

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Town Hall, Sheffield, S1 2HH, on Wednesday 6 November 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> Keith Hill Joe Otten Colin Ross	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Isobel Bowler Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Clive Skelton Roy Munn	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Garry Weatherall Steve Wilson Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Anders Hanson Nikki Bond
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Roger Davison Diana Stimely Penny Baker	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> Alan Law Chris Weldon Sheila Constance	22	<i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i> Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Price Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Shaffaq Mohammed Stuart Wattam Jayne Dunn	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Andrew Sangar Sue Alston	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> Cate McDonald Tim Rippon Steve Jones	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Vickie Priestley Katie Condliffe
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Jillian Creasy Mohammad Maroof Robert Murphy	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Denise Reaney Ian Auckland Bob McCann	25	<i>Stockbridge & Upper Don Ward</i> Alison Brelsford Philip Wood Richard Crowther
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Sylvia Anginotti Geoff Smith Rob Frost	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Janet Bragg Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond	26	<i>Walkey Ward</i> Ben Curran Nikki Sharpe Neale Gibson
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 Alf Meade Adam Hurst
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Ray Satur

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Helen Mirfin-Boukouris and Cliff Woodcraft.

2. COUNCILLOR JOHN ROBSON

The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) announced the sad death of Councillor John Robson. Members of the Council observed a minute's silence in his memory. Later in the meeting, Members of the Council paid tribute to John.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Karen McGowan declared a personal interest in the item numbered 11 on the Summons (Notice of Motion concerning the RISE Graduate Internship Scheme) because she is employed by the University of Sheffield.

4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that the minutes of the meeting of the City Council held on 3 October 2013 be approved as a correct record.

5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Communications

4.1.1 Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, announced that, with effect from 5th November 2013, Councillor Ben Curran was appointed as the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources.

4.2 Petitions

(a) Petition Objecting to the Possible Closure of Jordanthorpe Library

The Council received a petition, containing 991 signatures and objecting to the possible closure of Jordanthorpe Library.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Donna Furniss. She stated that the Jordanthorpe Library served the community, including school children at Norton Free and Lowedges primary schools. People wished to raise the educational attainment of children and the closure of Jordanthorpe Library would potentially damage this process. She strongly

urged the Council to retain Jordanthorpe Library.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion. Councillor Iqbal stated that no decisions had been made concerning Libraries. Proposals had been published by the Council and there was currently a period of consultation upon the proposals, which would last until 10 January 2014. It was important that people complete the survey about the future of library services, which was available, together with the Council's proposals, both online and at libraries.

Councillor Iqbal stated that it was important and a legal requirement that the Council provide a comprehensive Library service. The Council was also asking organisations to help look at alternative ways of running libraries. The context, he said, was the cuts in Government funding to the Council and the Library service was required to make savings of £1.6 million. He referred to the £180 million savings which the Council had to make in the previous three years and to the requirement to make significant further cuts in future years. He stated that the decisions relating to the library service were not easy for him or his colleagues to make.

Councillor Iqbal said that two consultation exercises and a call for action had been carried out. He had visited a number of libraries, including Burngreave, Broomhill, Frecheville, Topley, Newfield, Park, Woodhouse, Southey and Ecclesfield. He stated that it was important that as many libraries as possible were kept open. He stated that the Council's proposals included working in partnership with communities and that he had spoken with local Councillors Roy Munn and Clive Skelton with regard to issues including the establishment of a friends' group for Jordanthorpe Library, looking at how Jordanthorpe could be supported and added that workshops were being organised to take place in the Town Hall, to which the petitioners could be invited. He asked that people work together to find a solution for the Library service.

(b) Petition Regarding Prevention Workers in Children's Centres

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 1056 signatures regarding Prevention Workers in Children's Centres.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Sara Wealthall who stated that the petition concerned the ceasing of Prevention Workers at Children's Centres. She stated that she had become a Prevention Worker and had been made redundant from her post. The work which she had done had now ceased as a result of the decision made by the Cabinet Member for Children, Young people and Families and an unwillingness of Councillors to scrutinise the decision. The petition asked the Council to look again at the decision.

A public meeting had been organised in Sharrow at which only Green Party Councillors attended. She stated that there was real concern about the

decision concerning Prevention Services and the way in which it was made and stated that the decision, which was wrong, needed to be scrutinised. She said that the absence of paid, skilled workers supporting prevention services would have a detrimental effect on children and families and that some parents did not have the ability to solve problems for themselves, without the necessary support.

She stated that some services, such as health services or midwifery could be accessed but, if people sought help through the MAST (Multi-Agency Support Team) there was a four week waiting time, which parents who had expressed a view at consultation meetings had said was too long a time to wait.

Sara Wealthall referred to the Equalities Impact Assessment, which had formed part of the decision concerning Prevention Services and stated that there would be an impact on the inclusion of disabled children, support for fathers and lone parents.

The petitioners disputed that valid consultation had been carried out with parents and carers. The consultation had largely been done in a 1 week period and with a small number of service users. Senior Early Years' officers had attended groups unannounced and there had not been an attempt to provide translation in different community languages.

She stated that the decision concerning Prevention Services should be looked at again because of the failed tender process. A wide number of organisations wanted to provide the services but those had dropped out due to problems with the tender process. The inability of the Council to find providers of Prevention Services did not logically lead to suspending prevention work, which was budgeted for. She stated that there was a legal requirement for the Council to provide services and it was not necessarily the right approach to expect such services to be run by volunteers or co-ordinators. He stated that this was an opportunistic cut and the petitioners urged the Council to re-visit the decision.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families. Members of the Public in attendance with questions on the subject of prevention services were invited to ask their questions.

(a) Public Questions concerning Prevention Services

Phil Eddyshaw asked the following questions on behalf of Colin Walker:

Save Sheffield Early Years does not feel that the request for scrutiny of the decision to stop prevention services is being taken seriously.

He asked, why there had been no written responses (required within 28 days) to the previous petition and questions submitted at the last Council meeting; and why did no-one, with the exception of Green Party Councillors,

attend a public meeting which had been organised in Sharrow on 30 October?

Keith Levy stated that, now that the 27 prevention staff, who were funded by the Council, have been made redundant or redeployed in other jobs, what are the plans to replace what they were doing. He said; please do not tell us about volunteers, who cannot replace paid staff.

Ali Yusuf Bilqasab stated that people have had 3 answers about what has happened to the money which was in the Council's budget for Children's Centre prevention work this financial year, namely that:

- The money has been spent
- The money is still available pending a review
- (The money) has been cut (blame the Coalition Government)

He asked the Council to say which of the above is accurate.

The Council referred the petition, and the public questions on the subject of Prevention Services, to Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families. Councillor Drayton thanked the petitioners and people who had asked public questions. Firstly, she stated that she was sorry that Prevention Workers had been laid off and she recognised and knew that the work which prevention workers had done was good. She stressed that the Council did not employ the Prevention Workers but they were employed by other organisations, which were contracted to provide services by the Council.

In the Early Years Review last year, the Council said that one thing it had to do was to make savings. She explained the context of changes to funding provided to the Council by the Government and reductions to funding. The Council did have £21 million funding for Surestart, which was ringfenced to early year's services. The Coalition Government stopped that funding and the Area Based Grant of £17 million. These two grants were brought together in the Early Intervention Grant, which was reduced to £21million. The Early Intervention Grant was since cut further by £6.8 million and is no longer prioritised or ringfenced to Early Years. It also includes other services such as youth services, youth justice and children's disabilities services.

It was decided to protect as much as possible services to Children and Families and to make savings in management, premises and administrative costs. The number of Children's Centres areas was reduced from 36 to 17 areas. The three contracts for management, intervention and prevention were also examined. The management element was removed and the tender was re-profiled and divided into two contracts, one for prevention and one for intervention services which were put out to tender.

In relation to the money available for prevention services, it was a combination of the factors referred to by the questioner that were relevant. Councillor Drayton said she had always maintained that although savings of

£3.4 million had to be found in early years and the Council would do as much as possible to protect services to children and families, it would not be able to promise that services would be delivered in the same place, the same time or by the same provider. Councillor Drayton stated that it was not possible to take £3.4 million from the Early Years budget and for it not to make a difference.

A compact was in place with the voluntary, community and faith sector, including a commitment to tell providers from this sector, with six months' notice, that contracts would cease, which the Council did. These providers included Action for Children, the Manor Castle Development Company and the NHS. Contracts were extended until September. The tender process was carried out and bidders included existing provider organisations and others. The tender process followed normal procedures and was open and above board. Contracts were issued but organisations who had successfully bid then said "no" to the offer of a contract. Contracts for three specialist and 1 intervention service were accepted by the tendering organisations.

The Council made the decision that it needed to continue to provide services to the most vulnerable children and families and so would deliver intervention services in house as these had to continue, with the Council taking on the TUPE obligations. It was not a legal requirement to provide Prevention Services. The Council was to look again at how prevention services could be provided. However, she wanted to make it clear that no-one in the City wanted to provide the work in the contract, even the organisation who delivered the contract at the moment and employed the prevention workers.

