

Agenda Item 11

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH, on Wednesday 6 September 2023, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

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

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

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

- 1.1 Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Fran Belbin, Lewis Chinchen, Mike Drabble, Maleiki Haybe, Alison Norris, Martin Phipps, Vickie Priestley, Maroof Raouf and Paul Wood.

2. EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC

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

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Mayoral Engagements/Events

- 4.1.1 The Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) reported that to mark the first anniversary of the passing of Queen Elizabeth II a digital display of the book of condolences produced at the time, would be available in the Town Hall foyer. This would tie in with the Town Hall Heritage Open Days.

- 4.1.2 The Lord Mayor then reported that he had visited Sheffield's twin city of Bochum the preceding weekend with the aim of reviving the links between the two cities. Potential links between universities, Chambers of Commerce and schools would be explored.

- 4.1.3 The Lord Mayor also reported that he was taking part in a fundraising event for St. Luke's Hospices on 15th Sept, walking 9 miles, and visiting several St. Luke's shops on route. He invited Members to meet him at shops in their own ward or to walk with him.

4.2 Petitions and Public Questions

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) reported that one petition was to be received at the meeting and questions would be taken from ten members of the public. This included a written, postal question from a member of the public which, although only brought to his attention immediately prior to the meeting, had been posted to the Council prior to the published deadline for submission of petitions and questions for this meeting. He therefore proposed to use his discretion, as chair of the meeting, and permit the question to be asked on this occasion.

4.3 Petition Calling On The Council To Allow A Front Seat Passenger In A Hackney Carriage Cab With A Partition But No Intercom

The Council received an electronic petition containing 22 signatures, calling on the Council to allow a front seat passenger in a hackney carriage cab with a partition but no intercom.

There was no speaker for this petition.

The petition was referred to Councillor Joe Otten (Chair of the Waste and Streetscene Policy Committee) to provide a written response to the organiser of the petition.

4.4 Public Questions

4.4.1 Question From Abdul Raheem

“I would like to ask members of the Sheffield City Council why I have been sent PCN letters for entering Sheffield Clean Air Zone while my vehicle was exempt from Sheffield Clean Air Zone charges. A council officer who works at Sheffield city council financial support applications for CLEAN air zone department, e-mailed me that my vehicle was exempt from Sheffield Clean Air Zone charges until 26th of July 2023, yet I still received PCN letters on the 7th of August 2023. All PCN letters are dated from 26th June 2023 and 27th June 2023 and 28th June 2023 and 2nd of July 2023 - all these PCN letters I received on 7th of August 2023. I have email evidence from a senior officer of exemption given to my vehicle registration number.”

Mr Raheem also added that council departments should work together more effectively on this matter and that paper was being wasted sending out unnecessary notices, which has environmental impacts.

In response, Councillor Ben Miskell (Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) advised that following investigation, the PCNs had been cancelled and this had been confirmed in writing. He apologised that this issue had arisen and stated that he was working with representatives of the taxi industry on it.

4.4.2 Question From Julie Pearn

“Now that the Council has admitted that it wrongly characterised my remarks about twinning with Nablus on 20th February as antisemitic; and did not mean to falsely imply that I was antisemitic: will the Council now move forward with twinning arrangements with Nablus without any further unnecessary delay?”

In response, Cllr Tom Hunt, Leader of the Council & Chair of Strategy and Resources Policy Committee stated that a comprehensive review of all the Twin and Sister Cities was underway, given that there were 14 formal relationships with different places around the world already.

He added that the Council received many approaches each year and it had become necessary to establish a framework to consider these approaches within the councils staffing and budget resources. A draft framework was currently being reviewed and a cross party approach would be taken to this. The Nablus approach would be considered once the framework had been agreed and was in place, by the end of 2023.

4.4.3 Questions Regarding the Nether Edge Active Travel Neighbourhood Scheme

Viv Lockwood (representing the Banner Cross Neighbourhood Group):

“The introduction of the Nether Edge Active Neighbourhood scheme was meant to make changes to streets “creating a safer, cleaner and quieter environment for local residents and businesses to enjoy.” It has done just the reverse by closing Archer Lane with consequential hugely increased congestion, traffic chaos everywhere and pollution levels soaring. Given that accidents and air quality were never thought important enough even to evaluate when the scheme was first implemented, does the council agree with the overwhelming number of local residents that it should now be brought to an end and that a thorough assessment be undertaken into how such an ill thought-out and badly delivered scheme ever saw the light of day in the first place?”

Mr Lockwood added that an examination should also be made of what he considered to be highly questionable data which had been presented to justify the scheme.

Mohammad Maroof:

“It is understood that a report on the future of the Archer Lane closure, along with other transport initiatives will be submitted to the Transport Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee on 20 Sept 2023.

Will you agree with me that this report must be withdrawn until proper consultation on the results of the monitoring data and other issues are shared in a meaningful way with the affected community as promised during public meetings?

The way the initial consultation was carried out meant that a very small number of residents knew a lot about the scheme, but the vast majority of affected residents knew little or nothing about the scheme. The community for months had to continually ask for public meetings to explain the scheme, these meetings eventually happened in October last year. At these meetings the Officers promised to come back to the community with full details of all the monitoring data before any report went to committee. This has not happened.

I hope you will see the sense in saying it is not acceptable to release vast amounts of data with no explanation days before a committee and expect a community to respond in any meaningful way.

Throughout this part of the overall proposals Officers have said they are not accountable to the community/residents, hopefully, the Council is - Do you agree with officer's comments?"

Marion Gerson:

"In the 2021 consultation process for the Nether Edge Active Travel Neighbourhood, 5 desired outcomes were identified. The third of these was improved air quality.

However, many of us live in residential streets that have been seriously affected by a big increase in traffic pollution since Archer Lane and Little London Road were closed. In spite of our asking, no attempt was made to measure air quality on our roads directly.

There are monitoring stations on Abbeydale Road at Butterworth Cycles and Carter Knowle and in Nether Edge outside 13 Osbourne Road and 35 Montgomery Road that may at least give some indication of the consequences of the closures." Traffic Officers from Connecting Sheffield have not reported data from these and did not respond to my request in July for this data. Instead, I was pointed towards an interactive map on the Council's website but that doesn't have data beyond 2021 which is, of course, useless.

Can we please have the up-to-date air quality data from these locations made available both to us and to the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee at least a week before that committee considers the decision as to whether to continue with the closure of Archer Lane or not?"

Ms Gerson added that she has subsequently been advised that the map will be updated.

In response to those questions, Councillor Ben Miskell (Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) stated that a decision would be taken on the scheme at the next Transport, Regeneration and Climate Committee, which he encouraged residents to attend. He added that part of the Council's response to the climate emergency was to reduce carbon emissions whilst enabling the economy to grow. At the same time it was also important to make communities safer places to live for all.

He stated that the council had been collecting data on the Nether Edge Active Neighbourhood over the last twelve months. He had raised the issue of relevant monitoring data being put in the public domain and had been advised that this would happen by the end of the week. He was working with local councillors to make sure the correct decision on the scheme in Nether Edge was made

4.4.4 Question from Annie O'Gara

"On July 14th, a Sheffield Coalition made up of the city's Trades Council, Palestine Solidarity, Labour Friends of Palestine and Kairos groups, sent a formal letter – our first official communication with the Council - to every member of the Council and to the Leader, Tom Hunt. We specifically asked him to reply. The letter concerned the Government's proposed legislation ("Economic Activity of Public Bodies (Overseas matters)) – known as the Anti-boycott bill.

This bill is anti-democratic. It limits the ability of public bodies to make ethical choices about spending and investment that reflect widespread public support for human rights, climate goals and international law. It violates the rights of individual pension holders to invest their pensions in line with their values. It gags individual Councillors from expressing sincerely held views, unless these fit in with the Government's agenda.

The bill applies very widely from climate change issues to human rights and international law.

