

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 2 October 2013, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Vickie Priestley)
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Peter Rippon)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> 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 Anders Hanson Qurban Hussain
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> Sheila 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 Cliff Woodcraft	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> David Baker Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley
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> Richard Crowther Philip Wood
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Geoff Smith	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Janet Bragg Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond	26	<i>Walkey Ward</i> Ben Curran Neale Gibson Nikki Sharpe
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> Trevor Bagshaw 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 Alison Brelsford, Rob Frost, Keith Hill and John Robson.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bryan Lodge declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in Notice of Motion numbered 12 on the Summons for the Council meeting (relating to City Centre Events) because he owns a business in the City Centre.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

The minutes of the meeting of the City Council held on 4th September 2013 were approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Communications

Rugby League Championship

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) congratulated Sheffield Eagles on retaining their Championship title, with a victory in the Grand Final on 29th September.

4.2 Petitions

(a) Petition Regarding the Demolition of Don Valley Stadium

The Council received an electronic petition containing 620 signatures and requesting the Council to stop the proposed demolition of Don Valley Stadium and to look at alternative uses for the Stadium.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Rob Creasey. He explained that he was a community sports coach in Sheffield and had worked with schools and Sheffield International Venues as well as being a user of Don Valley Stadium. He stated that the Friends of Don Valley Stadium were campaigning to develop the stadium as a community asset and widen its use for sport and the performing arts.

He stated that people had been shocked at the announcement of the stadium's closure as the stadium was the second best such facility in the country, after the Olympics stadium in London. Users of the stadium discussed how to put together a plan to enable its use for sport, recreation and schools and community use by utilising the Localism Act and nominating the stadium as a community asset. A feasibility and business plan would need to be developed.

The nomination to register the Stadium as a community asset was made in July. It was turned down, at the last moment, and the response suggested that the O2 Arena in London was an alternative similar venue for people in Sheffield. The campaign group were seeking legal advice in relation to the application.

Rob Creasey stated that the campaign would welcome the Council's support in putting any progress toward demolition on hold and give people in the community time to work up proposals. He referred to the Tour de France in 2014 and that it would be a good opportunity for it to finish outside the stadium. He also reminded Councillors that they were elected to serve their constituents.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Isobel Bowler, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure. Councillor Bowler stated that she could not address the application to register the stadium as an asset of community value as it was subject to a legal challenge and it would be wrong for her to say anything in relation to this aspect.

Investment was being made in Woodbourn Road Stadium, with the support of Sport England and England Athletics and the stadium would be used as a training facility and had the support of both Sheffield Harriers and the City of Sheffield Athletics Club. At Woodbourn Road, athletics would be the priority. The facility was to be managed and maintained by Sheffield Hallam University and would open from Sunday 6 October.

Councillor Bowler stated that consultation relating to Don Valley Stadium had begun some 10 months ago. In August, she had asked the Director of Culture and Environment to meet with those members of the community who were developing a business plan and three meetings had taken place and information had been shared including profit and loss accounts. Don Valley Stadium had made a 700k deficit although it was accepted that costs might be reduced if the facility was community run.

£1 million of essential works were required at Don Valley and the costs of moth-balling, including insurance and security were significant and estimated to be 150K for a six month period and such expenditure would impact elsewhere on the Council's budget.

Councillor Bowler said that she did admire the passion and enthusiasm which the members of the community and users of Don Valley stadium had shown. However, she believed that outdoor athletics had a home at Woodbourn Road. She also noted that the City was close to finding a new home for the Sheffield Eagles. She stated that she was optimistic about the future of athletics in Sheffield and the City's status as a City of sport.

(b) Petition Objecting to Anti-Social Behaviour in the Midland Street/Charlotte Road Area

The Council received a petition containing 21 signatures objecting to anti-social behaviour in the Midland Street/Charlotte Road area.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by a member of the public, who stated that residents living on the street needed help. Over the past three years, there had been a series of break-ins and incidents relating to alcohol, litter and drug taking. They asked for the Council's help to move the family who were allegedly causing the problems referred to and which, they stated, would be the best thing for the area.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Harry Harpham, the Deputy Leader and Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods. Councillor Harpham said that the conditions which had been described were unacceptable and that people should not be expected to live in such conditions. On receipt of the petition, he stated that he had contacted both the anti-social behaviour team and South Yorkshire Police, who had both responded that they had no record of complaints from residents of Midland Street and Charlotte Road about these issues.

Councillor Harpham stated that, so that he could help, he would ask for the lead petitioner's contact details with a view to visiting residents and seeing for himself the conditions which had been described so that the matters now raised could be dealt with.

(c) Petition Complaining of Litter on the Streets Around Longley Sixth Form College

The Council received a petition containing 79 signatures complaining of litter on the streets around Longley Sixth Form College.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene.

(d) Petition Requesting that Glover Road be Made One-Way

The Council received a petition containing 105 signatures, requesting that Glover Road be made one-way.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Maxine Walton who stated that the petition requested the alteration of Glover Road into a one-way system from Mickley Lane to the traffic lights. She pointed to the dangers presented by speeding traffic from Mickley Lane and the need for vehicles to mount the pavement, to enable traffic from the opposite direction to pass and the fact that the pavement was only constructed on one side of the road, which presented a danger to pedestrians. She stated that Glover Road was a rat run.

Recently, the road had been closed at the Mickley Lane end and vehicles had driven down it and made illegal u-turns onto Baslow Road. There had also been near accidents on the pelican crossing. A recent traffic count recorded 200 vehicles in 20 minutes.

She suggested that speed humps would not be solution to the problem of speeding vehicles as cars would simply speed up in between them. The

petitioners' suggested solution was to install cameras on the existing lights to identify vehicles which were speeding or in relation to other traffic violations. The cost of such a scheme could be funded by income from fines.

Local people were concerned that there could be an injury or possibly a death due to the dangers presented by traffic on Glover Road and the Council was requested to please make the Road safe for everyone.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development. Councillor Bramall thanked the petitioners for bringing the matter to the Council and he stated that the petition was the first representation that had been made in relation to the issues raised. He informed the petitioners that the Council did receive a considerable number of requests for such highways schemes. Each request was assessed and scored and a priority list was produced when the Streets Ahead scheme went into an area, and an assessment was carried out with local ward councillors. The issue would now be put into the process.

(e) Petition Requesting Speed Reduction Measures on Albert Road

The Council received a petition containing 69 signatures requesting speed reduction measures on Albert Road.

Representations of behalf of the petitioners were made by Keith Wrigley who stated that he was speaking on behalf of the local residents. The traffic had become a worse problem during the past 10 years in which he had lived on Albert Road, which had previously been a rat run to Chesterfield Road. Speed humps were introduced but motorists had subsequently complained that these were too high, causing the bottom of car exhausts to scrape over them and the height of the humps was lowered and some of them were almost flat. This enabled vehicles to travel at speed once more, especially in the stretches of road in between speed humps.

A dog had recently been run over and other pets had been killed on Albert Road and there was increasing concern over the safety of children. Some residents' parked vehicles had also become damaged. The petition requested the implementation of a 20mph speed limit, although this would need to be enforced.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development. Councillor Bramall stated that the Streets Ahead programme was due to be in the area covering Albert Road in 2014 and this programme would renew existing highways infrastructure and there may be an opportunity to look at the size and orientation of speed humps on Albert Road.

In relation to 20 mph speed limits, there had been cuts to the available funding. However, the Council was introducing 20 mph zones in 7 areas. Schemes were based on the relevant criteria and assessment. In the longer term, he stated 20 mph zones would be rolled out to all suitable residential areas.

(f) Petition Objecting to the Proposed Withdrawal of Children's Centre

Prevention Services

The Council received a petition containing 209 signatures and objecting to the proposed withdrawal of Children's Centre Prevention Services.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Colin Walker, who was a member of a Dad's support group which was held at Sharrow Surestart Centre. He stated that people had been informed that the Dad's support group would cease as there was no-one to run the service, unless this could be done on a voluntary basis. More widely, preventative services were closing down across Sheffield.

He stated that the tender process and the way in which the service had been divided prevented certain organisations from being able to bid to run services. A professional support service with expertise was required to support groups, including groups for disabled children and first time mums. Volunteers also needed support and in the long term their use was not sustainable, compared to a professional support service. He pointed to the need to ensure the safeguarding and health and safety of children and young people. He also believed that the consultation which had been undertaken only days before the closure of his group did not constitute proper consultation.

The closing of prevention services would have long term impacts for the support of children and young people. Prevention services that were deployed early minimised the help required by families in the longer term and were better than having to use intervention services.

