. |
| Against paragraphs (g) to (j) of the Amendment (25) | - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) and Councillors Richard Shaw, Sophie Thornton, Bob McCann, Kurtis Crossland, Ann Woolhouse, Tim Huggan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Kevin Oxley, Gail Smith, Richard Williams, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery and Ann Whitaker. |
| Abstained from voting on paragraphs (g) to (j) of the Amendment (0) | - Nil |

8.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Alexi Dimond was then put to the vote and was carried in part. Part 1 and paragraphs (g) and (h) in Part 2 of the amendment were lost, and paragraphs (b) to (f) in Part 2 of the amendment were carried.

8.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 11 Members; AGAINST - 58 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Although Labour Group Members voted against, they voted for paragraphs (b), (e) and (f) in Part 2 of the amendment, and abstained from voting on paragraphs (c) and (h) in Part 2 of the amendment. Although Liberal Democrat Members voted against, they voted for paragraphs (b) to (d) in Part 2 of the amendment. Although Councillor Lewis Chinchin voted against, he voted for paragraphs (b) and (e) in Part 2 of the amendment.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the approval of the emerging Local Plan to go forward to public consultation, given at the December meeting of Full Council, however:-
 - (i) regrets that the process of developing the emerging Local Plan has been held back by numerous delays on the part of previous Council administrations between May 2011 and May 2021; and
 - (ii) believes that, as a result of delays to the emerging Local Plan, this Council has been left unable to oppose controversial housing developments such as the site at Hollin Busk Road, which was recommended by Full Council to be removed from the Local Plan as a Housing Site on the 14th of December, and despite this, plans for the development of 75 houses were approved at a Planning Committee meeting on the 10th of January;
- (b) believes that local residents know what is best for their own communities, and as such, welcomes the numerous representations, feedback, and petitions from members of the public concerning allocations and policies in the emerging Local Plan;
- (c) regrets that engaged local democracy is only now possible at this relatively late stage, and regrets that Local Area Committees and local councillors have had limited formal input into the plan development process;
- (d) believes that local residents of South East Sheffield have made their voices clear on the issue of the site east of Eckington Way (referred to in the Emerging Local Plan as site SES 03), which has been allocated for use as a 'General Employment and Traveller Site', and notes that a petition opposing the proposed site has received 2,773 signatures as of the 8th of February;
- (e) notes that democratic discussion of how the Council should discharge its duty to provide Gypsy and Traveller accommodation can regrettably sometimes attract discriminatory and racist views and therefore condemns in the strongest terms all forms of racism and discrimination against Gypsy, Traveller, Roma, and Travelling Showpeople communities, and especially any use of discriminatory stereotypes within political campaigning;
- (f) believes that, not only as a council but as a city, we should be proud to celebrate the rich histories and diverse cultures of the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, and provide traveller sites in full consultation with Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities;

- (g) notes that the site allocation list for Beighton, and the whole of the South-East, was put to councillors on 11th July 2022;
- (h) believes that this whole process was completely transparent and notes that, following these briefings and discussions within political groups, the whole Council met on 14th December 2022 to vote on the Local Plan, and all parties – Labour, Liberal Democrat, Conservative and Green – approved the plans;
- (i) notes that the Local Plan was delivered cross-party, and notes that were any traveller site removed from the current Plan, an alternative site would need to be found in order to meet recognised need;
- (j) notes that while an alternative site, instead of site SES 03, may be required, it would not be appropriate to determine this until the public consultation has completed – and Members need to consider all representations (including from the gypsy and traveller community) as well as any further evidence, around all sites in the city;
- (k) believes that the Local Plan is for all of Sheffield – all of its people and different communities, without prejudice – and that this Council needs to balance all considerations in the final approved report, including issues around traffic mitigation, supporting infrastructure, environmental protection, the standard of homes, and economic growth;
- (l) notes there has been significant concerns raised about the suitability of the site for use as industrial employment and traveller pitches, for the following reasons:-
 - (i) congestion on Eckington Way is a significant issue, as:-
 - (A) the site is very close to the Crystal Peaks shopping centre and Drakehouse Retail Park;
 - (B) there have been 13 collisions on the road and roundabout in the last five years, 5 of them serious;
 - (C) Ward members regularly receive complaints from constituents regarding the large volume of congestion on Eckington Way; and
 - (D) the site's proposed use for employment and travelling showpeople, with Eckington Way as its only access point, would significantly add to congestion on this street; and
 - (ii) the site is not appropriate for industrial or traveller development, as:-

- (A) it is in very close proximity to current residential development, which is likely to be adversely affected by an industrial and traveller site through noise and pollution;
 - (B) the site is on a Green Belt boundary, is of a substantially similar quality to the site adjacent which is included in the Green Belt (both were rated 13/20 in the 2020 Green Belt Review), and is only delineated from the section within the Green Belt by a footpath;
 - (C) a high pressure gas pipe is present on the site, which raises safety concerns around its proposed use as an industrial site;
 - (D) it is possible that the site may be protected as Grade 3a farming land at a future date, putting the Council in noncompliance with its legal obligation to provide Gypsy and Traveller accommodation; and
 - (E) industrial land use adjacent to housing has previously been shown to disturb the local community, such as at the Abbey Glen site nearby, where hundreds of residents have campaigned against the smell and noise created by the laundry service's industrial activities;
- (m) therefore resolves that officers are requested to include a reappraisal of SES 03 as an industrial and traveller site in the Local Plan, taking into account the views of this Council and the responses to the consultation, when officers present the 'schedule of suggested amendments' to the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee and subsequently to Full Council, as agreed on 14th December 2022;
- (n) notes that following the Race Equality Commission, and in the past, Sheffield Council has committed to working towards becoming an anti-racist city;
- (o) believes that, as the two biggest parties in the Council, both Labour and the Liberal Democrats have a responsibility to this commitment and should not be campaigning against one of the most marginalised and demonised groups in the UK;
- (p) notes that the Labour Party's nominated candidate for the Beighton Ward has set up a petition against the proposed traveller site in Beighton, and believes this is a cynical attempt to win votes in the local election;
- (q) affirms that the Council has a legal and moral obligation to provide traveller sites in Sheffield; and