Despite its serious implications for Sheffield City Council, and for the citizens of Sheffield, we have received no reply, even though a response was promised on July 17th and a reminder of this promise has been sent.

When will Tom Hunt reply on behalf of the Council he now leads?"

In response, the Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Hunt) apologised for the delay in responding and confirmed that the written response is being prepared and will be sent out soon. He explained that the bill was still being considered by Parliament and that his party, Labour had voted against it.

The position of his party was that they believe that all public bodies must act without bias or selectivity when making ethical decisions on procurement and investment, however they were concerned that the Bill, risks significantly undermining support for groups around the world facing persecution, such as the Uyghur.

He stated that the Labour Party had asked the Government to bring forward alternative proposals because the Bill in its current form placed unprecedented restrictions on the ability of public bodies, to express a view on policy, and had potential widespread and negative implications for local government pension funds and was likely to be subject to repeated and extended legal challenge.

4.4.5 Question from Abid Hussain

"Creating adequate burial provision is a city-wide issue in Sheffield, with land at cemeteries depleting at an alarming rate. Representations have also been submitted from across the city as part of the Sheffield Local Plan consultation which closed on 20th February 2023. Could Sheffield City Council provide an update on what progress has been made in identifying new sites for burial provision and timescales for making this provision available to the communities of Sheffield?"

Mr Hussain also underlined that this is a sensitive issue and stated that he was aware of private sector land that was former public land, lying barren in parts of Sheffield that could be used for burials, to ensure adequate provision was in place, not just for the Muslim community but for all communities.

In response, Councillor Richard Williams (Chair of the Communities, Parks and Leisure Policy Committee) stated that the Council's Bereavement Services Team had just appointed a temporary officer to help develop a burial, cremation and cemetery strategy for the whole city. Through consultation, this strategy would lay-out the council's aspirations for the service over the next 5-10 years,

including what burial provision was needed. This officer would take the lead in liaising with Property Services to establish what land may be available for cemetery development and would have quarterly meetings with appropriate and interested elected members, reporting progress through the Communities, Parks and Leisure Policy Committee.

Additionally, it had been investigated as to whether one of the existing cemeteries in the Tinsley/ Darnall area could be expanded but the land had proved to be unsuitable. Other options in this area were being explored.

Councillor Williams added that except for Tinsley cemetery, which was closed for new burials, there is around 5 years of available burial space before capacity is reached in some cemeteries and up to 30 years in others. He acknowledged that this was a sensitive issue and advised that it was a priority. He also offered to regularly meet with Mr Hussain.

4.4.6 Question from Shirley Bagnall

Linda Walker spoke on behalf of Shirley Bagnall:

Ms Bagnall's letter had stated:

"I am the lady who wrote the letter of protest about the bus service we are receiving on Chancet Wood and that is our priority.

But I would like to ask a few questions. Who is in control of the money funded by the government? Is this money being monitored so it is going to the right departments and areas where it is needed and spent wisely?

I was speaking to the security manager in the Sheffield Market and he told me the artificial plants scattered around the market had cost 20 thousand pounds. To me that is a waste of money and could have been spent on better things.

Also, the road works we are constantly getting on Greenhill Avenue, we understand these jobs have to be done but there are days and good weather when there is no work being done at all. Does the taxpayer have to pay them when they are not working as well?

I also heard on the news the Manchester mayor had received funding so why haven't we? They are a Labour controlled city like Sheffield. Come on Sheffield council you have to do better than this!"

Ms Walker added that in particular there were issues with the 76a bus which had got worse since it had been taken over by TM, having been formally operated by Stagecoach. There were too few buses, and they did not always turn up. This had led to Doctor's appointments being missed.

In response, Councillor Ben Miskell (Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) stated that as Mrs Bagnall's letter had been delayed, a full written response to all her points would be provided.

Regarding the bus service he agreed that many people in Sheffield get a poor bus service since deregulation. He reported that Oliver Coppard, the South Yorkshire Mayor, had launched a Campaign for a Fair Bus Deal (which can be joined online) and this highlights that 42% of bus services have been cut due to

cuts in government funding over the last 10 years. The Council continues to work with the South Yorkshire Mayor and the Shadow Transport Secretary to put pressure on the government.

4.4.7 Questions from Fiona Hinson

Fiona Hinson stated that she was representing residents of the Springwell Estate, some of whom were with her in the public gallery but many more of whom had not been able to attend due to work commitments. She also underlined that a 4000+ signature petition had been provided in addition to other formal objections. She formally requested that the land off Eckington Way, being unsuitable for the proposed development, was removed from the draft Local Plan. She asked the following questions:

"1. A formal FOI request was made to Cllr Tom Hunt, following the Strategy and Resourcing Meeting that I myself attended as the original questions posed at this meeting were not answered in required detail, and the response will be provided by 15th September which is too late for this meeting. These questions included:

a) How did the Labour Mosborough ward councillors manage to have their proposed site that was considered suitable from the local planners removed before the draft became public? The response was that concerns were raised about social cohesion - what were these concerns? We asked for specifics for reasons why other sites deemed suitable by local Planners had been ruled out and the response was not adequate.

b) From the site selection methodology, the vast majority of sites in private ownership have been ruled out, and you have deemed this as the most suitable to sufficiently separate from sensitive uses nearby because employment uses would be taking place. So why were sites such as say Norton Aerodrome for example removed that met policy? This site has direct access to a strategic road, and accessible utilities and making provision for GRT community housing?

c) The site has not been measured, you have confirmed this, so how have you arrived that the gross site size is 6.8 hectares? From our own measurements of this site, it is considerably less and with the consideration of the environmental buffers - the developable elements are much smaller than the 3.4 you mentioned in your response.

2. Why do SCC never learn from their mistakes?

a) Tree Felling - where the independent review condemned and said 'strategic leadership failure' and of being 'dishonest' - where SCC didn't listen to the protests and strength of feeling, and are now making apologies

b) Abbey Glenn - where SCC approved light industrial use, as being promised at this site, yet they're having to apologise again 'after the event' due to the noise and disruption to residents because it wasn't what they 'expected' when approval was given

c) Pushing decisions that SCC 'feel' are best for the people, but without adequate consultation. The GRT site at Tinsley, Huntsman's Gardens, is a prime example where SCC used funding for a purpose-built site that the GRT community didn't actually want and it was closed, after it ran at a significant loss. You mentioned at the February LAC you'd made contact with the Showmen's

Guild and they'd shown an interest, but do you have clear confirmation this site is the right / appropriate site for them after your amendments are made, as we've been made aware that the GRT Travelling Showpeople don't actually want Beighton; a point which we as a panel are taking up with the Showmen's Guild for clarity.

Have they seen the detail around the reduced site size with environmental buffer, provisions for privacy, the gas pipe and high voltage pylons that require 24/7 National Grid access - all issues you say will be addressed at 'planning stages'?

d) Never look at the 'wider picture' but silo project approvals - just see all the development approved in this area over the last 10 year period, with absolutely no change to infrastructure. A problem you recognise but make no attempt to address in your draft local plan around transport, only the perceived minimal impact of additional elements. So, you acknowledge there's a problem, but you'll do another review on this. So we have no clear plan on what you will do in terms of actions which traffic congestion was one of our key objections.

Finally, the whole process of the public consultation is disputed. The result had already been pre-determined, from when the draft was issued, as the responses to all objections are the same presentation slides, we saw at the LAC in February. Any 'removal' no matter how flawed the decision around this specific site for the provision of GRT housing would be classed as a major amendment, and as you have no 'Plan B' to fall back on at this stage, and say this is your professional judgement, it would mean SCC don't meet their objective of delivering a local plan that is already years late. But you can tick a box to say it's been submitted, and all the problems will be kicked down the line to 'planning stages'.

