

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH, on Wednesday 2 July 2014, at 2.05 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Peter Rippon)
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Talib Hussain)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Mike Drabble Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Isobel Bowler Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Roy Munn Richard Shaw	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Steve Wilson Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Nasima Akther Nikki Bond Qurban Hussain
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison Diana Stimely	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> John Campbell Lynn Rooney Paul Wood
4	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	13	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Sheila Constance Alan Law Chris Weldon	22	<i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Stuart Wattam Brian Webster	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	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Jillian Creasy Robert Murphy Sarah Jane Smalley	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Steve Ayris Denise Reaney	25	<i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Philip Wood
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Rob Frost Anne Murphy Geoff Smith	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake 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> John Booker 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 Cate McDonald, Tim Rippon and Ian Saunders.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

- 2.1 Members of the Council declared interests in the item of business Numbered 13 on the Council Summons (Notice of Motion concerning the Orgreave Truth and Justice Campaign), as follows:-

Councillor Vickie Priestley declared a personal interest on the grounds that her husband had been a serving Police Officer at the time.

Councillor Jack Clarkson declared a personal interest on the grounds that he had been a serving Police Officer at the time.

Councillor Helen Mirfin Boukouris declared a personal interest on the grounds that she had been employed by South Yorkshire Police and was a serving Special Police Constable at the time.

- 2.2 Item of Business numbered 4 on the Summons (Public Questions and Petitions - Petition Concerning Withdrawal Of The Freebee Bus Service)

Councillor Ray Satur declared a personal interest in the above item because he is employed by First Bus.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that the minutes of the ordinary meeting of Council held on 2nd April 2014 and the Annual Meeting of the Council held on 4th June be approved as true and accurate records.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

Councillors Alf Meade and Paul Wood

On behalf of the Council, the Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) congratulated Councillor Alf Meade, who had been awarded an MBE in the Queen's Birthday Honours List 2014 for services to the community; and Councillor Paul Wood, who had been awarded a British Empire Medal for his work to encourage people from minority ethnic communities to become involved in the political process.

- 4.1 Petitions

4.1.1 Petition Requesting the Council Not to Sign Contracts with G4S

The Council received a joint electronic and paper petition containing 702 signatures, requesting the Council not to sign any contracts with G4S.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Robert Spooner. Mr Spooner stated that the petition represented a number of groups in the City with concerns about the alleged violation of human rights by the company G4S and requested the Council to adopt a policy to suspend G4S from contracting with the Council and to not commission any goods or services from G4S.

Mr Spooner referred to examples of alleged breaches of international law in which he stated that G4S was complicit and to other issues relating to G4S, including its role as a housing provider for asylum seekers and the findings of the Public Accounts Committee. He also referred to provision by G4S of security systems in Israeli jails in which Palestinian children are allegedly detained and abused and the company's failure to pay any corporation tax in 2013. He stated that G4S had recently won part of the contract for the Workfare programme in relation to which the company had little experience.

He stated that universities and trades unions had cancelled contracts with G4S due to its recent history and background and under legislation it was possible for public bodies to exclude tenderers which have committed 'grave misconduct'. He asked the Council not to award contracts to G4S.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources. Councillor Curran confirmed that the Council did not currently have any contracts with G4S. The Council was bound by UK and EU law and whilst under the 2006 Regulations, the Council could declare a bidder ineligible it would be unlawful for the Council to apply a blanket policy. The Council had an ability to assess each individual bid according to criteria, including a range of factors such as evidence of fraud and corruption and also carried out a range of checks regarding a contractor's ability to deliver projects.

Councillor Curran stated that he had requested Council Officers to produce a framework and guidance in this regard and it was unlikely that G4S would be successful in meeting the framework regarding contracts with the Council unless it changed its practices considerably.

4.1.2 Petition Objecting to the Removal of the Concession of Free Rail Travel in Yorkshire, and the Freebee Bus Service

The Council received an electronic petition containing 18 signatures objecting to the removal of the concession of free rail travel in Yorkshire for the blind, vulnerable and elderly, and the removal of the FreeBee bus service.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, who stated that he would respond directly to the petitioners.

4.2 Public Questions

4.2.1 Public Questions Concerning the Supported Living Service

Tracy Bennett asked in relation to supported living, where is the service user's choice to remain with the current service provider considered and who has asked them?

Hilda Sables stated that she was concerned that the Supported Living Service, currently with the NHS, is to be outsourced by the City Council as early as July 2014. She said that that no one had approached the Sheffield Community Health Trust suggesting that the financial savings had to be made. She referred to a report of 21 January 2014 suggesting that the service should be privatised to 'stimulate the market in Sheffield'. The report confirms that some vulnerable service users would have to move out of their homes if the contract is outsourced as their tenancies would be at risk. She stated that this exercise would cost the NHS £6 million, if the contact was lost from the NHS and asked whether this was a good use of public money?

Sue Lavender referred to the report of 21 January 2014, in which the risk was highlighted of some service users losing their homes, should the contract be awarded to alternative providers. She asked how many service users were potentially at risk and how and where they would be re-housed if this was to happen.

Sue Jarman stated that the Council had said it would continue to provide a quality and value for money service after tendering. If this proved not to be the case, she asked how do we return the service to a quality provider and who will be held responsible and accountable for breaching the promises that the Council gave?