Councillor Drayton stated, with reference to the question from Mr Walker, that she apologised if no written response had been provided and said that she would follow up this matter.

Councillor Drayton stated that she was sorry she could not attend the public meeting, which had been organised on 30 October. She had received an invitation to the meeting and had written to explain why she couldn't attend and had given her apologies. She had explained that it was half term and she had childcare duties, and on that evening she had taken her granddaughter to her dance show dress rehearsal. She stated that she had hoped that her apologies would have been given to the people at the meeting.

Councillor Drayton stated that Prevention Workers were not employees of the Council but were employees of other organisations and she hoped they were treated fairly by those organisations and that if they felt this was not that case, they should contact their Trades Union. At the moment, the Council was looking at what it had to provide and how it could do that. The City was run by volunteers and a lot of organisations were also run by volunteers. The Council was not able to provide all of the services which it might like to, so the voluntary, community and faith sector was relied upon. In the circumstances, people had to pull together and it was about enabling

groups to continue meeting, with the use of a room, if they wanted to.

Councillor Drayton stated that she appreciated people coming to the Council, submitting the petition and asking questions and the fact that they cared about Early Years.

4.3 Public Questions

(a) Public Questions concerning Taxi Ranks

Abdul Raheem stated that he was a self employed taxi driver and had observed the development of businesses in the City Centre, such as the Genting Club. He stated that such businesses also required services, including parking for taxis for their customers. There was no parking outside of the premises, including for disabled people. If taxis did park, the driver would receive a parking ticket. He asked the Council to look at this issue further.

More widely, he asked the Council to consider facilities which businesses might require.

Mr Raheem also referred to an incident in which a traffic warden took a photograph of his vehicle and then walked away, without issuing a parking fine. The warden stated that they would pass the information to another authority. Mr Raheem expressed concern in relation to the incident and the potential sharing of information with another party.

Mr Raheem made reference to Pakistan and to the many civilian casualties, including children who had been killed during drone attacks. He stated that there were 30 thousand Pakistanis in Sheffield and 1 million in the United Kingdom. He said that the images on the television were heart breaking and asked the Council to consider this issue in the same way as it did in relation to circumstances in Iraq.

In response, Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, stated that in relation to taxi ranks, the Council had previously installed a significant number of new taxi ranks in the City Centre. Since then, the Council was also working with the taxi trade in relation to new potential locations on which to site taxi ranks. Two new ranks had been introduced on an experimental basis. He stated that he appreciated the need for taxis to have ranks and comments concerning enforcement. With respect to the particular issue which Mr Raheem had raised concerning the traffic warden, Councillor Bramall stated that he would investigate the matter further.

The Chief Executive informed Mr Raheem that Councillors had heard what Mr Raheem had said in relation to the situation in Pakistan and would note his comments.

(b) Public Questions concerning employment

Gareth Slater stated that he had expressed concern to the relevant Cabinet Member about underemployment and the number of people employed on zero hours contracts and making sure that people receive fair pay.

Councillor Leigh Bramall responded that despite the beginning of the economic recovery, there were concerns about the form of the recovery and the number of people employed on zero hours contracts, part time or having lower paid jobs. He welcomed the improvement in the employment figures but said that he still had concerns.

Councillor Leigh Bramall stated that long term unemployment in Sheffield was increasing, rising from 185 in 2008 to 2815 in 2013 and he made reference to the number of young people aged 18-24 claiming benefit. He stated that it was important to understand that we should not be complacent about the employment situation. Zero hours contracts were only used by the Council, where it was in the best interests of the Council and the employee. The Council had introduced a Living Wage Policy and it was taking action to stimulate the City's economy. The 100 Apprenticeship Scheme had been introduced and the RISE Graduate Scheme was also in place. He referred to the Skills Made Easy programme and to the Small and Medium Enterprise Growth Fund. He confirmed that there were 400 net new apprenticeships in the City and cautioned against negative comments, which talked the City down.

(c) Public Questions concerning Schools Outsourcing Services

Anne Fields asked if the Council was aware that an increasing number of schools were opting to outsource workers in catering and cleaning services, rather than adopting the Living Wage. This applied to bodies other than academies, trusts, PFI and Church aided schools. She asked what the Cabinet Member for Children and Young People was doing to pay the Living Wage, how many Schools have committed to the policy and how is this monitored.

James Stribley asked if the Council was aware that Capita and Council officers are actively encouraging schools to avoid paying the Living Wage by outsourcing catering staff to the Council's central caterer, Taylor Shaw, which, it was being made clear to the trades unions, will never pay the Living Wage in Schools.

Angela Harrison asked has the Council ever considered re-tendering current Council contracts early where it is clear that the Living Wage will not be paid within the duration or remainder of the contract.

Becky Wolsenholme asked does the Council support the GMB Ocean cleaners and their fight to get the Living Wage at Sheffield Park Academy.

Tracy Bailey asked will the Council consider adopting a motion to require all prospective delivery partners to include evidence of a commitment to the

Living Wage in all outsourced contracts.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families responded that the Council had committed to the Living Wage and had passed a motion concerning the Living Wage and had written to contractors to set out the position regarding the Living Wage. An increasing number of schools were signing up to the Living Wage and the Council had held meetings with the trades union in this regard. Human Resources had written to schools to inform them about the Living Wage and its implementation.

However, the City Council was not able to impose an agreement regarding the Living Wage where a school or academy governing body is the employer. 28 of the City's Voluntary Aided Foundation Schools were asked about their approach to the Living Wage and only 2 indicated that they did not intend to implement it. 25 out of 33 academies confirmed that they have implemented the Living Wage.

In relation to concerns that schools were being encouraged not to pay the Living Wage, an advisory note was sent to all contractors and to schools. With regard to the 2 Voluntary Aided Schools who were not paying the Living Wage, the Governors had said that this was due to a budget deficit which had influenced the decision as to whether to pay the Living Wage.

Councillor Drayton said that she had had informal discussions with Taylor Shaw and she did not get the impression that they were saying that they would never implement the Living Wage. The Council had a responsibility to ensure that schools can access appropriate advice and support regarding the decisions they made and the options and implications for school governing bodies. She stated that she assumed that Capita were also doing this. Councillor Drayton stated that she appreciated disappointment that some schools were not implementing the Living Wage. The Council would continue to do what it could and to press schools to implement the Living Wage.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, stated that he had been a long standing supporter of the Living Wage and was proud that the Council had implemented a policy to pay its employees the Living Wage and that its partners Amey and Veolia were also doing so. He expressed concern with regard to the allegation that Capita and Council staff were encouraging schools not to pay the Living Wage and asked to be provided with evidence that this had happened, which he could investigate.

There were legal issues in relation to the re-tendering of contracts. If examples were found, Councillor Curran stated that he would meet with the Directors of Commercial and Legal Services. He stated that, in his position as Cabinet Member, he would encourage the take-up of the Living Wage in the City, including for organisations with which the Council contracted services directly and he also realised that was the issue of organisations which were sub-contractors for Council services.

(d) Public Questions concerning Sheffield Children's Centre

Chrissy Meleady stated that, at the meeting of Council on 2 October 2013, Councillor Drayton denied that she or anyone else in the Council or Kier had been made aware of any concerns or complaints in regard to Sheffield Children's Centre at any time prior to 2 October and that if she and the Council and Kier were made aware then she and the Council would have instigated an investigation and redress.

Concerns and complaints have been issued and reissued over a period of six months to the Council and made known to Kier. She stated that she had written to all Councillors and to MPs to draw attention to the concerns and complaints and to ask for their intervention to redress the wrongs being done to Sheffield Children's Centres, children, families and staff. She raised this in writing and verbally in Council and Cabinet meetings and in other public arenas.

In previous Council meetings, Councillor Drayton's response to the concerns and complaints was to deny the reality of them and to assert they were allegations and each time, no investigation ensued and no redress has occurred. One month on, the heating is still turned off by Kier at Sheffield Children's Centre. Despite reissuing to every councillor in the full Council the previous 6 months of correspondence in regard to concerns about the heating and other concerns, there had been no investigation and the heating had not been reinstated. She asked why this was the case. She also asked how the Council and its partner Kier could leave vulnerable people using the Children's Centres in such conditions and when action would be taken.

(e) Questions concerning appointment of a consultant

Chrissy Meleady asked on behalf of another questioner, what best value analysis took place with regard to the appointment/commissioning of the consultant, Julie Dale, for 48 weeks work at a cost of £132,745 for her salary and the agency fee of £26,586 between 8th February 2012 and 8th March 2013, at a time when the Council were claiming poverty and enforcing through a 100 percent grant aid cut on community not for profit early years charities. As the Freedom of information release shows Julie Dale was taken on to carry through the axing of the funding to these organisations. She asked what other funding was expended in support of Julie Dale's role e.g. PA and administrative expenses etc.

Chrissy Meleady asked why the Council did not release the information requested with regard to Julie Dale in compliance with the Freedom of Information Act deadlines and why the Council was withholding the full information now.