As the Green Party have already commented, if the site is not here it has to be elsewhere in the City. This is based on the planners 'clear advice' - the same planners who at the February LAC meeting said they had not actually visited the site, BEFORE, the draft plan was made public. They say they have since visited, but, cannot provide the dates (not sure why when professionals use Outlook calendars?) but still feel the site is the best of the worst options they came up with, but this would be expected if removal with no alternative meant the rest of the draft local plan was delayed as a result of addressing all the 4,000 petitions and objections raised by local residents, councillors and local businesses."

Ms Hinson also underlined the potential damage to wildlife that would be caused by tarmacking over an arable field.

In response, the Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Hunt) thanked Ms Hinton for attending and for submitting the Freedom of Information Request. He stated that the FOI response would be sent to her, and made available to the public in the usual way.

Councillor Hunt emphasised that the consultation process for the Draft Local Plan had complied with national planning regulations and with the council's own Statement of Community Involvement and it had not been predetermined, everyone's views had been listened to and taken into account. The site had been visited by Officers and by the Head of Planning.

He continued that if the draft plan was submitted for examination and then subsequently adopted it would be reviewed at regular intervals and any planning proposals that came forward for any site in the plan would be subject to the usual planning process.

(NOTES: 1. The questions which had been submitted by Ibrar Hussain, but which had not been asked at the meeting due to his absence, would receive a written response from Councillors Joe Otten (Chair of the Waste and Streetscene Policy Committee) and Ben Miskell (Chair of the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee) and be published on the website; and

2. The Lord Mayor reported that several questions on the topic of non-ionising radiation risks had been received from Michael Mullin. The Lord Mayor stated that these latest questions were rather repetitious of a series of questions which had been asked and answered at the previous Council meeting, and therefore, under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 15.1(e)(iv), and on the advice of the Council's Monitoring Officer, he had not accepted Mr. Mullin's latest questions as he deemed them to fall within the category of "matters of an irrelevant, repetitious, defamatory, frivolous or offensive nature or a general misuse of the opportunity", as they seek to maintain an ongoing dialogue on a matter which has been substantively answered by the Council and on which the Council has made its position clear.)

5. CONSULTATION RESPONSES ON THE PUBLICATION DRAFT SHEFFIELD PLAN

5.1 RESOLVED: On the Motion of the Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross), seconded by the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Jayne Dunn), 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 45-minutes be set for the item.

5.2 It was moved by Councillor Tom Hunt, and seconded by Councillor Zahira Naz, that, as recommended in the report of the Executive Director, City Futures, published with this agenda, seeking approval of responses to representations received on the Publication Draft Sheffield Local Plan ('The Draft Sheffield Plan') and approval to submit the Plan and associated 'submission documents' to the Government for public examination, it be RESOLVED: That this Council:–

- (a) approves the recommended responses to the main issues raised in representations on the Publication Draft Plan set out in the Consultation Statement (already endorsed by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee and presented in Appendix 2, 2c & 2f of the report);

- (b) approves the more detailed responses to the individual representations received on the Publication Draft Plan Part 1, Part 2, Annex B and the Glossary, as well as the responses to representations on the other submission documents (not previously considered by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee unless the matter(s) raised was addressed as part of a 'main issue') – now set out in Appendix 2a, 2b, 2d, 2e and 2g of the report;
- (c) approves the suggested amendments to the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan set out in Appendix 3 of the report and shown as tracked changes within Appendices 5a-5e (which have already been endorsed by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee);
- (d) approves the further suggested amendments to the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan summarised in the report and highlighted in red in Appendix 3 (also shown as tracked changes in Appendices 5a-5e);
- (e) approves the suggested other minor amendments to the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan set out in Appendix 4 of the report and shown as tracked changes within Appendices 5a-5e (which have already been endorsed by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee);
- (f) approves the further suggested minor amendments to the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan highlighted in red in Appendix 4 (also shown as tracked changes in Appendices 5a-5e);
- (g) notes the ongoing evidence updates with respect to the relevant 'submission documents' as set out in Appendix 6 of the report;
- (h) endorses the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Part 2 (Appendix 7 of the report); and
- (i) approves submission of the Draft Sheffield Plan and associated documentation to the Government for independent examination.

5.3 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, and seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (i) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraph (i) as a new paragraph (j):-

- (i) requests that an amendment to the Draft Sheffield plan is submitted proposing the removal of clause a) of Policy NC12 ('Hot Food Takeaways');

5.4 It was then moved by Councillor Mary Lea, seconded by Councillor Mike Chaplin, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (i) to (k) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraph (i) as a new paragraph (l):-

- (i) expresses its thanks to all the people of Sheffield who submitted views about the Local Plan through the different stages of consultation;
- (j) notes that some members of the public and elected members have strong concerns about different parts of the Plan, including about the site at Eckington Way, and asks the independent inspector to pay proper and due regard to these concerns when they examine the plan and conduct public hearings;
- (k) notes that any future development would be subject to the usual planning process which would ensure that residents are able to further express their views on future planning proposals, and that traffic, biodiversity, and air quality assessments should be considered if any planning applications are submitted;

5.5 After contributions from 11 other Members, it was RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Bryan Lodge, 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 again suspended to remove the time limit agreed for this item of business, to enable all other Members who had indicated to the Lord Mayor that they wished to speak on this item, to do so.

5.6 After contributions from a further 10 other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Tom Hunt, the amendment moved by Councillor Joe Otten was put to the vote and was lost.

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

For the Amendment (26) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Sophie Thornton, Ian Horner, Kurtis Crossland, Ann Woolhouse, Tim Huggan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Robert Reiss, Alan Woodcock, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Mohammed Mahroof, Steve Ayris, Peter Price, Penny Baker, Richard Williams, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery and Ann Whitaker.

Against the Amendment (46) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Jayne Dunn) and Councillors Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Safiya Saeed, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Minesh Parekh, Ruth Milsom, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Craig Gamble Pugh, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Alexi Dimond, Marieanne Elliot, Paul Turpin, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Toby Mallinson, Henry Nottage, Sioned-Mair Richards, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, Glynis Chapman, Gail

Smith, Ibbly Ullah, Nighat Basharat, Ben Miskell, Nabeela Mowlana, Sophie Wilson, David Barker, Dianne Hurst, Dawn Dale, Garry Weatherall, Mike Chaplin, Julie Grocutt, Janet Ridler, Laura McClean, Tom Hunt, Bernard Little and Mick Rooney.

Abstained from voting - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Colin Ross) and
on the Amendment (2) Councillor Laura Moynahan.

5.7 The amendment moved by Councillor Mary Lea was then put to the vote and was carried, but in part. Paragraphs (i) and (k) of the amendment were carried, and paragraph (j) of the amendment was lost.

5.7.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 38 Members; AGAINST - 29 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 8 Members. Although Green Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraph (j) of the amendment.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) approves the recommended responses to the main issues raised in representations on the Publication Draft Plan set out in the Consultation Statement (already endorsed by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee and presented in Appendix 2, 2c & 2f of the report);
- (b) approves the more detailed responses to the individual representations received on the Publication Draft Plan Part 1, Part 2, Annex B and the Glossary, as well as the responses to representations on the other submission documents (not previously considered by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee unless the matter(s) raised was addressed as part of a 'main issue') – now set out in Appendix 2a, 2b, 2d, 2e and 2g of the report;
- (c) approves the suggested amendments to the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan set out in Appendix 3 of the report and shown as tracked changes within Appendices 5a-5e (which have already been endorsed by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee);
- (d) approves the further suggested amendments to the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan summarised in the report and highlighted in red in Appendix 3 (also shown as tracked changes in Appendices 5a-5e);
- (e) approves the suggested other minor amendments to the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan set out in Appendix 4 of the report and shown as tracked changes within Appendices 5a-5e (which have already been endorsed by the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee);

- (f) approves the further suggested minor amendments to the Publication Draft Sheffield Plan highlighted in red in Appendix 4 (also shown as tracked changes in Appendices 5a-5e);
- (g) notes the ongoing evidence updates with respect to the relevant 'submission documents' as set out in Appendix 6 of the report;
- (h) endorses the Infrastructure Delivery Plan Part 2 (Appendix 7 of the report);
- (i) expresses its thanks to all the people of Sheffield who submitted views about the Local Plan through the different stages of consultation;
- (j) notes that any future development would be subject to the usual planning process which would ensure that residents are able to further express their views on future planning proposals, and that traffic, biodiversity, and air quality assessments should be considered if any planning applications are submitted; and
- (k) approves submission of the Draft Sheffield Plan and associated documentation to the Government for independent examination.