The prevention services were already budgeted for and it was not acceptable to say that no one could be found to run services. The petition asked the Council to take emergency action in relation to this matter.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families. Councillor Drayton stated that she appreciated the petitioners submitting the petition to Council and said that the issues raised were very important. She reminded the petitioners that the Council had had budget cuts of over £230m over the last 3 years and that on top of that, Children, Young People and Families had a further cut of £6.8m. She added that a £3.5m cut had to be found in Early Years and that it was not possible to take that much out of a budget and it not make a difference.

As the Council had 3 contracts that were coming to an end, in Early Years it was decided to review those contracts and to make savings from management, administration and premises costs and to retender new contracts for intervention services and also prevention services across the City. The Council had protected services wherever possible and had specifically targeted the deployment of early intervention services and those services to the most vulnerable children and families. These included health, parenting, breastfeeding support and debt advice.

Following the contracts coming to an end and the tender process, unfortunately the winning providers refused the contracts they had put in for and were offered.

Therefore, the Council had to review the tender contract and service specification. This meant the Groups who had a worker supporting them would not have one in the future. Officers had gone to speak with all the groups that would be affected, to explain the circumstances and to ask whether anyone would wish to volunteer to help keep the groups going. The Officers also stated the groups could continue to meet in the Centres and there would still be other services going on. Councillor Drayton stated that she believed that there had been an offer from a volunteer at Sharrow, although from the information given in the petition, it seemed that the position had changed.

Councillor Drayton stressed that Children's Centres were still open, although the Council unfortunately could not provide workers to support groups, such as the Dad's group at Sharrow. However, they were doing everything they could to ensure the most vulnerable children and families were being protected and that groups were enabled to continue with the help of parent/carer volunteers if they wanted to.

4.3 Public Questions

(a) Public Questions concerning prevention services for children, young people and families

Hilda Muleahy stated that, according to the initial tender, the Council was budgeting to run prevention services until April 2014 and she referred to the crucial role of such services in child protection. She asked why the service was being cut now, rather than being brought in-house?

Linda Edwards stated that in carrying out the re-design of early years services, the Council had said that financial savings would be made and quality would improve. Since then, the Council had been taken through a Judicial Review process and the Court had said that the case should be heard in relation to people's voices being heard. She stated that people were being affected by the changes to early years provision and asked how the Council was planning to meet its statutory duties to provide information, early health advice and support at outreach sites now that workers in preventative services had been withdrawn.

Linda Edwards also referred to the lot 1 (prevention services) tender and asked how the Council was to amend and placate people regarding TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment)) information and she stated that it was illegal to have volunteers running services, which people had been employed to do.

In relation to prevention services, she stated that only 4 of the 9 available contracts were agreed and asked what criteria were used in relation to a failed contract or tender that led to the conclusion that led to the withdrawal of the service. She stated that lot 2 (intervention) services were moving to the MAST (Multi-Agency Support Teams) and asked what savings had been made in relation to lot 2 and whether existing family support workers would be subject to TUPE as they were being taken in – house. She indicated that a more detailed response in writing would be acceptable.

Sarah Wealthall asked what has happened to the money allocated for prevention services and why staff in prevention services were not subject to TUPE in the same way as those in intervention services. She stated the families need both prevention and intervention services.

Chrissy Meleady stated that she had previously raised the issue of bullying and intimidation at Sheffield Children's Centre. She said that people had been evicted from the premises in relation to money which they did not owe, heating had been turned off and people using the Centre were subject to other examples of victimisation. People were also redirected to other grade 3 private provision and she stated that she had a Council document which referred children in Sharrow to another area. She asked why has the victimisation and intimidation continued at Sheffield Children's Centre and other children's centres.

She stated that 100 mothers had come forward as volunteers in partnership with the Council. She asked why the Council was carrying through the policies of the Government, which she stated was destroying people's lives.

Joy French stated that she worked as a volunteer in a faith organisation and previously worked in CAMHS (Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services). She stated that there was evidence which says that preventative work with families with young children develops attachment and attunement. Cuts in such services inevitably leads to increased problems in other areas and costs in relation to education, social care, the criminal justice system and health services. She asked is this not short sighted economic planning?

Carl Birkinshaw, stated that he was a member of the Sharrow Dad's group and asked why money had been wasted in putting a service out to tender and was concerned that as part of the process, the service had been broken up into 6 pieces. He asked how is the consultation being done and what communication was being done in relation to the results of the tender process.

Javier Heinendez asked what the Council's plans were for Sharrow Surestart Centre, referring to it as a place where children can play and families receive support.

A question was asked by Matt concerning the cost of the tender process and asking how much it would cost to keep the Sharrow Dad's group running.

A question was asked on behalf of Karen as to what will happen next year when free early learning places for 2 year olds are introduced more widely and nurseries and early years' services have closed?

Theo Stamose stated that the Sharrow Surestart Dad's group was presented with a paper on 21 September, stating that the provision of prevention services commissioned by the Council would cease. However, on 30 September a briefing paper was seen which stated that the activities at the Sharrow Surestart Centre were not closing. He asked which of these was true.

Sally Pearse stated that her organisation had bid for one of the early years' services which was subject to a tender process. She referred to the limited timescales and to the fact that as part of the process, a consortium was set up and the bid put forward. Having been successful in the bid, they had found that there were additional liabilities relating to TUPE. She asked who approved, what she believed was a deeply flawed tender process which was liable to fail and who was responsible for the gaps in due diligence. What was happening to the £375K which was allocated to prevention services and to the early intervention funding of £81K.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, Councillor Jackie Drayton, responded by thanking people for their passion and commitment to early years, which was needed, especially at this particular time.

Councillor Drayton stated that in reference to the Dad's group at Sharrow, at the time when an officer had gone to speak with members of the group, an individual had been keen to volunteer to support the group in future, although from the information given in the petition, the position had changed.

The Sharrow Children's Centre would remain open and would continue to provide services including health and breastfeeding services. The Dad's group would be welcome to continue to meet at the Children's Centre.

She stated that she agreed with the points which had been raised concerning attainment and attunement, which were vital and reflected in the Council's commitment to protect intervention services. The Council was working with the voluntary sector on a Lottery bid, which it was hoped would result in significant funding for early years provision over a period of 10 years.

Councillor Drayton stated that in relation to any allegations of victimisation relating to Children's Centres, she would request that the specific details, including who was involved and where and when the incident occurred, were provided to her to follow up. She also stated that she wanted to reassure members of the public that the Council always took any allegation seriously and any incident would be investigated thoroughly by the legal team and possibly handed on to the police.

Councillor Drayton confirmed that the Council would continue to meet its statutory responsibilities together with its partners in the health service. The Council are currently in the process of making arrangements to transfer those existing intervention staff, who are currently employed by the NHS, Action for Children and Family Action and who wish to transfer into Sheffield City Council, under the TUPE agreement.

Councillor Drayton reassured the questioner that the tender was carefully written and it was clear in the documents and information that went out that there were TUPE implications for the contract and it was also an issue which was mentioned to bidders to be sure they understood the issues. Services were put out to tender and bidders submitted their applications. The applications were scored and three providers were informed that they had won a contract. Three of the successful bidders refused the contract. The bidders who had come in second place were

then asked whether they wished to take the contracts and they also refused. One provider had accepted and was awarded the contract.

Councillor Drayton stated that she would investigate the process relating to the tenders for services. She added that the funding which the Council received for free early learning was exactly what the Council had lost in relation to funding previously made available for early years provision.

Councillor Drayton stated that she would write to those people who had asked for a written response to questions.

(b) Public Question concerning Taxi Operating Licences

Jen Dunstan asked a question concerning operating licences for taxi operators and drivers. She stated that in a particular case, drivers had been expected work under the company's umbrella operator's licence. She asked what the Council was going to do about this situation.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure, Councillor Isobel Bowler, stated that she would refer the question to the Council's Head of Licensing to investigate.

(c) Public Question concerning Budget Cuts

Gareth Lane stated that he welcomed the fact that Councillor Julie Dore had committed to support the anti-austerity campaign. He said that a demonstration against austerity was to be held in Sheffield on 8th November 2013, organised by the People's Assembly. He asked if Councillor Dore and the Council would support the demonstration.

In response, Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council stated that she believed that the Government's austerity programme was unnecessary in terms of the speed at which it was being implemented and the particular places and people it affected. There was a disproportionate effect on people and places in the north of the country and on the most vulnerable people.

Councillor Dore stated that people have a right to hold a demonstration in a free society, even if others did not agree with their cause. If people wished to hold a demonstration they should abide by the relevant legislation. She asked that, if the organisers wanted specific actions to be taken by the Council in relation to the planned demonstration, they should make a request to the Council.