- (r) notes that no objections to the proposed site in Eckington were made at Full Council when the draft local plan was unanimously agreed in December 2022.
- 8.7 On being put to the vote, the Substantive Motion was carried, except for paragraphs (a) and (c) which were lost.
- 8.7.1 The votes on the amendment were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-
- | | |
|---|---|
| For paragraphs (a) and (c) of the Substantive Motion (26) | - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) and Councillors Richard Shaw, Sophie Thornton, Bob McCann, Kurtis Crossland, Ann Woolhouse, Tim Huggan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Kevin Oxley, Gail Smith, Richard Williams, Lewis Chinchin, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery and Ann Whitaker. |
| Against paragraphs (a) and (c) of the Substantive Motion (41) | - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) and Councillors Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Mark Jones, Safiya Saeed, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Minesh Parekh, Ruth Milsom, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Fran Belbin, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Alexi Dimond, Marieanne Elliot, Paul Turpin, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Henry Nottage, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, Peter Garbutt, Nighat Basharat, Ben Miskell, Nabeela Mowlana, David Barker, Dianne Hurst, Dawn Dale, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Julie Grocutt, Janet Ridler, Ben Curran, Tom Hunt, Mick Rooney and Jackie Satur. |
| Abstained from voting on paragraphs (a) and (c) of the Substantive Motion (2) | - Councillors Talib Hussain and Peter Price. |
| For paragraph (b), (d), (l) and (m) of the Substantive Motion (51) | - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards), the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) and Councillors Richard Shaw, Sophie Thornton, Bob McCann, Kurtis Crossland, Ann Woolhouse, |

Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Mark Jones, Safiya Saeed, Tim Huggan, Minesh Parekh, Ruth Milsom, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Fran Belbin, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, Kevin Oxley, Gail Smith, Nighat Basharat, Ben Miskell, Nabeela Mowlana, David Barker, Dawn Dale, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Williams, Lewis Chinchin, Julie Grocutt, Janet Ridler, Ben Curran, Tom Hunt, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery, Ann Whitaker and Jackie Satur.

Against paragraphs (b), (d), (l) and (m) of the Substantive Motion (16)

- Councillors Bryan Lodge, Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Alexi Dimond, Marieanne Elliot, Paul Turpin, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Henry Nottage, Peter Garbutt, Dianne Hurst and Mick Rooney.

Abstained from voting on paragraphs (b), (d), (l) and (m) of the Substantive Motion (2)

- Councillors Talib Hussain and Peter Price.

For paragraphs (e), (f), (k), (n), (o) and (p) of the Substantive Motion (62)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards), the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) and Councillors Richard Shaw, Sophie Thornton, Bob McCann, Kurtis Crossland, Ann Woolhouse, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Mark Jones, Safiya Saeed, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Tim Huggan, Minesh Parekh, Ruth Milsom, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Fran Belbin, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Alexi Dimond, Marieanne Elliot, Paul Turpin, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Henry Nottage, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, Kevin Oxley, Gail Smith, Peter Garbutt, Nighat Basharat, Ben Miskell, Nabeela Mowlana,

David Barker, Dawn Dale, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Richard Williams, Lewis Chinchin, Julie Grocutt, Janet Ridler, Ben Curran, Tom Hunt, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery, Ann Whitaker and Jackie Satur.

Against paragraphs (e), (f), (k), (n), (o) and (p) of the Substantive Motion (5)

- Councillors Bryan Lodge, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Dianne Hurst and Mick Rooney.

Abstained from voting on paragraphs (e), (f), (k), (n), (o) and (p) of the Substantive Motion (2)

- Councillors Talib Hussain and Peter Price.

For paragraphs (g) to (j), (q) & (r) of the Substantive Motion (37)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards) and Councillors Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Mark Jones, Safiya Saeed, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Martin Phipps, Minesh Parekh, Ruth Milsom, Fran Belbin, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Alexi Dimond, Marieanne Elliot, Paul Turpin, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Henry Nottage, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, Peter Garbutt, Nighat Basharat, Ben Miskell, Nabeela Mowlana, David Barker, Dawn Dale, Mike Chaplin, Tony Damms, Jayne Dunn, Lewis Chinchin, Julie Grocutt, Janet Ridler, Ben Curran, Tom Hunt and Jackie Satur.

Against paragraphs (g) to (j), (q) & (r) of the Substantive Motion (30)

- The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) and Councillors Richard Shaw, Sophie Thornton, Bob McCann, Kurtis Crossland, Ann Woolhouse, Bryan Lodge, Tim Huggan, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Vic Bowden, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Sue Auckland, Steve Ayris, Kevin Oxley, Gail Smith, Dianne Hurst, Richard Williams, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery, Ann Whitaker and Mick Rooney.

Abstained from voting on paragraphs (g) to (j), (q) & (r) of the Substantive Motion (2)

- Councillors Talib Hussain and Peter Price.

(Note: At the meeting of the Council held on 5th July 2023, when approving these minutes, it was agreed that a note be inserted into these minutes to record that the votes of Councillors Bryan Lodge, Talib Hussain, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Dianne Hurst, Peter Price and Mick Rooney had been cast in error, whereas their intention had been to align with the votes of the other Labour Group members, who voted “for” the Substantive Motion, but “against” paragraphs (a) and (c) of the Substantive Motion.)

8.8 Accordingly, the resolution passed by the Council was as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that local residents know what is best for their own communities, and as such, welcomes the numerous representations, feedback, and petitions from members of the public concerning allocations and policies in the emerging Local Plan;
- (b) believes that local residents of South East Sheffield have made their voices clear on the issue of the site east of Eckington Way (referred to in the Emerging Local Plan as site SES 03), which has been allocated for use as a ‘General Employment and Traveller Site’, and notes that a petition opposing the proposed site has received 2,773 signatures as of the 8th of February;
- (c) notes that democratic discussion of how the Council should discharge its duty to provide Gypsy and Traveller accommodation can regrettably sometimes attract discriminatory and racist views and therefore condemns in the strongest terms all forms of racism and discrimination against Gypsy, Traveller, Roma, and Travelling Showpeople communities, and especially any use of discriminatory stereotypes within political campaigning;
- (d) believes that, not only as a council but as a city, we should be proud to celebrate the rich histories and diverse cultures of the Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities, and provide traveller sites in full consultation with Gypsy, Roma and Traveller communities;
- (e) notes that the site allocation list for Beighton, and the whole of the South-East, was put to councillors on 11th July 2022;
- (f) believes that this whole process was completely transparent and notes that, following these briefings and discussions within political groups, the whole Council met on 14th December 2022 to vote on the Local Plan, and all parties – Labour, Liberal Democrat, Conservative and Green – approved the plans;
- (g) notes that the Local Plan was delivered cross-party, and notes that were any traveller site removed from the current Plan, an alternative

site would need to be found in order to meet recognised need;

