

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH, on Wednesday 5 February 2014, 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 &amp; Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Isobel Bowler Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief &amp; Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Roy Munn Clive Skelton	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Garry Weatherall Steve Wilson Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Nikki Bond Anders Hanson Qurban Hussain
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison Diana Stimely	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> John Campbell Martin Lawton Lynn Rooney
4	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	13	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Sheila Constance Alan Law Chris Weldon	22	<i>Shiregreen &amp; Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Shaffaq Mohammed Stuart Wattam	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Leigh Bramall Tony Damms Gill Furniss
6	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Ibrar Hussain Talib Hussain	15	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Steve Jones Cate McDonald Tim Rippon	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Jillian Creasy Mohammad Maroof Robert Murphy	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Bob McCann Denise Reaney	25	<i>Stockbridge &amp; Upper Don Ward</i> Alison Brelsford Richard Crowther Philip Wood
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Rob Frost Geoff Smith	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Janet Bragg George Lindars-Hammond	26	<i>Walkey Ward</i> Ben Curran 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 Adam Hurst Alf Meade
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Ray Satur



**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Sylvia Anginotti, Keith Hill, Bob Johnson and Nikki Sharpe.

**2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

There were no declarations of interest from Members of the City Council.

**3. 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 8 January 2014 be approved as a correct record.

**4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS**

**4.1 Petitions**

**4.1.1 Petition requesting a reduction in charges for parking permit schemes**

The Council received a petition containing 290 signatures and requesting a reduction in charges for parking permit schemes.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Sarah Jane Smalley. She stated that the prices of permits had increased to £36 for residents' parking permits and £12.50 for a book of visitor permits. Residents were informed that the parking permit schemes would be non-profit making. She also stated that this was a 'stealth tax', the money from which was not being spent in the same areas in which it was received. The charges particularly affected older people and vulnerable people and families with more than one car.

The parking permits schemes were a good idea, but the expansion of such schemes might be affected by people's perception that a surplus is made by the Council. She asked the Council to review the situation and consider reducing the charge of permits back to the level of £10, which they had been previously.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, Councillor Leigh Bramall. Councillor Bramall stated that the context had to be considered. The claim regarding the making of a surplus on residents' parking permits ignored the costs of the schemes.

A principle had been established that, where people benefit from the parking permit scheme, it was right that they should pay toward the cost of it. Residential Parking schemes were first introduced in 2004/5 and the cost of a resident's parking permit was £35, which then increased to £36. The charges did not cover

the full costs of the schemes.

Permits then reduced to £10 in 2010 and other Council resources were required to fill the resultant gap in funding. In subsequent years, it has become increasingly difficult to commit as much resource to bridge the funding gap in the context of Government austerity cuts affecting the Council's budget. The charge for a residents' permit was then increased from £10 to £36 (which was the same charge as that made in 2006). This was so that the permit fees contributed a greater proportion of the costs of operating permit parking schemes but only to the same level as in 2010.

If a proposal was made to reduce the cost of residents' permits to £10, then it was also important to explain how the decrease would be funded, for example by cutting the funding allocated to other services provided by the Council or by increasing the Council Tax. The wider context may be missed. An increase in Council Tax might be considered arbitrary because it affected people in all areas of the City, including areas with greater levels of deprivation where permits are not issued.

Councillor Bramall made reference to the comparative costs of parking permit schemes in Brighton and Hove, which were between £90 and £120. He stated that he believed that Sheffield had achieved a balance between schemes which provided a benefit to people and were reasonably priced, compared to other similar schemes. The City Council would not increase the cost of permits in the next financial year.

#### 4.1.2 Petition Regarding Possible Library Closures

The Council received a petition containing seven signatures requesting the Council to reconsider the proposals to close any libraries in Sheffield and to work with the people of Sheffield to develop an alternative plan.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Marcus O'Hagan. Mr O'Hagan stated that the seven signatories to the petition represented people from the 14 groups from libraries which were under threat of closure. He stated that people were upset and felt threatened by the prospect of library closures and these groups wanted to help each other.

He stated that it was hoped that the Council was able to reconsider the position with regard to libraries, particularly with regard to children, older people and those who were unemployed, who were dependent upon libraries. He stated that he did not think that decision makers in the Council did wish to close libraries and asked Councillors to do the right thing for the people who elected them.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Members for Communities and Inclusion, Councillor Mazher Iqbal.

#### 4.2 Public Questions

##### 4.2.1 Public Questions Concerning Libraries

- (a) Marcus O'Hagan stated that, in regard to the ongoing library consultation, it is widely perceived and can be demonstrated that the needs analysis and consultation documents are deeply flawed with statistical error, wrongly drawn conclusions and loaded questions. He asked: is this Chamber happy with the quality of this work and does it feel that decisions can be made in the light of this. Can it please show that those carrying out this work are suitably qualified?

Mr O' Hagan stated that when he came to this chamber he often saw people upset because they feel the questions they ask are not properly answered. Sometimes there were shouts of protest and Lord Mayor had to intervene to keep order. He asked whether, to assist the Lord Mayor and the democratic process in the City, the Council would approve the preparation, publishing and handing out to questioners of a form which explained what people can and should do if they are not happy with the responses they receive. This could include the request for review procedure and in the case of the Council not responding to this request an approach to the Information Commissioner.

- (b) Michael Davis stated that there were a number of library support groups which had come forward during the period of library consultation with ideas relating to the library service. He referred to the Notices of Motion on the Council meeting agenda and to the support for the rights of the individual to campaign. Campaigning would only have any meaning when the views expressed are listened to by the decision makers. He asked the Cabinet Member to assure people that this was not a box-ticking exercise but their views would be seriously considered and carry weight when the decision to retain or close libraries is made.
- (c) Alison Cowper stated that during the short period for the consultation, she and others had become aware of what appear to be oversights in the consultation process. For example, consultation on alternative arrangements for people using the reading for health facility, who might not be able to travel by public transport; home educators who rely on the libraries for literacy material and, in the case of Greenhill Library, the nursery group, the pre-school and the school, who all use the library and would not be in a position to take groups of children to the alternative proposed provision at Woodseats (a library which the Council describes as the most dilapidated in Sheffield). She asked can the Council assure people that the consultation has been sufficiently rigorous and will not be subject to a successful legal challenge at great expense to the people of Sheffield.

The Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion, Councillor Mazher Iqbal, responded to the petition and questions. He stated that he had met with Mr O'Hagan during the visits which he had been making across the City. The Libraries Review had started in 2011 and there had been a number of consultation events such as during last summer, when there had been over six thousand people respond and also last year, the Council published the library prospectus, to encourage as many organisations across the City and further

afield to come forward to look at how a viable and sustainable model for libraries could be found. This year, answering the points about whether this was a short period of consultation, the consultation ran over a period of three months. Any plans to change the library service were never going to be easy and as he had said a number of times, this was not a great move for the City. However, the Council could not continue with the library service as it was. Hours of opening had been reduced and vacancies had not been filled. Given the huge savings which had to be made, the service could not continue as it was. Proposals for the future of the library service were published in September 2013 and the Council had had to ensure that these complied with the requirements of the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964, to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service.

Councillor Iqbal referred to appendices which formed part of the proposals, one of which concerned the different models which were explored. The Council also looked at good practice across the country and colleagues visited five cities to find out how those places had carried out a review and how library services were working in their areas. Thirteen models were examined to ascertain the relative pros and cons of each model. This information was available on the Council's website. The proposals which the Council put forward, in three categories were, firstly, to ensure that the Council met the efficient and comprehensive duty in respect to the library service, so eleven hub libraries were proposed taking into account the geography and demography of Sheffield. The second category was to use the principles of the Fairness Commission. There were huge inequalities which have existed in Sheffield for many decades. The Council has signed up to the Fairness Commission Principles in order to look at how to bridge the inequality gap. The third category was independent libraries.

Councillor Iqbal stated that, as he had gone around the City with colleagues, it had been a genuine exercise and people had come out on cold evenings to meet with him and hear what the proposals were about. People had been given the opportunity not only to complete the questionnaire, and nine thousand responses had been received to the recently concluded consultation, but also to give people the opportunity to ask him and Council officers about the proposals. Information which had been requested had been provided and the Council had been open and transparent. The running costs had been provided for each library. Community organisations had come forward saying they would like to work with the Council and a guidance pack had been issued for community groups to put together a business case to keep as many libraries open as possible. Business cases had been submitted by community groups in respect of each of the libraries that were threatened with closure.

He referred to unprecedented cuts which the Council was facing, in which it had had to reduce its budget by £180 million and further savings would need to be made in the forthcoming years. In this context, the Library service was not able to continue as it had done. Therefore, as part of the listening exercise he stated that the Council was analysing the information that it had received. It had been agreed at the Council meeting in January 2014 that the matter would be taken to the appropriate Scrutiny Committee and would then be considered at Cabinet, at which a final decision would be made. He hoped that as many people as

possible would be able to come to the Scrutiny Committee and the Cabinet meeting.

(d) Will Hiorns asked a number of questions, as summarised below:

Does the Council accept that illiteracy has profound long term economic and social costs; that library services have a central role in encouraging literacy in children and adults; and that, in the long term, library services save councils money?

Does the Council accept that more efficient does not actually mean smaller; believe that volunteers can do the same job as skilled professional librarians more efficiently; or is it that volunteers do not need to be paid and so look cheaper?

He stated that it could be argued that bigger, better library services are more efficient in the long term and asked: does the Council agree that it would be interesting to hear legal opinion on that?

He also stated that the Council was proposing cuts because of a decrease in borrowing, but it was the local authority's statutory duty to encourage people to use the library service. He asked, what concrete actions the Council has taken in respect of that duty and with what budget allocation; what actions the Council has taken to understand and reverse the decline in borrowing; were the borrowing figures compensated for library closures and reduced opening hours; and over what period of time has this trend been visible?