(d) Public question concerning Zero Hours Contracts

Jackson Baines asked if the Council used zero hours contracts and where and what steps were taken to combat the use of such contracts and get fair conditions for people?

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, Councillor Bryan Lodge, responded that the Council did use zero hours contracts following negotiation with

the trades unions. He stated that there was ambiguity and misinterpretation in relation to zero hours contracts. Employees with zero hours contracts had terms and conditions which were in line with those for other full time employees.

For services which were provided by other parties, the Council expected employers to behave in a certain way and there were expectations in tenders for Council services in relation to terms and conditions. The Council worked with trades unions in this regard.

The Council did not approve of circumstances where some private businesses exploited the use of zero hours contracts.

(e) Public Question concerning Don Valley Stadium

Tim Appleyard stated, in relation to the process for registering the Don Valley Stadium as a community asset, it had been difficult to obtain information concerning the full three year figures. He also stated that it was felt that the facility had been run down over the past 3 years. A Freedom of Information request would be submitted to obtain all of the information that was required. He made reference to reports on land licences prior to Don Valley Stadium being closed. He asked the cost of demolishing the Stadium and asked whether it would be better to save the building.

Councillor Isobel Bowler, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure, said that she was sorry that it was felt that the Council had not provided enough information. She stated that the costs relating to Don Valley Stadium were available on the Council's website. The cost of closing Don Valley Stadium and opening the Woodbourn Road Stadium were £486k. The cost to demolish the Don Valley Stadium had been estimated by surveyors and was included in the Council's consideration of this issue. However, the demolition work was subject to commercial procurement and she was not able to share those estimated costs at the present time. There was a need for significant capital expenditure on the Don Valley Stadium, although main issue was the continuing revenue costs and the fact that facilities for athletics in the City could be provided at Woodbourn Road.

Councillor Bowler stated that if Mr Appleyard wanted more information, she would do everything that she could to make sure that it was made available.

(f) Public question concerning Care Providers' Pay

The following question was asked on behalf of Jen Dunstan:

Why was a care provider in Sheffield not paying their base-rate staff the minimum wage and as the commissioner of their services, the City Council should ensure that this matter was rectified.

The Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, Councillor Mary Lea, responded that the Council had contracts with a number of independent sector providers and the Council took seriously its duty of care to people that it cared for. She said that she would discuss the matter with Council officers and

would contact the questioner with a response.

(g) Public question concerning Support for Hard Working People

Jack Hetherington asked what the Council is doing for hard working people. He referred to the industrial action by teachers on 1st October and asked what the Council was doing to support people and when was the Council going to start standing up to the Government and doing something in relation to the cuts.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, responded that the Government was imposing hardship, particularly on the people of Sheffield.

(h) Public questions concerning the Library Service

David Kirkham asked questions which he directed to the Chief Executive of the Council. He referred to comments attributed to John Mothersole in the Local Government News concerning the library service and asked why he had made the comments. He expressed concern that there was a suggestion that a fourth-rate service would be implemented. He asked whether the Chief Executive believed that the use of volunteers to manage library services was the appropriate way forward and stated that this would allow the Council to abrogate accountability and responsibility for services.

Patrick Black referred to the proposed cuts to the library service, including the closing of up to 15 libraries, loss of 75 jobs and ceasing the mobile library service. He asked where the cuts would end and referred to the Council's role in implementing the austerity cuts.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, responded that people should not necessarily believe everything that they read in the papers

The Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion, Councillor Mazher Iqbal, responded in relation to the Local Government News article that one element of what was said had been quoted. He stated that the Council did not set the national budget. The Council and other cities in the north of the country was facing disproportionate and unfair cuts to its funding and in the next two years the Council had to find additional savings of £80 million.

Councillor Iqbal stated that the Council was carrying out consultation concerning the library service and no decisions had been made at this time. He had spoken with groups at Topley, Stannington, Newfield and Woodhouse and 30 organisations had said that they wished to work with the Council to retain library services.

(i) Public Questions concerning the 'Bedroom Tax'

Oliver Clayton stated that the Council had pledged to protect residents with regards to the effects of the 'Bedroom tax' and he asked, in this context, what constitutes engagement with the Council?

A question was asked on behalf of Jen Dunstan as follows: why is the Council stoic in implementing the Bedroom tax when it has been admitted that the measure is running at a deficit?

The Deputy Leader of the Council and the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, Councillor Harry Harpham, responded by referring to the Labour Party's statement at its party conference that it would scrap the Bedroom Tax and introduce measures relating to energy prices. Councillor Harpham contrasted this with the priorities of the party conferences of the other Political Parties.

Central Government policy meant that people would not be paid Housing Benefit to cover the cost of their rent if their home had what were considered to be spare bedrooms.

The Council had engaged with people who would be affected by the Bedroom tax by visiting them and speaking with them about a range of issues including budgeting and access to advice such as from Citizens Advice. The Council had also put in place a debt advice worker to advise tenants who were at risk of being in rent arrears and to help them access finance through the Credit Union.

Councillor Harpham stated that, if the Council had undertaken all of that activity with a tenant and the tenant refused to engage in the process, only then would the Council have to take other action which was open to it.

(j) Public Question concerning the nature of 'a question'

Nigel Slack asked "What's in a question?"

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, responded that she would need the question's background or context. The answer to a question depended upon the question, the individual and why they were asking it and the nature of the response they would want to receive.

(k) Public Question concerning the Sustainable Communities Act

Nigel Slack asked why do the Council's amendments to item 14 (on the Council Summons) concerning the Sustainable Communities Act, display an apparent disregard for allowing the community the opportunity to come up with ideas and a bias towards big business and the national retail companies, rather than local small businesses with the added benefits they bring to the table?

The Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, Councillor Leigh Bramall, stated that the Council was asked to look at the supermarket levy, which would apply to all retailers over a certain size, which would include retailers such as WH Smith, Marks and Spencer, Primark and John Lewis. The development of the City Centre was a crucial aspect of the future prosperity of Sheffield and it was the Council's responsibility to help to grow the economy. Many new small businesses had been introduced at Chapel Walk, for example, and it was important to support small businesses in the City Centre.

It was not felt that the proposed levy on supermarkets would be beneficial to the City. Business Rates were paid to the Government and Sheffield was a net beneficiary of the income from business Rates because of its specific needs and the City was therefore reliant on Business Rates. It was a crucial policy to bring about growth in the Business Rate base. The proposed levy would be most likely to damage such an increase in the Business Rate base and, in turn, the ability to fund basic Council services.

(l) Public Questions concerning Freedom of Information Act

Martin Brighton stated that it has been brought to the attention of the Council before, that costs for failing to comply with the Freedom of Information Act are racking up at the expense of the taxpayer. However, he stated, since last month, there have been further serious failures. Mr Brighton asked:

- (1) Doesn't the Leader care; and
- (2) When will officers and elected Members be held to account

Mr Brighton stated that an offending elected Member blames this citizen for the costs incurred that force the Council to disclose information that the law says should have been made publicly available and asked:

- (3) Does the Leader agree with this kind of character slur?

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, responded and stated that she was not aware of Freedom of Information requests where costs are 'racking up' and asked Mr Brighton to let her have the details. She stated that she did care about the expenditure of the Council as the Council had so little money.

(m) Public Question concerning Keeping Promises

Mr Brighton stated that at Cabinet, the Leader agreed that elected Members can be expected to keep their promises, yet an elected Member continues to flout her leadership. He stated that the information has already been provided. He asked, was this citizen just being patronised?

In response, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, stated that she expected elected Members to keep promises, this was not patronising where it was a genuine promise.

(n) Public Question concerning prejudice

Mr Brighton stated that, at Cabinet, the Leader made it clear that the principle of innocent until proven guilty applies, yet is doing nothing about an elected Member who supports sanction on prejudice admittedly, and [he quoted] "on the basis of no evidence". He asked what message does this send across the nation.

In response, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, stated that she believed in the principle of innocent until proven guilty.

(o) Public Questions concerning Criminal Record Bureau (CRB) checks

Mr Brighton stated that many in this Chamber will recall 5 November 2008, when this citizen was vilified by a previous Leader, for simply claiming that there were no CRB checks in place for Council-sponsored activity. Events have since shown this citizen to have been correct all along. He stated that meanwhile, it has been published how in 2006, a regional Tory leader was invited to an RMBC meeting and asked to keep quiet about child abuse. The errant senior manager came to Sheffield City Council shortly afterwards, prompting the questions of 2008.