5.8.1 The votes on the Substantive Motion were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
| For the Substantive Motion (37) | - | The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Jayne Dunn) and Councillors Angela Argenzio, Brian Holmshaw, Talib Hussain, Mark Jones, Safiya Saeed, Douglas Johnson, Ruth Mersereau, Minesh Parekh, Ruth Milsom, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Zahira Naz, Craig Gamble Pugh, Abdul Khayum, Abtisam Mohamed, Alexi Dimond, Marianne Elliot, Paul Turpin, Christine Gilligan Kubo, Toby Mallinson, Henry Nottage, Sioned-Mair Richards, Laura Moynahan, Ibbly Ullah, Nighat Basharat, Ben Miskell, Nabeela Mowlana, Sophie Wilson, David Barker, Dawn Dale, Mike Chaplin, Janet Ridler, Laura McClean, Tom Hunt, Bernard Little and Mick Rooney. |
| Against the Substantive Motion (17) | - | Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Sophie Thornton, Ian Horner, Kurtis Crossland, Ann Woolhouse, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Tim Huggan, Roger Davison, Barbara Masters, Terry Fox, Glynis Chapman, Gail Smith, Dianne Hurst, Garry Weatherall, Tony Damms and Julie Grocutt. |

Abstained from voting on the Substantive Motion (20) - Councillors Richard Shaw, Karen McGowan, Joe Otten, Martin Smith, Robert Reiss, Alan Woodcock, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Mohammed Mahroof, Steve Ayris, Tony Downing Penny Baker, Richard Williams, Alan Hooper, Mike Levery, Ann Whitaker and Mick Rooney.

6. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION

6.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Sue Alston, and formally seconded by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards, that this Council:-

- (a) approves the changes to the various Parts of the Constitution, as outlined in sections 3.2 to 3.6 of the report of the General Counsel (and Monitoring Officer) now submitted, and as set out in appendices 1 to 18 of that report; and
- (b) approves that where the agenda of any Committee meeting has already been published but the meeting has not yet taken place, any change now approved to the remit of that Committee does not take effect until the conclusion of the meeting.

6.2 After contributions from three other Members, and following a right of reply from Councillor Sue Alston, it was:-

RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: That this Council:-

- (a) approves the changes to the various Parts of the Constitution, as outlined in sections 3.2 to 3.6 of the report of the General Counsel (and Monitoring Officer) now submitted, and as set out in appendices 1 to 18 of that report; and
- (b) approves that where the agenda of any Committee meeting has already been published but the meeting has not yet taken place, any change now approved to the remit of that Committee does not take effect until the conclusion of the meeting.

7. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

7.1 Urgent Business

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

Q1. Following the Government's order to over 100 schools across the country to immediately vacate buildings made of reinforced autoclaved aerated concrete, how many schools in Sheffield are affected by this order, and how is this Council working to support schools to begin the term as normal?

Q2. In particular, to what extent is Abbey Lane Primary School affected, and what support is Sheffield City Council offering this school?

Q3. Is the Council aware of the prevalence of RAAC in other Council owned or private buildings in Sheffield?

In response to questions 1 and 2, Councillor Dawn Dale (Chair of the Education, Children and Families Policy Committee) advised that no school in Sheffield had been affected by the change of policy by DfE and there had been no need to vacate any buildings.

She stated that Abbey Lane school had been identified as having RAAC present in limited areas of the school in 2021. Since then, mitigations had been put in place to keep Abbey Lane open, and work was taking place on site with to replace the RAAC panels. The work would be finished by 1st December 2023. Temporary kitchen arrangements had been required as part of the affected area was over the school kitchen and these will remain in place until the school was fully handed back in December.

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Tom Hunt) responded to question 3. He advised that the Council is reviewing its building data for buildings constructed between 1930 and 2000. As a precautionary measure, properties built within this period would be inspected in order to identify any that might have RAAC. Appropriate action to mitigate risks would be taken if RAAC was found.

He continued that RAAC had not been included in routine surveys, but it would be going forward. He outlined the Council's 5 phase process as follows:

1. A desktop study to gather information (which was already underway).
2. Looking for RAAC in any Building where it could be present.
3. Appointing a Building Surveyor
4. Assessment of RAAC
5. Carrying out remedial works if required

He added that in his view the current situation had been brought about by 13 years of austerity and under investment in the public sector.

7.2 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).

7.3 Written Questions

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

8. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "NATIONAL POLICIES TO TACKLE CHILD POVERTY" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR BARBARA MASTERS

8.1 It was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, and seconded by Councillor Barbara Masters, that this Council:-

- (a) notes with concern that:-
 - (i) the child poverty rate in Sheffield is around 37%, the highest in South Yorkshire and 10% above the national average, with an estimated 7,096 children living in poverty;
 - (ii) families on Universal Credit earning above £7.4k are not eligible for Free School Meals in England, meaning that 30% of all school-aged children living in poverty in Yorkshire miss out on a free hot meal every day; and
 - (iii) 4,200 families in Sheffield do not receive support for one or more children due to the two-child benefit cap, with the average family losing out on £3,235 per year on average, with a corresponding serious impact on children's material wellbeing, nutrition, and mental health;
- (b) notes the positive work that the Council has undertaken on the Cost of Living crisis, including the recent allocation of £600,000 in additional funding to Local Area Committee (LAC) projects and citizens advice services to maximise benefits, however, believes that there is only so much that Local Authorities can do in the absence of Government support;
- (c) believes that several simple, relatively low-cost interventions are available to Government which would alleviate child poverty substantially, such as removing the two-child benefit cap (cost of £1.4bn), and universalising free school meals in primary schools (cost of £1bn);

- (d) notes that, disappointingly, the leadership of the two largest Westminster parties have refused to adopt these two policies; and
- (e) therefore, requests the Chief Executive to write to the Government stressing the importance of alleviating child poverty and requesting it commits to:-
 - (i) abolishing the two-child cap on benefits;
 - (ii) expanding free school meals to every child in primary school, and every secondary school child whose family receives Universal Credit; and
 - (iii) raising funding for Free School Meals in line with inflation, backdated to match the real terms level of funding provided in 2014-15.