Julie Gretton stated that for the financial year 2013/14, she understood that the Supportive Living contract as a whole had to save £600,000. She asked whether any discussion or negotiations had taken place with the NHS Trust to look at how the service they currently provide could assist with finding some of the savings and in maintaining the service within the NHS and, if not, why not?

Ann Bates stated that, under self-directed support and the assessment procedure, service users know how much money has been allocated to them and with this budget, they can chose what services they want to spend it on. She asked why under this proposal, will service users be told who has been chosen to provide the service to them and also not told in advance what budget they have been allocated, thus disempowering them.

Susan Highton stated that it had previously been stated that with the possible outsourcing of the NHS provided Supported Living Service, the employment protection afforded to workers under TUPE (Transfer of Undertakings (Protection of Employment) Regulations) does not apply and latterly stated it is a matter for the contractor who successfully tenders for the service.

She stated that this will result in whole sale redundancies if the contract is lost from the NHS and other run down costs amounting to an estimated £6 million. She asked, how can this be described as value for money to the public purse; and why does the Council believe TUPE can be ignored and workers' rights discounted in such a cavalier manner?

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, responded to the questions. She stated that nine registered residential homes for people with learning disabilities would become supporting living settings and people would be supported to live independently and they would have their own tenancy.

The focus was on meeting peoples' social care needs, individual care and choice. Service users would be engaged regarding the choice of provider. If support is arranged by the Council, this would be limited to providers within the Council's framework and there were bands for purchasing services for individuals or groups.

Tenders were evaluated and quality would come first. Services would be monitored by outcomes and factors including value for money and client support plans. The Council was responsible for the monitoring of quality standards which service providers were expected to meet and it had robust procedures to monitor contracts. The Care Quality Commission was responsible for overall monitoring.

The £600K referred to within the questions submitted was an estimated part year saving and the full year saving was £1 million. The tender for the Supported Living Service Framework applied to all providers, including the NHS and those in the voluntary and community sector.

The risk that some service users' tenancies may be jeopardised was one which was recognised in the tender process and would need to be carefully managed. Councillor Lea reassured people that in the future arrangements the tenancies would be secure. None of the housing providers intended to limit the supported living services to their own accommodation.

The Council had renegotiated the contract with the Community Health Trust.

With regard to stimulation of the market, the changes applied equally to all providers. Most residential and Supported Living services were provided by organisations in the independent and voluntary sector.

Councillor Lea stated that she was not clear where the quoted figure of £6 million came from and it was not correct to say that services were being sold to the private sector. The Council had reviewed the costs and was confident that it could save money without impacting the quality of service.

Users would be involved in the process and there would be choice for them, although choice was limited to providers in the Council's Supported Living Framework and if a service user were to choose another provider outside of the

framework, then they may need to 'top-up' the amount they paid.

Provision was changing from residential care to a different model of service in the Supported Living Model. The Council's view was that TUPE did not apply in these circumstances. In relation to Supported Living, this was an agreed approach which was considered to be the way forward for people with learning disabilities, giving independence and choice. Quality was paramount, together with the safety and wellbeing of service users who need the Council's help and support. The Council wanted to ensure that people receive services which are value for money and that people remained independent, safe and well.

4.2.2 Public Question Concerning Orgreave Truth and Justice Campaign

Peter Davies stated that Sheffield had a proud tradition of supporting action in relation to injustice. He stated that as a former coal miner, he would ask that the Council does not bend or relent in its duty to Support the Motion given by Councillor Harpham, calling for the truth, the whole truth and nothing but the truth and a public inquiry into the events which took place at Orgreave in 1984.

Councillor Harry Harpham, the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods responded that the truth will out regarding Orgreave and the other coalfields. He stated that his own coalfield was in a state of lock out in what he described as actions driven by political motivation at the top of the Government at that time. Evidence was increasing and he stated that he believed the Chamber owes it to miners to get justice and he would ask for the support of Members of the Council and ask the Main Opposition Group to withdraw the amendment which they had submitted to the Motion at item of business 13 on the Council Summons.

4.2.3 Public Questions Concerning the Library Service and Half Marathon

Knowledge Kutekwa referred to cuts to the City's Library Service and particularly to Spital Hill Library and asked how people were expected to learn and develop skills such as in Information Technology. He also asked about the links to increased crime if people had fewer amenities which allowed for such learning opportunities.

Mr Kutekwa also asked a question concerning the Sheffield Half Marathon, referring to the lack of water at the event in 2014.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health responded to the questions. He made reference to the wider cuts to the Council's budget of £238 million to date and stated that this would led to some services either disappearing or being delivered differently in future. He said there were 16 organisations working in partnership with the Council, including one in Burngreave, to see how best to run libraries. Business plans were to be submitted by 11 July. He said the Council was not planning to close any library in Sheffield at the present time.

In relation to the Sheffield half Marathon, the Council was seeking expressions

of interest to ask people to work with it to ensure the half Marathon could be held in 2015.

4.2.4 Public Question Concerning Arts Funding

Lisa Banes asked a question concerning the benefits of the recently announced Arts Council funding for Sheffield.

Councillor Isobel Bowler, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure, responded that the City was to receive a new funding package over the next three years. Arts Council England was investing £2 million more in Sheffield than the previous level of funding and had a good relationship with the City. Sir Peter Bazalgette, the Chair of Arts Council England had visited Sheffield and congratulated the City for the leadership it had shown. The Arts Council was maintaining support to Sheffield Theatres and funding was granted to Museums Sheffield of £600k each year over 3 years and she applauded the work of Kim Streets, the Chief Executive of the Museum. The City's arts and cultural offer was essential for its vibrancy and to attract people and in making it a great place to live, work and visit.