Mr Brighton asked the following questions:

- (1) What does this say about this Council's application of due diligence; and
- (2) When will this Council genuinely listen?

In response, the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, stated that the particular case concerning Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council was the subject of an inquiry and she could not comment on the case, which was of a serious nature.

(p) Public Question concerning review of Answers to Previous Questions

Mr Brighton stated that, at last month's full Council, the Leader answered questions from this citizen and was asked in writing to review those answers. He stated that no review has taken place. He asked, given his first question above, what example does this set for the Council.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore responded that in respect of the answers that she gave at the last Council meeting, she had just answered the questions again.

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 Boards, etc:-

Economic and Environmental - Councillor Keith Hill to replace Councillor Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Joe Otten
Development Committee

Locality Working – Lead Ward Councillors:-

Arbourthorne - Councillor Jack Scott to replace Councillor John Robson

Graves Park - Councillor Denise Reaney to replace Councillor Ian Auckland

(b) representatives be appointed to other bodies as follows:-

Seven Hills Leisure Trust - Councillor Neale Gibson to replace Councillor David Barker

South Yorkshire Police and - Councillor Nikki Sharpe to replace Crime Panel Councillor Helen Mirfin-Boukouris

(c) it be noted that, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its Annual Meeting held on 15th May 2013, the Chief Executive had authorised the appointment of Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to replace Councillor Helen Mirfin-Boukouris on the Audit Committee.

7. SCRAP METAL DEALERS ACT 2013

It was moved by Councillor Isobel Bowler, seconded by Councillor Clive Skelton, that the recommendation made by the Licensing Committee at its meeting held on 12 September 2013 be approved.

After a Right of Reply by Councillor Isobel Bowler, the Motion was carried:-

<p>RESOLVED: That approval be given to the recommendation made by the Licensing Committee at its meeting held on 12th September, 2013 that the Committee's published scheme of delegation be amended to reflect the legislative changes arising from the Scrap Metal Dealers Act 2013, as set out in the report of the Chief Executive now submitted.</p>

8. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BRYAN LODGE

Medium Term Financial Strategy

It was moved by Councillor Bryan Lodge, seconded by Councillor Geoff Smith, that this Council notes the following resolution passed by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 18th September, 2013, following its consideration of a report of the Executive Director, Resources on the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2018/19 -

"RESOLVED: That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the forecast position for the next 5 years;
- (b) agrees the approach to business planning targets;
- (c) agrees to give consideration to reviewing the Council Tax Support Scheme for 2014/15 with decisions based on an assessment of the impact of the reductions made in 2013/14 and the other welfare reforms that have/are being introduced;
- (d) agrees that as part of the business planning process, any increases in specific grant are to be held corporately to assist in balancing the overall budget; and
- (e) refers the report to Full Council for consideration."

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

1. the insertion of "(a)" after the words "That this Council"; and
2. the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (e) as follows:-
 - (b) therefore struggles to understand why the current Administration insists on wasting taxpayers' money on costly pet projects;
 - (c) notes the comments of the Leader of the Opposition in his Conference speech that "We are going to have to stick to strict spending limits to get the deficit down";
 - (d) notes research by the Institute of Fiscal Studies that the spending commitments and unfunded tax cuts already set by Labour politicians would add an estimated £201bn to the national debt; and
 - (e) therefore, assumes that a Labour Government would not reverse reductions in funding to Sheffield City Council and criticises the rank

hypocrisy of the current Administration.

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 notes the following resolution passed by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 18th September, 2013, following its consideration of a report of the Executive Director, Resources on the Council's Medium Term Financial Strategy 2014/15 to 2018/19 -

“RESOLVED: That Cabinet:-

- (a) notes the forecast position for the next 5 years;
- (b) agrees the approach to business planning targets;
- (c) agrees to give consideration to reviewing the Council Tax Support Scheme for 2014/15 with decisions based on an assessment of the impact of the reductions made in 2013/14 and the other welfare reforms that have/are being introduced;
- (d) agrees that as part of the business planning process, any increases in specific grant are to be held corporately to assist in balancing the overall budget; and
- (e) refers the report to Full Council for consideration.”

(Note: Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy indicated that they voted for paragraphs (a), (c), (d) and (e) and abstained on paragraph (b) of the resolution of the Cabinet and asked for this to be recorded.)

9. STATEMENT BY COUNCILLOR ROGER DAVISON

Councillor Roger Davison referred to an incident which had occurred at the meeting of the Council on 4th September 2013. He now gave an apology without reservation to Council with regard to his conduct, and in particular to the Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and to Councillor George Lindars-Hammond. Councillor Davison said that he was sorry for any offence that Councillor Lindars-Hammond may have felt and added that he would not repeat the behaviour.

10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MARY LEA

Health and Social Care Funding

It was moved by Councillor Mary Lea, seconded by Councillor Jayne Dunn, that

this Council:-

- (a) notes the article in "The Star" newspaper dated 17th September 2013 entitled 'Sheffield Council's anger at £40m health funding cut';
- (b) further notes that the article states 'The NHS Sheffield Clinical Commissioning Group's annual budget was set at £691m last year – but last week The Star reported that a proposed shake-up of the way funds are handed out would mean that is cut by 7.6 per cent, to just over £642m';
- (c) wholeheartedly agrees with comments by the Council's Chief Executive that "The NHS is giving more money to places like Bournemouth because of the pressure of having ageing populations. But this money is needed here, too. It's the equivalent of the funding settlement for local government which has seen councils in the north and cities take larger cuts";
- (d) is appalled, but not surprised, by the motivation of a Conservative Government taking money away from cities such as Sheffield to give to some of the healthiest, wealthiest areas of the country and believes this is just the latest example of the Deputy Prime Minister failing to stand up for Sheffield;
- (e) calls on the Government to immediately scrap this unfair funding redistribution;
- (f) is further concerned of increased pressures on NHS services which are already impacting on NHS budgets before they have been cut by the Government and this is being compounded by the Government's A&E crisis;
- (g) regrets that more than 5,000 nursing jobs have been lost on this Government's watch;
- (h) notes findings from a recent report to the Health Select Committee stating "Staffing levels in emergency departments are an area of considerable concern to the committee. They are not sufficient to meet demand, with only 17% of emergency departments managing to provide 16-hour consultant coverage during the working week";
- (i) acknowledges that Government cuts to funding for social care are contributing to the increasing waiting lists, producing a false economy due to the costs of increased waiting lists, and notes the scathing headline of the Independent newspaper article dated 16th August, 2013 'NHS Waiting List at five year high as cost cutting reforms strike' which outlines criticisms of the Government's health policy from a leading health journal;
- (j) fully supports the recent comments by The Rt. Hon. Andy Burnham, MP, Shadow Secretary of State for Health, "There has been a massive

increase in the numbers of people aged over 90 going into A&E by ambulance – up by over 100,000, an increase of 66 per cent - as £1.8 billion is cut from council care budgets. That is why Labour has said we would invest £1.2 billion of the NHS underspend, which Jeremy Hunt has handed back to the Treasury, over the next two years to ease the crisis in social care, tackling a root cause of the pressure on A&E. For older people this could make a huge difference by enabling them to stay in their own homes for longer and providing the support they need to return home after hospital.”; and

- (k) fully supports policies outlined by the Shadow Secretary of State for Health for whole person care through integrating health and social care.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Roger Davison, seconded by Councillor Diana Stimely, 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) supports the Government’s decision to protect NHS spending from the spending reductions that were caused by the previous Government’s record national deficit;
- (b) welcomes the £26 million increase in the 2011-12 revenue allocation for Sheffield Primary Care Trust, the additional £27 million increase in 2012-13 and the equivalent £16 million increase in 2013-14;
- (c) praises the Government for announcing £3.8 billion in the latest spending review to improve adult social care and join up with health services;
- (d) recalls comments by the Shadow Health Secretary, the Rt. Hon. Andy Burnham M.P., in June 2010 that it would be “irresponsible” to increase NHS spending and therefore believes that a Labour government would have cut Sheffield’s allocation rather than increase it; and
- (e) supports the Government’s increases in funding for NHS services in Sheffield, as opposed to its belief that the Shadow Health Secretary would cut funding for the NHS in Sheffield.