(f) Questions concerning Grace Owen Nursery

Chrissy Meleady asked why was it that Grace Owen Nursery was not

included in the Early Years review and that £700,00 was allocated to the nursery through the Local Growth Fund, which was never identified in the Early Years review which went on to cut funding for other provision. She asked what other funding has been given or is earmarked to Grace Owen Nursery – one of the Council's own nurseries.

In response to questions (f) and (g) above, Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, young People and Families, stated that she apologised if there had been a misunderstanding in respect of the concerns which Ms Meleady had raised. Councillor Drayton explained that in the past she meant that she, or the Council had not received anything regarding specific allegations so a response could be sent. She stated that Kier also had a complaints process. She also stated that she thought that Ms Meleady had received responses but if Ms Meleady sends her a letter clearly setting out the specific allegations and questions she thought she had not had answers to, then the Council would investigate the matter and make a response to her.

Councillor Drayton stated that she would respond in writing to the questions which had been asked in respect of Grace Owen Nursery and the consultancy fees.

(g) Public Question concerning Freedom of Information

Nigel Slack referred to an article in the Sunday Times concerning the idea that private companies providing public services should be covered by the Freedom of Information regulations and lose their right to commercial confidentiality, which was an idea that he had proposed to the Council on more than one occasion.

He asked will the Council undertake to add to its ground breaking decision that all new contracts will be let on a basis of "presumed full disclosure", the presumption that all contracts will require the winning bidder to abide by Freedom of Information regulations.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, responded that he acknowledged Mr Slack's championing of openness and transparency. He stated that the Council did co-operate with Freedom of Information requests. Freedom of Information applied to public bodies and not to private sector organisations. He would expect that private sector organisations would comply with the law and relevant regulations. He stated that it could not be taken for granted that there would be regulations also requiring private sector compliance.

(h) Public Question concerning Webcasting of Council Meetings

Nigel Slack stated that, having read some portions of the minutes of the previous Council meeting and noting that they bear only a passing resemblance to the actuality of the meeting that he witnessed and recognising that it is impossible for the official minutes to accurately reflect

every word of the exchanges that take place in a robust meeting, he would like to ask for some clarity on the Council's promise to review the potential for official webcasting of Council meetings. He asked who will conduct the review; what will the review's remit be; when will the review take place and when will it report; and will the review be open to public consultation.

Councillor Julie Dore stated that a similar question had been asked previously in relation to webcasting of Council meetings by Mr Slack. The subject of webcasting had been discussed by the Council's Corporate Governance Group and it had been decided that webcasting was not a priority for the Council at this time, with particular regard to costs in the present financial climate.

Councillor Dore stated that she had looked at examples of other local authorities' webcasts and it had been found that the viewing figures of such material was quite low. It was therefore not thought to be good value for money. There were other better methods of engagement for the Council to use with the public, including Local Area Partnerships, Meet the Cabinet and a variety of consultative events, which were sometimes general and at other times specific in nature. The Council was always looking at other ways it could engage with people and she did not believe the Council could afford to introduce webcasting.

(i) Public Question concerning Sanctions

Martin Brighton stated that the Council Leader has said that sanctions should not be imposed in the absence of evidence. However, he stated, her own senior personnel, supported by a few elected Members, are treating what has been said with contempt. He asked what does the Leader propose to do about this.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated in response that with regard to sanctions, she would request Mr Brighton to tell her on what particular instance a sanction was used and why.

She stated that there may be different interpretation of what constitutes a sanction. When there is an allegation then action must be taken pending the investigation, for example suspension; and some people assume that is a 'sanction'.

(j) Public Question concerning Promises

Martin Brighton stated that the Council Leader has said that she expects senior personnel and elected members to be trusted to keep their promises. Again, the Council Leader's words are being treated with contempt. He asked what does the Council Leader propose to do about this.

In response, Councillor Julie stated that the question which Mr Brighton had put was ambiguous and asked him to tell her the precise circumstances of

his concerns.

(k) Public Question concerning Contracts

Martin Brighton referred to comments made by Barnet's chief operating officer that "Publishing all Barnet's contracts with Capita will regain public trust and placate the sceptics" He stated that this was duly done and asked why can't the same happen here with this Council's contracts.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, responded that the London Borough of Barnet had transferred a number of services to Capita and without consultation. A Judicial Review found that in Barnet, they should have consulted. Sheffield was different. The Council was required to gain permission of a contractor in order to publish the relevant contract and there were some issues relating to commercial sensitivity. The Council had over 600 contracts and the publication of all such documents would involve a considerable amount of time and cost in proportion to the public demand to view contracts. Only three requests for the details of contracts had been made over the last 5 years.

(l) Public Question concerning Freedom of Information Requests

Martin Brighton asked the Council to explain why Freedom of Information requests are habitually not answered until the last of the 20-working days allowed, if at all, and even when the answer is to refuse the information, or provide inadequate or inaccurate information, requiring reviews at the ratepayers' expense?

He also asked, in the absence of any positive action on the above points, what objections could the Council Leader have to publicly naming and shaming those who are, as the documents would suggest, treating the Council Leader with contempt?

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, asked Mr Brighton to provide to her information as to which particular Freedom of Information request he was referring and where he had not received a response in the given time.

Councillor Dore stated that she understood that Mr Brighton had publicly 'named and shamed' individuals in a You Tube clip and she asked him to please give specific information in relation to the questions he had raised.

4.3 Petitions (2)

(a) Petition Requesting Permission to Construct a Cul-de-Sac on Land Fronting 245 to 275 Barnsley Road

The Council received a petition containing 13 signatures requesting permission to construct a cul-de-sac on land fronting 245 to 273 Barnsley Road.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development who stated that he would look at the detail of the petition and respond in writing to the petitioners.

(b) Petition Requesting the Change of the Pedestrian Crossing on Greenhill Avenue from a Zebra to a Traffic Light Crossing

The Council received a petition containing 45 signatures and requesting the change of the pedestrian crossing at Chancet Wood Drive/Greenhill Avenue from a zebra to a traffic light crossing.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development who stated that he would look at the detail of the petition and respond to the petitioners in writing.

(c) (Note: A petition was received objecting to the Lack of Consultation in connection with the Felling of Trees on Dalewood Road. There was no speaker present at the meeting and the petition was forwarded to Councillor Jack Scott, Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene.)

(d) Petition to Save Don Valley Stadium

The Council received an electronic petition containing seven signatures requesting that the process of demolishing Don Valley Stadium be stopped and that the land be not sold for profit.

There was no speaker to the petition. The Council referred the petition to Councillor Isobel Bowler, Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure.

4.4 Petition Requiring Debate:

Petition to Save Don Valley Stadium

The Council received an electronic petition containing 5,487 signatures, requesting that Don Valley Stadium be saved.

The petition contained more than 5,000 signatures and, at the request of the lead petitioner, under the Council's Petitions Scheme, the petition was subject to a public debate by the Council.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Rob Creasy. Mr Creasy stated that the number of signatures had been achieved in one week and, with other petitions which had also been created on this subject, signatures numbered over 10,000. Two photographs of Don Valley Stadium and Woodbourn Road Stadium featuring Mukhtar Mohammed (Team GB Olympian) were provided and displayed as part of Mr Creasy's presentation. He contrasted the facilities available at Don Valley Stadium, which were world class, with those at Woodbourn Road and asked if an athlete such as Jessica Ennis would have been inspired by the Woodbourn Road Stadium. There were 140 seats at Woodbourn Road and the Stadium was not secure, on a recent visit, there were no toilets other facilities available for young people.

Mr Creasy stated that Dr Steve Peters had made reference to Don Valley Stadium being more expensive than other comparative venues. The Stocksbridge Leisure Centre had shown the way in providing a solution to this type of issue.

He referred to 'soundbites' which were heard in relation to the Don Valley Stadium, including the reported 700K annual saving which would be made and the effects of austerity and Government cuts on the City. He stated that these were smoke and mirrors and questioned whether they made sense. He asked when the demolition of the Don Valley Stadium was due to take place and what had to be done to save the Stadium.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13 (b), the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure, Councillor Isobel Bowler made an initial response to the petition, followed by the Shadow Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure, Councillor Alison Brelsford. Members of the City Council then debated the issues raised by the petition. The points made by Members during the debate are summarised below:

- The Council had lost significant amount of funding.
- There is no budget to mothball for 6 months and if the Council was to do so it would have to make in year cuts to other services.
- The Council chose an option with relatively minimal impact and needed to develop an affordable city wide model that it can sustain, working with key partners.
- Don Valley was an ageing facility, requiring a large subsidy. The impact of the closure on the community was the least negative when considered alongside other alternatives.
- Woodbourn Road is a suitable athletics facility and approved by athletics bodies and the English Institute of Sport (EIS) provides indoor facilities of an international standard. The Don Valley Stadium had played an important role in the regeneration of the east side of the City but the type of events which it once attracted now go to

venues elsewhere instead.