- (h) notes that while an alternative site, instead of site SES 03, may be required, it would not be appropriate to determine this until the public consultation has completed – and Members need to consider all representations (including from the gypsy and traveller community) as well as any further evidence, around all sites in the city;
- (i) believes that the Local Plan is for all of Sheffield – all of its people and different communities, without prejudice – and that this Council needs to balance all considerations in the final approved report, including issues around traffic mitigation, supporting infrastructure, environmental protection, the standard of homes, and economic growth;
- (j) notes there has been significant concerns raised about the suitability of the site for use as industrial employment and traveller pitches, for the following reasons:-
 - (i) congestion on Eckington Way is a significant issue, as:-
 - (A) the site is very close to the Crystal Peaks shopping centre and Drakehouse Retail Park;
 - (B) there have been 13 collisions on the road and roundabout in the last five years, 5 of them serious;
 - (C) Ward members regularly receive complaints from constituents regarding the large volume of congestion on Eckington Way; and
 - (D) the site's proposed use for employment and travelling showpeople, with Eckington Way as its only access point, would significantly add to congestion on this street; and
 - (ii) the site is not appropriate for industrial or traveller development, as:-
 - (A) it is in very close proximity to current residential development, which is likely to be adversely affected by an industrial and traveller site through noise and pollution;
 - (B) the site is on a Green Belt boundary, is of a substantially similar quality to the site adjacent which is included in the Green Belt (both were rated 13/20 in the 2020 Green Belt Review), and is only delineated from the section within the Green Belt by a footpath;

- (C) a high pressure gas pipe is present on the site, which raises safety concerns around its proposed use as an industrial site;
 - (D) it is possible that the site may be protected as Grade 3a farming land at a future date, putting the Council in noncompliance with its legal obligation to provide Gypsy and Traveller accommodation; and
 - (E) industrial land use adjacent to housing has previously been shown to disturb the local community, such as at the Abbey Glen site nearby, where hundreds of residents have campaigned against the smell and noise created by the laundry service's industrial activities;
- (k) therefore resolves that officers are requested to include a reappraisal of SES 03 as an industrial and traveller site in the Local Plan, taking into account the views of this Council and the responses to the consultation, when officers present the 'schedule of suggested amendments' to the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee and subsequently to Full Council, as agreed on 14th December 2022;
- (l) notes that following the Race Equality Commission, and in the past, Sheffield Council has committed to working towards becoming an anti-racist city;
- (m) believes that, as the two biggest parties in the Council, both Labour and the Liberal Democrats have a responsibility to this commitment and should not be campaigning against one of the most marginalised and demonised groups in the UK;
- (n) notes that the Labour Party's nominated candidate for the Beighton Ward has set up a petition against the proposed traveller site in Beighton, and believes this is a cynical attempt to win votes in the local election;
- (o) affirms that the Council has a legal and moral obligation to provide traveller sites in Sheffield; and
- (p) notes that no objections to the proposed site in Eckington were made at Full Council when the draft local plan was unanimously agreed in December 2022.

9. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "MARKING THE SUCCESS OF THE COMMITTEE SYSTEM IN SHEFFIELD" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ANGELA ARGENZIO AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BERNARD LITTLE

9.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Angela Argenzio, and formally seconded by Councillor Christine Gilligan Kubo:-

That this Council notes:-

- (a) the successful campaign by the “It’s Our City” group to establish a Committee system and remove the “Strong Leader” model in Sheffield, with 65% of voters supporting the committee model in the referendum;
- (b) Sheffield is one of the first cities in the country to adopt the Committee system;
- (c) the greater collaboration between Councillors across political groups in policy formulation and in the decision-making processes of the Council;
- (d) the Committee system’s role in helping overcome party political tribalism to achieve positive outcomes;
- (e) the involvement of a wider number of Councillors in the decision-making of the Council;
- (f) the greater accountability of Councillors to the electorate due to their involvement in decision-making;
- (g) that autocratic top-down decision-making is reduced by the Committee system;
- (h) that the possibility of the Council making decisions that are misjudged, due to the lack of involvement of a wider number of members and political groups, is diminished;
- (i) the successful work, across the committees, to address the Council’s current financial crisis, with Councillors having worked together to reach an understanding of the issues and consensus over the ways to address them;
- (j) that part of the reasoning behind moving to a committee system was greater involvement of communities in decision making, and more work should be done to achieve this by the committees;

That this Council believes:-

- (k) the Council being in “no overall control” has been good for the Council and the people of Sheffield, and that this, combined with the new modern committee system, has led to improved cross-party working and better outcomes for our city;
- (l) the change in culture needed across political groups to embed the benefits of the Committee system is still “work in progress” and all groups should embrace this positive new way of governing the Council to realise

its benefits fully;

- (m) that the Committee Chair's role is not the equivalent of the old style Cabinet Member's role and work is still needed to ensure that this is understood by Councillors and Officers and the public to deliver more collaborative and consensual working across political groups;
- (n) that greater clarity is needed on which decisions are made by which committees as this is sometimes unclear;

That this Council resolves to:-

- (o) affirm its support for the Committee System in Sheffield;
- (p) work together across political groups to build on the successes we have already seen the committee system achieve;
- (q) promote a greater understanding of how the committee system works among the public, members and officers;
- (r) achieve greater involvement of the public in Council decision-making, such as by committees making more extensive use of the engagement toolkit;
- (s) develop protocols to be clear about the way committee decisions are made in a no overall control context; and
- (t) encourage a culture in the Council that matches the new cooperative way of working needed in a committee system.

9.1.1 (NOTE: In response to a Point of Order raised by Councillor Dianne Hurst under Council Procedure Rule 17.15(b), regarding the accuracy of paragraph (b) of the Motion, the Lord Mayor accepted that the Motion as published on the agenda should be altered by the replacement, in paragraph (b) of the Motion, of the words "Sheffield is the first city in the country to adopt the Committee system" by the words "Sheffield is one of the first cities in the country to adopt the Committee system".)