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

After a Right of Reply by Councillor Mary Lea, the original Motion was then put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the article in “The Star” newspaper dated 17th September 2013 entitled ‘Sheffield Council’s anger at £40m health funding cut’;
- (b) further notes that the article states ‘The NHS Sheffield Clinical Commissioning Group’s annual budget was set at £691m last year – but

last week The Star reported that a proposed shake-up of the way funds are handed out would mean that is cut by 7.6 per cent, to just over £642m’;

- (c) wholeheartedly agrees with comments by the Council’s Chief Executive that “The NHS is giving more money to places like Bournemouth because of the pressure of having ageing populations. But this money is needed here, too. It’s the equivalent of the funding settlement for local government which has seen councils in the north and cities take larger cuts”;
- (d) is appalled, but not surprised, by the motivation of a Conservative Government taking money away from cities such as Sheffield to give to some of the healthiest, wealthiest areas of the country and believes this is just the latest example of the Deputy Prime Minister failing to stand up for Sheffield;
- (e) calls on the Government to immediately scrap this unfair funding redistribution;
- (f) is further concerned of increased pressures on NHS services which are already impacting on NHS budgets before they have been cut by the Government and this is being compounded by the Government’s A&E crisis;
- (g) regrets that more than 5,000 nursing jobs have been lost on this Government’s watch;
- (h) notes findings from a recent report to the Health Select Committee stating "Staffing levels in emergency departments are an area of considerable concern to the committee. They are not sufficient to meet demand, with only 17% of emergency departments managing to provide 16-hour consultant coverage during the working week”;
- (i) acknowledges that Government cuts to funding for social care are contributing to the increasing waiting lists, producing a false economy due to the costs of increased waiting lists, and notes the scathing headline of the Independent newspaper article dated 16th August, 2013 ‘NHS Waiting List at five year high as cost cutting reforms strike’ which outlines criticisms of the Government’s health policy from a leading health journal;
- (j) fully supports the recent comments by The Rt. Hon. Andy Burnham, MP, Shadow Secretary of State for Health, “There has been a massive increase in the numbers of people aged over 90 going into A&E by ambulance – up by over 100,000, an increase of 66 per cent - as £1.8 billion is cut from council care budgets. That is why Labour has said we would invest £1.2 billion of the NHS underspend, which Jeremy Hunt has handed back to the Treasury, over the next two years to ease the crisis in social care, tackling a root cause of the pressure on A&E. For older people this could make a huge difference by enabling them to stay in their

own homes for longer and providing the support they need to return home after hospital.”; and

- (k) fully supports policies outlined by the Shadow Secretary of State for Health for whole person care through integrating health and social care.

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

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR DAVID BAKER

Library Service

It was moved by Councillor David Baker, seconded by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, that this Council:-

- (a) recalls the 10,000 signature petition presented to this Council, which opposed the closure of community libraries;
- (b) notes with dismay the Administration’s plans, which could see sixteen community libraries closed;
- (c) believes these closures could be avoided if the Administration did not continue to waste money on costly pet projects and notes the main opposition group’s budget amendment, which presented fully-costed measures to protect the libraries’ budget within 2013/14; and
- (d) opposes the Administration’s disastrous proposals.

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

- 1. the deletion in paragraph (c) of the words “believes the closures could be avoided if the Administration did not continue to waste money on costly pet projects and”;
- 2. the addition of a new paragraph (d) as follows:-
 - “(d) notes also the smaller opposition group’s budget amendment which proposed funding libraries in 2013/14 via a 2.95% increase in council tax, subject to endorsement in a local Council tax referendum, which equates to 48p extra a week for the majority of households”;
- 3. the re-lettering of original paragraph (d) as a new paragraph (e); and
- 4. the addition of a new paragraph (f) as follows:-

- “(f) believes that full financial transparency of the library service is necessary for community groups to form successful partnerships and that the books should be opened to the public as soon as possible”.

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

(Note: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe and David Baker voted for Paragraph 4 and against Paragraphs 1, 2 and 3 and asked for this to be recorded.)

It was then moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Karen McGowan, 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) opposes in the strongest possible terms the devastating cuts imposed on the Council by the Government which are impacting on libraries and services across the Council and notes figures from the latest Medium Term Financial Strategy confirms that the Council has a £78 million budget gap for the next two years in addition to the £182 million that has been saved over the past three years;
- (b) regrets that due to the Deputy Prime Minister’s complete inability to offer any plausible defence for the decisions this Government is making to impose unprecedented cuts to Sheffield City Council at the same time as wealthier councils receive just a fraction of the cuts, the Deputy Prime Minister and main opposition group have resorted to publically spouting factually inaccurate untruths about Council spending and recalls the letter from the Chief Executive explaining the facts on these issues and is appalled at the irresponsibility of the Deputy Prime Minister and main opposition group;
- (c) regrets that at the same time as the Government have imposed devastating cuts to local government, they have cut the high rate of income tax, wasted billions of pounds on the damaging NHS re-organisation and are now proposing to spend money on a tax break for some married couples which is expected to cost around £600 million;
- (d) notes that by 2015/16, the Council will have had an overall reduction in Government formula funding by 50% and, with the scale of the cuts the Council is facing, all services will face significant reductions meaning that the Council has no option but to do things differently;
- (e) notes that under the proposals, the Council has pledged to keep 11 libraries running with a further five as community-led libraries and the rest may become independent libraries, should enough interest be generated

from people;

- (f) welcomes that the present Administration are working with local communities to do everything to keep libraries open despite the reductions to the libraries budget and praises the spirit of local communities who have come forward with 27 registrations of interest from a wide variety of organisations ranging from individuals to community groups and businesses;
- (g) recalls that whilst the previous Administration were still in control, the Council had commissioned work to find £1.3 million of savings from the libraries budget, and is therefore appalled at the cynical hypocrisy of the main opposition group claiming that they would not have made reductions to libraries; and
- (h) resolves to do everything possible to support local communities to keep libraries open through finding alternative ways of delivering the service.

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

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

- For the amendment (56) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) and Councillors Julie Dore, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Mohammad Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Robert Johnson, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.
- Against the amendment (18) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Robert Murphy Jillian Creasy, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian

Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson,
Katie Condliffe and David Baker.

Abstained on the amendment - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley).
(1)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) opposes in the strongest possible terms the devastating cuts imposed on the Council by the Government which are impacting on libraries and services across the Council and notes figures from the latest Medium Term Financial Strategy confirms that the Council has a £78 million budget gap for the next two years in addition to the £182 million that has been saved over the past three years;
- (b) regrets that due to the Deputy Prime Minister's complete inability to offer any plausible defence for the decisions this Government is making to impose unprecedented cuts to Sheffield City Council at the same time as wealthier councils receive just a fraction of the cuts, the Deputy Prime Minister and main opposition group have resorted to publically spouting factually inaccurate untruths about Council spending and recalls the letter from the Chief Executive explaining the facts on these issues and is appalled at the irresponsibility of the Deputy Prime Minister and main opposition group;
- (c) regrets that at the same time as the Government have imposed devastating cuts to local government, they have cut the high rate of income tax, wasted billions of pounds on the damaging NHS re-organisation and are now proposing to spend money on a tax break for some married couples which is expected to cost around £600 million;
- (d) notes that by 2015/16, the Council will have had an overall reduction in Government formula funding by 50% and, with the scale of the cuts the Council is facing, all services will face significant reductions meaning that the Council has no option but to do things differently;
- (e) notes that under the proposals, the Council has pledged to keep 11 libraries running with a further five as community-led libraries and the rest may become independent libraries, should enough interest be generated from people;
- (f) welcomes that the present Administration are working with local communities to do everything to keep libraries open despite the reductions to the libraries budget and praises the spirit of local communities who have come forward with 27 registrations of interest from a wide variety of organisations ranging from individuals to community

groups and businesses;

- (g) recalls that whilst the previous Administration were still in control, the Council had commissioned work to find £1.3 million of savings from the libraries budget, and is therefore appalled at the cynical hypocrisy of the main opposition group claiming that they would not have made reductions to libraries; and
- (h) resolves to do everything possible to support local communities to keep libraries open through finding alternative ways of delivering the service.

(Note: Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy voted for paragraphs (a) to (e) and (h) and abstained on paragraphs (f) and (g) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR HARRY HARPHAM

“Bedroom Tax”

It was moved by Councillor Harry Harpham seconded by Councillor Tony Damms, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that the “Bedroom Tax” is a cruel and unfair measure hitting vulnerable people through no fault of their own and was introduced by the Conservative-led government, with support of the LibDems in government;
- (b) believes that the outcomes of the Liberal Democrat’s 2013 Conference demonstrates their Party’s indifference to the hardship caused by the Bedroom Tax;
- (c) welcomes the effective and broad-based campaign run by local Sheffield campaigners and activists against this most unfair tax;
- (d) reiterates in the strongest possible terms this Council’s opposition to the Bedroom Tax and warmly welcomes the commitment made by The Rt. Hon. Ed Miliband, MP, Leader of the Opposition, that a future Labour Government will repeal this unfair tax as part of the Labour Party’s concrete action to support families with the cost of living crisis;
- (e) further believes that this commitment is affordable as it is to be paid for without additional borrowing by reversing the current Government’s tax cut for hedge funds, unfair shares for rights scheme and tackling disguised employment in the construction industry; and
- (f) however, regrets that the Government’s failure to listen means Sheffield families are suffering today and resolves to write to the Deputy Prime Minister, who is the only local MP who supports this tax, urging him to take action to reverse this cruel and unfair measure now.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Jillian Creasy, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the re-lettering of paragraphs (b) to (f) as new paragraphs (c) to (g) and the addition of a new paragraph (b) as follows:-

“(b) notes the smaller opposition group’s motion to Full Council in April 2013 which called on the Administration to look into not taking eviction proceedings where arrears are solely due to unaffordability caused by the bedroom tax and is glad that the Administration has now implemented this idea”.