- Prior to consultation on the closure of the Stadium, the alternative options to closure were explored and a six month period was given in order that alternative proposals might emerge. However, no affordable and sustainable alternatives have been found during that time. Whilst a suggestion had been made that the Stadium is mothballed to allow additional time for the development of alternatives and a business plan, it was not apparent how this would be funded.
- Reference was made to the facilities, which included the Stadium and were developed for the World Student Games and the payments which the Council was making for the cost of those facilities.
- There was a vision for the future that the Stadium could become something more.
- The Stadium did not meet the criteria of an asset of community value.
- Decommissioning and demolition of the facility would also carry significant costs.
- The community would need more time to work up proposals as was the case at Stocksbridge Leisure Centre, which was open and full of people and being run at reduced cost.
- The decision to close Don Valley Stadium was not taken lightly. The alternative was to take money from other budgets.
- Track and field was not a popular spectator sport outside of major sporting competitions.
- The context of the decision to close the Stadium was the required savings of £80 million to be made by the Council. The stadium had not been filled to capacity since 2006 and cost £700K to run. Significant capital expenditure was also required.
- Other cities had learned from Sheffield's experience and had converted venues built for major events such as the Commonwealth and Olympic Games to other uses, such as football grounds.
- There should have been better consultation and co-operation with communities that wished to come forward with proposals, which may take time. The threat of closure of the Stadium was not published until January, although the budget savings process started much earlier. The Council had said it was willing to work with people to sustain services and there were examples of successful outcomes.

- The benefits of investing in high value quality sporting facilities included participation, attracting visitors and increasing footfall and lifting the profile of the City. Major events were held at the Don Valley Stadium in the first 10 years, but now places had to pay to host athletics events.
- Could more time be given for campaigners to work on plans for the Don Valley Stadium as was in the case of Stocksbridge Leisure Centre. The cost of demolition would be greater than those to mothball the Stadium.
- Sheffield Hallam University was running the Woodbourn Road Stadium, which would have economic benefit for the local area of Attercliffe and would bring about interaction between University students and others in the local community. The costs of mothballing the Don Valley Stadium for a further 6 months were high.
- It would take the community and organisations time to produce proposals.

Rob Creasy exercised his right of reply in relation to matters raised in the debate. He stated that the community had a vision for Don Valley Stadium and did their best to put together a plan for its future and would have been 3 months into the process had the Council looked at this in July, with the Community. The costs of the debt in building the Stadium would still be in place until 2024. He questioned the decision to resource other commitments such as the hosting of the Tour de France at a cost of £900K. Although the Council presented the issue as a dilemma, it was able to find funding for other purposes and he pointed out that the community were proposing a scheme at no cost, which would also include facilities for health, sport and the arts and the potential of building a school and health facilities into the structure of the existing Stadium.

Sporting and other events were now moving to other venues in Leeds and Nottingham, for example and this affected Sheffield's status as the City of Sport. He referred to other venues including the Sheffield Arena and Scarborough, with which Sheffield International Venues were involved. He also referred to the effect on business which had invested in Sheffield on the basis of the its sporting personalities and credentials. He asked for more time for the community to bring forward proposals for the Stadium.

The Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure, Councillor Isobel Bowler gave a right of reply to matters raised in the petition and during the debate. She stated that, in Stocksbridge, the Council had funded the Leisure Centre opening until the end of April 2013 and there was also 12 months' mothballing money in the budget for 2013/14 to allow the community options for the Leisure Centre to emerge.

In relation to Don Valley Stadium, Councillor Bowler said that she did understand that the community group had a vision of the future of the Don Valley Stadium

and the Council had looked for a solution which meant that that Stadium could remain. The Don Valley Arena made a surplus, which it was able to re-invest. In reference to a point which Mr Creasy had raised regarding a facility in Scarborough, the Scarborough Spa, Councillor Bowler stated that the funding for that venue was invested by Scarborough Council and not by the City Council or Sheffield International Venues.

In reference to mothballing the Stadium to allow further time for the community group to develop options, this would cost £180K for 6 months, which was not in the budget and would require the Council to cease doing something else as an in-year cut.

Councillor Bowler stated that the community group have not submitted a plan for the sustainable and affordable operation of the Don Valley Stadium and that she had not heard anything which suggested that there is a realistic option of a subsidy-free Stadium and which would change the decision which the Council took in April 2013.

It was then moved by Councillor Isobel Bowler, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that this Council endorses the previous decisions and agreed course of action concerning the Don Valley Stadium and does not extend the mothballing period for a further six months at a cost of £180k.

On being put to the vote, the Motion was carried:

RESOLVED: that this Council endorses the previous decisions and agreed course of action concerning the Don Valley Stadium and does not extend the mothballing period for a further six months at a cost of £180k.

As an alternative course of action, it was moved by Councillor Alison Brelford, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council:

1. thanks the petitioners for bringing their campaign to the Council;
2. Notes that additional time was crucial in securing community management of Stocksbridge Leisure Centre and that, similarly the campaigners have offered to run the stadium at no cost to taxpayers;
3. Urges the Administration to delay the demolition to allow campaigners more time to prepare a community bid and refers the petition to the Cabinet.

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

(NOTE: In accordance with the Council Procedure Rule 9.1, the order of business as published on the Council Summons was altered and item 7, the Director of Public Health Report for Sheffield 2013, was taken as the next item of business.)

6. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT FOR SHEFFIELD 2013

The Council received a presentation concerning the Director of Public Health Annual Report 2013 entitled New Opportunities, given by the Director of Public Health, Dr Jeremy Wight.

Dr Wight outlined the changes and opportunities arising from the transfer of public health leadership to the City Council. The presentation showed that, whilst life expectancy for women and men in Sheffield was gradually increasing, it was also less than the England average. Dr Wight described disability-free life expectancy and the inequality in disability-free life expectancy across the City.

The various recommendations of the Annual Report were included in the summary report previously circulated to Members of the Council.

Members of the Council asked a range of questions and responses were provided by Dr Wight, as summarised below:

Affordable warmth was an issue which particularly affected children and older people. For children it might impact on their attainment and development. The ability to heat a home was important to health. Cold and damp houses were harmful and contributed to respiratory disease in children and coronary vascular disease, among other things. People's mental health and the contribution of a cold home and heating bills to stress was also recognised. Energy charges were increasing and ways needed to be found to help people to live in warm homes by such means as insulation. The Council's housing stock was of generally good quality having been subject to improvements brought about by the Decent Homes Programme. However the quality of private sector rented housing was a real issue and it was hoped that property owners would invest more in the quality of insulation in their properties.

Air quality contributed to respiratory problems and deaths and the East of Sheffield was particularly affected by poorer air quality. Poor air quality was a significant cause of early deaths and might be due to poor air produced by energy production, transportation or industry. Public health could work with other services of the Council to improve air quality in such areas as transport policy and economic development. In respect of planning applications, such as the proposals for an IKEA store, there was a need to know the likely impact on peoples' health and to make sure that decisions which were made were ones which improved people's health.

In terms of meeting future challenges in the context of the present funding climate, a ring-fenced grant of £29.6 million had transferred from the NHS to the City Council and the amount of that grant would increase slightly in 2014/15. It was important that this resource was used to best effect and in the context of people living longer and a greater number of people with

disabilities. The Right First Time initiative in Sheffield showed greater integration of health and social care. Public Health could identify cost effective prevention measures, for example funding for people who are hypertensive. The root causes of ill health were such factors as housing and employment.

In relation to health checks, the figures for uptake were not good but they were increasing. Prior to the introduction of the health checks programme, there had been a number of successful initiatives which did much of what was subsequently incorporated into the health checks; although these were not badged as health checks. GPs were working hard to make sure that people were invited for a health check and a member of the public health team was working with them on that particular issue. However, it was often the case that people who least needed a health check took up the offer. GPs were incentivised to get people from deprived area postcodes to take up a health check.

In connection to the relationship between the Council and GPs more generally, there had been anxiety that public health practitioners would lose their link with the NHS following their integration into the local authority. The Health and Social Care Act mandated public health teams to provide an offer to GPs through the Clinical Commissioning Group.

Social isolation was suggested by some data to be as detrimental to health as was smoking. Community resilience needed to be built to help people to help each other and to prevent isolation from occurring to begin with.

For young people not in education employment or training, the Children and Young People's Directorate was undertaking work to address the issue and there were known health implications for people both in the present and the future.

The Council should lobby on the setting of minimum pricing of tobacco and alcohol. Public Health England had made its views clear to the Government regarding the failure to introduce legislation regarding smoking.

Minimum unit pricing of alcohol would be likely to have a major effect on purchasing and consumption and liver disease was the only cause of death which was rising and was related to alcohol consumption and obesity. It would be possible to extrapolate the relevant data for Sheffield

The introduction of the Living Wage would have significant health benefits, for example in reducing fuel poverty. Diet was an important public health issue, with some families unable to adequately feed themselves. Introducing a Living Wage was therefore an important intervention in public health terms.

Of the recommendations in the Director of Public Health Annual Report, the staffing of public health teams was especially important in making a substantial impact on improving outcomes in Sheffield. Some initiatives

were being held back by not having staff in place to take them forward. It was important therefore to fill vacant public health posts.

Water fluoridation would improve the dental health of children and young people, particularly in the poorer areas of the City. However, it was not necessarily easy to bring about change to introduce fluoridation, partly because of the infrastructure for the distribution of water to Sheffield. Whilst it was within the gift of the Council to request that water is fluoridised, this would need to be done on the basis of collaboration between the various authorities in the region.