9.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Sue Alston, and formally seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraphs (d), (g), (h) and (i) and the re-lettering of the original paragraphs (e) and (f) as new paragraphs (d) and (e).
2. the addition of new paragraphs (f) and (g) as follows:-
 - (f) that the Liberal Democrat group has advocated for this governance change for several years, and that a motion in support of moving to a Committee system was proposed by Councillor

Shaffaq Mohammed in June 2018;

- (g) that the committee system involves a greater number of councillors across the different political groups and enables higher quality debate on decisions, but believes that it is too early to judge whether this has resulted in improved decision making, particularly as the effect of the council being in Labour-led No Overall Control will also influence this process;
- 3. the re-lettering of paragraph (j) as a new paragraph (h).
 - 4. the addition (within the section “That this Council believes”) of new paragraphs (i) and (j) as follows:-
 - (i) that more work is needed to move away from the ‘strong leader’ culture, and believes that its continuing influence can be seen in several areas, for example the repeated delays to the publication of the Leisure Strategy;
 - (j) that more work is also needed to ensure that work programmes are not officer led and that policy committees are involved in the early stages of policy development, as the engagement findings of the Governance Review reported;
 - 5. the deletion of paragraph (k) and the addition of a new paragraph (k) as follows:-
 - (k) that effective scrutiny of decisions relies on active challenge and debate by the policy committees to ensure that decisions are made in the best interests of the city;
 - 6. the deletion of paragraph (s) and the addition of a new paragraph (s) as follows:-
 - (s) improve the understanding and clarity of the role of all committees to make decisions as envisaged when the system was developed, including committees being involved in the early stages of policy development, in order to reduce the number of decisions taken back to the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee; and
- 9.3 On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried, but in part. Parts 1, 3, 5 and 6 and paragraph (j) in Part 4 of the amendment were carried, and Part 2 and paragraph (i) in Part 4 of the amendment were lost.
- 9.3.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 60 Members; AGAINST - 10 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Although Labour Group Members voted for, they voted against Part 2 and paragraph (i) in Part 4 of the amendment.)
- 9.4 The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the

following form and carried:-

RESOLVED:

That this Council notes:-

- (a) the successful campaign by the “It’s Our City” group to establish a Committee system and remove the “Strong Leader” model in Sheffield, with 65% of voters supporting the committee model in the referendum;
- (b) Sheffield is one of the first cities in the country to adopt the Committee system;
- (c) the greater collaboration between Councillors across political groups in policy formulation and in the decision-making processes of the Council;
- (d) the involvement of a wider number of Councillors in the decision-making of the Council;
- (e) the greater accountability of Councillors to the electorate due to their involvement in decision-making;
- (f) that part of the reasoning behind moving to a committee system was greater involvement of communities in decision making, and more work should be done to achieve this by the committees;

That this Council believes:-

- (g) that more work is also needed to ensure that work programmes are not officer led and that policy committees are involved in the early stages of policy development, as the engagement findings of the Governance Review reported;
- (h) that effective scrutiny of decisions relies on active challenge and debate by the policy committees to ensure that decisions are made in the best interests of the city;
- (i) the change in culture needed across political groups to embed the benefits of the Committee system is still “work in progress” and all groups should embrace this positive new way of governing the Council to realise its benefits fully;
- (j) that the Committee Chair’s role is not the equivalent of the old style Cabinet Member’s role and work is still needed to ensure that this is understood by Councillors and Officers and the public to deliver more collaborative and consensual working across political groups;

- (k) that greater clarity is needed on which decisions are made by which committees as this is sometimes unclear;

That this Council resolves to:-

- (l) affirm its support for the Committee System in Sheffield;
- (m) work together across political groups to build on the successes we have already seen the committee system achieve;
- (n) promote a greater understanding of how the committee system works among the public, members and officers;
- (o) achieve greater involvement of the public in Council decision-making, such as by committees making more extensive use of the engagement toolkit;
- (p) improve the understanding and clarity of the role of all committees to make decisions as envisaged when the system was developed, including committees being involved in the early stages of policy development, in order to reduce the number of decisions taken back to the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee; and
- (q) encourage a culture in the Council that matches the new cooperative way of working needed in a committee system.

- 9.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 69 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member. Although Green Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (h) and (p) of the Substantive Motion.)

10. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "LEVELLING-UP - WHY WE NEED TO TAKE BACK CONTROL FROM WHITEHALL TO DELIVER ECONOMIC GROWTH FOR SHEFFIELD" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MINESH PAREKH AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BEN MISKELL

- 10.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Minesh Parekh, and formally seconded by Councillor Ben Miskell, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that too many places across the country have had nothing but crumbs from the Government's table in the latest round of 'levelling-up' funding;
- (b) notes that many communities in great need have lost out in the recent round of funding, and believes that the way this funding is distributed pits communities against one another, forced to compete in a contest where Whitehall Ministers pick winners and losers;

- (c) notes that the total cost of work producing bids for levelling-up funding for councils in England is at least £27 million, with the vast majority seeing no return on this spending;
- (d) notes that of the 80 successful bids to the second round of levelling-up funding in England, only half are in the 100 most deprived areas of the country;
- (e) notes that, compared to the first round of funding, Yorkshire and the Humber has seen its share drop by 5.3%, the West Midlands drop 4.1%, the East Midlands by 3.5%; and the North East's share drop 0.7%;
- (f) believes South Yorkshire's transport offer is being badly let down by this Government, noting that both bids to the Levelling-up Fund from the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority for support for the bus network have been rejected, and from March, Government bus cuts could see a third of services lost;
- (g) believes that this is unacceptable, and notes that this Council has called for bus franchising to be enacted as quickly as possible to bring buses under greater public ownership, and that the Labour Group is committed to seeing Sheffield buses and trams under full public ownership;
- (h) believes it takes extraordinary arrogance from the Government to expect gratitude for their failed 'levelling-up' policies and the marginal funding associated with this, when they have decimated vital local services like childcare, buses and social care;
- (i) notes that the Council has had to endure huge cuts for thirteen years; with the annual grant the Council receives from the Government now £288m less in real terms than in 2010, with a staggering £2.1billion being lost, in real terms, over the same period, which is around £9,000 per household in Sheffield;
- (j) notes the Parliamentary Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Committee calls for the Government to take steps to level up cultural opportunities and production across the country, and explicitly incorporate support for local arts and culture into the Government's First Statement for Levelling-Up Missions; and believes support for cultural industries must be included in levelling up efforts;
- (k) believes that Britain isn't working - after 13 years of virtually no growth our cherished public services are strained, our high streets are still boarded up, transport is getting worse, crime is on the rise and work simply doesn't pay sufficiently for many;
- (l) believes that the Government's only answer is an ineffectual system of short-term, competitive pots of money that pits communities against

each other, and believes that this is the kind of sticking plaster politics that the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Keir Starmer, has promised to end;