Mr Hiorns stated that, nationally, borrowing by children had increased and asked does the Council believe that Sheffield is special and different from that trend and is it content with that; or does the Council accept that this national trend may also be true in Sheffield but not measured during the review?

He referred to the presentation of an example of research reports that measure return on investment in library services and asked what has been done with that evidence; who has discussed it; what conclusions were drawn; in what ways has the Council integrated this knowledge into the proposal; and what is the strategic view of the sustainability of increased long-term costs due to short term dismantling of library services?

Mr Hiorns referred to the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources statement in relation to the renovation of Council buildings as making sound financial sense. He asked, why does the same logic not apply to return on investment through library services; is it because buildings are easily visible but illiteracy is not; and is that interest on borrowing against literacy will be paid for by future councils and not this one?

(e) Kathy Whitaker asked, given flaws in the needs assessment, is the Council prepared to acknowledge that its primary motivation in the selection of

libraries to close is political?

The Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion, Councillor Mazher Iqbal, responded by referring to the information concerning the proposals on the Council's website and he read an extract from the vision document to summarise the Council's stance.

He said that efficiency does not mean "smaller" and that when he had visited areas of the City in relation to the proposals concerning libraries or when he had been asked questions at Council or spoken to the press, he had not mentioned that library usage was falling. Usage nationally and in Sheffield was falling and in the summer of 2012, the first consultation was put in place to find out from existing library users and to hear from non-library users what it was that the Council would need to encourage people to use the library service. That formed the basis of the proposals which the Council now put forward. He had not said that the decisions which were to be taken relating to libraries were because of falling numbers.

In relation to volunteers, one of the models which was explored included looking at whether there was sufficient volunteer capacity and a track record in Sheffield to take up the challenge of running a library service. The proposals included how the Council could work with communities to run the library service. The Council wanted to promote reading and a wide range of resources for people of all ages.

In terms of research which had been undertaken, the Council had looked at good practice and visited five other local authorities, including Wakefield. Analysis was currently being carried out on all of the information which had been gathered and the resulting report would be made available at the Scrutiny Committee and it would be considered by the Cabinet.

There were 11 proposed hub libraries and, if the closure of specific libraries was a political decision then the Council would have ignored the Libraries Act, which places a statutory duty on the Council, to provide a comprehensive and efficient service. He stated that he believed that there had been some scaremongering and possibly hijacking by individuals of some of the good work which communities were doing to try to save their libraries. The list of libraries which were threatened with closure did impact on Councillors from different parties. For example in Birley Ward, which could lose two libraries. The Council had to provide an efficient and comprehensive library service and it had also signed up to the principles of the Fairness Commission.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources stated that the Council's accommodation strategy was about using buildings more efficiently. By using less expensive accommodation and not using rented accommodation, the Council would be able to save £30 million over the next 10 years. Capital resources were being used now to save in the future.

- (f) Hugh Cotton referred to the consultation process and to the analysis which would be made of the results. He stated that the fourth recommendation of the report of the Executive Director dated 25<sup>th</sup> September 2013 entitled



“The Future of Sheffield Library Service”, stated that the Council would consider whether any further consultation is required as part of the report to Cabinet. He stated that he appreciated that a lot of work had gone into the consultation. However, there was a lot of opposition to the prospect of libraries being closed. He stated that there had effectively not been consultation with regard to the proposed hub libraries. He asked how do the Council plan to provide for any further consultation before the Cabinet meeting on 19 February; and if there is no time for consultation and it became clear that this was necessary, is the Council prepared to postpone the library closure programme this year so that further consultation can take place?

- (g) Ruth Woodhouse stated that the Council had not consulted effectively with children, families or schools concerning young people’s need for local libraries and librarians. Library groups had conducted surveys, as the Council’s survey forms were unusable for children, and these had shown that thousands of children in Sheffield use, value and need their local library. Under 18s accounted for 31 percent of library users in Sheffield and she stated that consultation which omitted their voice was misrepresentative.

Park Library was increasing and promoting usage with children and in 2012 surveys of users prioritised keeping staff. However, a local group had bid to take over the Library with no dedicated Council staff and without consulting children, schools or families.

She referred to a response by Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families to a request for review concerning literacy issues which stated that schools have a major responsibility for teaching reading. Ruth Woodhouse stated that it was the legal responsibility of parents to ensure that children are properly educated and the loss of libraries would be detrimental to them fulfilling that duty.

She stated that she had requested minutes of any meetings where the Cabinet Member had championed the use of libraries by young people and where these needs had been discussed by Councillors, which had not been provided. She asked if the Cabinet Member could please tell the Chamber why she thinks she should remain in her post whilst apparently ignoring the plight of the young people she is there to represent.

- (h) Peter Hartley requested a written response to his written questions. He stated that there were six more branch libraries in the City in 1963. He expressed concern that if £1.6 million of the budget for libraries was reduced, there would be library closures. The Central Library had previously been open from 9 am to 9pm. He stated that over 22,000 people had signed petitions to save branch libraries. He asked how many more signatures would be needed before the Council would change its policy. He asked what assurances were there that further cuts would not be made in the future.

- (i) Nick Howard stated that a general grouping of representatives of library groups had met and had agreed to put forward a combined resolution, as follows: that they did not wish to see any public library close; they did not wish to see any paid librarian currently in employment lose their jobs; did not want voluntary groups to take over the running of any of the libraries; were in favour of public services, which are required by an Act of Parliament from the Council and were angry that the Council was acting against that ethos. In reference to consultation with groups outside of Sheffield, Mr Howard asked whether the Cabinet Member or officers had also been in consultation with an organisation which now ran all of the public libraries in Birmingham.

The Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion, Councillor Mazher Iqbal responded to the questions. He stated that hub libraries were part of the consultation process and that ideas and suggestions received as part of that process were being analysed and this would be made available to the Scrutiny Committee and discussed at Cabinet. He stated that he did not believe there was a need for further consultation. The review was started 3 years ago and there had been a number of consultation exercises. The proposals which the Council had put forward in the most recent consultation were also subject to change and he did not believe further consultation was needed.

In relation to the question concerning staff at Park Library, £180 million had been taken away from the Council and further cuts were being imposed in future years and 1,200 valuable members of staff had been lost and unfortunately there would be further redundancies. This was not something that the Council chose to do and the cuts had been imposed by the Government. He was not able to make assurances about which members of staff will or will not be in place and this is not something that would be appropriate for him to say.

As part of the second consultation exercise, which had just been concluded, the Council had been at a number of dedicated facilities in the City and there was a dedicated telephone line for people to give their views, language line resources were provided so that interpretation was available, postcards were produced, regular press releases were made and seven and half thousand emails were sent to organisations. Sheffield Futures was commissioned to organise focus groups with secondary school age pupils and young people up to the age of 25 and the children's commissioning team were also engaged in organising focus groups with primary school age children. There was also targeted work to ensure that the views were obtained of carers, disabled people, older people and children and young people.

Councillor Iqbal stated that it was important that people had the opportunity to put petitions and questions to the Council and that the Council was listening. He had been to meetings around the City, together with other councillors and officers. The documents concerning the proposals had said that proposals could be subject to change and the Council would examine the analysis resulting from the consultation.

The organisation to which Mr Howard had referred had not approached the

Council. As part of the consultation last year, it had been said that the Council would work to keep as many libraries open as possible. There were business plans in respect of all of the libraries that were threatened with closure.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families stated, in reference to the question from Ruth Woodhouse, that she apologised if she had upset her with the response that she had made in writing. She stated that Ruth Woodhouse had also asked her to respond in relation to literacy.

Whilst she had only received the questions today, she would respond the questions as they had been put forward by Ruth Woodhouse.

She had said how much she valued libraries and how important they were to communities and particularly older and young people. Unfortunately, the Council was in a difficult position as regards its budget. The Council would not have put forward any closures of any libraries if it did not have to. Councillor Drayton read part of the detailed letter which she had sent to Ruth Woodhouse.

Councillor Drayton referred to an emphasis on literacy, and the central role of schools, which have major responsibility for teaching and promoting a love of literacy.

Schools now offered additional support for reading through, for example, school libraries and breakfast clubs. She was keen that schools promote a love of reading and development of vocabulary. There was also focus upon supporting reading and literacy development in families, for example through the ESCAL project (Every Sheffield Child Articulate and Literate), stories for talking and targeted programmes for families and children and the Book Awards. There was also support in early years and for families. She agreed that parents have an important role to play but it was vital that schools promote literacy, especially for those children who are the most disadvantaged.

#### 4.2.2 Public Question Concerning Benefits and Rent Services

Ken Turton stated that there had been a lack of liaison between services in relation to benefits which support people who paid rent and were on low earnings and he wished to know why that was the case.

He referred to a dispute he had with the Council's rent service whereby he had to pay full rent. He believed that the benefits to which he was entitled should have been part of the calculation. Mr Turton stated that this illustrated a lack of co-operation between the Council and other agencies and asked how this situation would be improved.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, Councillor Ben Curran, responded that, if Mr Turton had such matters of concern in future, he did not have to wait until a Council meeting and that he could raise concerns with him as the appropriate Cabinet Member, at any time. He stated that Mr Turton's written question made reference to concerns about liaison between the Benefits and

rent service. Whilst this relationship was well established and quite successful, errors might occur from time to time. He would not go into the details of Mr Turton's individual case at this meeting. Councillor Curran stated that he would write to Mr Turton or could meet with him.