In response to an invitation to submit a written contribution to a Scrutiny exercise concerning Child and Adolescent Mental Health Services (CAMHS), Dr Wight replied that he would be pleased to provide a written submission. There was, he said, increasing evidence that the poor mental health of very young children (i.e. below school age) was a disadvantage, which inhibited their future development and opportunities. Sheffield's bid to the Big Lottery's Fulfilling Lives Better Start fund had the potential to attract significant funding to the City for children aged 0-3 years.

When a child of school age was truanting, they were not receiving an education, which was most important in determining their life trajectory and the potential effect on their health was similar as for young people not in education, employment or training.

Removing the health barriers for employment for people with mental health conditions was a challenging area to progress and the former Local Area Agreement did include targets relating to getting people with mental health conditions into employment. It was difficult to find suitable employment and to support people in retaining their job. Good employment was a positive aspect in improving people's mental health. The Council was in the process of formulating proposals in this regard, although there would not be a quick solution.

There was debate as to the value of electronic cigarettes which delivered nicotine. It was either considered to be a good way to wean people off cigarettes; or it was something which normalises smoking, which was not, from a health perspective, desirable. The results were inconclusive and some people say they have use electronic cigarettes to help them to give up smoking. On the other hand, electronic cigarettes might encourage children to take up smoking. There had also been recent debate in the European Parliament about regulating the sale of such e-cigarettes.

Poverty was bad for health and long standing public health issues relevant in the Victorian period, including air quality and diet remained. Access to clean water was an exception, since this is now universal. Health inequalities were brought about by socio-economic inequalities; and initiatives such as the Healthy Communities Programme aimed to minimise poor health resulting from inequalities. Measures to help mitigate the effects of inequality would be taken forward through, for example, locality working.

There were 450 deaths in the UK annually due to late diagnosis of breast cancer and improving this situation required the public health team to work with GPs.

The Southey and Owlerton Area Regeneration programme had done some fantastic work in respect of smoking cessation. Smoking cessation services were important in the City's approach to tobacco and were also one of the most cost effective means of reducing smoking. Provision of such services was subject to a tender process and particular communities would be targeted in this process. The supply of cheap and illicit tobacco was a problem, with half of the available tobacco being illegal. There was a relationship between the price of tobacco and the level of consumption. It was planned to divert some funding to support Trading Standards and Environmental Services to support enforcement and prosecutions. A difficulty was that Magistrates did not issue fines in relation to illegal tobacco that provided a large enough deterrent.

Methods did need to be found to help older people to be more active. The Health Survey for England indicated that activity levels decreased in older people aged over 60-65 years. Activity such as gardening was beneficial to people. The Move More initiative promoted physical activity for older people.

There was data relating to inequalities in the City which can be provided to Members.

A distributed model of public health had been implemented in Sheffield and it was important to have public health professionals working throughout the organisation and the location of those working in public health would be communicated to Members.

There were risks in participating in sports including rugby, horse riding and climbing and the responsibility for mitigating the risk of injury partly lay with the relevant governing body for those sports. It was also necessary to tell people about the benefits of participating in sport and physical activity.

On behalf of the Council, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) thanked Dr Wight for his presentation to Council and for his responses to Members' questions.

7. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

Pursuant to Council Procedure Rule 5.5 relating to the termination of meetings of the Council, the items relating to Urgent Business, Questions to Cabinet Members and Questions relating to the South Yorkshire Joint Authorities were not considered. A schedule of questions to Cabinet Members, submitted in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 16, and which contained written answers, was circulated.

8. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that (a) it be noted that the Leader has, with effect from 5th November 2013, appointed Councillor Ben Curran to serve as the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources and filling the vacancy in that office since 25th October;

(b) Councillor Jayne Dunn be appointed to serve as a Cabinet Adviser for Health, Care and Independent Living in place of Councillor Ben Curran;

(c) Councillor Bryan Lodge be appointed to serve on the South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority in place of Councillor Jayne Dunn;

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

Local Area Partnership Lead - Councillor Alan Law to replace Councillor Ward Member (Firth Park) Chris Weldon

(e) authorisation is given to the establishment of a Castlegate Member Working Group comprising 3 Labour Group Members, 2 Liberal Democrat Group Members and 1 Green Group Member and Councillors Chris Rosling-Josephs, Penny Baker and Jillian Creasy be appointed as Members of the Working Group.

9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MAZHER IQBAL

Energy Prices

At the request of Councillor Mazher Iqbal (the mover of the Motion) and with the consent of the Council, the Notice of Motion Numbered 8 on the Summons for this meeting was withdrawn.

10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR NEALE GIBSON

Homophobic Hate Crime

It was moved by Councillor Neale Gibson, seconded by Councillor Nikki Bond, that this Council:-

(a) calls on the Home Secretary to act on the recent report from Stonewall on homophobic hate crime showing that:

(i) one in six lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgendered (LGBT) people have experienced a homophobic hate crime in the last three years;

- (ii) one in ten victims experienced a physical assault as part of the incident;
- (iii) more than three out of four victims didn't report their experience to the police;
- (iv) almost a third didn't report because they didn't believe the police could or would do anything;
- (v) one in four gay or bisexual women have experienced domestic abuse in a relationship;
- (vi) half of all gay and bisexual men have experienced at least one incident of domestic abuse since the age of 16;
- (vii) a quarter expect discrimination if reporting a homophobic hate crime to the police; and
- (viii) more than a third of lesbian, gay and bisexual people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds expect discrimination from the police;
- (b) further notes that when these figures are extrapolated to Sheffield, over six thousand residents of the City have experienced homophobic hate crime in the last three years, and in recent years the total number of reports to the police was an average of 40 per year; and
- (c) recognises the work that the South Yorkshire Police, lead by Police and Crime Commissioner Shaun Wright, are currently undertaking with the LGBT groups in the City.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Roger Davison, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (c) and the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-

- (c) calls upon Shaun Wright, the Police and Crime Commissioner, to undertake further work with LGBT groups across the city to ensure that homophobic hate crimes are tackled.

On being put to the vote, the amendment was negated. The original Motion was then put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) calls on the Home Secretary to act on the recent report from Stonewall on homophobic hate crime showing that:
 - (i) one in six lesbian, gay, bisexual or transgendered (LGBT) people have experienced a homophobic hate crime in the last three years;
 - (ii) one in ten victims experienced a physical assault as part of the incident;

- (iii) more than three out of four victims didn't report their experience to the police;
- (iv) almost a third didn't report because they didn't believe the police could or would do anything;
- (v) one in four gay or bisexual women have experienced domestic abuse in a relationship;
- (vi) half of all gay and bisexual men have experienced at least one incident of domestic abuse since the age of 16;
- (vii) a quarter expect discrimination if reporting a homophobic hate crime to the police; and
- (viii) more than a third of lesbian, gay and bisexual people from black and minority ethnic backgrounds expect discrimination from the police;
- (b) further notes that when these figures are extrapolated to Sheffield, over six thousand residents of the City have experienced homophobic hate crime in the last three years, and in recent years the total number of reports to the police was an average of 40 per year; and
- (c) recognises the work that the South Yorkshire Police, lead by Police and Crime Commissioner Shaun Wright, are currently undertaking with the LGBT groups in the City.

(Note: Councillors Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted for paragraphs (a) and (b) and abstained on paragraph (c) and asked for this to be recorded.)

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED

Employment Growth and Apprenticeships

It was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, that this Council:-

- (a) wholeheartedly welcomes the latest labour bulletin, which reported an 11% drop in Jobseeker's Allowance claimants in Sheffield;
- (b) furthermore, welcomes reports that 25,000 jobs have been created in Yorkshire in the past three months;
- (c) further welcomes news that the economy grew by 0.8% in the third quarter

of 2013 and notes that the International Monetary Fund has upgraded its growth forecasts for the UK by more than any other advanced economy;

- (d) notes that a million private sector jobs have been created since May 2010 and contrasts this with the claim of the Leader of Her Majesty's Opposition that the Government's policies would lead to the disappearance of a million jobs;
- (e) believes the Liberal Democrats in Government have been crucial in rebuilding Britain's economy following the economic disaster presided over by the last Government;
- (f) specifically thanks Liberal Democrats in Government for helping to secure measures that will build a stronger economy for Sheffield, including:
 - (i) millions of pounds invested in local businesses through the Regional Growth Fund and the Growing Places Fund;
 - (ii) a new University Technical College to provide the next generation of Sheffielders with the skills they need;
 - (iii) record investment in transport infrastructure including £1 billion to enable the Streets Ahead project to proceed, electrification of Midland Main Line and a Tram/Train pilot; and
 - (iv) a Sheffield Enterprise Zone, which could deliver as many as 12,000 new jobs;
- (g) in particular, highlights the Sheffield City Deal, which the Deputy Prime Minister was crucial in securing and has already created 370 apprenticeships across the city region;
- (h) however, notes that other city regions have outpaced Sheffield with Greater Birmingham & Solihull having already established 1,351 apprenticeships and Greater Manchester having outperformed their own target by creating 2,755 apprenticeships; and
- (i) therefore, calls upon the Council to drop its anti-business rhetoric and work with local partners to ensure the Sheffield City Region maximises the potential of the City Deal.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Mick Rooney, 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) welcomes any fall in unemployment which is especially important given the mismanagement of the economic recovery by the present Government over the past three and a half years and notes reports from the Daily Express in May this year that 'George Osborne's economic policy has led

to the "weakest recovery in recent history", according to the International Monetary Fund (IMF).'