- (m) notes that the Labour Party has proposed the biggest ever transfer of power out of Westminster through the Take Back Control Act, so local leaders can harness the skills and assets in their area to drive growth, and believes that this Council should support this as a means of not only providing a greater say for our communities, but delivering essential support to public services and bringing vital economic growth;
- (n) believes that the Labour Party's proposed Take Back Control Bill would help deliver real economic growth and a redistribution of power to communities from Whitehall, and that the Council must proactively plan as to how we can best utilise this;
- (o) believes, however, that we cannot simply wait for a change of government and must continue to do what we can, right now, at a local level to deliver clean, inclusive economic growth, supporting both old and new industries;
- (p) further believes as part of this, that we must consider how best to safeguard and strengthen our city's economic drivers;
- (q) notes that Sheffield's economic power was initially built on the back of the steel industry and believes Sheffield still occupies a unique position as the heart of Britain's steel industry, and can set the course for its own future;
- (r) notes that Governments around the world have committed to their domestic industries with long-term strategic investment in green steel production, but believes the UK Government has failed to invest in the transition, have attempted to weaken safeguards that protect our steelmakers from being undercut by cheap steel imports, and have splashed tens of millions on imported steel to build British schools and hospitals;
- (s) believes that climate justice is indivisible from social and economic justice; that employing a 'just transition' approach to decarbonisation - protecting the livelihoods of those working in polluting industries, and transitioning these workers into well-paid, green jobs - is essential to ensure a green transition does not harm workers and their communities;
- (t) supports, therefore, TUC calls for the Government to set-up a national Just Transition Commission, to provide a worker-centred transition to a low carbon economy; with a Just Transition Commission helping to coordinate investment, boost learning skills agenda, support local manufacturing, and to work closely alongside local authorities in delivering this;

- (u) supports further, TUC Yorkshire and Humberside's calls for a regional Just Transition Commission to coordinate investment, learning skills agenda, changing procurement rules to support local manufacturing, and regional leadership on climate targets, as well as the work by the Yorkshire and Humber Climate Commission in supporting the just transition agenda; and
 - (v) believes that we need a radically different approach in the country to provide not only economic growth, but inclusive clean growth that benefits everyone, and secures a prosperous future for industries old and new.
- 10.1.1 (NOTE: With the agreement of the Council and at the request of the mover of the Motion (Councillor Minesh Parekh), the Motion as published on the agenda was altered by the addition, in paragraph (t) of the Motion, of the word "carbon" between the words "low" and "economy".)
- 10.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Tim Huggan, and formally seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-
- 1. the deletion of paragraphs (g) to (n), and the re-lettering of paragraphs (o) to (q) as new paragraphs (g) to (i);
 - 2. the deletion of paragraphs (r) to (v); and
 - 3. the addition of new paragraphs (j) to (r) as follows:-
 - (j) believes that Sheffield's steel industry only grew to such heights due to strong trading and export links, and that to rebuild green industry will similarly require a strong private sector and positive trading relationships;
 - (k) believes that governments since 2016 have weakened the UK's trading position in the world through pursuing a disastrous hard Brexit and protectionist trade barriers, and believes that the UK must take immediate action to rebuild trade links with our European neighbours;
 - (l) believes that Sheffield has an enormous opportunity to contribute to reaching the net zero target and creating a circular economy, but that this can only be achieved through resolving the UK's chronic low productivity and slow growth;
 - (m) condemns the decision by the Government to award no money to local authorities that had received funding from Round One of the Levelling Up Fund, and believes that not publishing this decision during the bid process led to a significant waste of officer resources;

- (n) believes that this Council must practice what it preaches when it comes to local decision making, and that it cannot decry the hoarding of power in Whitehall while seeking to hoard power in the Town Hall;
- (o) reaffirms its commitment to ensuring the success of the Local Area Committees, welcomes the good work that has been done locally across the whole city, and believes that truly local politics will be essential to building a circular economy;
- (p) believes that Local Area Committees have improved local decision making power for communities, and have made great progress on schemes which are tackling fly tipping and antisocial behaviour, beautifying local communities, and addressing the cost of living crisis;
- (q) believes that the LACs require significantly more powers in order to successfully deliver for their communities, including powers on local transport initiatives, parks and leisure, and social care, and believes that increasing the power of the LACs will go a significant way towards ensuring the success of the Committee system; and
- (r) believes that if localism is to be fully embraced, LACs must be empowered to make decisions which run contrary to the Town Hall's wishes.

10.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Ruth Mersereau, and formally seconded by Councillor Paul Turpin, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (w) to (cc) as follows:-

- (w) believes that a proportional voting system is necessary to truly "Take Back Control" by making all votes matter, noting that since 1935 not one of the single party majority governments elected by our current First Past The Post voting system received a majority of the votes;
- (x) notes that under First Past The Post voting system the amount of votes taken to elect an MP differs by party, and this historically favours the Conservative Party: the Green Party received 866,000 votes in the 2019 general election and elected one MP, the Liberal Democrat Party received 336,000 votes per MP elected, the Labour Party received 51,000 votes per MP elected and the Conservative Party only had to receive an average of 38,000 votes to elect an MP;
- (y) believes that under the current system the largest two parties appeal to voters in "swing seats", taking votes in "safe seats" for granted, and notes that proportional representation weighs all votes equally - if a party received 20% of the votes then they would receive approximately 20% of the seats;

- (z) believes that an electoral system returning results that match how the electorate voted is not only key to taking back control from Whitehall, but to democracy;
- (aa) notes that 40 out of 43 European countries use a form of proportional representation to elect MPs, with UK and Belarus the only countries using First Past The Post;

This Council resolves:-

- (bb) to support proportional representation and the Councils For PR campaign; and
- (cc) to request that the Chief Executive writes to the Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Rishi Sunak MP, and the Leader Of The Opposition, the Rt. Hon. Sir Keir Starmer MP, requesting the Government changes to use proportional representation in local, national and regional elections, attaching a copy of this motion.

