

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 7 November 2012, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor John Campbell)
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Vickie Priestley)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore John Robson Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> Keith Hill Joe Otten Colin Ross	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Isobel Bowler Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Roy Munn Clive Skelton	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Garry Weatherall Steve Wilson Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Nikki Bond Qurban Hussain Anders Hanson
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison Diana Stimely	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> John Campbell Martin Lawton Lynn Rooney
4	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	13	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Shelia Constance Alan Law Chris Weldon	22	<i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Shaffaq Mohammed Stuart Wattam	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Janice Sidebottom	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Leigh Bramall Tony Damms Gill Furniss
6	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Ibrar Hussain Talib Hussain	15	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Steve Jones Cate McDonald Tim Rippon	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley David Baker
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Jillian Creasy Mohammad Maroof Robert Murphy	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Bob McCann Denise Reaney	25	<i>Stockbridge & Upper Don Ward</i> Alison Brelsford Richard Crowther Philip Wood
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Sylvia Anginotti Rob Frost Geoff Smith	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Janet Bragg Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond	26	<i>Walkey Ward</i> Neale Gibson Nikki Sharpe Ben Curran
9	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Harry Harpham Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea	18	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Jenny Armstrong Terry Fox Pat Midgley	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> Adam Hurst Alf Meade
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Ray Satur

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Trevor Bagshaw, David Baker, Ben Curran, Anders Hanson and Ray Satur.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Denise Fox declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the Notice of Motion numbered 17 on the Summons (concerning immigration) as she is employed by the United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA).

Councillor Terry Fox declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the Notice of Motion numbered 17 on the Summons Notice of Motion numbered 17 on the Summons (concerning immigration) as his spouse is employed by the United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA).

Councillor Robert Murphy declared a personal interest in the Notice of Motion numbered 14 on the Summons (concerning energy prices) as he is employed in the renewable energy industry.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of Council held on 3rd October 2012 were approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Petitions

(a) Petition Objecting to the Planning Application – Coal Recovery and Restoration Scheme at the Former Hesley Wood Tip

The Council received a petition, containing 4600 signatures and objecting to the planning application relating to a Coal Recovery and Restoration Scheme at the former Hesley Wood Tip.

On behalf of the petitioners, Jean Howe and Mick Harrison addressed the Council.

Mick Harrison stated that the area of the former Hesley Wood Tip was woodland and the trees helped to reduce noise and pollution and lessened the risk of flooding. However, the plan to clear the trees would only serve to increase carbon and flood risk. The adverse health impact would also be significant due to the pollutants, poisons and dust from spoil storage and traffic pollution from plant vehicles on the site. He asked the Council to reject the planning application for the coal recovery restoration scheme.

Jean Howe stated that there was great concern about the risks to the health of people living in the areas neighbouring the site, which from 1972 had been left to nature and supported a diverse range of wildlife, woodland, flora and fauna. She referred to process of extraction which would release damaging small particulates that could travel up to 3 miles and may increase incidence of health related conditions, including asthma or respiratory disease, cancers, diabetes and had a damaging effect on the immune system. There are schools within a relatively short distance of the site as well as many residential areas.

RecyCoal had said that the processes used are clean and would remove the harmful particulates. However, campaigners were not satisfied that this would be the case. Bore holes in the spoil heap at the site showed traces of pollutants. In addition, the scheme would have a poor affect on air quality, despite the fact that Chapeltown was an air quality management area. There was concern that any action to address the health effects from the extraction process at the Hesley Wood site would be reactive, rather than preventative. Information packs had been produced by the petitioners for Members of the Council's Planning Committee.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development (Councillor Leigh Bramall), who stated that the Council had a duty to consider the planning application relating to the Hesley Wood tip. The planning application had been received by the Council's Development Control service and would then be submitted to the Planning Committee, which would make a decision. He added that the information to which Mrs Howe now referred would be brought to the attention of Development Control Officers and Members of the Planning Committee for their consideration when coming to a decision on the scheme.

(b) Petition regarding funding for Sheffield Somali Community Centre

The Council received a petition containing 560 signatures regarding funding for the Sheffield Somali Community Centre.

On behalf of the petitioners, Mr Abdillhi Boss addressed the Council. Mr Boss stated that the petition was in support of the Somali Community Centre against a decision of the Council not to grant funding of £16,000 used to pay the rent on premises at 30 Burngreave Road, which was the building used by the Somali community to access services and activities. He stated that there were many activities for which the building was used.

People who used the Community Centre believed that the decision had been based on false information and also felt as if they had been singled out. He asked Members to look at the matters he raised and invited them to observe activities at the Community Centre, so they might see how vital a resource it was for the people in the Somali community.

Public Questions

4.2 (a) Public Questions concerning grant funding for the Somali Community Centre

The following questions were asked concerning the funding of the Somali

Community Centre at 30 Burngreave Road:-

(i) a question from Mr Ali Abdi Mohamed asking why the Somali Community Centre was being closed down.

(ii) a question from Mr. Anab Ali Jama asking the Council to continue to support the Somali Community Centre in view of the importance of the centre for the local community and which was well used by the Somalian women and families and provided a social facility and educational opportunities for mothers who might otherwise be quite isolated and, therefore, asked the Council to re-consider its decision.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal (Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion) responded that he had met with representatives of the Somali community on three occasions and indicated that the process for the submission of applications for grant funding and the allocation of grant funding monies was the same for all voluntary, community and faith organisations. He was unable to circumvent this process as this would be unfair and ultimately challengeable. He had explained in the aforementioned meetings that the Council's grant-aid process for 2012-13 had now been concluded and that some organisations had been notified that they had been successful while others had been notified that they had not. Where organisations had not been successful, then the Council was able to provide feedback as to why they had not been successful.

Councillor Iqbal added that the Council would, if possible, work with any community in Sheffield regardless of their background or ethnicity and re-emphasised that, he had explained the process to those concerned with the Somali Community Centre and that there would be a new grant-aid process in 2013-14 and encouraged the Centre to apply for grant-aid within this new round.

He added that the Council did not possess the £16,000 applied for by the Somali Community in this instance, in light of the £50 million of budget cuts which would need to be found in 2013-14. However, a number of community buildings in Burngreave had been identified which are available to any organisation which needed a community space and which the Somali community might wish to consider. Councillor Iqbal stated that previously, and on numerous occasions, he had contacted representatives of the Community Centre to discuss this matter but had received no response. Councillor Iqbal said that would gladly meet with representatives of the community to discuss the premises which might be available for their use, with the help of Ward Councillors.

(b) Public Questions relating to the preservation of the remains of Sheffield Castle

The following questions were asked concerning the work to preserve the remains of Sheffield Castle:-

(i) a question from Mr. M. Graves asking whether the City Council had a professional Archaeologist in place to oversee the remains of Sheffield Castle while the demolition of the Castle market was in progress

(ii) a question from Annie Grassick asking whether the site of Sheffield Castle was going to be preserved as a heritage site after the demolition of the Markets. She commented that it would be a great tourist attraction due to its long history and compared favourably with sites in York and Nottingham.

(iii) Kath Taylor asked why Sheffield could not be a little like other cities, for example, York, who celebrate their history instead of knocking it down and building another monstrosity?

The Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development (Councillor Leigh Bramall) responded that he wanted to be absolutely clear that the Council was totally committed to preserving the remains of Sheffield Castle. However, the demolition of buildings would not commence until 2014 and was, therefore, some way off, providing an opportunity for further public consultation and involvement on future plans for the site during the next year or so.

Councillor Bramall indicated that, at the current time, arrangements were being made for the decommissioning of the buildings in the markets area and discussions were being held with heritage bodies regarding funding for the excavations and the archaeological investigations. Additionally, planning guidance was being adapted to take account of the wider environment around the site and talks were being held with the Environment Agency in relation to deculverting of the River Sheaf. The Council wished to pursue a project which would have local community support. In the long-term there was an ambition to establish a relationship between the Castle site and Manor Lodge and Hardwick Hall.

Councillor Bramall believed that the Castle would play a key role in the wider regeneration of that area of the City and he suggested that a recent letter published in the local press expressing concerns about the site's future plans were unfounded. He assured the questioners that the redevelopment of the site (which, he suggested, was some distance away) would involve with the public.

(c) Public Question relating to the Living Wage and the Council's Partners

Peter Davies referred to the fact that the GMB Union had been campaigning for a living wage for a number of years and welcomed the Leader of the Council's commitment to encourage partners to follow this example. He asked what the Council was intending to do, if their partners who ran outsourced services such as Veolia, Kier, Amey and others refused to pay a living wage as they had in response to previous Council requests to match City Council pay settlements?

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore) responded that in the letting of contracts for Council services with contractors, the Council would give consideration to how appropriate clauses might be included in such contracts relating to the requirement to pay a living wage, subject to such clauses being permitted by UK and European Union legislation. However, she recognised that some small businesses may find it difficult to pay the Living Wage but said that she hoped that the Council's campaign would encourage them to raise the living standards of their employees.

(d) Public Question relating to the Living Wage for Sheffield University staff

Mr. Richard Alderman commended the inclusion of a Notice of Motion in the Council agenda, to work with major employers in the City on the Living Wage and he asked what work the Council did intend to do to support established campaigns, such as the campaign of Sheffield University students, which called for a living wage for all University staff?

Councillor Julie Dore (Leader of the Council) responded that she absolutely supported the campaign, referring to the motion that would be considered later in the Council meeting and, which would seek to initiate a campaign comprising the Council's partners and other organisations in the public and private sectors across the City. Initial work on this campaign had been instigated by the Sheffield Fairness Commission, which was to recommend a number of measures to address inequality, including commencing a campaign to encourage organisations to introduce a Living Wage. She added that the Council would gladly work with University students on their campaign.

(e) Public Question relating to International Students

Mr Richard Alderman welcomed the motion to be discussed later in the Council meeting which, in part, related to changes of immigration rules concerning international students. He referred to the misinformation in the media concerning this issue and referred to the impending joint campaign to be launched by Sheffield University and the Students' Union to demonstrate the value of international students, in terms of economic benefit to and culture of the City. Mr Alderman, therefore, asked would the Council support the campaign?

Councillor Julie Dore (Leader of the Council) confirmed absolute support for the campaign and referred to the motion to be considered later in the meeting as testament to such support. She added that Sheffield's Labour Members of Parliament also supported this and that the Council would be pleased to work with the University and Students Union on this particular issue.

(f) Public Question relating to Recycling Dispute

Peter Davies referred to the recent conclusion of the industrial dispute between the GMB and SOLVA, the potential penalties facing Veolia and SOLVA if they failed to fulfil their obligations under the Council's Recycling contract and the complex management arrangements for the contract following SOVA's action in pulling out of the contract. Mr Davies referred to the fact that there was still no accepted method statement in place for the new bulky waste work so that the contract was unlikely to commence until mid December. He said Veolia had concerns that the new delivery partner would not have the capacity to deliver the contract. Mr Davies stated that the workers involved were disappointed and dismayed and were trying to survive on reduced hours this winter with a consequent effect on pay.