- (b) is concerned that the present Government are becoming increasingly complacent about the recovery and is concerned by the celebratory tone of the Leader of the Council's main opposition group's motion when many Sheffield families continue to face extremely challenging economic circumstances including the cost of living crisis which this Government is failing to tackle;
- (c) notes an article in the Guardian newspaper on 23rd October 2013 which states that "the recovery has so far been enjoyed by a relatively small number of people in a few patches of the country. Analysis of official statistics by the Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (Cresc) at Manchester University [shows that]: London and the south-east have come roaring out of the crash, and now account for a greater share of growth than they did even during the boom. Nearly every other part of the country has got relatively worse off. And while the typical worker is going through the longest squeeze in living standards since the 1870s, top-earning households are comparatively better off than they were before the crash."
- (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) recalls the principle that the City Deals were led by the cities and the ideas behind the Sheffield City Region Deal were formulated within the city region, led by local public and private leaders, and it is not the Deputy Prime Minister or Whitehall that have delivered the 425 apprenticeships, it's the City Region, with Sheffield as its Core City, providing the vision, leadership and delivery to make a difference to young people in SCR and to our businesses and is therefore pleased that the main opposition group have recognised the work taken by the present Administration, neighbouring authorities and the Local Enterprise Partnership;
- (f) regrets that the main opposition group have yet again attempted to mislead the Council, this time about apprenticeships, and notes an article from the Liverpool Daily Post from 10th June 2013 which states that "Liverpool is outranking most of its rival cities when it comes to helping young people into apprenticeships, new council figures reveal. Some 5.2% of the city's 16 and 17-year-olds now take up apprenticeships. That compares to an English average of 3.2% and is higher than the figures in other "core cities" Bristol, Nottingham, Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham and Newcastle. Only Sheffield performs better, with 6% of young people taking apprenticeships.";
- (g) regrets that the main opposition group have resorted to making misleading claims about apprenticeship figures and confirms the following facts:
 - (i) the Sheffield City Deal is unique in that it allows apprenticeships to be designed specifically to meet the needs of the local economy and welcomes that the private sector in Sheffield City Region are leading the skills deal with the SCR Skills for Growth Partnership which oversees the delivery of the deal;
 - (ii) Sheffield City Region has only counted additional apprenticeships created by Skills Made Easy and all other City Deals are simply counting the apprenticeships created during the period by providers, which is not additionality;
 - (iii) data from the Skills Funding Agency suggests that there were 18,785 Apprenticeship starts in the City Region during 2012 – 13;
 - (iv) 9,269 successful apprenticeship completions are being reported for the same year at the moment; and
 - (v) the latest figures show that 7.8% of Sheffield's 16 and 17 year olds are taking up an apprenticeship which exceeds the English average of 4.1% and the Core City average of 4.6%;
- (h) welcomes that these figures recognise Sheffield's success in delivering

apprenticeships and the efforts of the present Administration who have prioritised apprenticeships;

- (i) notes that this record is in stark contrast to the previous Administration who broke a promise made by its Leader to commit £1 million of council resources to the Future Jobs Fund; and
- (j) regrets that one of the first actions of this Government was to scrap the Future Jobs Fund and believes that this was a costly mistake.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes any fall in unemployment which is especially important given the mismanagement of the economic recovery by the present Government over the past three and a half years and notes reports from the Daily Express in May this year that 'George Osborne's economic policy has led to the "weakest recovery in recent history", according to the International Monetary Fund (IMF).'
- (b) is concerned that the present Government are becoming increasingly complacent about the recovery and is concerned by the celebratory tone of the Leader of the Council's main opposition group's motion when many Sheffield families continue to face extremely challenging economic circumstances including the cost of living crisis which this Government is failing to tackle;
- (c) notes an article in the Guardian newspaper on 23rd October 2013 which states that "the recovery has so far been enjoyed by a relatively small number of people in a few patches of the country. Analysis of official statistics by the Centre for Research on Socio-Cultural Change (Cresc) at Manchester University [shows that]: London and the south-east have come roaring out of the crash, and now account for a greater share of growth than they did even during the boom. Nearly every other part of the country has got relatively worse off. And while the typical worker is going through the longest squeeze in living standards since the 1870s, top-earning households are comparatively better off than they were before the crash."
- (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) recalls the principle that the City Deals were led by the cities and the ideas behind the Sheffield City Region Deal were formulated within the city region, led by local public and private leaders, and it is not the Deputy Prime Minister or Whitehall that have delivered the 425 apprenticeships, it's the City Region, with Sheffield as its Core City, providing the vision, leadership and delivery to make a difference to young people in SCR and to our businesses and is therefore pleased that the main opposition group have recognised the work taken by the present Administration, neighbouring authorities and the Local Enterprise Partnership;
- (f) regrets that the main opposition group have yet again attempted to mislead the Council, this time about apprenticeships, and notes an article from the Liverpool Daily Post from 10th June 2013 which states that "Liverpool is outranking most of its rival cities when it comes to helping young people into apprenticeships, new council figures reveal. Some 5.2% of the city's 16 and 17-year-olds now take up apprenticeships. That compares to an English average of 3.2% and is higher than the figures in other "core cities" Bristol, Nottingham, Leeds, Manchester, Birmingham and Newcastle. Only Sheffield performs better, with 6% of young people taking apprenticeships.";
- (g) regrets that the main opposition group have resorted to making misleading claims about apprenticeship figures and confirms the following facts:
- (i) the Sheffield City Deal is unique in that it allows apprenticeships to

be designed specifically to meet the needs of the local economy and welcomes that the private sector in Sheffield City Region are leading the skills deal with the SCR Skills for Growth Partnership which oversees the delivery of the deal;

- (ii) Sheffield City Region has only counted additional apprenticeships created by Skills Made Easy and all other City Deals are simply counting the apprenticeships created during the period by providers, which is not additionality;
- (iii) data from the Skills Funding Agency suggests that there were 18,785 Apprenticeship starts in the City Region during 2012 – 13;
- (iv) 9,269 successful apprenticeship completions are being reported for the same year at the moment; and
- (v) the latest figures show that 7.8% of Sheffield's 16 and 17 year olds are taking up an apprenticeship which exceeds the English average of 4.1% and the Core City average of 4.6%;
- (h) welcomes that these figures recognise Sheffield's success in delivering apprenticeships and the efforts of the present Administration who have prioritised apprenticeships;
- (i) notes that this record is in stark contrast to the previous Administration who broke a promise made by its Leader to commit £1 million of council resources to the Future Jobs Fund; and
- (j) regrets that one of the first actions of this Government was to scrap the Future Jobs Fund and believes that this was a costly mistake.

(Note: 1. Councillors Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted against paragraphs (a) to (c) and (e) to (j) and abstained on paragraph (d) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillor Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a), (c) and (h) and abstained on Paragraphs (b) and (d) to (g) and (i) and (j) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL

Rise Graduate Internships

It was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Isobel Bowler, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the success of the present Administration's RISE graduate scheme which has so far filled 28 graduate interns into 24 businesses;
- (b) notes that many students undertake internships shortly after graduating and that internships offer a great way to get a 'foot in the door' after graduating, get training, test out potential future employers and get experience on your CV;
- (c) welcomes that the RISE internship scheme brings together graduates, who want to work hard and do great things, with Sheffield-based businesses who appreciate an injection of energy and new ideas;
- (d) firmly believes that the scheme will not only give opportunities to graduates but will also provide local businesses with an opportunity to attract graduates to a range of sectors crucial to the growth of the local economy, including engineering, professional and financial services, creative and digital industries, to name a selective few;
- (e) notes that over 700 applications were received for the graduate internships and thanks all applicants, recognising the extremely challenging economic climate in gaining employment following graduation, noting the high levels of graduate unemployment;
- (f) welcomes the positive comments from local businesses about the scheme including the comment from one participant, "We found the RISE experience provided us with the confidence to invest in an intern with the objective of providing permanent full-time employment. The whole process from the initial advisory meetings, the communication and collaboration throughout the screening stage and the continued support, was and is invaluable to a small business such as ours. We have been involved in other apprenticeship and work experience schemes in the past and the RISE initiative has been by far the most professional and feel it provides great value to businesses in the region."
- (g) is therefore extremely disappointed that the main opposition group voted against welcoming the scheme at the two previous Council meetings and believes that this is the latest Liberal Democrat betrayal of students;
- (h) is delighted to confirm a further intake has now been approved, aiming to get a total of 50 RISE internships into Sheffield's small and medium enterprises by the end of the year which have been funded from the Keep Sheffield Working Fund, meaning a further 21 internships with 21 businesses have been secured for the second round of the programme; and
- (i) directs that a copy of this Motion be sent to Sheffield University Students Union and Sheffield Hallam University Students Union, the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce and Federation of Small Businesses.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, 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) laments the appalling legacy of unemployment, particularly among 18-24 year olds, left by the last Government;
- (b) supports all measures to help young people in Sheffield into jobs, including the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme, Rise Sheffield, the City Deal, the Youth Contract and University Technical Colleges;
- (c) welcomes news that the Sheffield City Deal has already created 370 apprenticeships across the city region;
- (d) however, notes reports in The Guardian newspaper that other city regions have outpaced Sheffield with Greater Birmingham and Solihull having already established 1,351 apprenticeships and Greater Manchester having outperformed their own target by creating 2,755 apprenticeships;
- (e) furthermore, believes that as this Administration gives to business with one hand it takes away with the other;
- (f) notes, in particular, the following as examples of the anti-business sentiments held by members of the ruling Group:
 - (i) rejecting a proposal by NEXT to locate a new department store in Sheffield, and providing a lukewarm reception to the proposal for an Ikea superstore;
 - (ii) failing to hold the full MADE entrepreneur festival in 2013;
 - (iii) hiking some city centre parking charges and increasing the hours of operation, damaging city-centre businesses;
 - (iv) ignoring appeals from traders in Millhouses for additional parking over the Christmas period and opposing plans to re-introduce free Christmas parking in the city and district centres; and
 - (v) attempting to ban ice cream vans more than 5 years old;
- (g) regrets that these policies have seen the Council criticised in The Star newspaper by business leaders for "closing its doors to business" and having "lost touch with the business reality of the 21st century"; and
- (h) calls upon the Administration to drop their anti-business rhetoric and work with the local business community to ensure the city maximises the potential of the City Deal and supports a generation of young people into

work.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the success of the present Administration's RISE graduate scheme which has so far filled 28 graduate interns into 24 businesses;
- (b) notes that many students undertake internships shortly after graduating and that internships offer a great way to get a 'foot in the door' after graduating, get training, test out potential future employers and get experience on your CV;
- (c) welcomes that the RISE internship scheme brings together graduates, who want to work hard and do great things, with Sheffield-based businesses who appreciate an injection of energy and new ideas;
- (d) firmly believes that the scheme will not only give opportunities to graduates but will also provide local businesses with an opportunity to attract graduates to a range of sectors crucial to the growth of the local economy, including engineering, professional and financial services, creative and digital industries, to name a selective few;
- (e) notes that over 700 applications were received for the graduate internships and thanks all applicants, recognising the extremely challenging economic climate in gaining employment following graduation, noting the high levels of graduate unemployment;
- (f) welcomes the positive comments from local businesses about the scheme including the comment from one participant, "We found the RISE experience provided us with the confidence to invest in an intern with the objective of providing permanent full-time employment. The whole process from the initial advisory meetings, the communication and collaboration throughout the screening stage and the continued support, was and is invaluable to a small business such as ours. We have been involved in other apprenticeship and work experience schemes in the past and the RISE initiative has been by far the most professional and feel it provides great value to businesses in the region."
- (g) is therefore extremely disappointed that the main opposition group voted against welcoming the scheme at the two previous Council meetings and believes that this is the latest Liberal Democrat betrayal of students;
- (h) is delighted to confirm a further intake has now been approved, aiming to get a total of 50 RISE internships into Sheffield's small and medium enterprises by the end of the year which have been funded from the Keep Sheffield Working Fund, meaning a further 21 internships with 21

businesses have been secured for the second round of the programme;
and

- (i) directs that a copy of this Motion be sent to Sheffield University Students Union and Sheffield Hallam University Students Union, the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce and Federation of Small Businesses.

(Note: 1. Councillors Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted for paragraphs (a) to (f) and (h) to (i) and against paragraph (g) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillor Robert Murphy voted for paragraphs (a) to (f) and (h) and (i) and abstained on paragraph (g) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR HELEN MIRFIN-BOUKOURIS

Blood Sports

It was moved by Councillor Steve Wilson seconded by Councillor Ian Saunders, that this Council:-

- (a) congratulates the League against Cruel Sports for its excellent “Manifesto to end Snaring in Great Britain and Northern Ireland.”, and
 - (i) notes the report details that in some instances trapped animals can take up to 16 hours to die even when a legal snare is used;
 - (ii) further notes that many of these animals die a horrible painful death and that often it is domestic animals such as cats that get caught in snares; and
 - (iii) further asks that this Council offers its support to the League against Cruel Sports campaign to get the use of all types of snares banned in Great Britain and Northern Ireland;
- (b) congratulates erstwhile colleagues from the 1980s who banned the use of snares and all blood sports on Council property, including fox hunting and hare coursing, and condemns the present Government’s promise to hold a free vote on repealing the Hunting Act 2004;
- (c) re-affirms its ban on blood sports and the use of all types of snares on Council land and property;
- (d) asks the Chief Executive of Sheffield City Council to ensure all Sheffield City Council land leaseholders are reminded of their duties of care to animals on Council land;

- (e) further instructs that a copy of this motion be sent to all Sheffield's Members of Parliament asking that they raise this Council's opposition to blood sports and the use of any type of snare with the Secretary of State for Environment and Rural Affairs, and that they encourage the Secretary of State to ban the use of all snares, and encourages all Sheffield MPs to vote against any vote that would repeal or weaken the Hunting Act 2004;
- (f) further asks the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Environment and Rural Affairs informing him of this Council's opposition to blood sports and the ban placed on them on Sheffield City Council land; and
- (g) also asks the Chief Executive to inform the Secretary of State for Environment and Rural Affairs of this Council's opposition to any repeal or weakening of the Hunting Act 2004.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Katie Condliffe, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended in paragraph (b) by the deletion of all the words in that paragraph after the word "coursing".

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

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

- | |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) congratulates the League against Cruel Sports for its excellent "Manifesto to end Snaring in Great Britain and Northern Ireland.", and<ul style="list-style-type: none">(i) notes the report details that in some instances trapped animals can take up to 16 hours to die even when a legal snare is used;(ii) further notes that many of these animals die a horrible painful death and that often it is domestic animals such as cats that get caught in snares; and(iii) further asks that this Council offers its support to the League against Cruel Sports campaign to get the use of all types of snares banned in Great Britain and Northern Ireland;(b) congratulates erstwhile colleagues from the 1980s who banned the use of snares and all blood sports on Council property, including fox hunting and hare coursing, and condemns the present Government's promise to hold a free vote on repealing the Hunting Act 2004;(c) re-affirms its ban on blood sports and the use of all types of snares on Council land and property;(d) asks the Chief Executive of Sheffield City Council to ensure all Sheffield City Council land leaseholders are reminded of their duties of care to |
|---|

animals on Council land;

- (e) further instructs that a copy of this motion be sent to all Sheffield's Members of Parliament asking that they raise this Council's opposition to blood sports and the use of any type of snare with the Secretary of State for Environment and Rural Affairs, and that they encourage the Secretary of State to ban the use of all snares, and encourages all Sheffield MPs to vote against any vote that would repeal or weaken the Hunting Act 2004;
- (f) further asks the Chief Executive to write to the Secretary of State for Environment and Rural Affairs informing him of this Council's opposition to blood sports and the ban placed on them on Sheffield City Council land; and
- (g) also asks the Chief Executive to inform the Secretary of State for Environment and Rural Affairs of this Council's opposition to any repeal or weakening of the Hunting Act 2004.

(Note: Councillors Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted for paragraphs (a) and (c) to (g) and against paragraph (b) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ANDREW SANGAR

Sorby House, Forum House and Vestry Hall

It was moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that since Sorby House, Forum House and Vestry Hall came under the Council's ownership more than £1.2 million has been spent by the Council on the premises in just two years;
- (b) further notes with concern reports that another £330,000 has been allocated to the buildings within the 2013/14 budget;
- (c) believes the Burngreave New Deal for Communities was another example of a costly New Labour project, which delivered poor value for money and almost no economic benefit for the city;
- (d) regrets that at a time when the Administration claim they have been forced to withdraw funding from libraries, yet more Council funds are being wasted on another Labour 'white elephant'; and
- (e) urges the Administration to ensure no further funds are wasted on these buildings and focus on saving treasured local libraries instead.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Ben Curran, seconded by Councillor Harry Harpham, 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 the continued irresponsible scaremongering of the main opposition group and reminds them that they made the decision to bring Sorby House, Forum House and Vestry Hall back into the Council in December 2010 and is therefore shocked at the hypocrisy of the main opposition group;
- (b) welcomes moves to put in place plans to ensure that the buildings are sensibly used as part of the Council's accommodation strategy which aims to save £30 million over 10 years by consolidating Council departments in fewer buildings;
- (c) regrets that the main opposition group continue to carp and criticise from the sidelines attempting to mislead local people, when the decision to bring these buildings into the Council was taken by the previous Administration and they are now being used to contribute to savings to the Council's accommodation costs;
- (d) continues to oppose the present Government's, of which the Liberal Democrat MP for Sheffield Hallam is Deputy Prime Minister, unfair cuts to Sheffield as they continue to slash Council budgets which is regrettably impacting on Council services; and
- (e) believes that the main opposition group should stand up for Sheffield at a time when the Council faces unprecedented cuts from the Coalition Government and believes this is the latest example of the main opposition group having absolutely no credibility and remembers that only a few months ago the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Party and Leader of the Council's main opposition group were written to by the Chief Executive of the Council to correct numerous misrepresentations that had been made about the Council's budget.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) regrets the continued irresponsible scaremongering of the main opposition group and reminds them that they made the decision to bring Sorby House, Forum House and Vestry Hall back into the Council in December 2010 and is therefore shocked at the hypocrisy of the main opposition group;
- (b) welcomes moves to put in place plans to ensure that the buildings are sensibly used as part of the Council's accommodation strategy which aims