On being put to the vote the amendment was negatived.

It was then moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, 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) reiterates its opposition to the so-called ‘bedroom tax’;
- (b) reaffirms that the root cause of this problem is the nation’s housing crisis and endorses the current Government’s action to build more affordable housing;
- (c) contrasts this action with the lamentable record of the previous Government who during their thirteen years in power:
 - (i) saw the building of social housing decline to its lowest figure since the Second World War;
 - (ii) built seven times more prison cells than council homes;
 - (iii) oversaw the Housing Market Renewal Scheme, in which 4,590 houses in South Yorkshire were demolished, while just 2,415 were built, at a cost of £265 million; and
 - (iv) left a legacy of 2 million households in England on housing waiting lists, 250,000 families living in over-crowded accommodation and 1 million bedrooms standing empty;
- (d) reminds Members that the under-occupancy principle was first agreed by the previous Government in the private sector, in which no concessions were made for foster children, overnight carers, or service personnel;
- (e) welcomes the motion agreed at the Liberal Democrat Conference this month, which expressed concerns about the policy and set out practical steps to support those affected by the reform;

- (f) supports concessions which have already been secured as a result of Liberal Democrat influence in Government including:
 - (i) exemptions for members of the armed forces and foster families;
 - (ii) trebling the Discretionary Housing Payment budget; and
 - (iii) providing councils with discretionary funding to help families in difficult circumstances;
- (g) encourages the Government to go further, following the measures set out by the policy motion agreed by the Liberal Democrat Conference;
- (h) highlights the work of Liberal Democrat run Stockport Council in supporting residents affected by the reform, specifically pledging not to evict anyone for arrears if those arrears are exclusively caused by this reform, up until the point that they have rejected two 'reasonable offers' of a smaller property;
- (i) draws attention to the complete lack of action from the present Administration in supporting affected residents and in particular notes the following decisions:
 - (i) imposing a 23% cut in Council Tax Benefit, refusing an offer of £1.1 million from the Government to reduce the cut;
 - (ii) consistent dithering over £10 million of New Homes Bonus funding, which should have been used earlier to help provide affordable housing in Sheffield; and
 - (iii) rejecting proposals from opposition councillors for a cross-party working group to support local residents affected by the 'bedroom tax'; and
- (j) implores the Administration to offer local residents more than crocodile tears and investigate what action the Council can take to support those who are affected.

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) believes that the "Bedroom Tax" is a cruel and unfair measure hitting vulnerable people through no fault of their own and was introduced by the

- Conservative-led government, with support of the LibDems in government;
- (b) believes that the outcomes of the Liberal Democrat's 2013 Conference demonstrates their Party's indifference to the hardship caused by the Bedroom Tax;
 - (c) welcomes the effective and broad-based campaign run by local Sheffield campaigners and activists against this most unfair tax;
 - (d) reiterates in the strongest possible terms this Council's opposition to the Bedroom Tax and warmly welcomes the commitment made by The Rt. Hon. Ed Miliband, MP, Leader of the Opposition, that a future Labour Government will repeal this unfair tax as part of the Labour Party's concrete action to support families with the cost of living crisis;
 - (e) further believes that this commitment is affordable as it is to be paid for without additional borrowing by reversing the current Government's tax cut for hedge funds, unfair shares for rights scheme and tackling disguised employment in the construction industry; and
 - (f) however, regrets that the Government's failure to listen means Sheffield families are suffering today and resolves to write to the Deputy Prime Minister, who is the only local MP who supports this tax, urging him to take action to reverse this cruel and unfair measure now.

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

For paragraphs (a), (d) and (f) (58) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) and Councillors Julie Dore, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Jillian Creasy, Mohammad Maroof, Robert Murphy, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Robert Johnson, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf

- Meade, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.
- Against paragraphs (a), (d) and (f) (16) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe and David Baker.
- Abstained on paragraphs (a), (d) and (f) (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley).
- For paragraphs (b) and (e) (56) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) and Councillors Julie Dore, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Mohammad Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Robert Johnson, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.
- Against Paragraphs (b) and (e) (16) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe and David Baker.
- Abstained on paragraphs (b) and (e) (3) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy.

For paragraph (c) (74)

The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) and Councillors Julie Dore, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Simon Clement-Jones, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Shaffaq Mohammed, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Mohammad Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Joyce Wright, Steve Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, George Lindars-Hammond, Robert Johnson, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Anders Hanson, John Campbell, Martin Lawton Peter Price, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Trevor Bagshaw, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Against paragraph (c) (0)

Nil.

Abstained on paragraph (c)
(1)

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley).

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BRYAN LODGE

City Centre Events

It was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Mohammad Maroof, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the Summer Saturdays' initiative which ran throughout the summer and saw Sheffield city centre host a series of events and activities designed to bring families into the city centre to stay, play, relax and enjoy the shops, entertainment and food and drink;
- (b) further welcomes the support for the event through investment from the Keep Sheffield Working fund to boost the city centre and pro-actively

support businesses in the current climate;

- (c) notes that the Sheffield by the Sea initiative has again proved very popular and was put on at no cost to the Council and thanks all partners who provide support enabling these events;
- (d) welcomes other activity in the City to support the city centre such as The Star newspaper's Summer of Love drive;
- (e) welcomes the wider programme of events and community festivals that add to the vibrancy of the City; and
- (f) resolves to continue to support city centre retail and requests officers to report to Cabinet with further proposals to support the city centre economy.

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

- 1. the deletion of paragraph (f); and
- 2. the addition of new paragraphs (f) to (h) as follows:-
 - (f) is pleased to see work to build upon the previous Administration's successes, including the Food Festival, Tramlines, the Peace Gardens ice-rink and the Sheffield Wheel;
 - (g) yet regrets that the current Administration's thoughtless 'anti-business' policies, such as the absurd changes to city-centre parking charges, are doing more harm to local businesses than good; and
 - (h) urges the Administration to drop their anti-business rhetoric and produce a report on the steps the Council can take to support city-centre businesses.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the Summer Saturdays' initiative which ran throughout the summer and saw Sheffield city centre host a series of events and activities designed to bring families into the city centre to stay, play, relax and enjoy the shops, entertainment and food and drink;
- (b) further welcomes the support for the event through investment from the

- Keep Sheffield Working fund to boost the city centre and pro-actively support businesses in the current climate;
- (c) notes that the Sheffield by the Sea initiative has again proved very popular and was put on at no cost to the Council and thanks all partners who provide support enabling these events;
 - (d) welcomes other activity in the City to support the city centre such as The Star newspaper's Summer of Love drive;
 - (e) welcomes the wider programme of events and community festivals that add to the vibrancy of the City; and
 - (f) resolves to continue to support city centre retail and requests officers to report to Cabinet with further proposals to support the city centre economy.

(Note: Councillor Bryan Lodge, having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in the above item, took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.)