8.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Dawn Dale, and formally seconded by Councillor Nighat Basharat, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (c) to (e) and the addition of new paragraphs (c) to (g) as follows:-

- (c) notes this Government have presided over the biggest fall in living standards ever recorded, but notes poverty has been rising dramatically since 2010;
- (d) believes that a newly elected government will face a difficult task of fixing the social and economic damage caused by 13 years of government mismanagement and austerity, and whilst this will certainly result in a new government needing to take tough choices, the Labour Party is absolutely committed to an anti-poverty strategy; driven by a focus on growing the economy, and making sure that growth is inclusive and in every part of the country;
- (e) notes that during the period of the last Labour government (1997-2010) the number of children in relative poverty fell by over 800,000, and for absolute poverty there was a fall of over two million;
- (f) notes local efforts to tackle child poverty in stark contrast with the actions of successive governments since 2010, and which include:-
 - (i) supporting thousands of children and young people with free school meal support and holiday activities;
 - (ii) new Community Youth Services, increasing youth sessions work across all local areas;
 - (iii) establishing a network of 171 community hubs and welcoming places (warm banks) delivered alongside the voluntary sector; and

- (iv) the approval of the Strategy and Resources Policy Committee for the Household Support Fund (£10.4m) including targeted awards to households in receipt of Housing Benefit and/or Council Tax Support but who missed out on the Government's Cost of Living payments; and
 - (g) requests that the Cost-of-Living Steering Group, in consultation with senior officers, look at how the Council can get money in people's pockets quickly.
- 8.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and formally seconded by Councillor Marieanne Elliot, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows, and the re-lettering of the original paragraph (e) as a new paragraph (f):-
- (e) notes that the effect of bad policies on child poverty, like the bedroom tax, were brought in through the Welfare Reform Act 2012; and
- 8.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Dawn Dale was put to the vote and was lost.
- 8.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 31 Members; AGAINST - 38 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member.)
- 8.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was then put to the vote and was carried.
- 8.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 41 Members; AGAINST - 28 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member.)
- 8.6 The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes with concern that:-
 - (i) the child poverty rate in Sheffield is around 37%, the highest in South Yorkshire and 10% above the national average, with an estimated 7,096 children living in poverty;
 - (ii) families on Universal Credit earning above £7.4k are not eligible for Free School Meals in England, meaning that 30% of all school-aged children living in poverty in Yorkshire miss out on a free hot meal every day; and
 - (iii) 4,200 families in Sheffield do not receive support for one or more children due to the two-child benefit cap, with the average family losing out on £3,235 per year on average, with a corresponding

serious impact on children's material wellbeing, nutrition, and mental health;

- (b) notes the positive work that the Council has undertaken on the Cost of Living crisis, including the recent allocation of £600,000 in additional funding to Local Area Committee (LAC) projects and citizens advice services to maximise benefits, however, believes that there is only so much that Local Authorities can do in the absence of Government support;
- (c) believes that several simple, relatively low-cost interventions are available to Government which would alleviate child poverty substantially, such as removing the two-child benefit cap (cost of £1.4bn), and universalising free school meals in primary schools (cost of £1bn);
- (d) notes that, disappointingly, the leadership of the two largest Westminster parties have refused to adopt these two policies;
- (e) notes that the effect of bad policies on child poverty, like the bedroom tax, were brought in through the Welfare Reform Act 2012; and
- (f) therefore, requests the Chief Executive to write to the Government stressing the importance of alleviating child poverty and requesting it commits to:-
 - (i) abolishing the two-child cap on benefits;
 - (ii) expanding free school meals to every child in primary school, and every secondary school child whose family receives Universal Credit; and
 - (iii) raising funding for Free School Meals in line with inflation, backdated to match the real terms level of funding provided in 2014-15.

8.6.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 69 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member. Although Labour Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraph (d) and abstained from voting on paragraphs (c) and (f) of the Substantive Motion. Although Liberal Democrat Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraph (e) of the Substantive Motion.)

9. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "QUICKER, SAFER, AFFORDABLE JOURNEYS" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BEN MISKELL AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR CRAIG GAMBLE PUGH

9.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Ben Miskell, and formally seconded by Councillor Craig Gamble Pugh, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the move to develop a new Sheffield Transport Strategy;
- (b) believes that the people of Sheffield need a transport system that gets them from A-to-B quickly, safely and affordably;
- (c) believes that upgrading our transport infrastructure is essential to grow Sheffield's economy, tackle congestion, reduce emissions, improve air quality and improve physical health;
- (d) believes that upgrading our transport infrastructure will provide people with greater choice about how to make journeys;
- (e) believes that Sheffield and South Yorkshire have been badly let down by 13 years of government underinvestment in transport infrastructure, and further notes the Government's track record of broken promises from cancelling the eastern leg of HS2, to scrapping the electrification of Midland Mainline, and chronically underfunding our buses;
- (f) supports bus franchising and welcomes the work by South Yorkshire's Mayor to accelerate the franchising process;
- (g) believes that congestion can be reduced through active travel schemes, improving public transport and upgrading key road junctions, and believes that sustainable development must be supported by sufficient transport infrastructure;
- (h) believes that an ambitious transport strategy will help to attract investment from the private sector and national government;
- (i) calls on the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to ensure the public has a say in designing the new strategy; and
- (j) believes that, from listening to residents throughout the city, it is clear that the prioritisation of the below in the strategy would be hugely welcome:-
 - (i) a plan to tackle congestion across the city, with a focus on hotspots, such as in parts of south-east Sheffield;
 - (ii) an ambitious vision to expand the tram network;
 - (iii) re-opening rail lines for tram-train and rail services including to Stocksbridge, along the Sheaf Valley and the Barrow Hill line through south-east Sheffield, with the potential for new stations, including at Beighton;
 - (iv) a plan to realise the benefits of bringing buses and trams under public control, such as shared ticketing arrangements and designing bus services that link with tram stops;

- (v) a plan to ensure all parts of Sheffield from Stocksbridge to Mosborough have frequent, reliable buses;
- (vi) a plan to upgrade cycling infrastructure, particularly with segregated cycle routes;
- (vii) a clear focus on improving the pedestrian experience, recognising the enormous health benefits of walking;
- (viii) accelerating the rollout of 20mph zones and school streets so that families have safe journeys to and from school; and
- (ix) restoring the direct rail link between Sheffield and Manchester airport.

9.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, and formally seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of a new paragraph (b) as follows, and the re-lettering of all further paragraphs accordingly:-
 - (b) believes that a strategy must help people get around the city, must have a vision for trams, trains, buses, taxis and other motor vehicles, and active travel, and must plan for how these forms of transport will interlink to create a multimodal, interconnected transport system;
2. the deletion, in the original paragraph (e) [re-lettered as a new paragraph (f)], of the words “believes that Sheffield and South Yorkshire have been badly let down by 13 years of government underinvestment in transport infrastructure, and further”;
3. the deletion of the original paragraph (f) [re-lettered as a new paragraph (g)] and the addition of a new paragraph (g) as follows:-
 - (g) strongly supports bus franchising; notes that the Liberal Democrat group has supported bus franchising for many years; believes that repeated delay to implement bus franchising has cost South Yorkshire through a diminished bus service; and notes that the South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority’s Bus Service Improvement Plan bid for £474m was rejected entirely by Government, while Greater Manchester got £95m and the North East Combined Authority got £163m;
4. the addition [after the original paragraph (g), re-lettered as a new paragraph (h)] of new paragraphs (i) and (j) as follows:-
 - (i) however, believes that active travel schemes and public transport initiatives are only successful when they have the support of their

local community, and reaffirms the Council's commitment to devolving decisions and budgets on minor local transport and highways issues to Local Area Committees (LACs);

(j) furthermore, believes that bus transport must be accessible to all Sheffield residents and recognise the needs of those with limited accessibility, and therefore asks the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to consider placing reopening Pinstone Street to buses on its work programme;

5. the addition, at the end of the original sub-paragraph (j)(iii) [re-lettered as a new sub-paragraph (m)(iii)], of the words “, the investigation of a tram line from Herdings to Meadowhead, and the investigation of a tram line to the Northern General Hospital”.

9.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Bernard Little, and formally seconded by Councillor Paul Turpin, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

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

(a) notes that Sheffield has had an agreed Transport Strategy in place since 2019; recognises that the strategy accepts the need for action now rather than wishful thinking under a future government; and believes the actions in the strategy should be carried out without further delay or watering down;

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

(f) notes that in 2017, emissions from the transport sector contributed 26% of Sheffield's emissions with $\frac{2}{3}$ of these from private car journeys;

(g) believes Sheffield must reduce our reliance on private cars to have any chance of meeting our net zero commitment, and that the most effective way to reduce congestion is to have more people using public transport, walking, wheeling and cycling;

3. the addition of new paragraphs (m) to (o) as follows:-

(m) notes that the Workplace Parking Levy in Nottingham contributed £90 million in direct funding and attracted £1 billion in investment for public transport and active travel over 10 years;

(n) believes that if Sheffield Council really believed in "Quicker, Safer, Affordable Journeys", they would take all available measures within our power rather than waiting for a potential change of government; and

- (o) therefore calls on the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to add a feasibility study for a Workplace Parking Levy to its work programme and to relook at bus priority and bus lane hours on arterial roads, and increased parking enforcement powers so that there may be some real prospect of "Quicker, Safer, Affordable Journeys" rather than wishful thinking and hand wringing.