- to save £30 million over 10 years by consolidating Council departments in fewer buildings;
- (c) regrets that the main opposition group continue to carp and criticise from the sidelines attempting to mislead local people, when the decision to bring these buildings into the Council was taken by the previous Administration and they are now being used to contribute to savings to the Council's accommodation costs;
 - (d) continues to oppose the present Government's, of which the Liberal Democrat MP for Sheffield Hallam is Deputy Prime Minister, unfair cuts to Sheffield as they continue to slash Council budgets which is regrettably impacting on Council services; and
 - (e) believes that the main opposition group should stand up for Sheffield at a time when the Council faces unprecedented cuts from the Coalition Government and believes this is the latest example of the main opposition group having absolutely no credibility and remembers that only a few months ago the Leader of the Liberal Democrat Party and Leader of the Council's main opposition group were written to by the Chief Executive of the Council to correct numerous misrepresentations that had been made about the Council's budget.

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

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR HELEN MIRFIN-BOUKOURIS

National Children's Day

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Gill Furniss, seconded by Councillor Jackie Drayton, that this Council:-

- (a) supports the campaign for a National Children's Day;
- (b) welcomes the launch of the campaign for a National Children's Day on 20th November in Sheffield by "Youth Can Achieve" which is endorsed by the National Society for the Prevention of Cruelty to Children (NSPCC);
- (c) encourages schools to celebrate this campaign launch on 20th November with games or activities and take this opportunity for a discussion with children about their rights to education, healthcare and economic opportunity;
- (d) acknowledges that although this is a wealthy country there are still 1.7million children who live in severe poverty;

- (e) reminds Members of their responsibilities as corporate parents to our Looked After Children;
- (f) encourages Members where possible to take time on 20th November to engage in an activity supporting young people and spreading awareness of the Campaign for a National Children's Day;
- (g) wishes the children and adults who will be debating the benefits of a National Children's Day an enjoyable and productive event; and
- (h) requests that a copy of this Notice of Motion be sent to Sheffield's Members of Parliament and the Children's Commissioner with a view to furthering the Campaign for a National Children's Day.

16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE

Sheffield Theatres

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Isobel Bowler, that this Council:-

- (a) congratulates Sheffield Theatres for their success at the recent UK Theatre Awards on 20th October, 2013;
- (b) notes that Sheffield Theatres received awards in four different categories: Best New Play, Best Supporting Performance, Best Musical Production and Best Touring Production;
- (c) congratulates Sheffield Theatres' Artistic Director Daniel Evans, whose plays 'This is My Family' and 'The Full Monty' won the Best Musical Production and Best Touring Production Awards respectively;
- (d) further congratulates Siân Phillips for winning Best Supporting Performance for her role in 'This Is My Family' and Mike Bartlett who wrote 'Bull' the winner of the Best New Play;
- (e) believes these awards highlight the contribution Sheffield Theatres makes to the City and thanks Sheffield Theatres staff and trustees for their hard work; and
- (f) directs that a copy of this Motion be sent to Sheffield Theatres and that letters of congratulations be sent to those mentioned above who have received individual awards.

17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR IAN AUCKLAND

Car Parking Revenue

It was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, that this Council:-

- (a) believes it is unacceptable to treat motorists as a cash cow for the Council;
- (b) recalls the annual parking enforcement reports introduced by the last Administration to bring transparency to parking services, which were nationally recognised as leading practice;
- (c) notes the recent report of the Transport Select Committee, which called on every local authority to publish an annual parking report outlining revenue gained from parking and how this money is spent;
- (d) regrets that under the current Administration the annual parking enforcement reports have ceased and that not a single report has been published covering the current Administration's time in control; and
- (e) therefore, calls upon the Administration to immediately publish a record of the revenue raised by parking services and how it has been spent.

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

1. the deletion of all the words after the words "reports" in paragraph (b) and their substitution by the words "for which plans were put in place by the previous Labour Administration but implemented by the previous Administration and regrets the shameful attempt to take credit for a plan that the previous Administration inherited from their predecessors";
2. the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows and the re-lettering of original paragraph (c) as a new paragraph (d):-
 - (c) notes that Sheffield's reports demonstrate that the previous Administration clearly oversaw surpluses in parking services which were justified on the basis that "The surplus generated from the City Council's parking activities contributes to the overall provision of Transportation, Parking and Highway services in the city."
3. the deletion of original paragraphs (d) and (e); and
4. the addition of new paragraphs (e) to (h) as follows:-
 - (e) notes that figures regarding income from parking services and associated costs have frequently been published in the public domain under the present Administration and regrets the continued political opportunism of the main opposition group;
 - (f) welcomes that the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development had already instructed officers to produce a parking

enforcement report and looks forward to its publication;

- (g) reminds the main opposition group of the previous Administration's record on parking which increased charges in all but one year, including the doubling of pay and display charges in permit parking zones; and
- (h) deplores the hypocrisy and cynical political opportunism of the main opposition group who campaigned against the increases of parking permit prices from £10 to £20 in 2012 and cynically dropped this commitment in their following year's budget proposal and believes that this is indicative of a culture of casual broken promises within the party of the main opposition group.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes it is unacceptable to treat motorists as a cash cow for the Council;
- (b) recalls the annual parking enforcement reports for which plans were put in place by the previous Labour Administration but implemented by the previous Administration and regrets the shameful attempt to take credit for a plan that the previous Administration inherited from their predecessors;
- (c) notes that Sheffield's reports demonstrate that the previous Administration clearly oversaw surpluses in parking services which were justified on the basis that "The surplus generated from the City Council's parking activities contributes to the overall provision of Transportation, Parking and Highway services in the city."
- (d) notes the recent report of the Transport Select Committee, which called on every local authority to publish an annual parking report outlining revenue gained from parking and how this money is spent;
- (e) notes that figures regarding income from parking services and associated costs have frequently been published in the public domain under the present Administration and regrets the continued political opportunism of the main opposition group;
- (f) welcomes that the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development had already instructed officers to produce a parking enforcement report and looks forward to its publication;
- (g) reminds the main opposition group of the previous Administration's record on parking which increased charges in all but one year, including the doubling of pay and display charges in permit parking zones; and

- (h) deplores the hypocrisy and cynical political opportunism of the main opposition group who campaigned against the increases of parking permit prices from £10 to £20 in 2012 and cynically dropped this commitment in their following year's budget proposal and believes that this is indicative of a culture of casual broken promises within the party of the main opposition group.

(Note: Councillor Robert Murphy voted for paragraphs (a) to (d), (f) and (g), against paragraph (e) and abstained on paragraph (h) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOE OTTEN

It was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Katie Condliffe, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the #WhyIAmIn campaign supporting membership of the European Union, which was launched by the Liberal Democrat MP for Sheffield Hallam, and has gained support from Sir Richard Branson, among others;
- (b) believes remaining part of the European Union is vital to the long term security of Sheffield businesses and to building a stronger local economy; and
- (c) calls upon Sheffield businesses and public sector organisations to highlight the importance of remaining within the European Union in the run-up to the 2014 European Parliament elections.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (c) and the addition of new paragraphs (c) and (d) as follows:-

- (c) believes local businesses should be free to make up their own view on the European Union and not be lectured to by the Liberal Democrat Party; and
- (d) regrets that this Government and the Deputy Prime Minister, The Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP, have yet again let Sheffield and South Yorkshire down over EU funding and urges them to urgently reconsider these proposals and give South Yorkshire a fair deal.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes the #WhyIAmIn campaign supporting membership of the European Union, which was launched by the Liberal Democrat MP for Sheffield Hallam, and has gained support from Sir Richard Branson, among others;
- (b) believes remaining part of the European Union is vital to the long term security of Sheffield businesses and to building a stronger local economy; and
- (c) believes local businesses should be free to make up their own view on the European Union and not be lectured to by the Liberal Democrat Party; and
- (d) regrets that this Government and the Deputy Prime Minister, The Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP, have yet again let Sheffield and South Yorkshire down over EU funding and urges them to urgently reconsider these proposals and give South Yorkshire a fair deal.

(Note: 1. Councillors Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted for paragraphs (a) and (b) and against paragraphs (c) and (d) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillor Robert Murphy voted for paragraphs (a) and (b) and abstained on paragraphs (c) and (d) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)