#### 4.2.3 Public Question Concerning the Streets Ahead Contract

Nigel Slack referred to a question which he had asked at the Council meeting in January concerning changes to the Streets Ahead Contract, in relation to which the Cabinet Member, Councillor Jack Scott was able to give more detail on the subject of the decision. At the subsequent Cabinet meeting, Mr Slack stated that he asked whether it would be possible for the Council to record future decisions of this nature with more transparency, rather than to exempt all information for the sake of what appeared to be a relatively small amount of confidential information. Councillor Dore had responded that the Council was committed to being as open and transparent as possible.

Mr Slack asked that, firstly, with these responses in mind, will the Council commit to applying the same approach to its own decisions, particularly ones of this nature, as it intends to apply to all new outsourcing contracts. Namely that of 'full disclosure', except where a strong case can be made that the information would seriously compromise confidentiality laws, such as 'data protection'. Secondly, he asked that, when considering any exemptions the Council put the public interest above the interest of all other parties where feasible and be prepared to support that in the scrutiny process.

In connection with the final question, concerning putting the public interest ahead of other considerations, Councillor Julie Dore stated that Members of the Council were elected to represent the public interest, although consideration of what was in the 'public interest' was subjective.

Councillor Dore then responded to a question raised earlier in the meeting by Mr O'Hagan concerning public questions. She stated that public questions at Council meetings took place only because the Council chose to include provision for them in its Constitution. They were not mandatory. Members of the public could also ask questions in other fora. There was a wide range of public engagement activity and people could also contact the Council in writing. Cabinet in the Community sessions were also being held in different areas of the City.

Councillor Dore stated that she could not see a problem with the Council producing advice for people concerning how they can ask questions in different fora and what people should do if the response which they had received to a question was not acceptable to them.

#### 4.2.4 Public Questions Concerning the principle of Innocent Until Proven Guilty, Evidence to Support an Answer and Social Engineering

Martin Brighton asked: does this Council support the principle of Innocent Until Proved Guilty, and, if it does, how does it ensure that this principle is upheld.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore responded that she really did aim to answer Mr Brighton's questions in the best way that she could. If the question was vague, she was not able to give a detailed answer. She did fully support the principle of innocent until proven guilty. If there were circumstances where this was not the case, she asked that this be brought to the Council's attention and that information could then be reviewed.

Secondly, Mr Brighton stated that the Cabinet Member for Housing gave a robust and unequivocal answer to what he described as a very difficult question at the last Full Council (Question 6). He asked if the evidence upon which that question was predicated was published, would the Cabinet Member be prepared to reconsider his position.

The Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, Councillor Harry Harpham, responded that the question which Mr Brighton referred to concerned the extent of trust for the Council's Chief Executive and whilst he stated that this was a "difficult question" this had to be set in context. He confirmed that he had no reason whatsoever to doubt the response which he gave and that he trusted the Chief Executive implicitly.

Thirdly, Mr Brighton asked: does this Council support the use of social engineering tactics by council officers, followed by misrepresentations of those being manipulated? If not, and if presented with the evidence, what is the Council's course of action?

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore responded that Mr Brighton should bring to the Council's attention any issue of concern where he felt that he had been misrepresented or action had been taken which he did not feel was right. The Council would take action according to the circumstances, for example if it was a grievance or a matter concerning data protection.

#### 4.2.5 Public Question Concerning Deprivation

Martin Brighton asked: why are the most deprived areas of Sheffield, 15 years ago still the most deprived areas today.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore responded that 15 years ago, and before that time (from the late 1970's onwards), the inequalities in Sheffield were widening and the previous Government started the process of addressing the issue. The Council introduced a closing the gap policy in 2002 to reduce inequalities, and areas of the City were regenerated, although some criticism was received of investment into those areas of the City.

Councillor Dore stated that the present Government does not believe in reducing inequalities but the Council would do what it could. The Fairness Commission had been established as a cross party body, to make Sheffield a fair City.

#### 4.2.6 Public Question Concerning Inactivity

Martin Brighton stated that, using the Freedom of Information Act, the

organisation UKactive produced a national rankings list for inactivity, noting the links between individual inactivity in areas of social deprivation, and consequent premature deaths. Sheffield is 102nd out of 150 nationally. He asked: what is this Council doing to remedy this.

The Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, Councillor Mary Lea responded that there was a correlation between a lack of physical activity and ill health and that activity does improve health.

The 'Move More' Strategy was shortly to be submitted to the Council's Health and Wellbeing Board. It was recognised that activity was not only about sport, but also concerned incorporating physical activity as part of a daily routine. The Council would promote physical activity in schools and as part of the Olympic legacy and in relation to the forthcoming Tour de France.

The Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure, Councillor Isobel Bowler, stated that UKactive was one of the lobby groups promoting physical activity. It was known that people were not physically active enough for the benefit of their health. The guideline was of five periods of 30 minutes exercise each week. The Council was addressing concerns relating to inactivity through the 'Move More' strategy, working with Activity Sheffield and Sport England had also invested in specific programmes. One problem was the quality of data, which presently used a sample of 500 people and better data and evidence was required, particularly concerning which interventions were most successful. The strategy was also to consider targeted interventions. The Move More Board included representatives from the Universities, the NHS and the City Council.

## **5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

### **5.1 Urgent Business**

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

### **5.2 Questions**

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

### **5.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities**

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

### **Order of Business**

In accordance with the Council Procedure Rule 9.1, the order of business as published on the Council Summons was altered and item 15, Notice of Motion given by Councillor Jillian Creasy concerning the Library Review, was taken as the next item of business.

**6. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JILLIAN CREASY**

**Library Review**

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

- (a) notes the unprecedented number of petitions and signatures in support of branch libraries, and the expressions of commitment, passion and willingness from the people of Sheffield;
- (b) recognises the enormous value of the network of libraries in the community, especially on the educational attainment levels of children in less affluent areas;
- (c) recognises the increasing need for free public internet access by people looking for work and claiming benefits, as well as the impact of libraries on nearby shops and business;
- (d) notes the serious pressure on the Council from central Government cuts but also recognises the range of choices still available in Sheffield, at whatever level of financial commitment;
- (e) believes the proposed model for community and independent libraries - which requires volunteers to both manage and finance a library service - is too rigid to be workable;
- (f) believes a better approach would allow for volunteers to take part in an integrated, city-wide and established network of library services and in all libraries, not just a few; and
- (g) therefore, urges the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion to bring forward different proposals from those consulted on, that take account of Sheffield residents' willingness to participate in a genuine community-based city-wide library service, and recognise the need for co-ordination and other input by librarians and other paid staff.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Geoff Smith as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (d) to (g) and the addition of new paragraphs (d) to (j) as follows:-

- (d) recognises that the Council is facing an unprecedented level of cuts from

Central Government meaning that by 2015/16 the Council will have had an overall reduction in Government formula funding by 50% and recognises that with this level of funding reductions all services across the Council will be seriously affected;

- (e) recognises that over the past three years, the Council has done everything possible to make budget reductions in libraries without making substantial changes to the service, however recognises that with the level of cuts now facing the Council, this is no longer possible;
- (f) welcomes that the Council is looking to find new ways of delivering library services given the serious situation facing libraries nationally and notes reports stating that over 400 libraries have closed nationally and 1000 are estimated to close by 2016;
- (g) further notes that the consultation on the library review has now closed and the Council is listening to the responses ahead of bringing forward proposals to Cabinet;
- (h) notes that the Council has received comments about the independent model from the groups looking to run libraries and will take on board these comments as it responds to the consultation;
- (i) recalls that the proposal by the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion that the results of the consultation be brought to scrutiny before a decision is made, was agreed by the Council last month; and
- (j) welcomes that the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion has already indicated that he is listening to concerns that have been raised about the Independent Model based on the feedback from the consultation and recognises that decisions about the library review will be made at Cabinet on 19th February, 2014.

On being put to the vote the Amendment was carried.

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

- For the Amendment (56)                      -    Councillors Julie Dore, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Mohammed Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox,



Anthony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Against the Amendment (21) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw.

Abstained on the Amendment (2) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and the Deputy Lord Mayor (Cllr Peter Rippon).

After a right of reply from Councillor Jillian Creasy, 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 unprecedented number of petitions and signatures in support of branch libraries, and the expressions of commitment, passion and willingness from the people of Sheffield;
- (b) recognises the enormous value of the network of libraries in the community, especially on the educational attainment levels of children in less affluent areas;
- (c) recognises the increasing need for free public internet access by people looking for work and claiming benefits, as well as the impact of libraries on nearby shops and business;
- (d) recognises that the Council is facing an unprecedented level of cuts from Central Government meaning that by 2015/16 the Council will have had an overall reduction in Government formula funding by 50% and recognises that with this level of funding reductions all services across the Council will be seriously affected;
- (e) recognises that over the past three years, the Council has done everything possible to make budget reductions in libraries without making substantial changes to the service, however recognises that with the level

of cuts now facing the Council, this is no longer possible;

- (f) welcomes that the Council is looking to find new ways of delivering library services given the serious situation facing libraries nationally and notes reports stating that over 400 libraries have closed nationally and 1000 are estimated to close by 2016;
- (g) further notes that the consultation on the library review has now closed and the Council is listening to the responses ahead of bringing forward proposals to Cabinet;
- (h) notes that the Council has received comments about the independent model from the groups looking to run libraries and will take on board these comments as it responds to the consultation;
- (i) recalls that the proposal by the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion that the results of the consultation be brought to scrutiny before a decision is made, was agreed by the Council last month; and
- (j) welcomes that the Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion has already indicated that he is listening to concerns that have been raised about the Independent Model based on the feedback from the consultation and recognises that decisions about the library review will be made at Cabinet on 19th February, 2014.