Mr Davies stated that the GMB was worried about the latest debacle, as should

the public be, and he asked was the Council worried about the situation and, if so, what did it intend to do about it?

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene (Councillor Jack Scott) responded that that no decisions had been taken yet, by SOVA, CRI, Veolia or the City Council about a merger of responsibilities and that any proposal would come to Council for approval.

In relation to pay, Councillor Scott indicated that the hours had been reduced, but the hourly rate of pay for July, August and September had been £8.14 an hour, which largely made up for the reduction in hours. He added that, on bulky waste, the key issue was that there was a lot of health and safety work that needed to be undertaken to the Longley site. He knew how important health and safety issues were for the GMB and that nobody would want cut corners on such matters. The Council was moving as quickly as it could but had to adhere to statutory requirements. The Council knew how important it was to get this right and, therefore, it would keep working with Veolia, SOVA and others to achieve a successful outcome.

(g) Public Question relating to Penalties on Recycling Contract

Robert Carlson referred to concerns expressed by one of the trustees of Salvaire Recycling Limited, the new Recycling Charity in Sheffield. There was concern that, should the Council and/or Veolia seek penalties for under-performance on the Household Waste and Recycling contract, Salvaire could not afford them. He asked, in light of the current budgetary problems and threats to jobs, could the Council confirm how much was owed in outstanding penalties in terms of performance on the Council's Household Waste and Recycling contract and when and by whom would this money be paid?

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene (Councillor Jack Scott) agreed that every penny was important at the moment, given the Council's financial circumstances. Like many local authorities in the north, the Council was feeling the effects of reduced Government support in a disproportionate way. He confirmed that there were penalties in the Veolia contract and that this was a key mechanism that was used to hold sub-contractors to account for performance. The Council and Veolia were currently in dispute regarding contract penalties and a process to resolve the dispute was being worked through which would be completed over the next few months. However, he was unable to report anything specific as this could prejudice the negotiations. The Council do apply all fines that are due very assertively.

(h) Public Question relating to Construction Industry "Blacklists"

Hannah Gibbons asked whether the Council was aware that the company at the centre of a national "blacklisting", collective racism and bullying scandal, Carillion, was now one of the largest providers of cleaning services in Sheffield's schools and, therefore, a key delivery partner for our public services?

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families (Councillor Jackie

Drayton) responded that she was shocked that, when records were seized the Information Commissioner in 2009, they showed that the names of 3,200 victims who had been deemed to be “troublesome” or “left wing” had been included in a construction industry “blacklist” collated by the Consulting Association, subscribed to by major names in the construction industry. She stated that it was felt that the names in the “blacklist” could only have been gained from MI5 or the Police. She understood that 44 companies had signed up to receive a copy of the “blacklist”. She commented that she deplored the existence of the “blacklist” and was very concerned about the matter on moral grounds.

Councillor Drayton explained that when contracts are let to outside contractors, as part of the evaluation and scrutiny process, there was an opportunity for trade unions to examine the track record of those companies, including as regards workforce and human resources was included. Trade Union representatives were included on the selection panel where there had been an opportunity to examine information.

However, with respect to Carillion, the company had stated that they, at present, do not use the list and had not done so for a number of years. She would, nevertheless, ask Council officers to seek assurances from Carillion and other contractors that they do not use the list. Should the membership of a company on the list come to light then this would be included within the human resources information as part of the evaluation of contractors within any future tendering procedure.

(i) Public Question relating to the Council’s support for the Arts in Sheffield.

Ms. Hannah Gibbons asked how will the Leadership continue to strategically support the Arts and Culture sector in the City following the recent resignation of the Head of Arts and the replacement of the post with a Head of Business Development and Strategic Projects given that there is no arts service or team to undertake this work in her absence?

The Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure (Councillor Isobel Bowler) responded that the newly created post retained a significant focus on the arts and work had been done with Council officers to maintain this emphasis and to continue to support the arts in the City. She had been assured by officers that changing the post would not disadvantage the quality and delivery of the arts in Sheffield.

(j) Public Question relating to gender balance in the Place Portfolio

Ms. Hannah Gibbons asked the Leadership to comment on the Equality Impact Assessment for the proposed changes to delete the Head of Arts role and replace it with a Head of Business Development, given that the resignation of the Head of Arts had resulted in the loss of a further senior female employee within the Council and reducing, even further, the gender balance in favour of male senior employees and raising questions about the culture of the organisation to retain and promote women in the Place Portfolio.

The Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure (Councillor Isobel Bowler) responded that the Equality Impact Assessment had been completed and signed off by the Equalities Officer. She suggested that Ms. Gibbons should raise the issue of organisational culture at the Joint Consultative Committee (comprising representatives of the Council and Trade Unions) where gender balance and the recruitment of women to posts could be explored.

(k) Public Questions regarding Fire Risk Assessment for 405 to 443 Leighton Road

Stuart Lapp referred to the fact that he had, under the Freedom of Information Act, asked the Council to supply him with Fire Risk Assessments (FRA) for 405–443 Leighton Road for the period 2006 -12 and the penalties for not having such an Assessment. He asked (i) who was the person responsible for not issuing a FRA, (ii) why had it taken six years to address this matter and (iii) if the work was necessary to comply with the law, why was this not done in 2007 at the same time as the Decent Homes work was undertaken?

The Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods (Councillor Harry Harpham) responded that it would have been helpful if Mr Lapp had let him have greater notice of the questions so that he could raise the matters with officers. He noted that Mr Lapp had submitted a number of questions under the Freedom of Information Act and these should be dealt with under a specific process which is managed by the Council's Freedom of information Officer. He, as a Cabinet Member, would pass on any Freedom of Information requests to the Officer as the Council were bound by a legal process to deal with such requests within prescribed timescales. He would, therefore, ask officers if they had supplied Mr Lapp with the information he had requested and, if they had, he would view the matter as being dealt with. However, he would ensure that officers would respond to any new questions that Mr Lapp had posed.

(l) Public Questions on Digital Aerial contract on Hanover/Lansdowne estate

Mr Stuart Lapp referred to the Digital Aerial contract on the Hanover/Lansdowne estate and alleged that the contractors installing the Aerials had been paid a considerable sum, which was over and above the true value the work. Mr Lapp asked who was responsible for this and what was the Council going to do to address what, he considered to be, a waste of money.

The Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods (Councillor Harry Harpham) stated that he had responded to the issues raised by Mr Lapp in March, 2012 so he would not be asking officers to investigate these matters any further, as he believed that they had been answered adequately.

(m) Public Questions on Hanover/Lansdowne Refurbishment

Kirsty Irwin asked the following questions:-

(i) why had no schedules of work been delivered to tenants or leaseholders who were having their homes clad on the Hanover and Lansdowne estates;

(ii) could she be given a schedule with a statement of how much of each product was to be applied to her property and for what reason it was being used;

(iii) why had everything been scheduled so quickly for the Hanover estate;

(iv) why has work been undertaken so slowly on the Lansdowne estate yet work on the Hanover estate was quicker;

(v) how many Insulated Render and Cladding Association (INCA) registered sub-contractors were engaged on the contract and which piece of the contract were they undertaking;

(vi) why were pensioners being told that their gas fires were being removed for eight weeks during the winter and why is central heating not installed first?

Councillor Harry Harpham (Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods) responded that he had received little notice of the questions, but that he would ensure that Ms. Irwin would receive a response in the near future. He added that, as far as the Decent Homes work programme was concerned, he was pleased that discussions held between Councillor Steve Jones and tenants and residents had revealed their satisfaction with the work undertaken under the programme.

(n) Public Question regarding Social Housing Entitlement

Ms. Mandy Scott asked why she was not allowed to stay in her two bedroom home subsequent to her daughter leaving the property? She referred to the need for her to remain in the property due to her close proximity to relatives and the support which they could offer her as she suffered from epilepsy.

The Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods (Councillor Harry Harpham) responded that the assertion that Ms Scott's property was now under occupied following her daughter leaving was as a result of the "bedroom tax" which was part of the Government's welfare reforms and which provides for a reduction of housing benefit where a tenant is assessed as under-occupying a property. The Council had a duty to explain the implications of the new proposals to people and did not wish to see people being required to move from their homes, as it recognised the value of people living in settled communities. However, the welfare reforms threatened vulnerable people and, as the Cabinet Member with responsibility for housing, he would try to speak to as many people as possible who were affected by the bedroom tax.

Under the changes, those people deemed by the Government to be under-occupying their homes to the degree that they had one bedroom more than was considered necessary, would lose 14% of housing benefit, whilst a person under-occupying by two bedrooms or more would lose 25% of housing benefit. Councillor Harpham repeated that the Council had a duty to explain the impact of the tax and help, with its partners, mitigate its effect on Council tenants in order to help them help themselves.

Councillor Harpham stated that the situation had been made worse by severe reductions in the social housing building programme, which presented difficulties in terms of re-housing people affected by the bedroom tax. The reductions in social housing building and the effects of the bedroom tax were being played out across the City's housing estates. The Council would continue to press the Government to change its policy on the bedroom tax, but the Council had extremely limited options for helping people in these circumstances.

(o) Public Questions on provision of grit bins, removal of litter, the collection and treatment of household waste, Council policy on non-mixed swimming sessions for schoolchildren, the response of the Council to an Ofsted inspection at Sharrow Junior School, Halal meat provision in Sheffield schools and the legal process for renaming roads.

Mr Zeesham Nagri asked whether the Council was going to provide any grit bins and remove accumulated litter from the parts of the Sharrow area; what action was the Council taking to reduce waste; what was Council policy on the provision of non-mixed swimming sessions for Sheffield schoolchildren; in light of the outcome of a recent Ofsted inspection of Sharrow Junior School (which showed the school to be performing below standard), how did the Council intend to respond to the inspection; what was available in terms of Halal meat provision at schools; and what was the legal process for the renaming of roads.

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene (Councillor Jack Scott) responded that he would supply Mr Nagri with details of the number of grit bins to be issued in the Sharrow area but he emphasised, that in terms of supplies of grit, the Council was better prepared than ever. He added that the litter problems to which Mr Nagri referred had been the subject of a site investigation by a member of the Council only today and that, the legal process for the renaming of roads was extremely complicated and that he would provide a written response to Mr Nagri.

As far as the reduction of waste was concerned, Councillor Scott stated that landfill rates in Sheffield had plummeted and that, over the last year, the City had seen the biggest reduction in landfill ever. Sheffield's Landfill rate now stood at 3% which was the lowest rate in the country and expenditure on the disposal of waste by landfill had reduced from £1.2 million in 2011/12 to £175k so far in 2012/13. These substantial savings could now be re-invested in other vital Council services and Councillor Scott thanked all those involved in reducing waste to landfill for securing such an achievement.