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR IAN AUCKLAND

The MADE Festival

It was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Denise Reaney, that this Council:-

- (a) praises the excellent MADE festival for entrepreneurs, which has brought an estimated £500,000 to the City;
- (b) notes with disappointment reports that the scope of the festival has been reduced in 2013;
- (c) regrets that the reported failure to deliver a festival of similar scale has led to further criticism of the Council as 'anti-business';
- (d) recalls that this latest criticism follows a string of dressing-downs by business groups and business leaders;
- (e) calls upon the Administration to drop its 'anti-business' rhetoric that is driving jobs and investment away from Sheffield; and
- (f) hopes that the MADE events to be held in 2013 will be a success and recommends that the festival returns to full strength in 2014.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Neale Gibson, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (f) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (f) as follows:-

- (b) therefore wholeheartedly welcomes the new partnership agreement with BE Group for the next three years which will take the MADE festival to the next level and is excited about the future and the pivotal role MADE can play in developing the next generation of entrepreneurs;
- (c) notes that in November a series of high profile MADE events will take place during Global Entrepreneurship Week 2013, with successful entrepreneurs sharing their experience and knowledge with the business leaders of the future and a major Festival programme is already being lined up for autumn 2014;
- (d) is committed to doing everything possible to support small businesses who are central to Sheffield's economy and therefore welcomes the following programmes of the present Administration to support local businesses:-
 - (i) breaking down the barriers for Small Medium Enterprises (SMEs) to access the Regional Growth Fund;
 - (ii) the RISE Graduate Scheme which supports local SMEs employ graduates;
 - (iii) the export project supporting local SMEs in the export market;
 - (iv) the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme;
 - (v) Skills Made Easy designed by Sheffield City Council, in partnership with the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), to put the purchasing power for training for the first time, in the hands of businesses in the Sheffield City Region (SCR);
 - (vi) Business Summits;
 - (vii) the small business loan fund;
 - (viii) up to 50% reductions in off street parking charges;
 - (ix) the Chapel Walk scheme;
 - (x) the Digital Direction Programme; and
 - (xi) securing a Start Up Loans for Young People, the only Council to have done so;
- (e) supports the recent policy proposal by the Rt. Hon. Ed Miliband MP to cut business rates which will provide much needed support to businesses across Sheffield and contrasts this with the Government's damaging decision to delay the review of business rates which will hit many small businesses; and

- (f) regrets that the only anti-business rhetoric in the City comes from the main opposition group who continue to talk Sheffield down.

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

(Note: Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy voted for paragraphs (b) and (c) and abstained on paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) praises the excellent MADE festival for entrepreneurs, which has brought an estimated £500,000 to the City;
- (b) therefore wholeheartedly welcomes the new partnership agreement with BE Group for the next three years which will take the MADE festival to the next level and is excited about the future and the pivotal role MADE can play in developing the next generation of entrepreneurs;
- (c) notes that in November a series of high profile MADE events will take place during Global Entrepreneurship Week 2013, with successful entrepreneurs sharing their experience and knowledge with the business leaders of the future and a major Festival programme is already being lined up for autumn 2014;
- (d) is committed to doing everything possible to support small businesses who are central to Sheffield's economy and therefore welcomes the following programmes of the present Administration to support local businesses:-
 - (i) breaking down the barriers for Small Medium Enterprises (SMEs) to access the Regional Growth Fund;
 - (ii) the RISE Graduate Scheme which supports local SMEs employ graduates;
 - (iii) the export project supporting local SMEs in the export market;
 - (iv) the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme;
 - (v) Skills Made Easy designed by Sheffield City Council, in partnership with the Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP), to put the purchasing power for training for the first time, in the hands of businesses in the Sheffield City Region (SCR);
 - (vi) Business Summits;

- (vii) the small business loan fund;
 - (viii) up to 50% reductions in off street parking charges;
 - (ix) the Chapel Walk scheme;
 - (x) the Digital Direction Programme; and
 - (xi) securing a Start Up Loans for Young People, the only Council to have done so;
- (e) supports the recent policy proposal by the Rt. Hon. Ed Miliband MP to cut business rates which will provide much needed support to businesses across Sheffield and contrasts this with the Government's damaging decision to delay the review of business rates which will hit many small businesses; and
- (f) regrets that the only anti-business rhetoric in the City comes from the main opposition group who continue to talk Sheffield down.

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

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JILLIAN CREASY

Supermarket Levy Proposal

It was moved by Councillor Jillian Creasy, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, that this Council:-

- (a) remembers the resolution it passed in October 2012 requesting officers to bring forward a report to Cabinet dealing with the benefits and resource implications of using the Sustainable Communities Act;
- (b) thanks Sheffield for Democracy for providing the Cabinet Member and relevant officer with details of a simple and inexpensive method for consulting with local people about possible proposals and for offering assistance to organise any public meetings;
- (c) welcomes the recent campaign by Local Works, the national organisation which has promoted the adoption and use of the Sustainable Communities Act, to use it to call for a levy on large supermarkets;
- (d) notes that under the proposal, local authorities would be given the power to introduce a local levy of 8.5% on large retail outlets in their area with a rateable value of over £500,000 and that the revenue would be used to promote local economic activity, local services and facilities, community

wellbeing and environmental protection;

- (e) notes that in Sheffield this would apply to 60 retail outlets (half of which are in Meadowhall) and raise in excess of £6million per year;
- (f) notes that similar measures have been introduced in Northern Ireland and Scotland without adversely affecting inward investment or the local economy;
- (g) welcomes the support for this measure by local authorities across the country and by the Shadow Minister for Communities and Local Government;
- (h) notes that the South and East Yorkshire branch of the Federation of Small Businesses also endorses the campaign; and
- (i) therefore urges the Cabinet Member and officers to expedite the Cabinet report requested in October 2012 so that the Sustainable Communities Act can be used to consult on the supermarket levy proposal as soon as possible.

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

1. the deletion in paragraph (c) of the word “welcomes” and its substitution by the word “notes”, and the addition of the following words at the end of that paragraph:-

“but would also impact retailers including Debenhams, WH Smiths, Primark, John Lewis and Marks & Spencer and is concerned that to introduce such a levy would undermine important efforts to increase the vitality of the city centre and progress a new retail quarter”

2. the deletion of paragraphs (d) to (i); and
3. the addition of new paragraphs (d) to (f) as follows:-
 - (d) believes that a strong city centre retail offer benefits local residents and boosts the local economy and is concerned that the introduction of such a levy could damage the prospects of securing a retail offer for the city centre which is a key component of the City Centre Masterplan;
 - (e) is concerned that this policy would place at risk the prospects of bringing a high quality retail development to Sheffield and could also see the loss of business rate income; and
 - (f) therefore will not seek powers from the Government for a levy on

large retail outlets and resolves to continue to assist small business development in the City through alternative means and to progress alternative ways of securing funding to support city centre vibrancy such as a Business Improvement District.

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

It was then moved by Councillor David Baker, seconded by Councillor Diana Stimely, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraphs (c) to (i); and
2. the addition of new paragraphs (c) and (d) as follows:-
 - (c) therefore, regrets that in the past twelve months no progress has been made in delivering new submissions through the Act; and
 - (d) believes than any new submissions should be based upon the ideas of Sheffields, as was the case the last time the Act was used, when Sheffield was highlighted as an example of best practice.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) remembers the resolution it passed in October 2012 requesting officers to bring forward a report to Cabinet dealing with the benefits and resource implications of using the Sustainable Communities Act;
- (b) thanks Sheffield for Democracy for providing the Cabinet Member and relevant officer with details of a simple and inexpensive method for consulting with local people about possible proposals and for offering assistance to organise any public meetings;
- (c) notes the recent campaign by Local Works, the national organisation which has promoted the adoption and use of the Sustainable Communities Act, to use it to call for a levy on large supermarkets, but would also impact retailers including Debenhams, WH Smiths, Primark, John Lewis and Marks & Spencer and is concerned that to introduce such a levy would undermine important efforts to increase the vitality of the city centre and progress a new retail quarter;
- (d) believes that a strong city centre retail offer benefits local residents and boosts the local economy and is concerned that the introduction of such a levy could damage the prospects of securing a retail offer for the city

centre which is a key component of the City Centre Masterplan;

- (e) is concerned that this policy would place at risk the prospects of bringing a high quality retail development to Sheffield and could also see the loss of business rate income; and
- (f) therefore will not seek powers from the Government for a levy on large retail outlets and resolves to continue to assist small business development in the City through alternative means and to progress alternative ways of securing funding to support city centre vibrancy such as a Business Improvement District.

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

16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ALISON BRELSFORD

Don Valley Stadium

It was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, that this Council:-

- (a) recalls the regrettable decision to close Don Valley Stadium;
- (b) reminds Members that the plan to delay closure, proposed by the main opposition group, would have actually saved the Council money in the 2013/14 financial year;
- (c) recalls the pledge of the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure that alternative facilities would be improved to required standards by the time Don Valley closed;
- (d) yet notes with concern the disparaging comments by members of the Sheffield athletics community regarding Woodbourn Road;
- (e) furthermore, highlights the difficulty of the Sheffield Eagles to find a new home in the City and expresses dismay that the team may be forced out of Sheffield;
- (f) welcomes the campaign to take community control of the Stadium and urges the Administration to provide assistance to community campaigners; and
- (g) requests the Cabinet Member to present an urgent plan to enable the demolition of the Stadium to be delayed until all outstanding issues are addressed.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by

Councillor Cliff Woodcraft, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraphs (f) to (g); and
2. the addition of new paragraphs (f) to (j) as follows:-
 - (f) notes the online comments of Lewis Samuel:

“@SaveDonValley offered to run the Stadium at no cost to the council tax payer. So what's the real agenda behind the closure?”;
 - (g) further notes the comments of Rob Creasey in The Sheffield Star newspaper:

“We went to the Town Hall for a meeting and were told to go away ... It was a cynical, political decision from a Council who have mismanaged the Stadium to the point where they want it destroyed”;
 - (h) believes that additional time secured by 4SLC was crucial in the preparation of a community bid and the successful transfer of Stocksbridge Leisure Centre;
 - (i) believes the Administration’s approach to Don Valley Stadium has been an insult to campaigners and that this may now leave the Council open to another judicial review; and
 - (j) requests that the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure immediately re-considers her decision and presents an urgent plan to enable the demolition of Don Valley Stadium to be delayed.