Note:1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker and Trevor Bagshaw voted for paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) and against paragraphs (d) to (j) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy voted for Paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (f) to (j) and against Paragraphs (d) and (e) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **7. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES**

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

Local Area Partnership – Central Lead Ward Member	-	Councillor Jillian Creasy to replace Cllr Robert Murphy
Scrutiny Committee Members	Substitute -	Councillor David Baker to replace Councillor Denise Reaney

(b) Abtissam Mohammed (Programme Director, Yemeni Community Association) be re-appointed to serve as a voluntary, community and faith sector representative on the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel for a full four year term ending 6<sup>th</sup> February 2018.

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

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| Sheffield Theatres Trust                                 | - Councillor Clive Skelton to fill a vacancy                 |
| Southey and Owlerton Regeneration Board                  | - Councillor Alan Law to replace Councillor Tony Damms       |
| Upperthorpe and Netherthorpe Healthy Living Centre Trust | - Councillor Neale Gibson to replace Councillor Ben Curran   |
| ACIS Local Management Committee                          | - Councillor Terry Fox to replace Councillor Jenny Armstrong |

**7.2 Sheffield City Region Combined Authority Appointment of Sheffield City Council Representatives**

Further to:-

- (a) The decision of Council on 3<sup>rd</sup> April 2013 that Sheffield City Council would formally become a constituent member of the proposed Sheffield City Region Combined Authority;
- (b) The anticipated laying before Parliament by the Secretary of State of an Order creating, with effect from 1<sup>st</sup> April 2014, such a body to be formally titled 'The Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield Combined Authority' but which will involve participation of the nine Sheffield City Region local authorities;

The City Council RESOLVES as follows:-

- (a) To appoint Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the City Council, to represent the City Council as a member of the Barnsley, Doncaster, Rotherham and Sheffield Combined Authority ('the Combined Authority')
- (b) To appoint Councillor Harry Harpham to act as a substitute member of the Combined Authority in the absence of the Leader;
- (c) To appoint Councillor Leigh Bramall to act as a 'second member' of the Combined Authority for potential appointment as a member of the Combined Authority on a rotational basis (such appointment being required to ensure the legally required voting majority for the South Yorkshire Councils within the Combined Authority);

- (d) To nominate Councillors Leigh Bramall, Tim Rippon, Bob Johnson, Bryan Lodge and Ian Auckland for potential appointment by the Combined Authority to its proposed Transport Committee.

## **8. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION**

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that this Council adopts the changes to the Contract Standing Orders in Part 4 of the Constitution to take effect from 1 April 2014, as set out in the report of the Chief Executive now submitted and Appendix A, and notes the minor/consequential changes to the Constitution made by the Director of Legal and Governance, in consultation with the Lord Mayor, under delegated authority, outlined at section 4 of the report and Appendices B and C.

## **9. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE, HRA BUDGET AND RENT INCREASE 2014/15**

It was moved by Councillor Harry Harpham, seconded by Councillor Tony Damms, that the following recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting on 15<sup>th</sup> January 2014, in relation to a joint report of the Executive Directors, Communities, Place and Resources providing the 2014/15 update to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan and a 2014/15 revenue budget for the HRA be approved:

“RESOLVED: That this Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City Council on 5th February, 2014 that :-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan update report for 2014/15 be approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget for 2014/15 as set out in Appendix B to the report be approved;
- (c) the rent increase for Council dwellings by an average of 6.2% from April 2014 be approved;
- (d) the rents for Council dwellings being set at target rent, when re-let following vacancy, from April 2014 be approved;
- (e) the increase of annual rents for garages and garage sites by an average of 6.2% from April 2014 be approved;
- (f) the increase of community heating charges by 3% in 2014/15 be approved;
- (g) it notes that it may be necessary to amend the sheltered housing service charge, in the event of a review of the service, if the Supported Housing Subsidy changes as part of the Council’s wider budget setting

process;

- (h) it resolves that charges for furnished accommodation and temporary accommodation are not increased;
- (i) it delegates authority to the Director of Commissioning, Communities to amend the burglar alarm charge in 2014/15 in line with the costs incurred under the new contract. Until the contract is in place and the charges are known the burglar alarm charge will remain unchanged; and
- (j) it delegates authority to the Director of Commissioning, Communities and the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods to authorise prudential borrowing as allowed under current Government guidelines.”

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an amendment, that the recommendations made by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 15th January 2014, concerning the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan Update, HRA Budget and Rent Increase 2014/15, be approved with the following comments and amendments:-

- (a) confirms that a rise in rents is a decision reserved for the Council and that any claim that the decision has been ‘forced’ by the Government is incorrect;
- (b) notes that the target rent policy, which was introduced by the last Government, is a guideline policy and that local authorities have been given more control over rent-setting since the move to self-financing of Housing Revenue Accounts;
- (c) believes that an excessive 6.2% rise in rents will be damaging to many Council tenants across Sheffield who are struggling with finances;
- (d) notes that Liberal Democrat-controlled Portsmouth City Council have previously agreed rises in rent below guideline levels and therefore confirms such a policy is possible;
- (e) regrets that members of the ruling group blocked discussion of this hike at last week’s Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny Committee meeting, thereby denying tenants the scrutiny they deserve;
- (f) believes the Administration are forcing through this hike without scrutiny because they think they can get away with blaming someone else;
- (g) understands that the hike in rents could be halved if an annual revenue saving of £3.3 million can be identified;
- (h) furthermore, confirms that above guideline rises in future years could return Sheffield rents to target rent values;

- (i) therefore, recommends that the following savings are investigated in order to halve the proposed hike in council rents and accordingly, a rent increase for Council dwellings of 3.1% (not 6.2%) from April 2014 be approved:-
- (i) 10% reduction in senior managers and back office teams equating to roughly £923,000;
  - (ii) 15% reduction in office costs and overheads equating to roughly £635,000;
  - (iii) 10% reduction in area teams equating to roughly £1,216,000;
  - (iv) 10% reduction in estate officers and environmental services equating to roughly £402,000; and
  - (v) 6% reduction in other costs coming from Going Local funds equating to roughly £115,000; and
- (j) notes the advice of the Section 151 officer that these saving targets could be achieved within the 2014-15 financial year, but recognises that if savings cannot be realised, a reduction will need to be made to the transfer to capital reserves, accepting the possible implications for future investment.

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

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

For Paragraphs (a), (b), (c) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker and Trevor Bagshaw.

Against Paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (e) (55) - Councillors Julie Dore, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Mohammed Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George

Lindars-Hammond, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Anthony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Abstained on Paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (e) (1) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Cllr Peter Rippon).

For Paragraphs (d), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (j) (18) Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker and Trevor Bagshaw.

Against Paragraphs (d), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (j) (55) Councillors Julie Dore, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Mohammed Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Anthony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Abstained on Paragraphs (d), (f), (g), (h), (i) and (j) (3) The Deputy Lord Mayor (Cllr Peter Rippon) and Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy.

After a Right of Reply from Councillor Harry Harpham, the original Motion was put to the vote and carried, as follows:

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 15<sup>th</sup> January, 2014:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan update report for 2014/15 be approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget for 2014/15 as set out in Appendix B to the report be approved;
- (c) the rent increase for Council dwellings by an average of 6.2% from April 2014 be approved;
- (d) the rents for Council dwellings being set at target rent, when re-let following vacancy, from April 2014 be approved;
- (e) the increase of annual rents for garages and garage sites by an average of 6.2% from April 2014 be approved;
- (f) the increase of community heating charges by 3% in 2014/15 be approved;
- (g) it be noted that it may be necessary to amend the sheltered housing service charge, in the event of a review of the service, if the Supported Housing Subsidy changes as part of the Council's wider budget setting process;
- (h) charges for furnished accommodation and temporary accommodation be not increased;
- (i) authority be given to the Director of Commissioning, Communities to amend the burglar alarm charge in 2014/15 in line with the costs incurred under the new contract, and until the contract is in place and the charges are known, the burglar alarm charge will remain unchanged; and
- (j) delegated authority be granted to the Director of Commissioning, Communities and the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, to authorise prudential borrowing as allowed under current Government guidelines.

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) took the Chair from the beginning of this item of business until the close of the meeting, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) having left the meeting.)

## **10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR NEALE GIBSON**

### **Food Banks**



It was moved by Councillor Neale Gibson, seconded by Councillor Jayne Dunn, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that Handsworth Grange Community Sports College installed two food bank collection boxes in January after becoming concerned that some families in the local area did not have enough money to feed their children;
- (b) recalls that the food bank came about after a pupil came into school on a Monday morning saying that the last full meal she had eaten was her school dinner on Friday lunchtime;
- (c) praises the work of Handsworth Grange Community Sports College and supports the work of the Council in announcing support to local food bank schemes across the city;
- (d) notes with concern that the number of Food Banks in Sheffield has grown to 16 and in the last year three Food Banks alone have fed 1988 people and more working families are being referred to Food Banks which is a clear sign that more people are suffering a rise in the cost of living and that wages are not keeping up;
- (e) believes that this is a damning indictment of the record of the present Government's and Deputy Prime Minister's record in Sheffield and calls upon him to explain what action he as the Deputy PM is going to take to halt the growth of food banks in his City, especially now that one has opened in the middle of his Constituency;
- (f) calls upon the Deputy Prime Minister and the Government to publish the 2013 DEFRA report on Food Banks that cost £43,000 of public money and has never seen the light of day; and
- (g) confirms that publication of the report would allow Sheffield City Council to check if the information in the DEFRA report correlates with the evidence in the quick review report done by the Council and the view of Chris Mould, the Trussell Trust executive chairman that there is a link between low wages, changes in benefits, and use of food banks by families.