9.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar was put to the vote and was carried, but in part. Parts 1, paragraph (i) of Part 4 and Part 5 of the amendment were carried, and Parts 2, 3 and paragraph (j) of Part 4 of the amendment were lost.

9.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 28 Members; AGAINST - 42 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 0 Members. Although Labour Group Members voted against, they voted for Part 1, paragraph (i) in Part 4 and Part 5 of the amendment. Although Green Group Members voted against, they voted for Part 5 of the amendment. Although Councillor Sophie Wilson voted against, she voted for Parts 4 and 5 of the amendment.)

9.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Bernard Little was then put to the vote and was carried, but in part. Part 2 of the amendment was carried, and Parts 1 and 3 of the amendment were lost.

9.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 10 Members; AGAINST - 58 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member. Although Labour Group Members voted against, they voted for Part 2 of the amendment; 2. Although Councillor Sophie Wilson voted against, she voted for Parts 1 and 2 of the amendment.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the move to develop a new Sheffield Transport Strategy;
- (b) believes that a strategy must help people get around the city, must have a vision for trams, trains, buses, taxis and other motor vehicles, and active travel, and must plan for how these forms of transport will interlink to create a multimodal, interconnected transport system;
- (c) believes that the people of Sheffield need a transport system that gets them from A-to-B quickly, safely and affordably;
- (d) believes that upgrading our transport infrastructure is essential to grow Sheffield's economy, tackle congestion, reduce emissions, improve air quality and improve physical health;

- (e) believes that upgrading our transport infrastructure will provide people with greater choice about how to make journeys;
- (f) believes that Sheffield and South Yorkshire have been badly let down by 13 years of government underinvestment in transport infrastructure, and further notes the Government's track record of broken promises from cancelling the eastern leg of HS2, to scrapping the electrification of Midland Mainline, and chronically underfunding our buses;
- (g) notes that in 2017, emissions from the transport sector contributed 26% of Sheffield's emissions with $\frac{2}{3}$ of these from private car journeys;
- (h) believes Sheffield must reduce our reliance on private cars to have any chance of meeting our net zero commitment, and that the most effective way to reduce congestion is to have more people using public transport, walking, wheeling and cycling;
- (i) supports bus franchising and welcomes the work by South Yorkshire's Mayor to accelerate the franchising process;
- (j) believes that congestion can be reduced through active travel schemes, improving public transport and upgrading key road junctions, and believes that sustainable development must be supported by sufficient transport infrastructure;
- (k) however, believes that active travel schemes and public transport initiatives are only successful when they have the support of their local community, and reaffirms the Council's commitment to devolving decisions and budgets on minor local transport and highways issues to Local Area Committees (LACs);
- (l) believes that an ambitious transport strategy will help to attract investment from the private sector and national government;
- (m) calls on the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee to ensure the public has a say in designing the new strategy; and
- (n) believes that, from listening to residents throughout the city, it is clear that the prioritisation of the below in the strategy would be hugely welcome:-
 - (i) a plan to tackle congestion across the city, with a focus on hotspots, such as in parts of south-east Sheffield;
 - (ii) an ambitious vision to expand the tram network;
 - (iii) re-opening rail lines for tram-train and rail services including to Stocksbridge, along the Sheaf Valley and the Barrow Hill line through south-east Sheffield, with the potential for new stations, including at Beighton, the investigation of a tram line from

Herdings to Meadowhead, and the investigation of a tram line to the Northern General Hospital;

- (iv) a plan to realise the benefits of bringing buses and trams under public control, such as shared ticketing arrangements and designing bus services that link with tram stops;
- (v) a plan to ensure all parts of Sheffield from Stocksbridge to Mosborough have frequent, reliable buses;
- (vi) a plan to upgrade cycling infrastructure, particularly with segregated cycle routes;
- (vii) a clear focus on improving the pedestrian experience, recognising the enormous health benefits of walking;
- (viii) accelerating the rollout of 20mph zones and school streets so that families have safe journeys to and from school; and
- (ix) restoring the direct rail link between Sheffield and Manchester airport.

9.6.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 67 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member. Although Liberal Democrat Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (f) to (i) of the Substantive Motion. Although Green Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (a), (b) and (k) of the Substantive Motion. Although Councillor Sophie Wilson voted for, she voted against paragraphs (f), (i) and (n)(iv) of the Substantive Motion.)

10. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "PROTECTING OUR SOCIAL HOUSING STOCK" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PENNY BAKER AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR MOHAMMED MAHROOF

10.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Penny Baker, and formally seconded by Councillor Mohammed Mahroof, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that the Right to Buy (RTB) scheme has been detrimental to Sheffield, as:-
 - (i) Sheffield is suffering from an annual affordable accommodation shortfall of 902 units;
 - (ii) in 2021-22, this Council lost 408 units of housing stock to RTB sales, representing a net loss of 277 units of affordable housing in Sheffield;

- (iii) despite positive work being done to increase Sheffield's social rented stock through the Stock Improvement Programme, Sheffield has suffered a net loss of affordable housing since 2015-16 due to the RTB;
 - (iv) due to this long-term reduction in social housing stock, on average only 54 council properties are advertised each week in Sheffield, with 22,338 households on the housing register;
 - (v) of these, 639 are in priority bands A and B, representing the highest housing need, including people who are homeless and people suffering from domestic abuse; and
 - (vi) this Council has recently begun a review of planned new build housing, as due to construction inflation, a new build property being purchased under RTB after 10 years would represent a significant financial loss to the Council;
- (b) notes that a shortage of social housing impacts renters widely, as:-
- (i) tenants requiring extensive repairs can wait for months to be moved into a temporary property while repairs are carried out;
 - (ii) the 881 households with a priority rehousing award will wait longer for rehousing, residing meanwhile in abusive relationships, homeless accommodation, and unsuitable properties;
 - (iii) a 2015 evidence review found that the RTB intensified problems of housing affordability and increased Housing Benefit expenditure; and
 - (iv) nationally over 40% of homes bought under RTB are now let privately, and that 1 in 3 private renters borrowed money to pay their rent in June 2023;
- (c) notes with concern that this Government has proposed to extend RTB to Housing Associations, and believes this is likely to exacerbate negative trends in affordable housing provision;
- (d) believes that, in addition to increasing housing stock, the Council must work more closely with private developers to prioritise affordable housing completions; and
- (e) therefore resolves to write to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, requesting the Government grant local councils the power to set the RTB discount locally (including the power to discontinue the scheme), and to make permanent the 100% retention of RTB receipts, in line with the Local Government Association's position.