4.2.5 Public Questions Concerning Exclusion From Tendering for Contracts

Hilary Smith asked a question concerning the exclusion criteria, on the grounds of grave misconduct for companies wishing to tender for contracts and in particular, how people might obtain information about the criteria used by the Council. She asked if the Council would consider the advice of the human rights lawyer, Daniel Machover, in that it might be said to be acting unlawfully if it directed its power wrongly with regards to award of a contract.

Stuart Crosthwaite commented that he was pleased that the Cabinet Member had previously said that the Council did not have any contracts with the company G4S and asked whether any of its contractors had sub-contracts with G4S.

J Grayson asked if the Council was aware of the previous record of G4S, that G4S had proved shambolic in the delivery of the 2012 Olympics contract and that the company had been investigated in relation to tagging and given a fine and it had also been fined for failing in the asylum housing contract. He asked the Council to look at the previous record of G4S.

In response to the questions, Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, stated that he had requested Council officers to refresh the guidance in respect of contacts and said that, if people asking questions left their contact details, he would consult with them on the draft guidance.

In respect of legal advice, the Council's Legal Services were the first place from which he would seek advice. He did not want the City Council to be complicit in any abuses of human rights. He gave an assurance that the Council would refresh the framework relating to contracts.

Councillor Curran reiterated that the Council did not have any contracts with G4S. However, he did not have an answer as to whether any of its contractors sub-contacted with G4S. He undertook to respond in writing to that question.

In relation to G4S handling of the contract for the 2012 Olympics, Councillor Curran commented that this had been subject to considerable publicity and there had been a failure in their performance. The Council's Executive Director of Communities had also written to the Home Office to outline concerns with regards asylum housing and the Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health, Councillor Mazher Iqbal had made representations to the Housing Minister on that matter.

4.2.6 Public Questions Concerning New School on site of the Don Valley Stadium

Nigel Slack referred to the development of a new school on the site of the former Don Valley Stadium. He stated that "in Sheffield we are welcoming the news that a new school, operated by a fundamental Christian sect, is to be built on the site and that we will be handing the most valuable part of this city's future to an organisation that believes the Bible story should be at the forefront of education". He stated that whilst he "recognised that the 'bribe' being offered by central government is huge and that we need the extra school places, we should recognise that all faith schools are Trojan Horses and seek to mould young minds into their beliefs systems". He said "if we must accept another privatised educational establishment in this City, could we at least ensure that it is a secular option that is given the benefit of our taxes?"

In response, Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that she welcomed the development of a new school at Don Valley and that the local community were to have a through-school for children aged from 2 to 16 years. She said that she did not recognise the description of the Oasis Academy given by Mr Slack in his question. The City took a pragmatic view in relation to academies and the Government was determined to make schools academies and impose this model. The Council had worked to ensure that academies were not imposed on the City. The Sheffield "ask" had been formalised, in respect of ethos, membership of the City's family of schools, supporting training and development, a common admissions policy and recognition of trades union rights etc.

There was a process for the choice of academy, including a desktop investigation into all of the providers of academies which put themselves forward. For the interview process, a selection panel had been formed, comprising local people, Councillors, Council Officers and a Trade Union representative). The Panel unanimously selected Oasis.

Councillor Drayton read a quote from the Oasis website, which stated that the organisation was a charity inspired by a Christian ethos and was inclusive in providing services, regardless of such factors as faith, age or sexuality. It did not recruit staff or students on the basis of faith. Oasis provided education and services for the entire community and operated a mainstream curriculum; and it did not force a particular belief system.

4.2.7 Public Questions Concerning the Meadowhead Roundabout

Nigel Slack asked if the recent obliteration of at least forty years of green space development in the shape of the Meadowhead Roundabout, carried out by Amey's changes to this road feature were agreed by the Council before it happened; and was any consideration given as to how to achieve the changes without this wholesale destruction? He said that he been told on more than one occasion that the contract specifies like for like replacement of features. He asked when the work will continue to replace the mature growth lost with something other than 'a few sickly looking saplings'.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene stated that the Council was aware of the design of the scheme at Meadowhead Roundabout and the re-shaping which was intended to reduce congestion and pollution and improve safety. The advice had been sought of an arboriculturalist and ecologist in respect of habitat and wildlife. There were some safety issues relating to the Poplar Trees and some Sycamore Trees had been found to be damaged. None of the trees were said to be suitable for bat roosting and pigeon nests were retained until they had been vacated. There was no evidence of burrowing animals or anything specific of note.

Fifty trees had been planted and a further ten were to be planted. There were 45 trees before the works took place. Planting had predominantly taken place along the central reservation on Bochum Way and the new trees were robust enough to adapt to the conditions on a busy highway. There was a more demanding requirement in such Transport Programme schemes with regard to tree replacement, over and above the 'like for like' requirement of the Streets Ahead programme. The new design at Meadowhead would make the area less polluted and safer.