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

- 1. the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (g); and
- 2. the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (l) as follows:-
  - (b) thanks all volunteers and donators to food banks and supports their work to help Sheffielders in need;

- (c) however, believes it is highly inappropriate to exploit individual cases to draw broad conclusions or score political points;
- (d) notes that under the last Government the number of food banks increased tenfold;
- (e) highlights the following quote from Channel 4's Fact Check blog: "It's clear that food banks started under Labour and began to grow rapidly before the global financial crisis";
- (f) notes that the Coalition Government have allowed Jobcentre staff to refer people to food banks - a move that was blocked by the last Government;
- (g) recalls that Labour politicians have still not apologised for the economic downturn that they helped create and the impact of that downturn on local people's living standards;
- (h) supports the measures taken by the Coalition Government to resuscitate economic growth and deliver a stronger economy;
- (i) believes Liberal Democrats in Government have been vital in supporting local people with the cost of living, by fighting to:-
  - (i) give 24 million ordinary workers a £700 tax cut;
  - (ii) increase the state pension by £650 thanks to our 'triple lock';
  - (iii) freeze Council Tax, saving the average Sheffield household £185 this year;
  - (iv) deliver an average saving of £50 on household energy bills; and
  - (v) freeze fuel duty, saving motorists £170 per year;
- (j) contrasts this with the appalling record of the last Government, who:-
  - (i) crashed the economy, which is why the cost of living is high now;
  - (ii) scrapped the 10p tax, leaving half a million of the lowest paid workers worse off; and
  - (iii) increased the state pension by an insulting 75p;
- (k) furthermore highlights the following decisions of the current Administration, which have failed to support local families:-
  - (i) imposing a 23% cut in Council Tax Benefit, refusing an offer of £1.1 million from the Government to reduce the cut; and
  - (ii) rejecting proposals from opposition councillors for a cross-party

working group to support local residents affected by the 'bedroom tax'; and

- (l) therefore calls upon the ruling group to drop their petty political point-scoring and work with the Government and local agencies to support local families.

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

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

- For the Amendment (17)
- Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker and Trevor Bagshaw.
- Against the Amendment (55)
- Councillors Julie Dore, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Mohammed Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Anthony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.
- Abstained on the Amendment (3)
- The Deputy Lord Mayor (Cllr Peter Rippon) and Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy.

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

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) notes that Handsworth Grange Community Sports College installed two food bank collection boxes in January after becoming concerned that some families in the local area did not have enough money to feed their children;
- (b) recalls that the food bank came about after a pupil came into school on a Monday morning saying that the last full meal she had eaten was her school dinner on Friday lunchtime;
- (c) praises the work of Handsworth Grange Community Sports College and supports the work of the Council in announcing support to local food bank schemes across the city;
- (d) notes with concern that the number of Food Banks in Sheffield has grown to 16 and in the last year three Food Banks alone have fed 1988 people and more working families are being referred to Food Banks which is a clear sign that more people are suffering a rise in the cost of living and that wages are not keeping up;
- (e) believes that this is a damning indictment of the record of the present Government's and Deputy Prime Minister's record in Sheffield and calls upon him to explain what action he as the Deputy PM is going to take to halt the growth of food banks in his City, especially now that one has opened in the middle of his Constituency;
- (f) calls upon the Deputy Prime Minister and the Government to publish the 2013 DEFRA report on Food Banks that cost £43,000 of public money and has never seen the light of day; and
- (g) confirms that publication of the report would allow Sheffield City Council to check if the information in the DEFRA report correlates with the evidence in the quick review report done by the Council and the view of Chris Mould, the Trussell Trust executive chairman that there is a link between low wages, changes in benefits, and use of food banks by families.

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

For Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) (75) - Councillors Julie Dore, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Simon Clement-Jones, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-

Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Shaffaq Mohammed, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Mohammed Maroof, Rob Frost, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Colin Ross, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, George Lindars-Hammond, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Anthony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Anders Hanson, Lynn Rooney, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Trevor Bagshaw, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Against Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) - Nil  
(0)

Abstained on Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) (1) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Cllr Peter Rippon).

For Paragraphs (d), (e), (f) and (g) (57) Councillors Julie Dore, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Mohammed Maroof, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Steven Wilson, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim

Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars-Hammond, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Anthony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, John Campbell, Martin Lawton, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Neale Gibson, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Against Paragraphs (d), (e), (f) and (g) (17)

Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker and Trevor Bagshaw.

Abstained Paragraphs (d), (e), (f) and (g) (1)

The Deputy Lord Mayor (Cllr Peter Rippon).

## **11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL**

### **Betting Shops**

At the request of Councillor Pat Midgley and with the consent of the Council, the Notice of Motion Numbered 10 on the Summons for this meeting was withdrawn.

## **12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR IAN AUCKLAND**

### **Planning for Housing Development**

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

- (a) is committed to defending Sheffield's reputation as the greenest city in the country – affording our green and open spaces the protection they deserve;
- (b) therefore notes with concern the following sentence from the Sheffield Local Plan report agreed by the Cabinet on 18th December 2013: "Work has already commenced on developing a methodology for strategic review of the South Yorkshire and North Derbyshire Green Belt";

- (c) recognises the importance of demonstrating a five-year economically-deliverable supply of housing within the City's Local Plan;
- (d) however, believes that using future allocations of the New Homes Bonus to invest in brown-field sites and bring more empty homes back into use, could avoid the need to concrete over green field and Green Belt land;
- (e) furthermore, hopes the Council will re-investigate density and height requirements within the inner ring-road to help protect important green spaces;
- (f) regrets that instead the Administration appear to have surrendered to big developers by allowing them to cherry-pick treasured green sites across the City for development;
- (g) believes that the Administration have once again taken the easy way out because they think they can get away with blaming someone else; and
- (h) opposes a Green Belt review until more innovative ways of delivering Sheffield's five-year housing supply have been exhausted.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Julie Dore, 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 "therefore notes with concern" in paragraph (b) and their substitution by the following words "the Government's National Planning Policy Framework which has resulted in the Planning Inspectorate stating that the current allocation of sites for housing does not go far enough to meet the demands"; and
2. the deletion of paragraphs (c) to (h) and the addition of new paragraphs (c) to (o) as follows:-
  - (c) regrets that this is an issue for the vast majority of local authorities across the country and notes that other authorities such as Brighton, Hull, Coventry and Kirklees have had to withdraw local plans as they did not meet requirements;
  - (d) confirms that if the Council do not meet the Government targets for a five year supply of immediately deliverable sites, developers could win permission to build on the city's green spaces and even green belt sites on appeal, even after a planning application is turned down by the Council, which could lead to a planning free for all, potentially increasing the level of development on green belt land in an uncontrolled manner, which has already happened in other places such as Leeds;
  - (e) regrets that yet again the main opposition group seek to mislead local people by suggesting that the need to find green spaces for housing is merely down to Councils wishing to build on them, rather than the reality,

which is that it is driven by their own Government's planning policy;

- (f) notes these comments by Jonathan Carr-West, Chief Executive of the Local Government Information Unit: 'the National Planning Policy Framework and targets around housing supply are putting significant strain on councils' ability to protect the green belt.';
- (g) confirms that this is the view of the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) who state that: 'Local authorities that are producing plans are coming under pressure to allocate more greenfield sites than originally intended. And over half (52%) of local authorities do not have up to date adopted local plans in place. As a result, they will come under increased pressure to approve any application for housing development in line with policies in the NPPF, rather than with local views.';
- (h) notes these comments from Shaun Spiers, Chief Executive of CPRE: 'We know that Planning Minister Nick Boles wants good quality, beautiful development, but his policies are not delivering. There can be no sustainable solution to this country's housing problems unless there is a renewed focus on improving quality, increasing local control and minimising the loss of countryside. The NPPF is not currently delivering that mix. The Government urgently needs to rethink its approach.';
- (i) echoes criticisms that this Government have significantly weakened the previous Government's brownfield-first policy which actively prioritised building on brownfield sites;
- (j) confirms that the present Administration is doing all it can to see as much brownfield land as possible built on and will continue to work to minimise development on green field sites, but it is the Government that has both cut the Council's funding to subsidise brownfield site regeneration, and then stipulated that the Council has to provide a five year supply at any one time of 'economically deliverable' (ie, financially attractive) sites for developers, which rules out many brownfield sites, restricting site supply;
- (k) welcomes the action of the present Administration to bring hundreds of empty homes back into use, however, will take no lectures from the main opposition group who brought a derisory 13 empty homes back into use in their last year in administration;
- (l) welcomes the policy of the Labour Party to stand up to developers by tackling landbanking through the proposed introduction of a "use it or lose it policy" and believes it is this Government that have surrendered to big developers through rejecting this idea;
- (m) confirms that the Council would be willing to stand up to developers and implement the 'use it or lose it' policy were the Government to give local authorities the freedoms to do so;
- (n) believes that the Government's reforms have been anti localist and have



taken planning powers away from local people and given them instead to the Secretary of State and believes that the need to consider the Green Belt is ultimately a consequence of this Government's approach; and

- (o) proposes that the Cabinet Member for Business Skills and Development writes to the Secretary of State outlining the consequences of the issues caused by the Government's cuts to housing investment for brown field development, and the problems this has caused, and asks the mover of the motion to confirm he will co-sign the letter.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