Councillor Isobel Bowler (Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure) responded in relation to non-mixed swimming sessions that this facility was, in her experience, not only required by some groups on religious grounds. Sometimes, women simply wished to take part in non-mixed swimming sessions. She added that she would discuss with Council officers, the Council's partners and Sheffield International Venues, the extent to which non-mixed swimming sessions could be provided and stated that she would write to Mr. Nagri to let him know the outcome.

Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and

Families) responded that she would forward the latest policy on the provision of Halal meat in schools.

With regard to the Ofsted inspection of Sharrow School, Councillor Drayton responded that the Council's big ambition was to help every child, young person and family to achieve their full potential and to create a situation where every school in the City was an excellent school and the Council would work with schools, governors and parents to ensure schools provided the best quality education to young people, wherever they lived. The Council's officers would also work with schools and Ofsted to secure this aim, in circumstances where any school was failing to meet the required standards. She added that she would send Mr Nagri the proposed course of action the Council was proposing to take in respect of Sharrow School. On the question of the provision of Halal meat in schools, Councillor Drayton added that the City Council did have a policy on the subject and that she would ask officers to send the policy to Mr. Nagri.

(p) Public Question concerning the payment of Full -Time Trade Union Officials

Colin Taylor referred to the urgent need for funding towards traffic speed reduction measures in various parts of the City. He particularly referred to the need for such measures outside Ecclesfield School and, in light of this need, he asked the Council whether it would be better to spend the funding of the pay of full-time trade union officials amounting to nearly £500,000, on important issues like road safety, such as that required at Ecclesfield School.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources (Councillor Bryan Lodge) responded that the former Liberal Democrat Administration had recognised the value of trade union representation and that they felt that full-time trade union officials provided value for money in that they were involved in many employment issues across the Council in their broadest sense and not just the protection of employees. He added that, over a period of three years, the previous Liberal Democrat Administration had opportunities to reduce the funding of full-time trade union officials but chose to take no action. He added that, currently, a review was being undertaken of the funding of full-time trade union officials and it was hoped that this would be finalised in the near future following approval by the Arbitration, Conciliation and Advisory Service.

(q) Public Question relating to a complaint to the Leader

Mubarak Ismail read out a question on behalf of Mr. Abas Oday. He referred to a complaint he had made to the Leader of the Council regarding a Member of the City Council, to which he had, as yet, received no reply. Mr Oday asked whether a further meeting could be arranged with the Leader to discuss the substance of the complaint.

Councillor Julie Dore (Leader of the Council) responded that there was a process for complaints being taken forward. She added that investigations regarding the complaint were on-going and that Mr Oday would receive a response in due course. She would also be pleased to meet with Mr Oday, once the investigation had been concluded.

(r) Public Questions relating to access and circulation of information

Mr Martin Brighton asked the following questions :-

(i) Questions from this citizen to this Chamber have been deferred with a request to provide more information. What is the point of such a deferral when the email providing that information is ignored, and then, later, emails are being blocked?

(ii) When asked, this Council wrote to confirm that not one Elected Member had complained to the Council about this citizen's emails. What right therefore do officers of this Council have to decide what Elected Members can and cannot read?

(iii) In one of many cases, the Information Commissioner recently found against the Council and ordered disclosure of information. The information should never have been kept secret in the first place. Now the Council is allegedly appealing the decision of the Information Commissioner. Therefore:-

(a) to what extent is the Council prepared to go to continue with this unnecessary secrecy ?

(b) what is this Council hiding about its plans for Sheffield Homes and for when Council Housing goes back in-house?

(iv) Under what circumstances, and in accordance with which policy of the Council, does reputation management have primacy over truth? Council answers to two previous public questions have declined to say that truth is more important.

(v) Does this Council uphold the principles of Free Speech?

The Chief Executive advised the Council that he had received a complaint from a Member of the Council regarding the content of an e-mail from the questioner.

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore) responded that the Council had a policy which specified that emails would not be accepted in circumstances where they contained information or statements that are inappropriate, offensive or defamatory. Council officers are instructed not to circulate these and that is why some e-mails are not distributed. She added that the Council always provide truthful information but, sometimes the recipients of information, do not believe this is true. The Council absolutely believed in Free Speech.

4.3 Petitions

(c) Petition Requesting the Reinstatement of Weekly Bin Collections and the Free Garden Waste Bin Service

The Council received an electronic petition containing 40 signatures and requesting the reinstatement of weekly bin collections and the free garden waste bin service.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene (Councillor Jack Scott), who formally acknowledged the petition and stated that he would respond to the lead petitioner in writing.

(d) Petition Requesting the Council to Stop Plans for Grazing Cattle on Wadsley and Loxley Commons

The Council received an electronic petition containing 23 signatures and requesting the Council to stop plans for grazing cattle on Wadsley and Loxley Commons.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure (Councillor Isobel Bowler) who acknowledged receipt of the petition and stated that she would respond in writing to the petition.

(e) Petition Requesting the re-siting of a dropped curb on Grimesthorpe Road

The Council received a petition containing 24 signatures and requesting the re-siting of a dropped curb on Grimesthorpe Road.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development (Councillor Leigh Bramall), who stated that a response would be made to the petitioners in writing.

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

5.1 Urgent Business

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

5.2 Questions

A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated and supplementary questions under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.4 were asked and were answered by the appropriate Cabinet Members.

5.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

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

6. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that (a) approval be given to the following changes to the memberships of Committees, Panels, Groups, etc:

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee - Councillor Pat Midgley to replace Councillor Peter Rippon

Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee Substitute Members - Councillor Clive Skelton to replace Councillor Pat Midgley

Monitoring and Advisory Board (Adult Services) - Councillor Peter Rippon to fill a vacancy

(b) approval be given to the appointment of representatives to serve on other bodies as follows:-

Appoint Councillor Penny Baker as an additional member of the Member Development Working Group.

(c) the continued appointment of Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs to the National Association of British Market Authorities be noted.

7. APPOINTMENT OF INDEPENDENT PERSONS IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE LOCALISM ACT 2011

RESOLVED: That Stuart Carvell, Marvyn Moore and David Waxman be appointed as Independent Persons as defined by the Localism Act 2011, as outlined in the report of the Director of Legal Services now submitted.

8. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING A LIVING WAGE

It was moved by Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor George Lindars Hammond, that this Council:-

(a) notes that 4th - 10th November is Living Wage Week, and that the Living Wage is calculated by the Centre for Research in Social Policy at £7.20 per hour, compared to the national minimum wage of £6.19 per hour;

(b) notes recent research from KPMG indicating that 4.82 million people across the country are paid less than the Living Wage, which amounts to

one in five workers in the UK;

- (c) notes that a Living Wage has been introduced in other areas across the country where several leading public and private sector organisations have signed up to the campaign;
- (d) believes that paying the living wage boosts the incomes of the lowest paid, who have been hit especially hard by rising prices, increasing costs of living and the double dip recession;
- (e) supports this Administration's commitment to providing the Living Wage of £7.20 per hour for all Council employees from 1st January 2013;
- (f) welcomes that this commitment from the present Administration means that from January next year all staff employed by Sheffield City Council will be paid a wage of at least £7.20 per hour, which will see an increase for the lowest paid 275 staff on the lowest two grades at the Council;
- (g) regrets that Council staff have seen their pay frozen for the past two years in order to protect as many jobs and services as possible given the massive cuts imposed by the Government and notes that consultation is currently taking place with trade unions to extend the increment freeze, acknowledging that if increments were frozen again the Council would save £5 million per year, however, implementing a living wage would target raising the incomes of the Council's lowest paid staff;
- (h) supports the present Administration's commitment to meet the cost of the Living Wage at the same time as making a £1 million saving through cuts to senior management positions; and
- (i) directs that a report is brought to Cabinet outlining plans to implement a Living Wage in the Council and to initiate a campaign to support a Living Wage for Sheffield involving partners across the City in public, private and voluntary sector organisations.

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

1. the deletion of paragraphs (g) and (h);
2. the addition of new paragraphs (g) to (m) as follows:-
 - (g) praises the previous Administration for implementing a £250 pay award for low-paid Council staff, whilst other members of staff were facing a pay freeze;
 - (h) yet recalls with disappointment that the current Administration did not adopt the intention of the previous Administration to proceed with the award as a two-year annual increase;

- (i) furthermore, recalls the decision of Labour councillors to vote down the main opposition group's 2012/13 budget amendment, thereby protecting the salaries of highly-paid staff, at the expense of low-paid jobs like binmen and care workers;
- (j) therefore regrets that the current Administration's record on supporting the low-paid has not always lived up to their rhetoric;
- (k) however, supports this Council's commitment to implement a Living Wage and hopes that this policy will apply to agency staff as well as directly-employed Council staff;
- (l) furthermore, encourages companies to whom the Council outsources services, to pay their staff a living wage; and
- (m) equally welcomes reports that the current Administration plan to reduce senior management positions by £1 million but believes they could go further in reducing back office costs; and

3. the relettering of the original paragraph (i) as a new paragraph (n).

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

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

For the amendment (15) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Colin Ross, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Katie Condliffe and Alison Brelsford.

Against the amendment (48) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor John Campbell) and Councillors Julie Dore, John Robson, Jack Scott, Ian Saunders, Helen Mirfin Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Ibrar Hussain, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Mohammad Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Mazher Iqbal, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars Hammond, Robert Johnson, Pat Midgley, Jenny Armstrong, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, Martin Lawton, Sioned Mair Richards, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Adam Hurst,

Alf Meade, Jackie Satur, and Mick Rooney.

Abstained on the - Nil
amendment (0)

(Note: 13 Members present at the meeting at the time the vote was taken did not record their vote on the electronic voting system.)

It was then moved by Councillor Jillian Creasy, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of the words “and notes that it was first proposed in a motion to Full Council by the smallest opposition group in 2009” at the end of paragraph (e); and
2. the deletion of paragraphs (h) and (i) and the addition of new paragraphs (h) to (k) as follows:-
 - (h) welcomes reducing genuinely unnecessary management positions but notes that that the approximate £70,000 cost of delivering the Living Wage would be covered several times over by reducing the pay of all employees paid over £50,000 by 10%, a measure which would also reduce the divisive gap between what Council staff at the lowest and highest scales are paid;
 - (i) believes that many companies contracted to the Council currently pay below the current living wage;
 - (j) notes the recent report by One Society “Leading the Way on Fair Pay” that stated “Whilst some local authorities may fear that extending the Living Wage to contractors might have substantial adverse impact on budgets, those who have put this into effect have not found this to be so.”; and
 - (k) directs that a report is brought to Cabinet outlining plans to implement a Living Wage in the Council, explore the options with regard to making Living Wage a mandatory requirement of future Council contracts, and to initiate a campaign to support a Living Wage for Sheffield involving partners across the City in public, private and voluntary sector organisations.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negated.