4.2.8 Public Questions Concerning Bluecoats Development on Psalter Lane

Nigel Slack asked a question concerning the new development on Psalter Lane known as Bluecoats. He stated that under the original planning application for the development, on the site of Psalter Lane Art School, the roof treatments were supposed to be a mix of grey and red tiles to reflect the surrounding area's character. An amendment to this permission was granted ten months later to allow all the roofs to be in red tiles. This has resulted in a block of buildings that would be better suited to some seaside town rather than a mature suburb of Sheffield. He asked why this change was allowed. Who allowed it? And why was a fundamental change asked for by the developer?

Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development stated that he would respond in writing to Mr Slack.

4.2.9 Public Questions Concerning Local Area Partnerships

Nigel Slack stated that it was now more than 12 months since the demise of the Community Assemblies. He said he was one of many citizens who have yet to

see a ward meeting take place or to see details of any meetings of the Local Area Partnerships taking place or any record of the decisions made at either. He stated that it appeared to him that the much vaunted improvements to local democracy have actually lead to less contact and consultation with the public and a greater lack of transparency.

He asked how many wards have had no meetings at all in the last 12 months; which Local Area Partnerships have met; how often; and where can the minutes of those meetings be found?

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health responded and stated that he disagreed with the points which Mr Slack had made regarding democracy and transparency. He stated that the Council had received a £238 million cut in its budget so far and there were further cuts to come. Services had to change and the Community Assembly/Locality Working budget had reduced from £2.5 million to £500k. Local Area Partnership meetings were not the same as meetings of the former Community Assemblies and the Council was clear that they would not be the same. Community Assembly meetings did not effectively involve the public and there was considerable bureaucratic process in the way they had operated. The Local Area Partnerships were based on local issues and did not have decision making powers and did not have to hold meetings in public.

In the South area, for example community engagement focussed on wards in that area. Local Councillors decide the best way to engage with their constituents, which might be to tag on to existing meetings of other local bodies such as Tenants and Residents Associations (TARAs) or they might hold ward-based meetings. Social media was also used as a means of communication with local people. Councillor Iqbal said that he would provide further information on meetings which had taken place in writing in response to Mr Slack's question.

4.2.1 Public Question Concerning Public Questions

0

Martin Brighton asked: Does this chamber agree that, provided citizens' questions comply with the constitution, that each should be read out and recorded for the public record, and that no question be attempted to be expunged by dint of deceit?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, responded that, in reference to Mr Brighton's question, she believed that is what happens i.e. questions are read out and answers to questions are recorded more or less verbatim. The minutes of meetings are approved by its Members.

Councillor Harry Harpham, the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods and Deputy Leader of the Council, stated that Mr Brighton's question was in reference to the Cabinet meeting held on 18 June 2014. At that meeting, only Mr Brighton, Members of Cabinet and officers were present and he had thought it expedient not to read out the questions which Mr Brighton had submitted in writing and had been circulated as appropriate. The questions were recorded in

the minutes of that Cabinet meeting.

4.2.1 Public Question Concerning Deprived Areas

1

Martin Brighton asked: Where areas have for fifteen or more years been designated as deprived, but have improved little or not at all, despite the continuing pouring of vast resources into those areas, up to the change of government, which elected members have offered to stand down for what an outsider would conclude was years of failure, and if none, why none?

Given that these deprived areas continue to receive funds, perhaps justifiably, amid much publicity, and retaining the same political profile, how would this council respond to any expressed perceptions that, in effect, political patronage is being bought?

Councillor Julie Dore stated that she had responded in the past to questions from Mr Brighton relating to this issue. There had been considerable investment in the City, especially during the 13 years of the previous Government. The 'Closing the Gap' policy was developed by a previous Council administration. She said she fully supported investment in areas of deprivation and it was absolutely justifiable that deprived areas receive funding.

Councillor Harry Harpham stated that City Councillors stand for election every 4 years on the record of what they have achieved for their ward and for the City and that was the democratic process.

In relation to the reference to 'political patronage', Councillor Harpham stated that he did not believe it was not true [that political patronage was being sought] and if there was any evidence to the contrary, then Mr Brighton should go the Police.

4.2.1 Public Question Concerning Racism Awareness Training

2

Martin Brighton asked what measures are in place for this Council to have in place, and specifically within housing, racism awareness training for officers, elected members, and volunteers?

Councillor Harry Harpham responded that there was a racism training programme for all employees, contractors, partners and Tenants and Residents Associations and the training was being refreshed this month.

4.2.1 Public Question Concerning Recognition Policy for TARAs

3

Martin Brighton stated that, at a recent meeting of tenants, the meeting indicated by 38 to 2, to reject the Council's Recognition Policy for TARAs. The officers present said that not only would they not record that part of the meeting, but since that meeting have made it clear that the Recognition Policy shall be

imposed regardless. He asked: in what way does this show respect for local democracy?

Mr Brighton asked: has this Council any plans, however tentative, to seek investment funds from any institution in any way associated with supporting any proscribed organisation?

Councillor Harry Harpham responded that a draft Recognition Policy had been drawn up by a group of tenants. Both he and Councillor Tony Damms had met with people and their views would be communicated back to the Tenants, who will be responsible for the Recognition Policy. It was, he said, critical that the process operates in a democratic and accountable manner, particularly as regards the use of public money.

4.2.1 Public Questions Concerning Road Safety on Normanton Hill

4

Kerry Milnes stated that, prior to the tragic accident on 9 May 2014, it had been stated that there had been two recorded accidents on Normanton Hill in the last 5 years, although people believed the number of accidents was actually three. She asked why safety measures such as a 30 mph sign were never implemented.