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

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) is committed to defending Sheffield's reputation as the greenest city in the country – affording our green and open spaces the protection they deserve;
- (b) therefore notes with concern the Government's National Planning Policy Framework which has resulted in the Planning Inspectorate stating that the current allocation of sites for housing does not go far enough to meet the demands;
- (c) regrets that this is an issue for the vast majority of local authorities across the country and notes that other authorities such as Brighton, Hull, Coventry and Kirklees have had to withdraw local plans as they did not meet requirements;
- (d) confirms that if the Council do not meet the Government targets for a five year supply of immediately deliverable sites, developers could win permission to build on the city's green spaces and even green belt sites on appeal, even after a planning application is turned down by the Council, which could lead to a planning free for all, potentially increasing the level of development on green belt land in an uncontrolled manner, which has already happened in other places such as Leeds;
- (e) regrets that yet again the main opposition group seek to mislead local people by suggesting that the need to find green spaces for housing is merely down to Councils wishing to build on them, rather than the reality, which is that it is driven by their own Government's planning policy;
- (f) notes these comments by Jonathan Carr-West, Chief Executive of the Local Government Information Unit: 'the National Planning Policy Framework and targets around housing supply are putting significant strain on councils' ability to protect the green belt.';
- (g) confirms that this is the view of the Campaign for the Protection of Rural England (CPRE) who state that: 'Local authorities that are producing plans

are coming under pressure to allocate more greenfield sites than originally intended. And over half (52%) of local authorities do not have up to date adopted local plans in place. As a result, they will come under increased pressure to approve any application for housing development in line with policies in the NPPF, rather than with local views.’;

- (h) notes these comments from Shaun Spiers, Chief Executive of CPRE: ‘We know that Planning Minister Nick Boles wants good quality, beautiful development, but his policies are not delivering. There can be no sustainable solution to this country’s housing problems unless there is a renewed focus on improving quality, increasing local control and minimising the loss of countryside. The NPPF is not currently delivering that mix. The Government urgently needs to rethink its approach.’;
- (i) echoes criticisms that this Government have significantly weakened the previous Government’s brownfield-first policy which actively prioritised building on brownfield sites;
- (j) confirms that the present Administration is doing all it can to see as much brownfield land as possible built on and will continue to work to minimise development on green field sites, but it is the Government that has both cut the Council’s funding to subsidise brownfield site regeneration, and then stipulated that the Council has to provide a five year supply at any one time of ‘economically deliverable’ (ie, financially attractive) sites for developers, which rules out many brownfield sites, restricting site supply;
- (k) welcomes the action of the present Administration to bring hundreds of empty homes back into use, however, will take no lectures from the main opposition group who brought a derisory 13 empty homes back into use in their last year in administration;
- (l) welcomes the policy of the Labour Party to stand up to developers by tackling landbanking through the proposed introduction of a “use it or lose it policy” and believes it is this Government that have surrendered to big developers through rejecting this idea;
- (m) confirms that the Council would be willing to stand up to developers and implement the ‘use it or lose it’ policy were the Government to give local authorities the freedoms to do so;
- (n) believes that the Government’s reforms have been anti localist and have taken planning powers away from local people and given them instead to the Secretary of State and believes that the need to consider the Green Belt is ultimately a consequence of this Government’s approach; and
- (o) proposes that the Cabinet Member for Business Skills and Development writes to the Secretary of State outlining the consequences of the issues caused by the Government’s cuts to housing investment for brown field development, and the problems this has caused, and asks the mover of the motion to confirm he will co-sign the letter.

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

### **13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BEN CURRAN**

#### **National Minimum Wage**

It was moved by Councillor Ben Curran, seconded by Councillor Adam Hurst, that this Council:-

- (a) celebrates the 15th anniversary of the introduction of the National Minimum Wage, which falls this year, and the contribution it has made to making work pay, boosting living standards and tackling in-work poverty;
- (b) notes that, before the National Minimum Wage was established, poverty pay was widespread and that the Conservative Party opposed its introduction;
- (c) further notes that families are on average £1,600 worse off a year, and that the National Minimum Wage is now worth less in real terms, than in May 2010;
- (d) further notes that the Government has not backed up its promise to name and shame firms not paying the minimum wage;
- (e) calls on the Government to strengthen enforcement of the National Minimum Wage, including by increasing fines for non-payment of the National Minimum Wage and giving local authorities enforcement powers;
- (f) welcomes the action of the present Administration in implementing the Living Wage within the Council after the previous Administration failed in their pledge to do so, and the policy of supporting a Living Wage for Sheffield involving partners across the city in public, private and voluntary sector organisations; and
- (g) further calls on the Government to encourage employers to pay a living wage and take action to restore the value of the National Minimum Wage so that the UK can earn its way out of the cost of living crisis and to help control the cost of social security.

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

1. the deletion of paragraphs (c) to (g); and

2. the addition of new paragraphs (c) to (g) as follows:-
  - (c) praises measures championed by Liberal Democrats in Government to support the low paid, including a £700 tax cut for ordinary workers;
  - (d) compares this to the last Government who scrapped the 10p tax, leaving half a million of the lowest paid workers worse off;
  - (e) notes that British workers – excluding the richest 10% – saw their take-home pay rise in real terms in the past year;
  - (f) however, recognises that more needs to be done to support low paid workers and therefore welcomes calls from The Rt. Hon. Vince Cable MP for a significant rise in the minimum wage; and
  - (g) furthermore, supports the Liberal Democrat aspiration to raise the income tax threshold again to lift all workers on national minimum wage out of income tax altogether.

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) celebrates the 15th anniversary of the introduction of the National Minimum Wage, which falls this year, and the contribution it has made to making work pay, boosting living standards and tackling in-work poverty;
  - (b) notes that, before the National Minimum Wage was established, poverty pay was widespread and that the Conservative Party opposed its introduction;
  - (c) further notes that families are on average £1,600 worse off a year, and that the National Minimum Wage is now worth less in real terms, than in May 2010;
  - (d) further notes that the Government has not backed up its promise to name and shame firms not paying the minimum wage;
  - (e) calls on the Government to strengthen enforcement of the National Minimum Wage, including by increasing fines for non-payment of the National Minimum Wage and giving local authorities enforcement powers;
  - (f) welcomes the action of the present Administration in implementing the Living Wage within the Council after the previous Administration failed in their pledge to do so, and the policy of supporting a Living Wage for Sheffield involving partners across the city in public, private and voluntary sector organisations; and

- (g) further calls on the Government to encourage employers to pay a living wage and take action to restore the value of the National Minimum Wage so that the UK can earn its way out of the cost of living crisis and to help control the cost of social security.

(Note: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker and Trevor Bagshaw voted for Paragraphs (a), (b) and (g) of the Motion and against all of the remaining paragraphs and asked for this to be recorded.)

#### **14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE**

##### **Individual Electoral Registration**

It was moved by Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Jackie Drayton, that this Council:

- (a) notes that 5th February is Voter Registration Day and encourages all Sheffield people to register to vote;
- (b) welcomes the recent action taken by the Council to attempt to encourage more people to register to vote and believes this action is more important than ever due to the Government's introduction of Individual Electoral Registration;
- (c) is concerned by reports that the Individual Electoral Registration risks millions of people falling off the register especially the young, students, some minority ethnic communities and private renting tenants; and
- (d) notes that the previous Government set out a more responsible approach implementing a voluntary system until late in 2015 and would delay further if the Electoral Commission had concerns and believes that the Government should think again about rushing the implementation of these reforms and beginning the introduction of Individual Electoral Registration this year.

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

- 1. the deletion of paragraphs (c) and (d); and
- 2. the addition of new paragraphs (c) and (d) as follows:-
  - (c) supports the Government's move towards Individual Electoral Registration and recognises the importance of Liberal Democrats in improving this legislation; and

- (d) regrets that following the Electoral Commission's 2003 recommendation that the United Kingdom move to Individual Electoral Registration, the last Government dithered for seven years instead of taking the necessary action.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Nikki Bond, seconded by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (d) as follows and the re-lettering of original paragraph (d) as a new paragraph (e):-

- (d) notes with concern the implications of this policy on Sheffield as a city with a high student population and communities with high numbers of ethnic minority residents.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

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

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) notes that 5th February is Voter Registration Day and encourages all Sheffield people to register to vote;
- (b) welcomes the recent action taken by the Council to attempt to encourage more people to register to vote and believes this action is more important than ever due to the Government's introduction of Individual Electoral Registration;
- (c) is concerned by reports that the Individual Electoral Registration risks millions of people falling off the register especially the young, students, some minority ethnic communities and private renting tenants;
- (d) notes with concern the implications of this policy on Sheffield as a city with a high student population and communities with high numbers of ethnic minority residents; and
- (e) notes that the previous Government set out a more responsible approach implementing a voluntary system until late in 2015 and would delay further if the Electoral Commission had concerns and believes that the Government should think again about rushing the implementation of these reforms and beginning the introduction of Individual Electoral Registration this year.

(Note: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker and Trevor Bagshaw voted for Paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (d) and against Paragraph (e) of the Substantive Motion and

asked for this to be recorded.