It was then moved by Councillor Harry Harpham, seconded by Councillor John Robson, as a further amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the insertion between the words “per hour” and “compared to” in paragraph (a) of the words “and this will increase to £7.45 per hour for 2013/14”; and
2. the addition of the words “and from April 2013 this will increase to £7.45 per

hour” at the end of paragraph (f)

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

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 4th - 10th November is Living Wage Week, and that the Living Wage is calculated by the Centre for Research in Social Policy at £7.20 per hour, and this will increase to £7.45 per hour for 2013/14, compared to the national minimum wage of £6.19 per hour;
 - (b) notes recent research from KPMG indicating that 4.82 million people across the country are paid less than the Living Wage, which amounts to one in five workers in the UK;
 - (c) notes that a Living Wage has been introduced in other areas across the country where several leading public and private sector organisations have signed up to the campaign;
 - (d) believes that paying the living wage boosts the incomes of the lowest paid, who have been hit especially hard by rising prices, increasing costs of living and the double dip recession;
 - (e) supports this Administration’s commitment to providing the Living Wage of £7.20 per hour for all Council employees from 1st January 2013;
 - (f) welcomes that this commitment from the present Administration means that from January next year all staff employed by Sheffield City Council will be paid a wage of at least £7.20 per hour, which will see an increase for the lowest paid 275 staff on the lowest two grades at the Council, and from April 2013 this will increase to £7.45 per hour;
 - (g) regrets that Council staff have seen their pay frozen for the past two years in order to protect as many jobs and services as possible given the massive cuts imposed by the Government and notes that consultation is currently taking place with trade unions to extend the increment freeze, acknowledging that if increments were frozen again the Council would save £5 million per year, however, implementing a living wage would target raising the incomes of the Council’s lowest paid staff;
 - (h) supports the present Administration’s commitment to meet the cost of the Living Wage at the same time as making a £1 million saving through cuts to senior management positions; and
 - (i) directs that a report is brought to Cabinet outlining plans to implement a Living Wage in the Council and to initiate a campaign to support a Living Wage for Sheffield involving partners across the City in public, private and

voluntary sector organisations.

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Keith Hill, Colin Ross, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Alison Brelsford voted for Paragraphs (a) to (f), (h) and (i) and against Paragraph (g) and asked for this to be recorded.)

9. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING GOVERNMENT FUNDING REDUCTIONS

It was moved by Councillor Bryan Lodge, seconded by Councillor Ian Saunders, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2013/14 to 2017/18 presented to Cabinet last month outlining the financial position of Sheffield City Council over the next five years;
- (b) expresses its anger and dismay at the Council's budget position which is now significantly worse than was previously estimated because the Government are making additional unfair cuts to Sheffield as a result of their failure to grow the economy and notes that even without the additional cuts the Council was already facing an impossible budget position which will have a massive impact on Council services in Sheffield;
- (c) notes that this is in addition to the £140 million that has been reduced from the Council's budget over the past two years meaning that future cuts will unavoidably have a bigger impact on Council services that are valued by local people;
- (d) further notes that the £50 million of cuts to next year's budget followed by £35 million the following year means that the cuts will now total £225 million over four years;
- (e) deplores this Government's continued attack on Sheffield and believes that they have no understanding of the lives of normal hardworking families and the fact that they are making additional cuts to local government at the same time as giving income tax cuts to millionaires indicates the values of this Government;
- (f) is shocked at the irresponsibility of the Government who will not confirm the final settlement until the Autumn Statement in December, when the Council has to set the budget in March;
- (g) continues to oppose the unfairness of the cuts which see councils with the highest levels of deprivation receiving the majority of the cuts whilst some of the wealthiest areas in the country receive almost no cuts at all;
- (h) deplores the continued broken promises of the Member of Parliament for

Sheffield Hallam, who earlier this month stated that he would ensure that future cuts are targeted at the wealthiest, whilst at the same time being the Deputy Prime Minister in a Government which is making additional unfair cuts to Sheffield and renegeing on its promise that 100% of Sheffield's business rates would be localised to spend on local services by now reducing this to 50% of business rates;

- (i) welcomes that the present Administration have identified protecting services for the most vulnerable as a key priority in addition to the significant work that the present Administration are undertaking to support the development of the local economy;
- (j) further welcomes that the present Administration are standing up for Sheffield, taking action to bring attention to the damaging impact of the reckless and unfair cuts that this Government are making to Sheffield and to be honest with local people by making clear the impact it will have on Sheffield; and
- (k) resolves to continue to stand up for Sheffield, focus on jobs, be business friendly and support and protect communities, however, regrets that given the level of cuts that the Government are imposing on the Council there will be significant changes to council services in the future which is unavoidable due to the Government's reckless and irresponsible actions.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

- 1. the deletion of paragraphs (a) to (j)
- 2. the re-lettering of paragraph (k) as a new paragraph (a) and the deletion in that paragraph of all the words after the words "regrets that" and their substitution by the words "cuts are necessary due to the previous Government's reckless and irresponsible actions"; and
- 3. the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (j) as follows:-
 - (b) highlights the following announcements as big wins for Sheffield and thanks the Coalition Government for its support:
 - (i) millions of pounds for Sheffield's buses and trams, including the financial backing for a Tram/Train pilot;
 - (ii) £1.2 billion to allow Sheffield's Streets Ahead project to proceed, alongside hundreds of millions of pounds to improve the M1 near the City;
 - (iii) approval of massive rail infrastructure projects, including the electrification of the Midland Mainline and massive improvements to the Northern Hub rail service;

- (iv) millions of pounds for Sheffield schools through the Government's pupil premium, alongside £9.9 million for the construction of a Sheffield University Technical College;
 - (v) millions of pounds to support construction and infrastructure through the New Homes Bonus and the Growing Places Fund; and
 - (vi) financial backing for more apprenticeships, as part of the £1 billion Youth Contract led by the Deputy Prime Minister and, most recently, £27 million to support the Sheffield City Region Deal for Skills;
- (c) in particular welcomes the £65 million that was recently awarded within Sheffield City Region, as part of the third round of the Government's Regional Growth Fund, which will boost jobs across the region;
 - (d) furthermore, thanks the Government for the Sheffield City Deal, a radical agreement, which will see significant funds and powers devolved to the Sheffield City Region and will put the region in the driving seat for economic growth;
 - (e) however, understands the Council faces tough decisions and, therefore, must cut back on any unnecessary spend;
 - (f) reminds Members that the previous Government pledged £82bn of cuts and promised to be "ruthless" in cutting public spending if elected again;
 - (g) is therefore shocked that the Council's review of trade union facility time, including the GMB, UNITE and UNISON unions, has still not reported, despite the clear commitment of the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources that the review would be completed in July;
 - (h) understands that the Council currently spends £476,479 a year on staff that only perform trade union functions, in addition to 61 members of staff who do so on a part time basis, and believes this cost is far too high;
 - (i) furthermore, recalls that within the current Administration's 2012/13 budget, £2.2 million was allocated to the heading "Town Hall Meeting Rooms" in the 2013/14 financial year and believes this spend cannot be justified;
 - (j) therefore, recommends that in their 2013/14 budget the current Administration:-
 - (i) significantly reduces the budget for full-time trade union

officials; and

- (ii) confirms that funds currently earmarked for Town Hall meeting rooms will be re-allocated.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negated.

It was then moved by Councillor Jillian Creasy, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of four new paragraphs as follows:-

- (i) believes the Council's ability to manage changes to its budget has been severely restricted by the number of large, long-term contracts entered into with private companies for the provision of public services;
- (i) believes that the estimated £9m profit made last year by the largest contractors would have been better spent on protecting the most vulnerable from central government cuts;
- (i) also believes that the loss of £9m from the local economy has a significant effect on local businesses and jobs; and
- (i) requests the Cabinet to take the necessary action to bring services supplied in the Council's buildings repair and maintenance contract back 'in house' in 2014.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negated.

After a right of reply by Councillor Bryan Lodge, the original Motion was put to the vote and carried, as follows:

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the Medium Term Financial Strategy 2013/14 to 2017/18 presented to Cabinet last month outlining the financial position of Sheffield City Council over the next five years;
- (b) expresses its anger and dismay at the Council's budget position which is now significantly worse than was previously estimated because the Government are making additional unfair cuts to Sheffield as a result of their failure to grow the economy and notes that even without the additional cuts the Council was already facing an impossible budget position which will have a massive impact on Council services in Sheffield;
- (c) notes that this is in addition to the £140 million that has been reduced from the Council's budget over the past two years meaning that future cuts will unavoidably have a bigger impact on Council services that are valued by local people;
- (d) further notes that the £50 million of cuts to next year's budget followed by

£35 million the following year means that the cuts will now total £225 million over four years;

- (e) deplores this Government's continued attack on Sheffield and believes that they have no understanding of the lives of normal hardworking families and the fact that they are making additional cuts to local government at the same time as giving income tax cuts to millionaires indicates the values of this Government;
- (f) is shocked at the irresponsibility of the Government who will not confirm the final settlement until the Autumn Statement in December, when the Council has to set the budget in March;
- (g) continues to oppose the unfairness of the cuts which see councils with the highest levels of deprivation receiving the majority of the cuts whilst some of the wealthiest areas in the country receive almost no cuts at all;
- (h) deplores the continued broken promises of the Member of Parliament for Sheffield Hallam, who earlier this month stated that he would ensure that future cuts are targeted at the wealthiest, whilst at the same time being the Deputy Prime Minister in a Government which is making additional unfair cuts to Sheffield and reneging on its promise that 100% of Sheffield's business rates would be localised to spend on local services by now reducing this to 50% of business rates;
- (i) welcomes that the present Administration have identified protecting services for the most vulnerable as a key priority in addition to the significant work that the present Administration are undertaking to support the development of the local economy;
- (j) further welcomes that the present Administration are standing up for Sheffield, taking action to bring attention to the damaging impact of the reckless and unfair cuts that this Government are making to Sheffield and to be honest with local people by making clear the impact it will have on Sheffield; and
- (k) resolves to continue to stand up for Sheffield, focus on jobs, be business friendly and support and protect communities, however, regrets that given the level of cuts that the Government are imposing on the Council there will be significant changes to Council services in the future which is unavoidable due to the Government's reckless and irresponsible actions.