10.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Tim Huggan was put to the vote and was carried, but in part. Paragraphs (j) and (l) to (r) in Part 3 of the amendment were carried, and Parts 1 and 2 and paragraph (k) in Part 3 of the amendment were lost.

10.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 27 Members; AGAINST - 42 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Although Labour Group Members voted against, they voted for paragraphs (j) and (l) to (r) in Part 3 of the amendment. Although Councillor Lewis Chinchon voted for, he voted against paragraphs (k) to (m) in Part 3 of the amendment.)

10.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Ruth Mersereau was then put to the vote and was carried.

10.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 36 Members; AGAINST - 34 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that too many places across the country have had nothing but crumbs from the Government's table in the latest round of 'levelling-up' funding;
- (b) notes that many communities in great need have lost out in the recent round of funding, and believes that the way this funding is distributed pits communities against one another, forced to compete in a contest where Whitehall Ministers pick winners and losers;

- (c) notes that the total cost of work producing bids for levelling-up funding for councils in England is at least £27 million, with the vast majority seeing no return on this spending;
- (d) notes that of the 80 successful bids to the second round of levelling-up funding in England, only half are in the 100 most deprived areas of the country;
- (e) notes that, compared to the first round of funding, Yorkshire and the Humber has seen its share drop by 5.3%, the West Midlands drop 4.1%, the East Midlands by 3.5%; and the North East's share drop 0.7%;
- (f) believes South Yorkshire's transport offer is being badly let down by this Government, noting that both bids to the Levelling-up Fund from the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority for support for the bus network have been rejected, and from March, Government bus cuts could see a third of services lost;
- (g) believes that this is unacceptable, and notes that this Council has called for bus franchising to be enacted as quickly as possible to bring buses under greater public ownership, and that the Labour Group is committed to seeing Sheffield buses and trams under full public ownership;
- (h) believes it takes extraordinary arrogance from the Government to expect gratitude for their failed 'levelling-up' policies and the marginal funding associated with this, when they have decimated vital local services like childcare, buses and social care;
- (i) notes that the Council has had to endure huge cuts for thirteen years; with the annual grant the Council receives from the Government now £288m less in real terms than in 2010, with a staggering £2.1 billion being lost, in real terms, over the same period, which is around £9,000 per household in Sheffield;
- (j) notes the Parliamentary Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Committee calls for the Government to take steps to level up cultural opportunities and production across the country, and explicitly incorporate support for local arts and culture into the Government's First Statement for Levelling-Up Missions; and believes support for cultural industries must be included in levelling up efforts;
- (k) believes that Britain isn't working - after 13 years of virtually no growth our cherished public services are strained, our high streets are still boarded up, transport is getting worse, crime is on the rise and work simply doesn't pay sufficiently for many;
- (l) believes that the Government's only answer is an ineffectual system

of short-term, competitive pots of money that pits communities against each other, and believes that this is the kind of sticking plaster politics that the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Keir Starmer, has promised to end;

- (m) notes that the Labour Party has proposed the biggest ever transfer of power out of Westminster through the Take Back Control Act, so local leaders can harness the skills and assets in their area to drive growth, and believes that this Council should support this as a means of not only providing a greater say for our communities, but delivering essential support to public services and bringing vital economic growth;
- (n) believes that the Labour Party's proposed Take Back Control Bill would help deliver real economic growth and a redistribution of power to communities from Whitehall, and that the Council must proactively plan as to how we can best utilise this;
- (o) believes, however, that we cannot simply wait for a change of government and must continue to do what we can, right now, at a local level to deliver clean, inclusive economic growth, supporting both old and new industries;
- (p) further believes as part of this, that we must consider how best to safeguard and strengthen our city's economic drivers;
- (q) notes that Sheffield's economic power was initially built on the back of the steel industry and believes Sheffield still occupies a unique position as the heart of Britain's steel industry, and can set the course for its own future;
- (r) notes that Governments around the world have committed to their domestic industries with long-term strategic investment in green steel production, but believes the UK Government has failed to invest in the transition, have attempted to weaken safeguards that protect our steelmakers from being undercut by cheap steel imports, and have splashed tens of millions on imported steel to build British schools and hospitals;
- (s) believes that climate justice is indivisible from social and economic justice; that employing a 'just transition' approach to decarbonisation - protecting the livelihoods of those working in polluting industries, and transitioning these workers into well-paid, green jobs - is essential to ensure a green transition does not harm workers and their communities;
- (t) supports, therefore, TUC calls for the Government to set-up a national Just Transition Commission, to provide a worker-centred transition to a low carbon economy; with a Just Transition Commission helping to coordinate investment, boost learning skills

agenda, support local manufacturing, and to work closely alongside local authorities in delivering this;

- (u) supports further, TUC Yorkshire and Humberside's calls for a regional Just Transition Commission to coordinate investment, learning skills agenda, changing procurement rules to support local manufacturing, and regional leadership on climate targets, as well as the work by the Yorkshire and Humber Climate Commission in supporting the just transition agenda;
- (v) believes that we need a radically different approach in the country to provide not only economic growth, but inclusive clean growth that benefits everyone, and secures a prosperous future for industries old and new;
- (w) believes that Sheffield's steel industry only grew to such heights due to strong trading and export links, and that to rebuild green industry will similarly require a strong private sector and positive trading relationships;
- (x) believes that Sheffield has an enormous opportunity to contribute to reaching the net zero target and creating a circular economy, but that this can only be achieved through resolving the UK's chronic low productivity and slow growth;
- (y) condemns the decision by the Government to award no money to local authorities that had received funding from Round One of the Levelling Up Fund, and believes that not publishing this decision during the bid process led to a significant waste of officer resources;
- (z) believes that this Council must practice what it preaches when it comes to local decision making, and that it cannot decry the hoarding of power in Whitehall while seeking to hoard power in the Town Hall;
- (aa) reaffirms its commitment to ensuring the success of the Local Area Committees, welcomes the good work that has been done locally across the whole city, and believes that truly local politics will be essential to building a circular economy;
- (bb) believes that Local Area Committees have improved local decision making power for communities, and have made great progress on schemes which are tackling fly tipping and antisocial behaviour, beautifying local communities, and addressing the cost of living crisis;
- (cc) believes that the LACs require significantly more powers in order to successfully deliver for their communities, including powers on local transport initiatives, parks and leisure, and social care, and believes that increasing the power of the LACs will go a significant way towards ensuring the success of the Committee system;