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

**15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED**

**Economic Growth and Job Creation**

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

- (a) welcomes the latest national unemployment figures, which saw the largest single fall in unemployment in seventeen years, and growth figures, which recorded the UK's fastest annual rate of growth since 2007;
- (b) notes also that British workers – excluding the richest 10% – have seen their take-home pay rise in real terms in the past year;
- (c) furthermore, confirms that the vast majority of new jobs created since 2010 have been in full-time employment;
- (d) also draws attention to research which demonstrates companies in the North of England are now growing at the fastest pace seen in any UK region;
- (e) in addition, notes the latest local employment statistics, which demonstrate that the number of residents claiming jobseekers allowance has reduced in every Ward in Sheffield;
- (f) believes these moves towards a stronger economy and a more balanced economy could not have been achieved without Liberal Democrats in Government;
- (g) recognises that the current situation is a long way from the “post-soviet meltdown”, riots in the street and triple-dip recession predicted by Labour politicians;
- (h) recalls the comments of The Rt Hon Ed Miliband MP that one million jobs would be lost under this Government and contrasts this with the more than one million private sector jobs created since 2010;
- (i) believes it is time for Labour politicians to apologise for their dire and failed predictions and for their role in bringing Britain to the brink of the economic precipice;
- (j) however, also underlines the important role the Council can play in delivering a stronger local economy; and

- (k) therefore, implores the ruling group to finally drop its anti-business mentality and actively work with local businesses to help create new jobs in Sheffield.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Gill Furniss, seconded by Councillor Geoff Smith, 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) echoes criticisms that since it came to power in 2010 this Government presided over the weakest economic recovery in history which was a direct result of the Government's failure to produce a credible plan for jobs and growth and led to a double dip recession;
- (b) believes that after three damaging years of flatlining, people in Sheffield will be astonished at the breathtaking arrogance and complacency of the Leader of the main opposition group;
- (c) regrets that because of the Government's mismanagement of the economy, with slower growth and higher unemployment, the Government is now set to continue to make cuts beyond the current Parliament;
- (d) notes that the impact of the Government's economic failure has hit the north of England and areas such as Sheffield much harder than the south;
- (e) believes that this is illustrated by the recent Centre for Cities report which demonstrates that between 2010 and 2012 80% of all new jobs created in the United Kingdom were in London;
- (f) recalls that the most high profile politician to suggest that unfair government cuts delivered by an unpopular and illegitimate government could lead to riots was the Deputy Prime Minister before the last general election;
- (g) opposes Government decisions which contributed to the weakening of the recovery such as cutting public spending too far too fast, significantly cutting investment in regional economic growth including the abolition of Regional Development Agencies, abolishing the Future Jobs Fund, increasing VAT and failing to put in place measures to stimulate growth;
- (h) calls on the Government to do more to support local businesses and commit to giving genuine support to all small and medium-sized enterprises, which are the lifeblood of our economy, by matching the pledge of the Leader of the Opposition to cut and freeze business rates for all small firms, and not just those in retail, but manufacturers, high-tech firms and other job creators;
- (i) welcomes the business friendly approach of the present Administration and supports the following actions taken locally by the present Administration to support local businesses including:



- (i) the Skills Made Easy Programme;
  - (ii) Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme;
  - (iii) RISE graduate internship programme;
  - (iv) start up loans for young people;
  - (v) Keep Sheffield Working Fund;
  - (vi) SME Loan Fund;
  - (vii) Export Pilot project for 30 companies;
  - (viii) launched Threshold Companies Initiative for growth SMEs;
  - (ix) Summer Saturdays;
  - (x) developed Sheffield City Region Investment Fund;
  - (xi) secured Tax Increment Finance scheme for city centre – 1 of 3 places in UK;
  - (xii) enterprise programme provided intensive support to over 200 growing SMEs and 150 start ups;
  - (xiii) launch of the Sheffield Economic Masterplan;
  - (xiv) series of business summits held, hundreds of business engaged;
  - (xv) Business Advisor Panel helping to keep Sheffield business friendly; and
  - (xvi) making the case for HS2 and Victoria Station; and
- (j) welcomes the present Administration's action to support the economy, however, believes that the Government must do much more to redress the widening gap between London and the rest of the country and calls on the Government to give cities such as Sheffield the tools they need to grow their local economies and welcomes the Core Cities Prospectus for Growth which outlines several steps the Government could take to achieve this.

On being put to the vote the amendment was carried.

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

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

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) echoes criticisms that since it came to power in 2010 this Government presided over the weakest economic recovery in history which was a direct result of the Government's failure to produce a credible plan for jobs and growth and led to a double dip recession;
- (b) believes that after three damaging years of flatlining, people in Sheffield will be astonished at the breathtaking arrogance and complacency of the Leader of the main opposition group;
- (c) regrets that because of the Government's mismanagement of the economy, with slower growth and higher unemployment, the Government is now set to continue to make cuts beyond the current Parliament;

- (d) notes that the impact of the Government's economic failure has hit the north of England and areas such as Sheffield much harder than the south;
- (e) believes that this is illustrated by the recent Centre for Cities report which demonstrates that between 2010 and 2012 80% of all new jobs created in the United Kingdom were in London;
- (f) recalls that the most high profile politician to suggest that unfair government cuts delivered by an unpopular and illegitimate government could lead to riots was the Deputy Prime Minister before the last general election;
- (g) opposes Government decisions which contributed to the weakening of the recovery such as cutting public spending too far too fast, significantly cutting investment in regional economic growth including the abolition of Regional Development Agencies, abolishing the Future Jobs Fund, increasing VAT and failing to put in place measures to stimulate growth;
- (h) calls on the Government to do more to support local businesses and commit to giving genuine support to all small and medium-sized enterprises, which are the lifeblood of our economy, by matching the pledge of the Leader of the Opposition to cut and freeze business rates for all small firms, and not just those in retail, but manufacturers, high-tech firms and other job creators;
- (i) welcomes the business friendly approach of the present Administration and supports the following actions taken locally by the present Administration to support local businesses including:
  - (i) the Skills Made Easy Programme;
  - (ii) Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme;
  - (iii) RISE graduate internship programme;
  - (iv) start up loans for young people;
  - (v) Keep Sheffield Working Fund;
  - (vi) SME Loan Fund;
  - (vii) Export Pilot project for 30 companies;
  - (viii) launched Threshold Companies Initiative for growth SMEs;
  - (ix) Summer Saturdays;
  - (x) developed Sheffield City Region Investment Fund;
  - (xi) secured Tax Increment Finance scheme for city centre – 1 of 3 places in UK;
  - (xii) enterprise programme provided intensive support to over 200 growing SMEs and 150 start ups;
  - (xiii) launch of the Sheffield Economic Masterplan;
  - (xiv) series of business summits held, hundreds of business engaged;
  - (xv) Business Advisor Panel helping to keep Sheffield business friendly; and
  - (xvi) making the case for HS2 and Victoria Station; and
- (j) welcomes the present Administration's action to support the economy,

however, believes that the Government must do much more to redress the widening gap between London and the rest of the country and calls on the Government to give cities such as Sheffield the tools they need to grow their local economies and welcomes the Core Cities Prospectus for Growth which outlines several steps the Government could take to achieve this.

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

## **16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MAZHER IQBAL**

### **Transparency of Lobbying, Non-Party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Bill**

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

- (a) notes the Transparency of Lobbying, Non-Party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Bill;
- (b) believes it is outrageous that whilst the Bill could stop campaigners and charities it doesn't stop commercial lobbyists from influencing government policies and believes this is a further example of the Government standing up for the wrong people;
- (c) further believes that the Bill is a cynical attempt by the Government to insulate their policies from legitimate, democratic criticism and for example could stop organisations such as the National Union of Students from being able to hold the Liberal Democrat Party to account for their broken promises on tuition fees;
- (d) notes comments from the Royal College of Nursing that the Bill will "place unwarranted restrictions on many organisations that seek to legitimately and impartially campaign, provide commentary and influence party policy in the run up to a general election";
- (e) believes that the Bill isn't about transparency, but is about gagging charities and campaigners whilst doing nothing to address the real 'big money' in politics; and
- (f) believes that whilst the Government have been forced into some concessions after pressure from charities and campaigners, the concessions don't go far enough and the Bill still stands up for vested interests.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Roger Davison, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended

by:-

1. the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (f); and
2. the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (h) as follows:-
  - (b) recalls the numerous scandals involving big money in politics under the last Government including the Bernie Ecclestone, Hinduja Brothers and Cash for Peerages scandals;
  - (c) furthermore, reminds Members of the 2010 lobbying scandal, which engulfed a number of Labour MPs – including the former MP for Sheffield Central – in which one ex-Minister described himself as a ‘cab for hire’;
  - (d) praises the decision of Liberal Democrats in Government to fight for a fairer politics by tackling the big money in politics and the unhealthy influence of lobbyists;
  - (e) however recognises the legitimate concerns raised by charities and therefore welcomes the pause on the Bill and the numerous concessions agreed by the Government;
  - (f) believes that the final legislation will not restrict charities from campaigning on national issues as they have done in previous general elections;
  - (g) notes that, among others, the Bill has been backed by former Labour MP and Speaker of The House of Commons, Michael Martin; and
  - (h) yet believes that the current national Labour leadership is under such submission to the vested interests within its own party that it is unwilling to support moves to make politics more transparent.

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) notes the Transparency of Lobbying, Non-Party Campaigning and Trade Union Administration Bill;
- (b) believes it is outrageous that whilst the Bill could stop campaigners and charities it doesn't stop commercial lobbyists from influencing government policies and believes this is a further example of the Government standing up for the wrong people;
- (c) further believes that the Bill is a cynical attempt by the Government to insulate their policies from legitimate, democratic criticism and for example could stop organisations such as the National Union of Students from being able to hold the Liberal Democrat Party to account for their broken promises

- on tuition fees;
- (d) notes comments from the Royal College of Nursing that the Bill will “place unwarranted restrictions on many organisations that seek to legitimately and impartially campaign, provide commentary and influence party policy in the run up to a general election”;
  - (e) believes that the Bill isn’t about transparency, but is about gagging charities and campaigners whilst doing nothing to address the real ‘big money’ in politics; and
  - (f) believes that whilst the Government have been forced into some concessions after pressure from charities and campaigners, the concessions don’t go far enough and the Bill still stands up for vested interests.

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

#### **17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JAYNE DUNN**

##### **One Billion Rising Campaign**

**RESOLVED:** On the Motion of Councillor Jayne Dunn, seconded by Councillor Nikki Bond, that this Council:-

- (a) fully endorses the One Billion Rising Campaign which will build upon the energy and momentum that was created in 2013 when one billion activists in 207 countries came together to strike, dance, and rise to end violence against women and girls;
- (b) recalls that the campaign recognises that one in three women on the planet will be raped or beaten in her lifetime which amounts to one billion women; and
- (c) notes that One Billion Rising for Justice is a call to women, men, and young people around the world to gather safely on 14 February 2014 outside places where they are entitled to justice – court houses, police stations, government offices, school administration buildings, work places, sites of environmental injustice, military courts, embassies, places of worship, homes, or simply public gathering places where women deserve to feel safe but too often do not.