(Note: Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a), (c) and (e) to (k) and abstained on Paragraphs (b) and (d) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

**10. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING 'STREETS AHEAD' PROJECT :
DISRUPTION TO ON-STREET PARKING PROVISION**

It was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council:-

- (a) recognises and welcomes the progress of the 'Streets Ahead' scheme, secured by Liberal Democrat influence in Government and backed by £1.2 billion of Coalition Government funding;
- (b) believes that, as a result of the hard work of Liberal Democrat Councillors, the whole of Sheffield will see dramatic improvements in the quality of its road network;
- (c) however, notes the large swathes of the City's residential areas, with highly-concentrated areas of on-street parking, and is concerned that no effort has been made to provide alternative parking arrangements to mitigate the significant disruption that will be caused by these vital works; and
- (d) therefore, calls upon the Council to liaise with Amey and local land owners in order to provide free and secure alternative parking facilities to affected residents for the duration of the works.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Leigh Bramall, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the substitution of the following words therefor:-

- (a) wholeheartedly supports the decision of the previous Government to invest in the repair of Sheffield's highways and welcomes the progress of the 'Streets Ahead' project under the present Administration, after delays under the previous Administration and this Government;
- (b) acknowledges that the project will cause unavoidable inconvenience for some people and supports efforts to communicate this as much as possible;
- (c) notes a Sheffield Liberal Democrat Group press release dated 18th October 2012 which states "Liberal Democrat councillors, who helped secure the project, are raising concerns about the effect on on-street parking. With each of the planned 108 'work zones' taking between 15-20 weeks to complete" and "Liberal Democrat councillors want the Council to work in conjunction with Amey, the organisation contracted to carry out the work, to temporarily provide free, alternative parking arrangements for residents. Proposals include unused land or existing parking bays from local retailers, pubs, or supermarkets, offering residents flexibility during the vital works.";
- (d) further notes with great concern comments by the Federation of Small Business regarding the idea that local businesses' parking spaces should be used to accommodate local residents affected by the Streets Ahead project - "We perceive this to be a policy which will cause devastating loss of trade to local retailers and will potentially bring about unnecessary business closures, with the attending loss of livelihoods and jobs" and is concerned that adopting this policy would be anti-business and contradict the present

Administration's desire to be a business friendly Council;

- (e) believes it is completely impractical to offer parking for everyone affected by the works, noting feedback from officers that there are not the facilities available in the whole City to provide alternate parking arrangements and realistically to make any attempt to do this it would involve the Council having to secure free parking;
- (f) further believes that the only way to achieve this would be to pay a private contractor for parking and, based on a cost of £4 per day per car, assuming one car per household in the City, forecasts this could cost up to £132 million in the first 5 years;
- (g) notes that people are being supported to make their own arrangements whilst the work is taking place and are being given a lot of advance warning to put these arrangements in place;
- (h) appreciates that with this amount of investment and improvement, a level of disruption is unavoidable for some residents and notes that the Council wouldn't be asking people to do this if it wasn't to make such important improvements to transform the roads network, which we all know that people really want to see; and
- (i) notes that in the first three zones where work has started (Shiregreen, Carbrook and Ewden) the Administration's approach is working well, without wasting significant amounts of resources on providing alternative parking and therefore condemns the main opposition group for seeking to scaremonger and undermine the Streets Ahead project, which is vital for Sheffield's future.

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

After a right of reply by Councillor Ian Auckland, the original Motion, as amended, was put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) wholeheartedly supports the decision of the previous Government to invest in the repair of Sheffield's highways and welcomes the progress of the 'Streets Ahead' project under the present Administration, after delays under the previous Administration and this Government;
- (b) acknowledges that the project will cause unavoidable inconvenience for some people and supports efforts to communicate this as much as possible;
- (c) notes a Sheffield Liberal Democrat Group press release dated 18th October 2012 which states "Liberal Democrat councillors, who helped secure the project, are raising concerns about the effect on on-street parking. With each of the planned 108 'work zones' taking between 15-20 weeks to

complete” and “Liberal Democrat councillors want the Council to work in conjunction with Amey, the organisation contracted to carry out the work, to temporarily provide free, alternative parking arrangements for residents. Proposals include unused land or existing parking bays from local retailers, pubs, or supermarkets, offering residents flexibility during the vital works.”;

- (d) further notes with great concern comments by the Federation of Small Business regarding the idea that local businesses’ parking spaces should be used to accommodate local residents affected by the Streets Ahead project - “We perceive this to be a policy which will cause devastating loss of trade to local retailers and will potentially bring about unnecessary business closures, with the attending loss of livelihoods and jobs” and is concerned that adopting this policy would be anti-business and contradict the present Administration’s desire to be a business friendly Council;
- (e) believes it is completely impractical to offer parking for everyone affected by the works, noting feedback from officers that there are not the facilities available in the whole City to provide alternate parking arrangements and realistically to make any attempt to do this it would involve the Council having to secure free parking;
- (f) further believes that the only way to achieve this would be to pay a private contractor for parking and, based on a cost of £4 per day per car, assuming one car per household in the City, forecasts this could cost up to £132 million in the first 5 years;
- (g) notes that people are being supported to make their own arrangements whilst the work is taking place and are being given a lot of advance warning to put these arrangements in place;
- (h) appreciates that with this amount of investment and improvement, a level of disruption is unavoidable for some residents and notes that the Council wouldn’t be asking people to do this if it wasn’t to make such important improvements to transform the roads network, which we all know that people really want to see; and
- (i) notes that in the first three zones where work has started (Shiregreen, Carbrook and Ewden) the Administration’s approach is working well, without wasting significant amounts of resources on providing alternative parking and therefore condemns the main opposition group for seeking to scaremonger and undermine the Streets Ahead project, which is vital for Sheffield’s future.

(Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (b) (c) (d) (g) and (h) and abstained on Paragraphs (a), (e), (f) and (i) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

11. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING WELFARE CHANGES

It was moved by Councillor Jayne Dunn, seconded by Councillor Clive Skelton, that this Council:-

- (a) is appalled that the Chancellor of the Exchequer in this Government has announced he is planning to make £10billion of further cuts to the welfare budget;
- (b) is concerned that the impacts will be felt greatly by hard working low income families, and that Northern cities including Sheffield will bear the brunt of the cuts, having huge detrimental impacts on local residents, the Council's services and the local economy with an estimate of £180 million less coming into the City's economy annually;
- (c) worries that the system is not fit for purpose, noting that analysis of the new system for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, by the University of Portsmouth and the Centre for Social and Economic Inclusion, has raised serious concerns about the administration of Universal Credit and potential outcomes and they believe that "while some would see improvements to their finances, the report concludes, not everyone will benefit and some could be worse off on universal benefit than under current arrangements...our research has found the actual roll-out could unintentionally trap people in poverty and hardship";
- (d) is concerned that the proposal of Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, (the Rt. Hon. Iain Duncan Smith, MP) to only give child and work related benefits to the first two children is attacking poor low paid families in an attempt to paint welfare recipients as 'takers' who should have to "cut their cloth like everyone else", and believes that the move is ill thought out and would only save £200million;
- (e) is worried that recipients of disability benefits are going to be worse off under Universal Credit, noting that £9billion has already been cut from the budget since this Government came to power with further cuts planned and many people will have to be reassessed and will find their benefits reduced, and that the Hardest Hit Campaign believes these further cuts will put disabled people at risk of poverty, debt and isolation;
- (f) is concerned that the bedroom tax is likely to affect approximately 6-7000 residents in Sheffield, and that many residents will have to leave family homes as they will be unable to pay the tax to stay put, and that this also puts a further strain on the Council as there is a shortage of housing in the City;
- (g) opposes the Government's cuts to Council tax benefit which will see many families in Sheffield being hit with increased Council tax bills, putting a further strain on their finances at the same time as this Government are giving tax cuts to millionaires;
- (h) worries that the cumulative effect of welfare cuts is going to have a huge

detrimental impact on the most vulnerable people in society and cause further poverty, force people into using debt and burden frontline services that are already being cut; and

- (i) urges this Government to wait a year before implementing Universal Credit and believes that there are too many questions that have yet to be answered and such significant changes to welfare should wait until they can be implemented properly.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Diana Stimely, seconded by Councillor Denise Reaney, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the substitution of the following words therefor:-

- (a) recalls the previous Government's inability to handle public finances, increasing the national deficit year-on-year from 2001 onwards, reaching a total of £43bn prior to the economic crash;
- (b) believes that, with the cost of welfare representing roughly a third of Government expenditure, refusing to make changes to the benefits system would only ensure cuts to other areas of Government spending – such as the NHS or education;
- (c) welcomes statements from the Shadow Work & Pensions Secretary that reform of welfare is needed but questions his rhetoric, which was criticised in the national media, as "playing to the Right-whinge gallery";
- (d) however, notes that Her Majesty's Opposition are still yet to bring forward any concrete and costed proposals for reforming the current welfare system;
- (e) broadly supports the Government's plans to reduce the welfare bill but still holds significant concerns over specific measures, in particular, the proposed bedroom tax and reduction in Council tax benefit;
- (f) welcomes reports that Liberal Democrats in Government will block plans to restrict child and work related benefits to the first two children within a family, and reminds Members that the £10bn of further cuts in the welfare budget is Conservative Party not Coalition Government policy;
- (g) believes at a local level the Council should seek to mitigate the impact of benefit cuts and welcomes new powers to tax empty and second homes introduced by the Coalition Government; and
- (h) therefore, calls upon on the Cabinet Member for Finance & Resources to bring forward a report to Cabinet on the introduction of new taxes on second and empty homes, following the example of councils in Barnsley and Rotherham.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Jillian Creasy, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:

1. the deletion of original paragraph (g);
2. the addition of new paragraphs (g) and (h) as follows:-
 - (g) therefore requests the Cabinet to urgently make an accurate assessment of how many households will be affected and the capacity for downsizing within the City's affordable rented sector, in order to plan a response and provide data to support a campaign on this issue;
 - (h) opposes the Government's cuts to Council tax benefit, which are being made at the same time as it is giving tax cuts to millionaires, but requests the Cabinet to pass on the cut in the fairest possible way by ensuring that the City as a whole shares the burden, not just the poorest 60,000 households currently in receipt of Council tax benefit;
3. the relettering of original paragraphs (h) and (i) as new paragraphs (i) and (j).