10.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Nabeela Mowlana, and formally seconded by Councillor Mark Jones, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (e) to (h) as follows, and the re-lettering of the original paragraph (e) as a new paragraph (i):-

- (e) believes that the RTB policy as currently enacted has done considerable damage to Sheffield, and the wider nation, and further believes that replacing properties lost through RTB on a one-to-one basis would be a huge help in replacing lost stock;
- (f) believes that strong local communities are built on the back of families having a secure and stable home, not being forced to repeatedly uproot on the whims of landlords or due to escalating prices, and notes that the Labour Party has promised to deliver a new housing settlement, rebalancing power between developers and communities, and ensuring local councils can deliver the affordable housing their communities need;
- (g) notes that the Labour Party have stated they will create a new definition of affordable homes pegged to local incomes, close the loopholes that let developers wriggle out of commitments and introduce tough new powers so councils can develop more land for affordable housing, and this Council supports this approach;
- (h) notes the stated ambition of the Labour Party to ensure that more council homes are built in every part of the country that provide secure, genuinely affordable tenancies and which will further boost communities through the skills, apprenticeships and jobs created to build these homes, with Labour recognising the challenges councils face in delivering these vital services and being committed to working with them to address these; and

10.3 It was then formally moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson, and formally seconded by Councillor Brian Holmshaw, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (e) and the addition of new paragraphs (e) to (h) as follows:-

- (e) believes that Right to Buy legislation has decimated good council housing estates, subsidised an exploitative private landlord market and left numerous properties across the country in poor repair;
- (f) believes that former council homes now in private ownership are often a major obstacle to large-scale effective housing retrofit schemes, leaving both council and private tenants in fuel poverty;
- (g) notes the successful award of a small amount of government money to address the problems of private tenants in right to buy properties missing out on the benefits of retrofitting of council homes and believes this to be an acknowledgement of one of the disadvantages of the right to buy scheme; and

- (h) therefore resolves to write to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, requesting the Government to abolish the Right to Buy.
- 10.4 The amendment moved by Councillor Nabeela Mowlana was put to the vote and was carried.
- 10.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 43 Members; AGAINST - 26 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member. Although Liberal Democrat Group Members and Councillor Sophie Wilson voted against, they voted for paragraph (e) of the amendment.)
- 10.5 The amendment moved by Councillor Douglas Johnson was put to the vote and was lost.
- 10.5.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 11 Members; AGAINST - 27 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 30 Members.)
- 10.6 The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that the Right to Buy (RTB) scheme has been detrimental to Sheffield, as:-
 - (i) Sheffield is suffering from an annual affordable accommodation shortfall of 902 units;
 - (ii) in 2021-22, this Council lost 408 units of housing stock to RTB sales, representing a net loss of 277 units of affordable housing in Sheffield;
 - (iii) despite positive work being done to increase Sheffield's social rented stock through the Stock Improvement Programme, Sheffield has suffered a net loss of affordable housing since 2015-16 due to the RTB;
 - (iv) due to this long-term reduction in social housing stock, on average only 54 council properties are advertised each week in Sheffield, with 22,338 households on the housing register;
 - (v) of these, 639 are in priority bands A and B, representing the highest housing need, including people who are homeless and people suffering from domestic abuse; and
 - (vi) this Council has recently begun a review of planned new build housing, as due to construction inflation, a new build property

- being purchased under RTB after 10 years would represent a significant financial loss to the Council;
- (b) notes that a shortage of social housing impacts renters widely, as:-
 - (i) tenants requiring extensive repairs can wait for months to be moved into a temporary property while repairs are carried out;
 - (ii) the 881 households with a priority rehousing award will wait longer for rehousing, residing meanwhile in abusive relationships, homeless accommodation, and unsuitable properties;
 - (iii) a 2015 evidence review found that the RTB intensified problems of housing affordability and increased Housing Benefit expenditure; and
 - (iv) nationally over 40% of homes bought under RTB are now let privately, and that 1 in 3 private renters borrowed money to pay their rent in June 2023;
 - (c) notes with concern that this Government has proposed to extend RTB to Housing Associations, and believes this is likely to exacerbate negative trends in affordable housing provision;
 - (d) believes that, in addition to increasing housing stock, the Council must work more closely with private developers to prioritise affordable housing completions;
 - (e) believes that the RTB policy as currently enacted has done considerable damage to Sheffield, and the wider nation, and further believes that replacing properties lost through RTB on a one-to-one basis would be a huge help in replacing lost stock;
 - (f) believes that strong local communities are built on the back of families having a secure and stable home, not being forced to repeatedly uproot on the whims of landlords or due to escalating prices, and notes that the Labour Party has promised to deliver a new housing settlement, rebalancing power between developers and communities, and ensuring local councils can deliver the affordable housing their communities need;
 - (g) notes that the Labour Party have stated they will create a new definition of affordable homes pegged to local incomes, close the loopholes that let developers wriggle out of commitments and introduce tough new powers so councils can develop more land for affordable housing, and this Council supports this approach;
 - (h) notes the stated ambition of the Labour Party to ensure that more council homes are built in every part of the country that provide secure, genuinely affordable tenancies and which will further boost communities through the skills, apprenticeships and jobs created to build these

homes, with Labour recognising the challenges councils face in delivering these vital services and being committed to working with them to address these; and

- (i) therefore resolves to write to the Secretary of State for Levelling Up, Housing and Communities, requesting the Government grant local councils the power to set the RTB discount locally (including the power to discontinue the scheme), and to make permanent the 100% retention of RTB receipts, in line with the Local Government Association's position.

10.6.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 68 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 1 Member. Although Labour Group Members voted for, they abstained from voting on paragraph (i) of the Substantive Motion. Although Liberal Democrat Group Members voted for, they voted against paragraphs (f) to (h) of the Substantive Motion. Although Councillor Sophie Wilson voted for, she voted against paragraph (i) of the Substantive Motion.)

11. NOTICE OF MOTION REGARDING "A FAIRER GREEN ECONOMY FOR SHEFFIELD" - GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MINESH PAREKH AND TO BE SECONDED BY COUNCILLOR RUTH MILSOM

11.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Minesh Parekh, and formally seconded by Councillor Ruth Milsom, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that:-
 - (i) through its Decarbonisation Routemaps, the Council is setting out plans to minimise, mitigate and adapt to the climate emergency;
 - (ii) small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) account for 50% of UK business emissions, yet currently 76% of SMEs do not have a decarbonisation strategy;
 - (iii) as well as residents, SMEs are struggling with record energy costs; and
 - (iv) Sheffield's businesses want to be leaders on climate but need a willing partner in Government that is prepared to invest in low-carbon energy and provide energy support for businesses;
- (b) welcomes:-
 - (i) that South Yorkshire is the UK's first Investment Zone which will create new opportunities for jobs and investment in Sheffield;
 - (ii) the new £80m investment for a Boeing-led research project at the Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre (AMRC) into

manufacturing lightweight structures for aeroplanes which is a key part of making global aviation more sustainable;

- (iii) that Sheffield has been announced as a heat network zoning pioneer, opening a route to cheaper and cleaner energy for our city's businesses and public services; and
 - (iv) the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee's recent approval of £3.4m Shared Prosperity Funding to support SMEs become more energy efficient;
- (c) believes that:-
- (i) the development of home-grown British renewables and nuclear power will make us less dependent on energy imports;
 - (ii) we must address climate change in a way that creates good green jobs;
 - (iii) trade unions must be partners in any industrial transition;
 - (iv) Sheffield's advanced manufacturing and research expertise provides enormous potential to create new jobs in the nuclear and low-carbon energy sectors;
 - (v) pursuing a decarbonisation agenda will unlock social, economic and climate opportunities and deliver sustainable economic growth;
 - (vi) Sheffield's draft Local Plan sets out an ambitious vision for advanced manufacturing and green industries and will deliver high-skilled, high-wage jobs; and
 - (vii) the Labour Party's commitment to invest £3 billion in green steel production will support steel jobs in Stocksbridge and lead to more steel jobs in the future; and
- (d) resolves to:-
- (i) ask the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee to consider working with partners, including its Diverse Business Advisory Board and the Chamber of Commerce, on how to further support small businesses to address climate impacts; and
 - (ii) establish a cross-committee working group, drawing on Members from the Governance Committee, the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee, and the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, to investigate how the Authority's Decarbonisation Routemaps can be embedded into our decision-making structures.