Michael Fogg asked why Normanton Hill was not classed as a high collision location.

Michael Barker asked why, after a history of accidents, concerns over excessive speeds and previous petitions have we had to endure a tragedy to bring this to the Council's attention?

Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene, responded that it was important that a further meeting is held with local people to take appropriate action in relation to road safety on Normanton Hill. Decisions concerning road safety schemes were made based on criteria which had been in place since 2003. It was right, he said, to look at the criteria again.

A Speed Indicator Device (SID) had been placed at that location a few weeks before the tragic accident occurred on Normanton Hill in recognition of the fact that there was danger on the road and, he understood that data was available from that device.

More significant plans and investment were to be considered and the Council was working closely with the community and those people who were affected by the recent events. He appreciated that there was a lot more work required to ensure that action was taken to bring about a safer road and ensure that vehicles slowed down. Councillor Scott suggested that a community meeting be held on a regular basis, to include local Councillors and to make sure there was progress.

4.3 Petition Requiring Debate

Petition Requesting Road Safety Measures on Normanton Hill

The Council received a combined paper and electronic petition, containing a total of approximately 12,571 signatures, concerning road safety on Normanton Hill. As the petition contained more than 5000 signatures and, at the request of the lead petitioners, under the Council's Petitions Scheme, the petition was subject to a public debate by the Council.

The wording of the petition was as follows:-

"We the undersigned, are concerned citizens and demand that Sheffield City Council (Highways Authority) install controlled crossing and speed restrictions, speed limits with immediate effect. We have grave concerns and have had concerns for many years regarding excessive speeds that vehicles achieve on Normanton Hill, which is a very busy stretch of road, compounded by narrow pavements and the concealed entrance to Richmond Park. This entrance is used Monday to Friday by local schoolchildren who attend Outwood Academy (former City School), dog walkers on a daily basis, teenagers use Friday evenings, weekends and holidays. All who wish to access this concealed entrance to Richmond Park have to negotiate Normanton Hill."

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Sandra Bradley. She stated the petitioners demand that the Council install a controlled crossing and implement speed restrictions with immediate effect. There had been grave concerns for many years about the excessive speeds of vehicles on Normanton Hill, which was a very busy stretch of road. The problems on the road were compounded by narrow pavements and a concealed entrance to Richmond Park. There was particular concern for pedestrians including children, older people and disabled people and those who wished to access the Park. The entrance to Richmond Park was used by school children attending Outwood Academy and dog walkers and young people and all of those who wished to use the concealed entrance to the Park had to negotiate Normanton Hill.

Petitions had been submitted over a number of years in relation to Normanton Hill and it was acknowledged that railings had been installed. The resurfacing works to the highway had been temporarily suspended, which gave the Council an opportunity to put in place safety measures. It was considered that, had appropriate safety measures been in place, the tragic accident which had occurred on 9 May 2014 could have been prevented.

Petitioners believed that there had been 3 recorded accidents on that road in the past 5 years. People wanted to see a controlled crossing in place on Normanton Hill. The newly erected 30mph sign had made little effect on vehicle speeds. The Council was asked to alleviate the problems on that road to help make Normanton Hill as safe as possible.

In accordance with Council Procedure Rule 13.1 (b), the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene made an initial response to the petitions, followed by the Shadow Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling

and Streetscene.

Councillor Jack Scott, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene, responded to the petition. He stated that the entire City Council wished to extend condolences to the family and friends of Jasmyn Chan and to thank people for their efforts in bringing the petition concerning road safety on Normanton Hill to Council. The Council wanted make sure it properly did what it could.

The Police were to carry out short term speed enforcement action and additional signs had been erected. The enforcement action had shown that 55 vehicles had exceeded the speed limit tolerance; with one vehicle travelling up to 66 mph. "Slow" signs were to be painted on the road in the next few weeks. The Council was trying to recruit to a school crossing patrol post in time for the start of the school term in September. Over the summer holidays a Vehicle Activated Sign would be installed, which displayed a vehicle's speed on approach. The Streets Ahead works had been suspended. There was also too much vegetation overhanging the footpath in some places and the Council had written to tenants and homeowners in that regard.

The Streets Ahead improvement works included the installation of new LED streetlights which would improve lighting at the entrance to Richmond Park and would also improve lighting for pedestrians walking to and from the bus stop. There was also a need to widen the pavement and it was possible that the hedgerow could be moved to improve safety. It was acknowledged that this was an exposed piece of road, particularly for young people and people with issues around their mobility.

The Council's Road Safety team will be working with Birley Community College and would be talking to drivers. A controlled pedestrian crossing would be installed near to the site of the accident following appropriate consultation with the community and landowners. It would take a certain amount of time to design, develop and consult upon the crossing in order to make sure it was the right solution. Potentially, other traffic calming solutions would also be considered as there is a wish to reduce traffic speeds.

Councillor Scott reassured people that the Council was determined to take action and would meet regularly with the petitioners and local Councillors as well. He stressed how important it was that people worked together to make sure that the tragedy which had occurred on that stretch of road did not happen again.

Members of the City Council then debated the issues raised by the petition. The points made by Members during the debate are summarised below:

It was right that comprehensive action is taken in relation to the safety of pedestrians and road users on Normanton Hill, which included a controlled crossing and the development of a scheme needed to be carried out carefully.

The role of road safety teams to provide educational advice to young people was

supported and it was important for adults to meet their obligations in respect of road safety.