- (dd) believes that if localism is to be fully embraced, LACs must be empowered to make decisions which run contrary to the Town Hall's wishes;
- (ee) believes that a proportional voting system is necessary to truly "Take Back Control" by making all votes matter, noting that since 1935 not one of the single party majority governments elected by our current First Past The Post voting system received a majority of the votes;
- (ff) notes that under First Past The Post voting system the amount of votes taken to elect an MP differs by party, and this historically favours the Conservative Party: the Green Party received 866,000 votes in the 2019 general election and elected one MP, the Liberal Democrat Party received 336,000 votes per MP elected, the Labour Party received 51,000 votes per MP elected and the Conservative Party only had to receive an average of 38,000 votes to elect an MP;
- (gg) believes that under the current system the largest two parties appeal to voters in "swing seats", taking votes in "safe seats" for granted, and notes that proportional representation weighs all votes equally - if a party received 20% of the votes then they would receive approximately 20% of the seats;
- (hh) believes that an electoral system returning results that match how the electorate voted is not only key to taking back control from Whitehall, but to democracy;
- (ii) notes that 40 out of 43 European countries use a form of proportional representation to elect MPs, with UK and Belarus the only countries using First Past The Post;

That this Council resolves:-

- (jj) to support proportional representation and the Councils For PR campaign; and
- (kk) to request that the Chief Executive writes to the Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Rishi Sunak MP, and the Leader Of The Opposition, the Rt. Hon. Sir Keir Starmer MP, requesting the Government changes to use proportional representation in local, national and regional elections, attaching a copy of this motion.

10.7 On being put to the vote, the Substantive Motion was carried, except for paragraphs (m) and (n) which were lost.

10.7.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 68 Members; AGAINST - 1 Member; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Although Labour Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (ee) to (kk) of the Substantive Motion. Although Liberal Democrat Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (g) to (n) and (r) to (v) of the Substantive Motion. Although Green Group Members

voted for, they voted against paragraphs (m) and (n) of the Substantive Motion. Although Councillor Lewis Chinchen voted against, he voted for paragraphs (j), (p), (q), (s) to (u), (w) and (z) to (dd) of the Substantive Motion.)

10.8 Accordingly, the resolution passed by the Council was as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that too many places across the country have had nothing but crumbs from the Government's table in the latest round of 'levelling-up' funding;
- (b) notes that many communities in great need have lost out in the recent round of funding, and believes that the way this funding is distributed pits communities against one another, forced to compete in a contest where Whitehall Ministers pick winners and losers;
- (c) notes that the total cost of work producing bids for levelling-up funding for councils in England is at least £27 million, with the vast majority seeing no return on this spending;
- (d) notes that of the 80 successful bids to the second round of levelling-up funding in England, only half are in the 100 most deprived areas of the country;
- (e) notes that, compared to the first round of funding, Yorkshire and the Humber has seen its share drop by 5.3%, the West Midlands drop 4.1%, the East Midlands by 3.5%; and the North East's share drop 0.7%;
- (f) believes South Yorkshire's transport offer is being badly let down by this Government, noting that both bids to the Levelling-up Fund from the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority for support for the bus network have been rejected, and from March, Government bus cuts could see a third of services lost;
- (g) believes that this is unacceptable, and notes that this Council has called for bus franchising to be enacted as quickly as possible to bring buses under greater public ownership, and that the Labour Group is committed to seeing Sheffield buses and trams under full public ownership;
- (h) believes it takes extraordinary arrogance from the Government to expect gratitude for their failed 'levelling-up' policies and the marginal funding associated with this, when they have decimated vital local services like childcare, buses and social care;
- (i) notes that the Council has had to endure huge cuts for thirteen years;

with the annual grant the Council receives from the Government now £288m less in real terms than in 2010, with a staggering £2.1billion being lost, in real terms, over the same period, which is around £9,000 per household in Sheffield;

- (j) notes the Parliamentary Digital, Culture, Media and Sport Committee calls for the Government to take steps to level up cultural opportunities and production across the country, and explicitly incorporate support for local arts and culture into the Government's First Statement for Levelling-Up Missions; and believes support for cultural industries must be included in levelling up efforts;
- (k) believes that Britain isn't working - after 13 years of virtually no growth our cherished public services are strained, our high streets are still boarded up, transport is getting worse, crime is on the rise and work simply doesn't pay sufficiently for many;
- (l) believes that the Government's only answer is an ineffectual system of short-term, competitive pots of money that pits communities against each other, and believes that this is the kind of sticking plaster politics that the Leader of the Opposition, Sir Keir Starmer, has promised to end;
- (m) believes, however, that we cannot simply wait for a change of government and must continue to do what we can, right now, at a local level to deliver clean, inclusive economic growth, supporting both old and new industries;
- (n) further believes as part of this, that we must consider how best to safeguard and strengthen our city's economic drivers;
- (o) notes that Sheffield's economic power was initially built on the back of the steel industry and believes Sheffield still occupies a unique position as the heart of Britain's steel industry, and can set the course for its own future;
- (p) notes that Governments around the world have committed to their domestic industries with long-term strategic investment in green steel production, but believes the UK Government has failed to invest in the transition, have attempted to weaken safeguards that protect our steelmakers from being undercut by cheap steel imports, and have splashed tens of millions on imported steel to build British schools and hospitals;
- (q) believes that climate justice is indivisible from social and economic justice; that employing a 'just transition' approach to decarbonisation - protecting the livelihoods of those working in polluting industries, and transitioning these workers into well-paid, green jobs - is essential to ensure a green transition does not harm workers and their communities;