#### **18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR COLIN ROSS**

##### **Community Pubs**

It was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor David Baker, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes news that the New York Times named Sheffield the beer capital of Britain;
- (b) recognises the important role local pubs play in the life of our city by providing a community hub for residents to meet, relax, debate and do business;
- (c) regrets the decline of community pubs in recent years and notes that in the past three years fifteen planning applications have been granted to change the use of local pubs;
- (d) supports campaigns led by Greg Mulholland MP and The Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) to reverse this decline and put local pubs back at the heart of our communities;
- (e) endorses Government proposals to introduce a code of practice, which would contain mandatory rules for all pub companies owning more than 500 pubs, and an independent adjudicator with the power to investigate and settle disputes; and
- (f) however, also calls on the Administration to support local pubs by:
  - (i) supporting community groups who wish to register their local pubs as assets of community value; and
  - (ii) amending local planning policies to stipulate that no pub will be allowed to change use unless it is demonstrated that continued trading is not economically viable and that the premises has been marketed as a pub unsuccessfully for a stipulated minimum period.

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

1. the deletion in paragraph (d) of the words "led by Greg Mulholland MP" and their substitution by the words "by members of all parties";
2. the addition of the words ", after pressure from Toby Perkins MP," after the words "Government proposals" in paragraph (e); and
3. the deletion of paragraph (f) and the addition of new paragraphs (f) and (g) as follows:-
  - (f) regrets that changes directly implemented by the Coalition Government to General Permitted Development Orders have made it easier for pubs to be converted to small supermarkets without the need for planning permission at all and opposes these Government changes; and

- (g) confirms that the issue of creating a retention of community facilities policy and requiring applicants to demonstrate the lack of economic viability of a pub will be considered as part of the development of the Local Plan.

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 news that the New York Times named Sheffield the beer capital of Britain;
- (b) recognises the important role local pubs play in the life of our city by providing a community hub for residents to meet, relax, debate and do business;
- (c) regrets the decline of community pubs in recent years and notes that in the past three years fifteen planning applications have been granted to change the use of local pubs;
- (d) supports campaigns by members of all parties and The Campaign for Real Ale (CAMRA) to reverse this decline and put local pubs back at the heart of our communities;
- (e) endorses Government proposals, after pressure from Toby Perkins MP, to introduce a code of practice, which would contain mandatory rules for all pub companies owning more than 500 pubs, and an independent adjudicator with the power to investigate and settle disputes;
- (f) regrets that changes directly implemented by the Coalition Government to General Permitted Development Orders have made it easier for pubs to be converted to small supermarkets without the need for planning permission at all and opposes these Government changes; and
- (g) confirms that the issue of creating a retention of community facilities policy and requiring applicants to demonstrate the lack of economic viability of a pub will be considered as part of the development of the Local Plan.

(Note: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Colin Ross, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker and Trevor Bagshaw voted for Paragraphs (a) to (d) and (g), against Paragraph (f) and abstained on Paragraph (e) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

**19. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PENNY BAKER**

**Park Hill Redevelopment**

It was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, that this Council:-

- (a) notes with concern reports in The Sheffield Star newspaper on 3rd January 2014 that the Council intends to spend another £1 million in the Park Hill area;
- (b) recalls the concern of the Main Opposition Group when the Council revealed its intention to spend £2.5 million of taxpayers' money at Park Hill in 2011;
- (c) furthermore, highlights that this latest announcement follows the allocation of £381,000 to the Park Hill Green Links project;
- (d) struggles to understand how members of the ruling group can continue to make the erroneous claim that there is no money available for vital services, when funds continue to be poured into these kinds of pet projects; and
- (e) calls on the Administration to reassess its priorities and use funds earmarked for the Park Hill area to keep open treasured local libraries.

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

- (a) regrets the continued smoke and mirrors of the main opposition group who continue to make erroneous claims about the Park Hill project;
- (b) reiterates the numerous previous motions that have been passed by the Council stating for the record that not a penny of the funds described by the main opposition group will be spent on the refurbishment of the Park Hill flats and regrets that the main opposition group are continuing to imply that the Council has allocated Council resources for the Park Hill redevelopment when in fact this is not the case;
- (c) for the avoidance of doubt, re-iterates that:
  - (i) there are additional costs relating to the Park Hill site which until this Government came to power were paid for by a Government grant;
  - (ii) these costs include looking after the empty flat blocks, providing security where the blocks are still lived in, funding Police Community Support Officer patrols and rehousing local residents; and
  - (iii) the Coalition Government has now completely ended the Housing



Market Renewal Grant that previously paid for these costs and the Council has been left to pick up the £2.4m bill;

- (d) further believes that there is no question about whether or not these costs should be funded and firmly believes that it is the right thing to do to ensure that the local residents are safe;
- (e) also notes that it is the Council's statutory duty to provide home loss payments to residents who are moving home;
- (f) further reiterates its opposition to the irresponsible decision of the Government to end the Housing Market Renewal Grant, leaving local taxpayers to pick up the bill for costs that were previously funded by the Government;
- (g) confirms that the Green Links project is not part of the Park Hill development, and that it will improve links between Norfolk Park all the way down to the Canal Basin and is funded from the New Homes Bonus (NHB) which is specifically designed for regeneration projects and not to fund services such as libraries;
- (h) further confirms that this is an initiative under the City Centre Breathing Spaces strategy signed off by Councillor Penny Baker when she was Cabinet Member and continues the implementation of the Sheaf Valley Park Master Plan which links Norfolk Park to Victoria Quays which has been supported by public consultation and local friends groups and was also signed off by the previous Administration;
- (i) notes that the present Administration's use of the NHB has been held up as best practice by the Audit Commission; and
- (j) believes that it is outrageous that when Council services are at serious risk from the Government, the main opposition group continue to support slashing Council budgets in the north and 400 libraries have shut nationwide with 1000 predicted by 2016, and believes that all the main opposition group are interested in doing is trying to mislead local people in a desperate attempt to deflect the responsibility from the Deputy Prime Minister.

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 smoke and mirrors of the main opposition group who continue to make erroneous claims about the Park Hill project;
- (b) reiterates the numerous previous motions that have been passed by the

Council stating for the record that not a penny of the funds described by the main opposition group will be spent on the refurbishment of the Park Hill flats and regrets that the main opposition group are continuing to imply that the Council has allocated Council resources for the Park Hill redevelopment when in fact this is not the case;

- (c) for the avoidance of doubt, re-iterates that:
  - (i) there are additional costs relating to the Park Hill site which until this Government came to power were paid for by a Government grant;
  - (ii) these costs include looking after the empty flat blocks, providing security where the blocks are still lived in, funding Police Community Support Officer patrols and rehousing local residents; and
  - (iii) the Coalition Government has now completely ended the Housing Market Renewal Grant that previously paid for these costs and the Council has been left to pick up the £2.4m bill;
- (d) further believes that there is no question about whether or not these costs should be funded and firmly believes that it is the right thing to do to ensure that the local residents are safe;
- (e) also notes that it is the Council's statutory duty to provide home loss payments to residents who are moving home;
- (f) further reiterates its opposition to the irresponsible decision of the Government to end the Housing Market Renewal Grant, leaving local taxpayers to pick up the bill for costs that were previously funded by the Government;
- (g) confirms that the Green Links project is not part of the Park Hill development, and that it will improve links between Norfolk Park all the way down to the Canal Basin and is funded from the New Homes Bonus (NHB) which is specifically designed for regeneration projects and not to fund services such as libraries;
- (h) further confirms that this is an initiative under the City Centre Breathing Spaces strategy signed off by Councillor Penny Baker when she was Cabinet Member and continues the implementation of the Sheaf Valley Park Master Plan which links Norfolk Park to Victoria Quays which has been supported by public consultation and local friends groups and was also signed off by the previous Administration;
- (i) notes that the present Administration's use of the NHB has been held up as best practice by the Audit Commission; and
- (j) believes that it is outrageous that when Council services are at serious risk from the Government, the main opposition group continue to support slashing Council budgets in the north and 400 libraries have shut

nationwide with 1000 predicted by 2016, and believes that all the main opposition group are interested in doing is trying to mislead local people in a desperate attempt to deflect the responsibility from the Deputy Prime Minister.

(Note: Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy voted for Paragraphs (a) to (i) and abstained on Paragraph (j) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **20. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ROBERT MURPHY**

### **Public Transport**

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

- (a) understands the importance of public transport in getting access to employment, education and volunteer opportunities particularly in times of economic difficulties; and
- (b) believes also public transport is an important tool in combating the related problems of congestion, air pollution, climate change and road safety.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Sue Alston, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-

- (c) therefore welcomes the millions of pounds that have been invested in Sheffield's trams, trains and buses since 2010 as a result of Liberal Democrat influence in Government.

On being put to the vote the amendment was negated.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Jillian Creasy, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (c) to (e) as follows:-

- (c) notes with dismay proposals to cut over £5 million from the budget of the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive (PTE), proposals which include reducing the hours and journeys qualifying for concessionary travel for OAPs and the disabled, the ending of the popular Freebee city centre bus service and making cuts to Community Transport;
- (d) understands that making cuts to the PTE grant is a decision made by South Yorkshire councillors on the Integrated Transport Authority, not Central Government; and

- (e) calls on all Members of the South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority to reject any cuts to the PTE grant and the District Council Levy, and asks the representatives of Sheffield to convey this motion to the Authority.

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

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

**RESOLVED:** That this Council:-

- (a) understands the importance of public transport in getting access to employment, education and volunteer opportunities particularly in times of economic difficulties; and
- (b) believes also public transport is an important tool in combating the related problems of congestion, air pollution, climate change and road safety.