Normanton Hill (B6064) feeds routes to the City centre and Crystal Peaks. Whilst the road had a 'B' Road classification, the Council might consider a weight restriction on the road and other measures such as the installation of speed retarders.

It was commendable that the community has come together over this issue to reduce future risk of a road accident at this location. Both short and long term speed enforcement action was required to improve road safety and enforceable measures should be incorporated in to safety improvements.

It was suggested that the slow sign on the road be re-lined as it was already fading and that speed reduction measures are introduced in the approach to any future crossing. The camber of the road was also considered to be an issue which may need to be addressed.

The issue of road safety at Normanton Hill should not be looked at in isolation. Consideration should be given to the fact that many people were injured or killed on roads in contrast to other forms of transport, which was clearly not acceptable. Drivers that speed should be dealt with appropriately and this required a change in culture. It was also important that such measures as 20mph roads were introduced in areas of the City. Speed cameras also saved people's lives.

The measures outlined should be introduced as quickly as possible and, at the same time, properly designed and engineered. Speed limits were in place for a reason and more people survived accidents at impacts of 20mph, compared to higher speeds of 30mph or 40mph.

Members were most supportive of the introduction of measures to prevent such a tragic incident from occurring again.

The combination of factors on the B6064, Normanton Hill including the narrow width of the road and pavement, the topography and access to the Park should be considered and the Council's criteria for the assessment of such safety schemes did need to take account of the sum of all these elements. The criteria for road safety schemes could be reviewed. A timetable for action would need to be quickly ascertained and it was critical that effective communications with local people were established.

Following a brief Right of Reply by Marie Gratton, Councillor Jack Scott responded to issues raised during the debate. He stated that the budget for the controlled crossing would require capital expenditure and there was not, therefore, a concern about the works having to take place before financial year end. The necessary design, development and consultation would need to take place and the Council would work with the community to put in place a proper project management plan. It was important that work also took place with the Police, particularly with regard to reckless or criminal behaviour and making sure any convictions were appropriately publicised. There was genuine commitment

and resolve on this issue. Young people were potential ambassadors on the issue of road safety and it was important to seize their energy and momentum.

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that the petition now submitted containing 12,571 signatures requesting the implementation of road safety measures on Normanton Hill be referred to the Cabinet with a request that a report be prepared on a detailed programme of works to be undertaken to improve road safety at that location.

4.4. Ordinary Petitions

4.4.1 Petition Requesting the Provision of a Zebra Crossing outside Hucklow Primary School

The Council received a petition containing 287 signatures, requesting the provision of a zebra crossing outside Hucklow Primary School.

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

4.4.2 Petition Requesting the Council to Save the Institute of Lifelong Learning in its Current Format

The Council received an electronic petition containing 202 signatures, requesting the Council to save the Institute of Lifelong Learning in its current format of offering degrees to mature, part-time students.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families.

4.4.3 Petition Regarding Council Tax Arrears

The Council received an electronic petition containing 24 signatures requesting the Council to take a tougher stance with regard to the collection of Council Tax arrears.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources.

4.4.4 Petition Objecting to the Withdrawal of the FreeBee Bus Service

The Council received a petition containing 1024 signatures objecting to the withdrawal of the FreeBee bus service.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development.

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 or Pensions under the provisions of Council Procedure Rule 16.6 (i).

6. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

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

Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee	-	Councillor Pat Midgley to Replace Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards
Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee	-	Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to Replace Councillor Bryan Lodge
Planning and Highways Committee	-	Councillor Bryan Lodge to Replace Councillor Terry Fox
Planning and Highways Committee Substitute Members	-	Councillor Terry Fox to Replace Councillor Bryan Lodge
	-	Councillor John Booker to fill a vacancy
Appeals and Collective Disputes Committee		Councillor Pauline Andrews to fill a vacancy
Crookes Local Area Partnership Lead Ward Member	-	Councillor Geoff Smith to fill a vacancy
East Ecclesfield Local Area Partnership Lead Ward Member	-	Councillor Joyce Wright to fill a vacancy
Richmond Local Area Partnership Lead Ward Member	-	Councillor Lynn Rooney to fill a vacancy

Older People's Champion	-	Councillor Peter Price to fill a vacancy
Sexual Health Champion	-	Councillor Nikki Bond to fill a vacancy
Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education	-	Mr Martin Lawton to fill a vacancy
Younger People's Champion	-	Councillor Olivia Blake to fill a vacancy
Allotments and Leisure Gardens Advisory Group	-	Councillor Jack Scott to fill a vacancy
Corporate Parenting Board	-	Councillor Talib Hussain to fill a vacancy Councillor Martin Smith to fill a vacancy
Planning Policy Advisory Group	-	Councillors Leigh Bramall, Alan Law, Tony Downing, Bryan Lodge and Joyce Wright to fill vacancies
Sheffield Conservation Advisory Group	-	Councillor Roger Davison to fill a vacancy
Walking Forum	-	Councillor Andrew Sangar to fill a vacancy

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

Charities/Educational Foundations:-

Norton Educational Foundation and Non-Educational Trusts	-	Councillor Roy Munn to fill a vacancy
Groundwork Sheffield Trust	-	Mr Martin Lawton and Councillor Ian Auckland to fill vacancies
Reserve and Cadet Forces Association – Yorkshire and Humber	-	Councillor John Campbell (to replace Mr Clive Skelton)
Sheffield Compact	-	Councillor Mazher Iqbal to fill a vacancy
Sheffield Health and Social Care Foundation Trust - Council of Governors (3)	-	Councillor Jayne Dunn to fill a vacancy

(c) it be noted that the Motorists' Forum has been merged into Sheffield on the Move and Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs be appointed Chair of that Committee.