- 11.1.1 (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 substitution of the word “advanced” for the word “advancing” in sub-paragraph (c)(iv) of the Motion.)
- 11.2 Whereupon, it was formally moved by Councillor Martin Smith, and formally seconded by Councillor Robert Reiss, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-
1. the addition of new paragraphs (b) and (c) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (b) to (d) as new paragraphs (d) to (f):-
 - (b) believes that SMEs are essential for sustainable economic growth and job creation;
 - (c) believes that Sheffield’s historic heavy industry sector continues to play a critical role in the city and that these large employers must be properly supported on the net zero transition, and welcomes the moves towards ‘Green Steel’ production through modern steelmaking technology;
 2. the insertion, in the original sub-paragraph (b)(ii) [re-lettered as a new sub-paragraph (d)(ii)], of the words “University of Sheffield and” after the words “£80m investment for a”;
 3. the insertion at the end of the original sub-paragraph (b)(iv) [re-lettered as a new sub-paragraph (d)(iv)], of the words “, and the Committee’s continued funding for the Launchpad start up and early stage business support scheme”;
 4. the addition of a new sub-paragraph (d)(v) [in the original paragraph (b)], as follows:-
 - (d)(v) that Sheffield has significantly improved its environment for business start ups, and in particular has:-
 - (A) the strongest annual business growth across the core cities at 27%;
 - (B) the 3rd lowest business failure rate across the core cities; and
 - (C) been voted the best city to start a business in 2022;
 5. the addition at the beginning of the original sub-paragraph (c)(iii) [re-lettered as a new sub-paragraph (e)(iii)], of the words “a wide range of stakeholders including”;
 6. the deletion of the original sub-paragraph (c)(vii) [re-lettered as a new sub-paragraph (e)(vii)] and the addition of a new sub-paragraph (e)(vii) as follows:-

(e)(vii) the Liberal Democrats commitment to quadruple the Employment Allowance and create an Entrepreneur's Allowance to help people start new businesses would further support Sheffield's SME community;

7. the deletion of the original sub-paragraph (d)(ii) [re-lettered as a new sub-paragraph (f)(ii)] and the addition of a new sub-paragraph (f)(ii) as follows:-

(f)(ii) reaffirm the Council's commitment to assessing the environmental impact of relevant decisions, and notes that this will include reference to the Decarbonisation Routemaps where relevant.

11.3 On being put to the vote, the amendment was carried, but in part. Parts 1 to 5 of the amendment were carried, and Parts 6 and 7 of the amendment were lost.

11.3.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 59 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 11 Members. Although Labour Group Members voted for, they voted against Parts 6 and 7 of the amendment.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) notes that:-

(i) through its Decarbonisation Routemaps, the Council is setting out plans to minimise, mitigate and adapt to the climate emergency;

(ii) small and medium-sized enterprises (SMEs) account for 50% of UK business emissions, yet currently 76% of SMEs do not have a decarbonisation strategy;

(iii) as well as residents, SMEs are struggling with record energy costs; and

(iv) Sheffield's businesses want to be leaders on climate but need a willing partner in Government that is prepared to invest in low-carbon energy and provide energy support for businesses;

(b) believes that SMEs are essential for sustainable economic growth and job creation;

(c) believes that Sheffield's historic heavy industry sector continues to play a critical role in the city and that these large employers must be properly supported on the net zero transition, and welcomes the moves towards 'Green Steel' production through modern steelmaking technology;

- (d) welcomes:-
- (i) that South Yorkshire is the UK's first Investment Zone which will create new opportunities for jobs and investment in Sheffield;
 - (ii) the new £80m investment for a University of Sheffield and Boeing-led research project at the Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre (AMRC) into manufacturing lightweight structures for aeroplanes which is a key part of making global aviation more sustainable;
 - (iii) that Sheffield has been announced as a heat network zoning pioneer, opening a route to cheaper and cleaner energy for our city's businesses and public services; and
 - (iv) the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee's recent approval of £3.4m Shared Prosperity Funding to support SMEs become more energy efficient, and the Committee's continued funding for the Launchpad start up and early stage business support scheme;
 - (v) that Sheffield has significantly improved its environment for business start ups, and in particular has:-
 - (A) the strongest annual business growth across the core cities at 27%;
 - (B) the 3rd lowest business failure rate across the core cities; and
 - (C) been voted the best city to start a business in 2022;
- (e) believes that:-
- (i) the development of home-grown British renewables and nuclear power will make us less dependent on energy imports;
 - (ii) we must address climate change in a way that creates good green jobs;
 - (iii) a wide range of stakeholders including trade unions must be partners in any industrial transition;
 - (iv) Sheffield's advanced manufacturing and research expertise provides enormous potential to create new jobs in the nuclear and low-carbon energy sectors;
 - (v) pursuing a decarbonisation agenda will unlock social, economic and climate opportunities and deliver sustainable economic growth;

- (vi) Sheffield's draft Local Plan sets out an ambitious vision for advanced manufacturing and green industries and will deliver high-skilled, high-wage jobs; and
 - (vii) the Labour Party's commitment to invest £3 billion in green steel production will support steel jobs in Stocksbridge and lead to more steel jobs in the future; and
- (f) resolves to:-
- (i) ask the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee to consider working with partners, including its Diverse Business Advisory Board and the Chamber of Commerce, on how to further support small businesses to address climate impacts; and
 - (ii) establish a cross-committee working group, drawing on Members from the Governance Committee, the Economic Development and Skills Policy Committee, and the Transport, Regeneration and Climate Policy Committee, to investigate how the Authority's Decarbonisation Routemaps can be embedded into our decision-making structures.

11.4.1 (NOTE: The result of the vote was FOR - 59 Members; AGAINST - 0 Members; ABSTENTIONS – 10 Members. Although Liberal Democrat Members voted for, they voted against sub-paragraphs (e)(vii) and (f)(ii) of the Substantive Motion.)

12. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

12.1 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: On the motion formally moved by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards and formally seconded by Councillor Ruth Milsom, that the minutes of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 5th July 2023 be approved as a true and accurate record.

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

13.1 RESOLVED UNANIMOUSLY: On the motion formally moved by Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards 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 17th May 2023, the Monitoring Officer had authorised the following appointments/nominations, with effect from the dates shown:-

- South Yorkshire Mayoral Combined Authority – Audit, Standards and Risk Committee - Councillor Joe Otten appointed as substitute member of the Committee, with effect from 11th July 2023;
- Sheffield Health and Social Care Foundation Trust – Council of Governors - Councillor Sophie Thornton appointed as member, with effect from 11th July 2023;

(b) it be noted that (i) the number of persons able to be appointed as Directors and Members of the Sheffield Theatres Trust has been increased from two Members and one non-Council Member, to three Members and one non-Council Member; and (ii) accordingly, on 21st August 2023, the Monitoring Officer, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its annual meeting held on 17th May 2023, had authorised the nominations of Councillors Safiya Saeed, Ann Woolhouse and Brian Holmshaw and Ms. Ruth McDonald to serve on the Trust;

(c) the Chair of the Adult Health and Social Care Policy Committee (Councillor Angela Argenzio), the Director of Public Health (Greg Fell) and the Director of Adult Social Services (Alexis Chappell), be appointed to serve on the South Yorkshire Integrated Care Partnership;

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

- South Yorkshire Police and Crime Panel - Councillor Henry Nottage to replace Councillor Maleiki Haybe;

(e) it be noted that the Community Covenant Partnership Board, on which Members have previously been appointed to serve, no longer exists; and

(f) (i) it be noted that the Senior Officer Employment Sub-Committee, at its meeting held on 25th July, 2023, appointed David Hollis as General Counsel, and that Mr. Hollis started in post on 26th July 2023 and (ii) Mr. Hollis' continued designation as the Council's Monitoring Officer in accordance with section 5 of the Local Government and Housing Act 1989 and Part 7 of the Council's Constitution, be confirmed.

This page is intentionally left blank