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

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Keith Hill, Colin Ross, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Alison Brelsford voted for Paragraph (g) and against Paragraph (h) of the above amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

After a right of reply by Councillor Jayne Dunn, the original Motion was put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) is appalled that the Chancellor of the Exchequer in this Government has announced he is planning to make £10billion of further cuts to the welfare budget;
- (b) is concerned that the impacts will be felt greatly by hard working low income families, and that Northern cities including Sheffield will bear the brunt of the cuts, having huge detrimental impacts on local residents, the Council's services and the local economy with an estimate of £180 million less coming into the City's economy annually;
- (c) worries that the system is not fit for purpose, noting that analysis of the new system for the Joseph Rowntree Foundation, by the University of Portsmouth and the Centre for Social and Economic Inclusion, has raised serious concerns about the administration of Universal Credit and potential

outcomes and they believe that “while some would see improvements to their finances, the report concludes, not everyone will benefit and some could be worse off on universal benefit than under current arrangements...our research has found the actual roll-out could unintentionally trap people in poverty and hardship”;

- (d) is concerned that the proposal of Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, (the Rt. Hon. Iain Duncan Smith, MP) to only give child and work related benefits to the first two children is attacking poor low paid families in an attempt to paint welfare recipients as ‘takers’ who should have to “cut their cloth like everyone else”, and believes that the move is ill thought out and would only save £200million;
- (e) is worried that recipients of disability benefits are going to be worse off under Universal Credit, noting that £9billion has already been cut from the budget since this Government came to power with further cuts planned and many people will have to be reassessed and will find their benefits reduced, and that the Hardest Hit Campaign believes these further cuts will put disabled people at risk of poverty, debt and isolation;
- (f) is concerned that the bedroom tax is likely to affect approximately 6-7000 residents in Sheffield, and that many residents will have to leave family homes as they will be unable to pay the tax to stay put, and that this also puts a further strain on the Council as there is a shortage of housing in the City;
- (g) opposes the Government’s cuts to Council tax benefit which will see many families in Sheffield being hit with increased Council tax bills, putting a further strain on their finances at the same time as this Government are giving tax cuts to millionaires;
- (h) worries that the cumulative effect of welfare cuts is going to have a huge detrimental impact on the most vulnerable people in society and cause further poverty, force people into using debt and burden frontline services that are already being cut; and
- (i) urges this Government to wait a year before implementing Universal Credit and believes that there are too many questions that have yet to be answered and such significant changes to welfare should wait until they can be implemented properly.

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Keith Hill, Colin Ross, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Alison Brelsford voted for Paragraphs (d) and (f) and against Paragraphs (a) to (c), (e) and (g) to (i) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

12. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING CHILD POVERTY

It was moved by Councillor Nikki Sharpe, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that this Council:

- (a) is aware that there are approximately 3.6 million children living in poverty in the UK today and the Government is not doing enough to tackle the problem and proposed new legislation announced by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, (the Rt. Hon. Iain Duncan Smith MP) which limits benefits to two children threatens to make the situation much worse;
- (b) regrets that there are even more serious concentrations of child poverty at a local level: in 100 local wards, for example, between 50 and 70 per cent of children are growing up in poverty, 23% of children in Sheffield live in poverty, there are significant variations with numbers at 36% and 37% for Brightside and Central compared to just 5% in Hallam and 11% in Hillsborough;
- (c) believes that, despite Government rhetoric, work does not provide a guaranteed route out of poverty in the UK, noting that almost two-thirds (62 per cent) of children growing up in poverty live in a household where at least one family member works;
- (d) acknowledges that people are poor for many reasons, however, believes this Government's explanations which put poverty down to drug and alcohol dependency, family breakdown, poor parenting, or a culture of worklessness, are not supported by the facts;
- (e) also regrets that child poverty blights childhoods and has long lasting effects, noting that by age 16, children receiving free school meals achieve 1.7 grades lower at GCSE than their wealthier peers, and that leaving school with fewer qualifications translates into lower earnings over the course of working life;
- (f) is concerned that child poverty is also related to more complicated health histories over the course of a lifetime, again influencing earnings as well as the overall quality and indeed length of life, noting that professionals live, on average, eight years longer than unskilled workers;
- (g) is aware that child poverty imposes costs on broader society – estimated to be at least £25 billion a year, but believes that savings could be made if the Government tackles the problem now;
- (h) acknowledges that child poverty reduced dramatically between 1998/9-2010/11 when 1.1 million children were lifted out of poverty (before housing costs) and that this reduction is credited in large part to measures by the previous Government that increased the levels of lone parents working, as well as real and often significant increases in the level of benefits paid to families with children;
- (i) is concerned that according to the charity Child Poverty UK, under current

Government policies, child poverty is projected to rise from 2012/13 with an expected 300,000 more children living in poverty by 2015/16, and that this upward trend is expected to continue with 4.2 million children projected to be living in poverty by 2020;

- (j) is saddened that this Government has failed to acknowledge that what happens outside schools has a huge impact on children's ability to do well within them, noting that since the Coalition Government took office, out-of-school support for children has taken above-average cuts through the early intervention grant and local authority budget settlements, youth services have shrunk or disappeared, and financial support for low-income families has diminished, and that it is hardly surprising, then, that child poverty is projected to rise and frontline workers are under more pressure; and
- (k) urges this Government to tackle child poverty in the UK to give every child a fair and equal chance in life.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Rob Frost, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of all the words after the words "today" in paragraph (a);
2. the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (d) and (g) to (k) and the relettering of paragraphs (e) and (f) as new paragraphs (b) and (c); and
3. the addition of new paragraphs (d) to (g) as follows:-
 - (d) regrets the gap between the richest and the poorest rose during the thirteen years of the previous Government and that the previous Government failed to meet its target by hundreds of thousands of children;
 - (e) therefore welcomes the commitment within the Coalition Agreement to maintaining the goal of eradicating child poverty by 2020;
 - (f) notes that last year, according to current indicators, the number of children living in poverty in the UK actually fell by 300,000; and
 - (g) applauds the work of Liberal Democrats in Government to support children living in poverty, including:
 - (i) funding to provide 15 hours of free childcare per week to disadvantaged 2 year olds;
 - (ii) the pupil premium, which has seen £11.4 million invested into Sheffield schools this academic year, a figure which will continue to grow year-on-year;
 - (iii) the successful Summer Schools, and a further £100m to repeat the programme in 2013 and 2014; and

- (iv) an additional £50 million a year to provide extra tuition to 11-year-olds who are struggling with poor maths and reading skills.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negated.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) is aware that there are approximately 3.6 million children living in poverty in the UK today and the Government is not doing enough to tackle the problem and proposed new legislation announced by the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions, (the Rt. Hon. Iain Duncan Smith MP) which limits benefits to two children threatens to make the situation much worse;
- (b) regrets that there are even more serious concentrations of child poverty at a local level: in 100 local wards, for example, between 50 and 70 per cent of children are growing up in poverty, 23% of children in Sheffield live in poverty, there are significant variations with numbers at 36% and 37% for Brightside and Central compared to just 5% in Hallam and 11% in Hillsborough;
- (c) believes that, despite Government rhetoric, work does not provide a guaranteed route out of poverty in the UK, noting that almost two-thirds (62 per cent) of children growing up in poverty live in a household where at least one family member works;
- (d) acknowledges that people are poor for many reasons, however, believes this Government's explanations which put poverty down to drug and alcohol dependency, family breakdown, poor parenting, or a culture of worklessness, are not supported by the facts;
- (e) also regrets that child poverty blights childhoods and has long lasting effects, noting that by age 16, children receiving free school meals achieve 1.7 grades lower at GCSE than their wealthier peers, and that leaving school with fewer qualifications translates into lower earnings over the course of working life;
- (f) is concerned that child poverty is also related to more complicated health histories over the course of a lifetime, again influencing earnings as well as the overall quality and indeed length of life, noting that professionals live, on average, eight years longer than unskilled workers;
- (g) is aware that child poverty imposes costs on broader society – estimated to be at least £25 billion a year, but believes that savings could be made if the Government tackles the problem now;
- (h) acknowledges that child poverty reduced dramatically between 1998/9-

2010/11 when 1.1 million children were lifted out of poverty (before housing costs) and that this reduction is credited in large part to measures by the previous Government that increased the levels of lone parents working, as well as real and often significant increases in the level of benefits paid to families with children;

- (i) is concerned that according to the charity Child Poverty UK, under current Government policies, child poverty is projected to rise from 2012/13 with an expected 300,000 more children living in poverty by 2015/16, and that this upward trend is expected to continue with 4.2 million children projected to be living in poverty by 2020;
- (j) is saddened that this Government has failed to acknowledge that what happens outside schools has a huge impact on children's ability to do well within them, noting that since the Coalition Government took office, out-of-school support for children has taken above-average cuts through the early intervention grant and local authority budget settlements, youth services have shrunk or disappeared, and financial support for low-income families has diminished, and that it is hardly surprising, then, that child poverty is projected to rise and frontline workers are under more pressure; and
- (k) urges this Government to tackle child poverty in the UK to give every child a fair and equal chance in life.

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Keith Hill, Colin Ross, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Alison Brelsford voted for Paragraphs (b) and (e), (f), (g) and (k) and against Paragraphs (a), (c), (d), (h), (i) and (j) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

13. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING PARKS AND GREEN SPACES

It was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Diana Stimely, that this Council:-

- (a) reiterates its commitment to Sheffield's magnificent parks and green spaces, which have earned Sheffield a reputation as the greenest city in the country;
- (b) praises the work of the previous Council Administration in doubling the number of parks with Green Flag awards, securing more of the awards than any other authority in Yorkshire;
- (c) believes that despite financial constraints the maintenance of local parks and green spaces remains an important duty;
- (d) understands that as the Council faces its future, more innovative and cost-

effective methods of delivering services are required; and

- (e) therefore calls upon the Council to investigate new methods for delivering services in local parks, including partnership working with external organisations and greater collaboration with “Friends of Groups”.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Isobel Bowler, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraph (b) and the addition of a new paragraph (b) as follows:-
 - (b) praises the work of previous Administrations of both parties in increasing the number of parks with Green Flag awards, securing more of the awards than any other authority in Yorkshire, and welcomes the £150,000 additional investment in parks in the present Administration’s 2012/13 budget amendment demonstrating their commitment to parks and green spaces despite the unprecedented level of cuts from this Government.
2. the deletion of paragraph (e) and the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows:-
 - (e) notes that the Council is already working with external partners, finding new income streams, looking at new maintenance models and collaborating with Friends groups and other volunteers to maintain our green space despite the challenges of the cuts to the Council budget.