7. CHANGES TO THE CONSTITUTION

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that this Council adopts the changes to Parts 4 and 6 of the Council's Constitution, as set out in the report of the Chief Executive now submitted and Appendices A to C, and notes the minor/consequential change to the Members' Allowances Scheme within the Constitution made by the Interim Director of Legal and Governance, in consultation with the Lord Mayor, under delegated authority, outlined in the report and Appendix D.

(Note: These changes to the Constitution include approval of revised Financial Procedure Rules (Financial Regulations))

8. JOINT HEALTH OVERVIEW AND SCRUTINY COMMITTEE (YORKSHIRE AND THE HUMBER) & THE NEW CONGENITAL HEART DISEASE REVIEW

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Mick Rooney, seconded by Councillor Roger Davison, that this Council approves the recommendations of the Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee, set out in the report now submitted, made at its meeting held on 10th April 2014, relating to the new Congenital Heart Disease Review and the Council's participation in the Joint Health Overview and Scrutiny Committee (Yorkshire and the Humber).

9. TRIBUTES TO FORMER COUNCILLORS

Members of the Council paid tribute to former Councillors who had retired or had not been re-elected at the Municipal elections. These were former Councillors Sylvia Anginotti, Trevor Bagshaw, Janet Bragg, Alison Brelsford, Keith Hill, Anders Hanson, Martin Lawton, Mohammad Maroof, Bob McCann, Shaffaq Mohammed, Clive Skelton and Garry Weatherall.

It was RESOLVED that thanks be given to all of those former Members of the Council for their hard work and service to the City.

10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE

The Queen's Speech 2014

It was moved by Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Steve Wilson, that this Council:-

- (a) regrets that the Queens Speech completely failed to tackle the challenges facing Sheffield and the country as a whole, providing no vision and positive action to improve people's lives and simply offered more of the same, recycled measures already announced;

- (b) further regrets that the Government's Queens Speech failed to tackle the cost-of-living crisis, felt by people in Sheffield, with a plan to secure a strong and sustained recovery that delivers rising living standards for the many, not just a few at the top;
- (c) calls on the Government to:
 - (i) act to boost housing supply and ensure at least 200,000 new homes are built each year;
 - (ii) introduce an independent infrastructure commission;
 - (iii) reform the energy and banking markets to make them more competitive for consumers and businesses;
 - (iv) make work pay by expanding free childcare for working parents;
 - (v) raise the value of the minimum wage over the next Parliament;
 - (vi) introduce a lower ten pence starting rate of tax;
 - (vii) introduce a Mansion Tax;
 - (viii) set out reforms to ban recruitment agencies from hiring solely from overseas and put in place tougher enforcement of minimum wage laws to tackle the exploitation of migrant workers that undercuts local workers;
 - (ix) introduce a compulsory jobs guarantee for young people and a new gold standard vocational qualification and give business a real say on apprenticeships in return for increasing their numbers to ensure that every young person gets the skills they need to succeed in the future;
 - (x) give local authorities and communities greater control over fracking in their areas and address the completely inadequate payments to communities in which fracking takes place, considering the enormous amount of revenue to be gained by the companies from fracking activities, in particular given the tax breaks awarded by the Government;
 - (xi) introduce an NHS Bill, to put a stop to its privatisation and improve access to GPs; and
 - (xii) give people a greater say over pay day lenders and betting shops on their high streets; and
- (d) believes that the country needs a new direction to deliver these changes and welcomes the agenda set out by the Labour Party to make work pay,

reform the banks, freeze energy bills and build more homes.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words therefore:-

- (a) believes Liberal Democrats in Government are committed to building a stronger economy and a fairer society, creating opportunity for all;
- (b) welcomes measures set out in the 2014 Queens Speech, which will help to build a stronger economy and a fairer society in Sheffield, specifically:
 - (i) an increase in the total number of apprenticeship places to 2 million by 2015;
 - (ii) greater support for families with up to £2,000 a year per child in a childcare subsidy;
 - (iii) more power for workers to control their own pensions and new 'defined ambition' pensions to help boost savings;
 - (iv) new regulations to allow all new homes to meet a zero carbon standard by 2016;
 - (v) new powers to crack down on employers who abuse zero-hour contracts;
 - (vi) tougher penalties for employers who do not pay the Minimum Wage;
 - (vii) a new 5p levy on plastic bags, with proceeds going to charity;
 - (vii) a new independent adjudicator to protect pub landlords and community pubs from exploitative 'pub-cos';
 - (ix) tougher powers to tackle Female Genital Mutilation; and
 - (x) a new power of recall over constituency MPs;
- (c) notes research by the Institute of Fiscal Studies that the spending commitments set out by the last Government would have added an estimated £201bn to the national debt;
- (d) notes the comments of John Cruddas MP, who is leading the Labour Party's Policy Review, that the Labour Leadership have "parked" ideas and replaced them with "cynical nuggets of policy to chime with our focus groups and press strategy"; and
- (e) calls upon the Administration to admit that the policies put forward by the national Labour Party are not credible and back proposals in the Queens

Speech, which will help to improve the lives of ordinary Sheffielders.