- (r) supports, therefore, TUC calls for the Government to set-up a national Just Transition Commission, to provide a worker-centred transition to a low carbon economy; with a Just Transition Commission helping to coordinate investment, boost learning skills agenda, support local manufacturing, and to work closely alongside local authorities in delivering this;
- (s) supports further, TUC Yorkshire and Humberside's calls for a regional Just Transition Commission to coordinate investment, learning skills agenda, changing procurement rules to support local manufacturing, and regional leadership on climate targets, as well as the work by the Yorkshire and Humber Climate Commission in supporting the just transition agenda;
- (t) believes that we need a radically different approach in the country to provide not only economic growth, but inclusive clean growth that benefits everyone, and secures a prosperous future for industries old and new;
- (u) believes that Sheffield's steel industry only grew to such heights due to strong trading and export links, and that to rebuild green industry will similarly require a strong private sector and positive trading relationships;
- (v) believes that Sheffield has an enormous opportunity to contribute to reaching the net zero target and creating a circular economy, but that this can only be achieved through resolving the UK's chronic low productivity and slow growth;
- (w) condemns the decision by the Government to award no money to local authorities that had received funding from Round One of the Levelling Up Fund, and believes that not publishing this decision during the bid process led to a significant waste of officer resources;
- (x) believes that this Council must practice what it preaches when it comes to local decision making, and that it cannot decry the hoarding of power in Whitehall while seeking to hoard power in the Town Hall;
- (y) reaffirms its commitment to ensuring the success of the Local Area Committees, welcomes the good work that has been done locally across the whole city, and believes that truly local politics will be essential to building a circular economy;
- (z) believes that Local Area Committees have improved local decision making power for communities, and have made great progress on schemes which are tackling fly tipping and antisocial behaviour, beautifying local communities, and addressing the cost of living crisis;
- (aa) believes that the LACs require significantly more powers in order to

successfully deliver for their communities, including powers on local transport initiatives, parks and leisure, and social care, and believes that increasing the power of the LACs will go a significant way towards ensuring the success of the Committee system;

- (bb) believes that if localism is to be fully embraced, LACs must be empowered to make decisions which run contrary to the Town Hall's wishes;
- (cc) believes that a proportional voting system is necessary to truly "Take Back Control" by making all votes matter, noting that since 1935 not one of the single party majority governments elected by our current First Past The Post voting system received a majority of the votes;
- (dd) notes that under First Past The Post voting system the amount of votes taken to elect an MP differs by party, and this historically favours the Conservative Party: the Green Party received 866,000 votes in the 2019 general election and elected one MP, the Liberal Democrat Party received 336,000 votes per MP elected, the Labour Party received 51,000 votes per MP elected and the Conservative Party only had to receive an average of 38,000 votes to elect an MP;
- (ee) believes that under the current system the largest two parties appeal to voters in "swing seats", taking votes in "safe seats" for granted, and notes that proportional representation weighs all votes equally - if a party received 20% of the votes then they would receive approximately 20% of the seats;
- (ff) believes that an electoral system returning results that match how the electorate voted is not only key to taking back control from Whitehall, but to democracy;
- (gg) notes that 40 out of 43 European countries use a form of proportional representation to elect MPs, with UK and Belarus the only countries using First Past The Post;

That this Council resolves:-

- (hh) to support proportional representation and the Councils For PR campaign; and
- (ii) to request that the Chief Executive writes to the Prime Minister, the Rt. Hon. Rishi Sunak MP, and the Leader Of The Opposition, the Rt. Hon. Sir Keir Starmer MP, requesting the Government changes to use proportional representation in local, national and regional elections, attaching a copy of this motion.

11. APPOINTMENTS TO CHIEF OFFICER POSTS - APPROVAL OF SALARY PACKAGES

11.1 RESOLVED: On the motion formally moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed and formally seconded by Councillor Douglas Johnson, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the information contained in the reports now submitted on the recruitment exercises for certain Chief Officer posts;
- (b) approves the salary packages for the posts of Chief Operating Officer and Strategic Director of Children's Services, in the range £118,693 to £130,461; and
- (c) approves a market supplement payment of £8,539, lifting the total remuneration of the Chief Operating Officer to £139,000.

11.1.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote on the motion was FOR - 36 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 32 Members.)

12. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION

12.1 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: On the motion formally moved by Councillor Dianne Hurst and formally seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, that this Council:-

- (a) approves the changes to the various Parts of the Constitution, as outlined in sections 3.1 to 3.7 of the report of the Interim Director of Legal and Governance and as set out in appendices B to J; and
- (b) notes the minor change to the Council Procedure Rules in Part 4 of the Constitution that had been made by the Interim Director of Legal and Governance, as outlined in section 4 of the report and as set out in appendix K.

13. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS

13.1 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: On the motion formally moved by Councillor Dianne Hurst and formally seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, that (a) the minutes of the special and ordinary meetings of the Council held on 14th December 2022 be approved as true and accurate records and (b) the minutes of the ordinary meeting be amended by the alteration of the result of the vote set out at paragraph 5.4.1 of the minutes, to incorporate a change of Councillor Peter Price's vote from "for" to "against".

14. MEMBERSHIPS OF COUNCIL BODIES AND REPRESENTATIVES TO SERVE ON OTHER BODIES

14.1 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: On the motion formally moved by Councillor Dianne Hurst and formally seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, that:-

(a) it be noted that, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its annual meeting held on 18th May 2022, the Monitoring Officer had authorised the following appointments, with effect from the dates shown:-

Strategy and Resources Policy Committee - Councillor Dawn Dale to replace Councillor Mick Rooney, with effect from 23rd January 2023.

Charity Trustee Sub-Committee - Councillor Dawn Dale to replace Councillor Mick Rooney, with effect from 23rd January 2023.

Senior Officer Employment Committee - Councillor Mary Lea to replace Councillor Dianne Hurst, with effect from 8th February 2023.

(b) Councillor Tom Hunt be appointed as Deputy Chair of the Audit and Standards Committee, in place of Councillor Ben Curran;

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

Waste and Street Scene Policy Committee - Councillor Maroof Raouf to replace Councillor Brian Holmshaw as a substitute member of the Committee.

Senior Officer Employment Committee - Councillor Dawn Dale to replace Councillor Mick Rooney

Sheffield Health and Wellbeing Board - Councillor Dawn Dale to replace Councillor Mick Rooney.

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

Sheffield Football Trust - Councillor Denise Fox to fill a vacancy.

Sheffield Co-Operative Development Group - Councillor Denise Fox to fill a vacancy.

Sheffield Theatres Trust - Councillor Peter Price to fill a vacancy.

(e) it be noted that the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 30th January, 2023, appointed (i) Catherine Bunton to the post

of Assistant Director, Commissioning & Partnerships, within the Adult Social Care Service, and that Ms. Bunton started in post on 6th February, 2023 and (ii) Jo Pass to the post of Assistant Director, Living & Ageing Well, within the Adult Social Care Service, and that Ms. Pass started in post on 6th February, 2023.