On being to the vote, the amendment was carried.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) reiterates its commitment to Sheffield’s magnificent parks and green spaces, which have earned Sheffield a reputation as the greenest city in the country;
- (b) praises the work of previous Administrations of both parties in increasing the number of parks with Green Flag awards, securing more of the awards than any other authority in Yorkshire, and welcomes the £150,000 additional investment in parks in the present Administration’s 2012/13 budget amendment demonstrating their commitment to parks and green spaces despite the unprecedented level of cuts from this Government;
- (c) believes that despite financial constraints the maintenance of local parks and green spaces remains an important duty;
- (d) understands that as the Council faces its future, more innovative and cost-

effective methods of delivering services are required; and

- (e) notes that the Council is already working with external partners, finding new income streams, looking at new maintenance models and collaborating with Friends groups and other volunteers to maintain our green space despite the challenges of the cuts to the Council budget

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Keith Hill, Colin Ross, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Alison Brelsford voted for Paragraphs (a) and (c), (d) and (e) and against Paragraph (b) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

14. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING ENERGY PRICES

It was moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Mick Rooney, that this Council:-

- (a) is concerned that the average energy bills are soaring, up by £200 in the last two years and this Conservative-led Government is out-of-touch, out-of-date and puts the interests of the big energy companies ahead of ordinary families and pensioners struggling with soaring energy bills;
- (b) believes that this is a big contributor to the cost of living crisis afflicting millions of families across the country, where many families, including in Sheffield, are having to choose whether to heat or eat;
- (c) is aware that the energy market is dominated by just six companies; in fact 99 per cent of households get their energy from one of the 'Big Six' who are all but one putting up their prices between 6-11% by the end of 2012;
- (d) understands that a lack of competition in the market means energy prices are higher than they might otherwise be, and notes that a recent report by the Institute for Public Policy Research suggests that with more competition in the market, bills could be as much as £70 less per year;
- (e) acknowledges that switching between energy suppliers reached its lowest ever level in the first quarter of 2012, and believes this is not because customers are happy with their energy providers, but rather because there has been a loss of faith in the energy market;
- (f) is not surprised that the Prime Minister's announcement that the Government would legislate to force energy companies to put customers on their lowest tariffs unravelled within hours, noting that even consumer groups argued that it was unworkable and would destroy what little competition there is in the energy market, forcing prices up not down and believes this is another u-turn by the Coalition Government who have proven that they do not think before they make announcements;

- (g) is disappointed that the Government's Draft Energy Bill has nothing to help families struggling to make ends meet and believes that their only answer so far has been to say that customers are to blame for not shopping around enough and, at the same time as energy bills are rocketing, the Government has cut back the support it is offering to help people heat their homes;
- (h) regrets that this Government is not prepared to stand up to powerful vested interests, noting that they have backed business-as-usual in the energy market and refused to challenge the practices, pricing and structure of the energy market, and the need for urgent reform;
- (i) believes that the Government should change course and make reforms that would benefit hard working families in the UK, and that they should open up the market to greater competition and transparency by following Labour's Real Energy Market Reform which:
 - (i) would force the energy companies to pool the power they generate and to make it available to any retailer, in an attempt to open the market and to put downward pressure on prices;
 - (ii) would abolish Ofgem and create a tough new energy watchdog with a statutory duty to monitor wholesale and retail energy prices, and the power to force energy suppliers to pass on price cuts when the cost of wholesale energy falls; and
 - (iii) would require energy companies to put all over-75s on their cheapest tariff, which could save as many as four million pensioners as much as £200 a year from their annual energy bills;
- (j) supports the Labour Party's Switch Together Scheme; and
- (k) welcomes that the current Administration is looking at options for a Council backed initiative on ways to support Sheffield residents to access cheaper energy tariffs through collective purchasing.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Alison Brelsford, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of all the words after the words "years" in paragraph (a);
2. the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (k) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (g) as follows:-
 - (b) therefore supports the action the Coalition Government is taking to tackle fuel poverty, including:
 - (i) reversing the previous Government's planned cut to Cold Weather Payments, which are targeted at the most vulnerable;

- (ii) reducing fuel bills for 2 million families by up to £130 through the Warm Home Discount; and
 - (iii) rolling out a 'smart meter' programme, which helps people save money and ensures energy companies meet demand more efficiently;
- (c) furthermore, understands that 13,000 homes in Sheffield are already benefiting from warmer homes and cheaper energy bills, thanks to the previous Administration's Free Insulation Scheme;
 - (d) keenly anticipates the Coalition's Government's Green Deal, secured by Liberal Democrats in Government and potentially the most ambitious insulation scheme in modern history;
 - (e) notes that part of the Green Deal will be specifically designed to provide 'Affordable Warmth' to low income vulnerable households;
 - (f) welcomes the decision to already grant Sheffield City Council £570,000 as part of the Green Deal scheme; and
 - (g) calls upon the Cabinet Member for Environment, Waste & Streetscene to bring a report to the Council's Cabinet detailing the Council's planned actions to support the Green Deal.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negated.

It was then moved by Councillor Jillian Creasy, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the addition of a new paragraph (a) as follows:-
 - (a) believes any long term solution to the related problems of energy security, rising prices and carbon reduction must prioritise investment in energy efficiency measures and renewable energy generation;
2. the relettering of original paragraphs (a) to (k) as new paragraphs (b) to (l);
3. the addition of a new paragraph (m) as follows:-
 - (m) requests the Cabinet to ring fence 50% of any financial benefit to the Council of such a scheme, to invest in energy efficiency and renewable energy generation.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negated.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) is concerned that the average energy bills are soaring, up by £200 in the last two years and this Conservative-led Government is out-of-touch, out-of-date and puts the interests of the big energy companies ahead of ordinary families and pensioners struggling with soaring energy bills;
- (b) believes that this is a big contributor to the cost of living crisis afflicting millions of families across the country, where many families, including in Sheffield, are having to choose whether to heat or eat;
- (c) is aware that the energy market is dominated by just six companies; in fact 99 per cent of households get their energy from one of the 'Big Six' who are all but one putting up their prices between 6-11% by the end of 2012;
- (d) understands that a lack of competition in the market means energy prices are higher than they might otherwise be, and notes that a recent report by the Institute for Public Policy Research suggests that with more competition in the market, bills could be as much as £70 less per year;
- (e) acknowledges that switching between energy suppliers reached its lowest ever level in the first quarter of 2012, and believes this is not because customers are happy with their energy providers, but rather because there has been a loss of faith in the energy market;
- (f) is not surprised that the Prime Minister's announcement that the Government would legislate to force energy companies to put customers on their lowest tariffs unravelled within hours, noting that even consumer groups argued that it was unworkable and would destroy what little competition there is in the energy market, forcing prices up not down and believes this is another u-turn by the Coalition Government who have proven that they do not think before they make announcements;
- (g) is disappointed that the Government's Draft Energy Bill has nothing to help families struggling to make ends meet and believes that their only answer so far has been to say that customers are to blame for not shopping around enough and, at the same time as energy bills are rocketing, the Government has cut back the support it is offering to help people heat their homes;
- (h) regrets that this Government is not prepared to stand up to powerful vested interests, noting that they have backed business-as-usual in the energy market and refused to challenge the practices, pricing and structure of the energy market, and the need for urgent reform;
- (i) believes that the Government should change course and make reforms that would benefit hard working families in the UK, and that they should open up the market to greater competition and transparency by following Labour's Real Energy Market Reform which:
 - (i) would force the energy companies to pool the power they generate

- and to make it available to any retailer, in an attempt to open the market and to put downward pressure on prices;
- (ii) would abolish Ofgem and create a tough new energy watchdog with a statutory duty to monitor wholesale and retail energy prices, and the power to force energy suppliers to pass on price cuts when the cost of wholesale energy falls; and
 - (iii) would require energy companies to put all over-75s on their cheapest tariff, which could save as many as four million pensioners as much as £200 a year from their annual energy bills;
- (j) supports the Labour Party's Switch Together Scheme; and
- (k) welcomes that the current Administration is looking at options for a Council backed initiative on ways to support Sheffield residents to access cheaper energy tariffs through collective purchasing.

(Note: 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Keith Hill, Colin Ross, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Alison Brelsford voted for Paragraphs (b) and (c), (d), (e) and (k); and against Paragraphs (a) and (f) to (j) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) to (f), (h) and (k); against Paragraphs (i) and (j) and abstained on Paragraph (g) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

15. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING SHEFFIELD EAGLES RLFC

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Peter Price, seconded by Councillor Mick Rooney, that this Council:-

- (a) congratulates the Sheffield Eagles on their magnificent victory over Featherstone Rovers in the Rugby League Championship Grand Final last month;
- (b) congratulates Mark Aston and his colleagues on their tireless efforts in rebuilding the new Eagles since 1999;
- (c) thanks the Sheffield Eagles for all the work done in promoting Sheffield nationally;
- (d) thanks the Sheffield Eagles for their rugby league development work done within Sheffield communities and particularly young people (boys and girls);
- (e) wishes them every success in their aim to attain Super League status; and

- | |
|---|
| (f) directs that copies of this resolution be sent to Mark Aston, the Chief Executive of the Sheffield Eagles and the Chief Executive of the Rugby Football League. |
|---|

(Note: At the request of Councillor Peter Price (the mover of the Motion) and with the consent of the Council, Paragraph (e) of the Motion, as included in the Summons, was amended by the replacement of the words “return to the” with the word “attain” and the addition, after the word “League”, of the word “status”.)

16. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING PLANNING LAW

It was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Sue Alston, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the recent announcement by the Prime Minister of a proposal to relax certain planning laws relating to housing for a three-year period;
- (b) notes that nearly 90% of all planning applications from householders are approved and believes the failure to proceed with housing developments is not a result of the current planning laws;
- (c) believes these proposals go against the principle of localism, will fail to protect local communities and fears the changes could lead to inappropriate developments, which will adversely impact communities in Sheffield;
- (d) recalls the motion agreed at the 2012 Liberal Democrat Conference, which set out opposition to these proposals;
- (e) echoes the sentiments of this motion and calls upon the Prime Minister to withdraw these proposals; and
- (f) directs that a copy of this motion is sent to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

- 1. the insertion between the words “Prime Minister” and “of a” in paragraph (a) of the words “and Deputy Prime Minister”;
- 2. the addition of the words “but the double dip recession caused by this Government’s disastrous economic policies” after the words at the end of paragraph (b);
- 3. the insertion between the words “Prime Minister” and “to withdraw” in paragraph (e) of the words “and Deputy Prime Minister”;
- 4. the addition of the words “Deputy Prime Minister” at the end of paragraph

(f).

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the recent announcement by the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister of a proposal to relax certain planning laws relating to housing for a three-year period;
- (b) notes that nearly 90% of all planning applications from householders are approved and believes the failure to proceed with housing developments is not a result of the current planning laws but the double dip recession caused by this Government's disastrous economic policies;
- (c) believes these proposals go against the principle of localism, will fail to protect local communities and fears the changes could lead to inappropriate developments, which will adversely impact communities in Sheffield;
- (d) recalls the motion agreed at the 2012 Liberal Democrat Conference, which set out opposition to these proposals;
- (e) echoes the sentiments of this motion and calls upon the Prime Minister and Deputy Prime Minister to withdraw these proposals; and
- (f) directs that a copy of this motion is sent to the Prime Minister, the Deputy Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government.