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

(Note: Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy voted for paragraph 2(h) and abstained on paragraphs 1 and 2 (sub-paragraphs (f), (g), (i), and (j)) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

It was then moved by Councillor Isobel Bowler, seconded by Councillor Mary Lea, 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) opposes in the strongest possible terms the devastating cuts imposed on the Council by the Government which are impacting on services across the Council and notes figures from the latest Medium Term Financial Strategy which confirm that the Council has a £78 million budget gap for the next two years in addition to the £182 million that has been saved over the past three years;

- (b) notes that by 2015/16, the Council will have had an overall reduction in Government formula funding by 50% and, with the scale of the cuts the council is facing, all services will face significant reductions meaning that the Council has no option but to do things differently;
- (c) regrets that one of the consequences of these unfair cuts to Sheffield is the closure of Don Valley Stadium, however, acknowledges that Woodbourn Road Athletics Stadium will be open from 6th October, meaning that Sheffield will continue to have a purpose built track and field facility;
- (d) welcomes the partnership working between local athletics clubs, Sheffield Hallam University and the Council in developing the Woodbourn Road facility;
- (e) therefore notes The Friends of Don Valley Stadium group's application was assessed against the legislation as set out by the Government, and did not meet the criteria to warrant Don Valley Stadium being registered as an asset of community value; and
- (f) notes the comments by the Director of Culture and Leisure:

“But what we would like to say is this does not mean we are not wanting to look at other ways we can work with this group and other interested parties and we have offered to meet the group again to talk about what is next for the Stadium We really appreciate what the Friends were trying to achieve If anyone can show they can take on the Stadium and have the cash to do it, clearly we will work with them The Council now has no budget to keep it open, no money to mothball it and no offer of money from anyone else.”

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

(Note: Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy voted for paragraphs (a) and (b) and abstained on paragraphs (c) to (f) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) opposes in the strongest possible terms the devastating cuts imposed on the Council by the Government which are impacting on services across the Council and notes figures from the latest Medium Term Financial Strategy which confirm that the Council has a £78 million budget gap for the next two years in addition to the £182 million that has been saved over the past three years;
- (b) notes that by 2015/16, the Council will have had an overall reduction in

Government formula funding by 50% and, with the scale of the cuts the Council is facing, all services will face significant reductions meaning that the Council has no option but to do things differently;

- (c) regrets that one of the consequences of these unfair cuts to Sheffield is the closure of Don Valley Stadium, however, acknowledges that Woodbourn Road Athletics Stadium will be open from 6th October, meaning that Sheffield will continue to have a purpose built track and field facility;
- (d) welcomes the partnership working between local athletics clubs, Sheffield Hallam University and the Council in developing the Woodbourn Road facility;
- (e) therefore notes The Friends of Don Valley Stadium group's application was assessed against the legislation as set out by the Government, and did not meet the criteria to warrant Don Valley Stadium being registered as an asset of community value; and
- (f) notes the comments by the Director of Culture and Leisure:

"But what we would like to say is this does not mean we are not wanting to look at other ways we can work with this group and other interested parties and we have offered to meet the group again to talk about what is next for the Stadium ... We really appreciate what the Friends were trying to achieve ... If anyone can show they can take on the Stadium and have the cash to do it, clearly we will work with them ... The Council now has no budget to keep it open, no money to mothball it and no offer of money from anyone else."

(Note: Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy voted for paragraphs (a) and (b) and abstained on paragraphs (c) to (f) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PENNY BAKER

Park Hill Redevelopment

It was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, that this Council:-

- (a) recalls the pledge of previous Labour Administrations that the cost to Council-tax payers of the Park Hill refurbishment would not extend beyond paying the wages of Council staff working on the project;
- (b) notes with dismay the decisions of the current Administration to agree more than £2.8 million of Council spend at Park Hill;
- (c) notes with concern statements from the developer that they are

“discussing funding” with the Council on future development of the site;

- (d) furthermore, highlights comments in a Cabinet paper agreed in August 2013 that stated: “There is a risk to delivering the full scope of major schemes such as Park Hill ... This could result in schemes ‘stalling’, leading to increased costs”;
- (e) believes these comments are of particular concern given the current Administration’s decision to allow wide-reaching agreements to be signed-off behind closed doors; and
- (f) recommends that no further funding is agreed for this political vanity project at a time when every penny counts and funds need to be directed to vital front-line services.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Harry Harpham, seconded by Councillor Pat Midgley, 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) regrets that for the past eight years the main opposition group have consistently denigrated the Park Hill Development, even though in over eight years of criticising Park Hill, they have never proposed a workable alternative to the redevelopment project;
- (b) furthermore regrets that the main opposition group are continuing to imply that the Council has allocated £2.4m of Council resources for the Park Hill redevelopment when in fact this is not the case;
- (c) notes that not a penny of the £2.4m is to be spent on the refurbishment of the Park Hill flats;
- (d) for the avoidance of doubt, re-iterates that:
 - (i) there are additional costs relating to the Park Hill site which until this Government came to power were paid for by a Government grant;
 - (ii) these costs include looking after the empty flat blocks, providing security where the blocks are still lived in, funding Police Community Support Officer patrols and rehousing local residents; and
 - (iii) the Coalition Government has now completely ended the Housing Market Renewal Grant that previously paid for these costs and the Council has been left to pick up the £2.4m bill;
- (e) further believes that there is no question about whether or not these costs should be funded and firmly believes that it is the right thing to do to ensure that the local residents are safe;

- (f) also notes that it is the Council's statutory duty to provide home loss payments to residents who are moving home;
- (g) believes that the main opposition group know that it would not be reasonable to ask Urban Splash to foot the bill for this, as ultimately this is the Council's responsibility, and at no point during the life of the project has it ever been expected that Urban Splash should pay for these costs;
- (h) regrets that the Coalition Government has ended the Housing Market Renewal Grant, leaving local taxpayers to pick up the bill for costs that were previously funded by the Government; and
- (i) believes that instead of 'playing politics', the main opposition group should be standing up for Sheffield and condemning the Government for ending Housing Market Renewal funding.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) regrets that for the past eight years the main opposition group have consistently denigrated the Park Hill Development, even though in over eight years of criticising Park Hill, they have never proposed a workable alternative to the redevelopment project;
- (b) furthermore regrets that the main opposition group are continuing to imply that the Council has allocated £2.4m of Council resources for the Park Hill redevelopment when in fact this is not the case;
- (c) notes that not a penny of the £2.4m is to be spent on the refurbishment of the Park Hill flats;
- (d) for the avoidance of doubt, re-iterates that:
 - (i) there are additional costs relating to the Park Hill site which until this Government came to power were paid for by a Government grant;
 - (ii) these costs include looking after the empty flat blocks, providing security where the blocks are still lived in, funding Police Community Support Officer patrols and rehousing local residents; and
 - (iii) the Coalition Government has now completely ended the Housing Market Renewal Grant that previously paid for these costs and the Council has been left to pick up the £2.4m bill;

- (e) further believes that there is no question about whether or not these costs should be funded and firmly believes that it is the right thing to do to ensure that the local residents are safe;
- (f) also notes that it is the Council's statutory duty to provide home loss payments to residents who are moving home;
- (g) believes that the main opposition group know that it would not be reasonable to ask Urban Splash to foot the bill for this, as ultimately this is the Council's responsibility, and at no point during the life of the project has it ever been expected that Urban Splash should pay for these costs;
- (h) regrets that the Coalition Government has ended the Housing Market Renewal Grant, leaving local taxpayers to pick up the bill for costs that were previously funded by the Government; and
- (i) believes that instead of 'playing politics', the main opposition group should be standing up for Sheffield and condemning the Government for ending Housing Market Renewal funding.