(Note: 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Keith Hill, Colin Ross, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Alison Brelsford voted for Paragraphs (a) and (c) to (f) and against Paragraph (b) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

17. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING IMMIGRATION

It was moved by Councillor Mohammad Maroof, seconded by Councillor Nikki Bond, that this Council:-

- (a) is concerned that changes to the immigration policy will be hugely detrimental to the multicultural vitality of Sheffield and the UK, and believes that changes to the minimum income threshold, right of appeal and student

immigration would cause damage to the culture and economy of our City;

- (b) disagrees with the decision of the Government to scrap the full right of appeal for more than 80,000 relatives of British families who are refused entry to visit them each year;
- (c) notes that from 9 July 2012, uncles, aunts, nephews, nieces and first cousins will no longer be considered to be family visitors for appeal purposes;
- (d) is further concerned about Government intentions to remove completely the right of appeal against family visitor visa refusal decisions through a clause in the Crime and Courts Bill (House of Lords Bill 4 of 2012-13);
- (e) is worried that if this Bill is passed in 2013, the family members (spouses, parents, siblings, children, grandparents, grandchildren, in-laws) will also lose the right of appeal;
- (f) recognises the importance of right of appeal: principles of equality, and respect for the rule of law demand an appropriate mechanism to check the actions of the entry clearance officers through scrutinising their findings, decisions and all of the relevant evidence upon which they are based, and that appropriate mechanism is a right of appeal;
- (g) opposes the proposal by the Home Secretary to impose a minimum income threshold of £27,500 to allow a British Citizen to bring their non European Union partner/spouse and family to settle in the U.K;
- (h) condemns the Liberal Democrats in Government for supporting the measures and doing a u-turn in their support of Article 12 of the Human Rights Act 'the right to marry and found a family' ;
- (i) supports the right of people to choose their life partner from anywhere in the world and believes these proposals, if implemented, would have a detrimental effect on the vitality of multicultural life in Sheffield;
- (j) views these proposals as a back door attempt by the Conservative party to bring back the Primary Purpose Rule which was abolished by the previous Government, thereby enabling families to be reunited who had been separated for more than 10 years by the rule;
- (k) supports the work of Paul Blomfield MP, in particular, his work on the Select Committee on Business Innovation and Skills towards taking students out of the net migration targets and reviewing the restrictive proposals on the new English test and the restrictive rules on post-study work, noting that overseas students contribute millions of pounds a year into the local economy and according to Professor Edward Acton (Vice-Chancellor of the University of East Anglia) the change could result in as many as 70% of these students being barred from entry to the U.K; and

- (l) resolves to write to the City's six MPs requesting that they write to the Home Secretary to raise the deep concerns of this Council and on behalf of the families living in our City, further requests the City's six MPs including Sheffield Hallam MP and Deputy Prime Minister, Nick Clegg, to oppose the Bill.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Denise Reaney, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the substitution of the following words therefor:-

- (a) recalls the view of the current Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition that the previous Government 'got it wrong' with regards to immigration policies;
- (b) notes that the current Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition reiterated this point in his Party Conference speech by claiming that the failure to take public concern over the issue seriously was one of the reasons the previous Government lost the 2010 general election;
- (c) deplores the previous Government's record on immigration, in that it took no action against the incarceration of thousands of children in immigration removal centres such as the infamous Yarl's Wood facility;
- (d) praises the successful efforts of Liberal Democrats in Government to end this barbaric and inhumane practice;
- (e) notes with concern proposals to remove the right of appeal against family visitor visa decisions and recalls Liberal Democrat support for the re-introduction of this right in 2000;
- (f) however, understands that it is much quicker and cheaper for applicants to re-submit a fresh application than launch an appeal, with the UK Border Agency processing 95% of visit visa applications within 15 working days; and
- (g) therefore, calls upon the Government to consider carefully the potential implications of this proposal during the passage of the Crime and Courts Bill.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) is concerned that changes to the immigration policy will be hugely detrimental to the multicultural vitality of Sheffield and the UK, and believes that changes to the minimum income threshold, right of appeal and student immigration would cause damage to the culture and economy of our City;

- (b) disagrees with the decision of the Government to scrap the full right of appeal for more than 80,000 relatives of British families who are refused entry to visit them each year;
- (c) notes that from 9 July 2012, uncles, aunts, nephews, nieces and first cousins will no longer be considered to be family visitors for appeal purposes;
- (d) is further concerned about Government intentions to remove completely the right of appeal against family visitor visa refusal decisions through a clause in the Crime and Courts Bill (House of Lords Bill 4 of 2012-13);
- (e) is worried that if this Bill is passed in 2013, the family members (spouses, parents, siblings, children, grandparents, grandchildren, in-laws) will also lose the right of appeal;
- (f) recognises the importance of right of appeal: principles of equality, and respect for the rule of law demand an appropriate mechanism to check the actions of the entry clearance officers through scrutinising their findings, decisions and all of the relevant evidence upon which they are based, and that appropriate mechanism is a right of appeal;
- (g) opposes the proposal by the Home Secretary to impose a minimum income threshold of £27,500 to allow a British Citizen to bring their non European Union partner/spouse and family to settle in the U.K;
- (h) condemns the Liberal Democrats in Government for supporting the measures and doing a u-turn in their support of Article 12 of the Human Rights Act 'the right to marry and found a family' ;
- (i) supports the right of people to choose their life partner from anywhere in the world and believes these proposals, if implemented, would have a detrimental effect on the vitality of multicultural life in Sheffield;
- (j) views these proposals as a back door attempt by the Conservative party to bring back the Primary Purpose Rule which was abolished by the previous Government, thereby enabling families to be reunited who had been separated for more than 10 years by the rule;
- (k) supports the work of Paul Blomfield MP, in particular, his work on the Select Committee on Business Innovation and Skills towards taking students out of the net migration targets and reviewing the restrictive proposals on the new English test and the restrictive rules on post-study work, noting that overseas students contribute millions of pounds a year into the local economy and according to Professor Edward Acton (Vice-Chancellor of the University of East Anglia) the change could result in as many as 70% of these students being barred from entry to the U.K; and
- (l) resolves to write to the City's six MPs requesting that they write to the Home Secretary to raise the deep concerns of this Council and on behalf of

the families living in our City, further requests the City's six MPs including Sheffield Hallam MP and Deputy Prime Minister, Nick Clegg, to oppose the Bill.

(Note: Councillors Denise Fox and Terry Fox, having declared a pecuniary interest in the above item of business, took no part in any discussion or voting thereon.)

18. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING ACCESS TO EDUCATION

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs, seconded by Councillor Ibrar Hussain, that this Council:-

- (a) is dismayed by the recent unjust and vicious attack on Malala Yousafzai, a 14 year old girl who has campaigned for education for girls in Pakistan;
- (b) is pleased to hear that Malala is making progress while being treated at Queen Elizabeth's and Birmingham Children's Hospital, Birmingham;
- (c) joins the international community in condemning this attack and stands shoulder to shoulder with Pakistan in its fight against terrorism;
- (d) is aware that 32 million girls worldwide do not have access to education;
- (e) calls on the international community and Pakistan to ensure that every girl like Malala has the chance to go to school;
- (f) supports Gordon Brown, UN Special Envoy for Global Education, in his calling for action on the second millennium goal for universal primary education; and
- (g) believes that by declaring 10 November - one month after the attempted assassination - "Malala and the 32 million girls day", we can start to make Malala's dream come true.

19. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING RECYCLING

It was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the recent YouGov survey commissioned by the Resource Association, which demonstrated that 73 per cent of adults did not know where the waste ended up, with 68 per cent saying they would like more information;
- (b) therefore supports the Resource Association's End Destination of Recycling Charter, which encourages local authorities and companies to publish an annual register of the end point to its recyclables;

- (c) welcomes the hard work of Rebecca Taylor MEP to promote the Charter across Yorkshire and The Humber; and
- (d) calls upon the Council to sign up to the Charter with immediate effect.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Ibrar Hussain, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the substitution of the following words therefor:-

- (a) is committed to supporting Sheffielders to recycle and therefore deplors the record of the previous Administration who increased recycling by less than 2.5% between 2008 and 2011 and believes this is just another example of their three wasted years;
- (b) notes that these poor recycling levels under the previous Administration are despite spending an additional £2 million on recycling services which was made possible due to the investment in local public services by the previous Government;
- (c) believes that the incompetence of the previous Administration contributed to this failure to significantly improve recycling rates, which is demonstrated by ill-thought through initiatives which clearly made it harder for Sheffielders to recycle, such as the blue boxes for paper and card, a decision made when the present Leader of the Main Opposition Group was the Cabinet Member for waste management between 2008-2010;
- (d) welcomes the present Administration's campaign to improve recycling in Sheffield whilst moving to Alternate Week Collections with measures such as the roll out of flexible choice for blue bins and boxes, increasing staffing in the Veolia call centre and the work of the liaison team to support Sheffield people to use the full range of facilities available;
- (e) welcomes recent reductions in the amount of waste sent to landfill and acknowledges that this is now at a record low under the present Administration; and
- (f) will therefore continue to take real action to support Sheffielders to recycle instead of taking the approach of the previous Administration and main opposition group pledging to transform recycling rates but failing to do so and believes that the Liberal Democrat Party both locally and nationally has an ever increasing reputation for breaking pledges across a range of policy areas.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) is committed to supporting Sheffielders to recycle and therefore deplores the record of the previous Administration who increased recycling by less than 2.5% between 2008 and 2011 and believes this is just another example of their three wasted years;
- (b) notes that these poor recycling levels under the previous Administration are despite spending an additional £2 million on recycling services which was made possible due to the investment in local public services by the previous Government;
- (c) believes that the incompetence of the previous Administration contributed to this failure to significantly improve recycling rates, which is demonstrated by ill-thought through initiatives which clearly made it harder for Sheffielders to recycle, such as the blue boxes for paper and card, a decision made when the present Leader of the Main Opposition Group was the Cabinet Member for waste management between 2008-2010;
- (d) welcomes the present Administration's campaign to improve recycling in Sheffield whilst moving to Alternate Week Collections with measures such as the roll out of flexible choice for blue bins and boxes, increasing staffing in the Veolia call centre and the work of the liaison team to support Sheffield people to use the full range of facilities available;
- (e) welcomes recent reductions in the amount of waste sent to landfill and acknowledges that this is now at a record low under the present Administration; and
- (f) will therefore continue to take real action to support Sheffielders to recycle instead of taking the approach of the previous Administration and main opposition group pledging to transform recycling rates but failing to do so and believes that the Liberal Democrat Party both locally and nationally has an ever increasing reputation for breaking pledges across a range of policy areas.

20. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING BLACKLISTING

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Nikki Sharpe, seconded by Councillor Chris Weldon, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that a number of construction companies have been challenged about supporting the existence of and subscribing to construction industry 'blacklists';
- (b) believes that blacklisting is an unacceptable practice and cannot be condoned, and notes that the GMB union is leading a national campaign aimed at forcing those who have been involved in blacklisting to apologise to those who have been affected by it;

- (c) notes that it is understood that the construction industry blacklist was collated by the Consulting Association (a private consultancy) and was then provided at a cost to construction companies as they sought to recruit/avoid new workers;
- (d) notes that the Information Commissioner has investigated and taken action against the Consulting Association for this practice and the Information Commissioner has taken enforcement action against a number of construction companies based on the evidence recovered from the Consulting Association;
- (e) further notes that owing to the concentration of construction activity in and around large cities, many of those alleged to have been discriminated against live in the country's major cities; and
- (f) resolves to support the GMB campaign.