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

Following a right of reply by Councillor Julie Dore the original Motion was then put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) regrets that the Queens Speech completely failed to tackle the challenges facing Sheffield and the country as a whole, providing no vision and positive action to improve people's lives and simply offered more of the same, recycled measures already announced;
- (b) further regrets that the Government's Queens Speech failed to tackle the cost-of-living crisis, felt by people in Sheffield, with a plan to secure a strong and sustained recovery that delivers rising living standards for the many, not just a few at the top;
- (c) calls on the Government to:
 - (i) act to boost housing supply and ensure at least 200,000 new homes are built each year;
 - (ii) introduce an independent infrastructure commission;
 - (iii) reform the energy and banking markets to make them more competitive for consumers and businesses;
 - (iv) make work pay by expanding free childcare for working parents;
 - (v) raise the value of the minimum wage over the next Parliament;
 - (vi) introduce a lower ten pence starting rate of tax;
 - (vii) introduce a Mansion Tax;
 - (viii) set out reforms to ban recruitment agencies from hiring solely from overseas and put in place tougher enforcement of minimum wage laws to tackle the exploitation of migrant workers that undercuts local workers;
 - (ix) introduce a compulsory jobs guarantee for young people and a new gold standard vocational qualification and give business a real say on apprenticeships in return for increasing their numbers to ensure that every young person gets the skills they need to succeed in the future;
 - (x) give local authorities and communities greater control over fracking in their areas and address the completely inadequate payments to

- communities in which fracking takes place, considering the enormous amount of revenue to be gained by the companies from fracking activities, in particular given the tax breaks awarded by the Government;
- (xi) introduce an NHS Bill, to put a stop to its privatisation and improve access to GPs; and
 - (xii) give people a greater say over pay day lenders and betting shops on their high streets; and
- (d) believes that the country needs a new direction to deliver these changes and welcomes the agenda set out by the Labour Party to make work pay, reform the banks, freeze energy bills and build more homes.

(Note: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted against paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) and abstained on paragraph (c) of the above motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BEN CURRAN

Workfare Schemes

It was moved by Councillor Ben Curran, seconded by Councillor Nikki Bond, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that work should pay and therefore opposes the introduction of schemes which force job seekers into unpaid work or face losing their benefits – schemes known popularly as workfare;
- (b) is concerned that there is no evidence workfare assists job seekers in finding work and in fact working a 30-hour week makes that more difficult; that workfare is replacing paid work; and that workfare stigmatises benefits claimants and locks them further into poverty; and
- (c) pledges not to use any workfare placements and will also encourage contractors not to use the schemes.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words therefor:-

- (a) supports the numerous steps the Government have taken to support young people into work, including:

- (i) increasing spending on apprenticeships in its first year by £250 million – a 50% increase on the previous Government's commitments;
 - (ii) implementing a £1 billion Youth Contract, to tackle unemployment among 16-24 year-olds; and
 - (iii) introducing University Technical Colleges, delivering vital skills and training to young people;
- (b) welcomes the latest employment statistics that show that there is now a record number of people in Sheffield in work;
 - (c) welcomes that the proportion of young people in England not in education, employment or training (NEETs) has fallen to the lowest level since records began in 1994;
 - (d) furthermore notes the expectation of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) that the British economy would grow faster in the first six months of this year than any other G7 economy;
 - (e) contrasts this record of action with the disastrous performance of the previous Government, where youth employment rose by almost 75% between 2001 and 2010;
 - (f) recalls that when workfare legislation passed through the House of Commons in March 2013, the majority of the Parliamentary Labour Party refused to vote against the measures;
 - (g) notes the latest comments by the Rt. Hon. Ed Miliband MP that young unemployed people who refuse to take part in mandatory schemes could lose their benefits under a Labour Government;
 - (h) furthermore regrets the rhetoric of the former Shadow Secretary of State for Work & Pensions, the Rt. Hon. Liam Byrne MP, who was criticised in the national media as “playing to the Right-whinge gallery”; and
 - (i) believes that members of the majority group continue to act in a completely hypocritical manner and should concentrate on altering the position of their own national front-bench.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that work should pay and therefore opposes the introduction of schemes which force job seekers into unpaid work or face losing their benefits – schemes known popularly as workfare;

- (b) is concerned that there is no evidence workfare assists job seekers in finding work and in fact working a 30-hour week makes that more difficult; that workfare is replacing paid work; and that workfare stigmatises benefits claimants and locks them further into poverty; and
- (c) pledges not to use any workfare placements and will also encourage contractors not to use the schemes.

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

- For the Motion (58) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Brian Webster, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Chris Weldon, Steve Jones, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.
- Against the Motion (0) - Nil
- Abstained on the Motion (22) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe, Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson and John Booker.

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOE OTTEN

Winter Maintenance Service

It was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Vickie Priestley, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the proposal of the Administration to remove 100 miles of road from Sheffield's gritting routes and cease the recruitment of new snow wardens;
- (b) believes that Labour politicians have decided to hit the west of the city and rural areas hardest while protecting their own favoured areas;
- (c) regrets that these plans could put local residents' safety at risk, while leaving some elderly and vulnerable people trapped in their homes for days;
- (d) furthermore notes with concern the impact these changes will have on rural businesses, in particular farms, and the damage this could cause to their trade;
- (e) recalls that the main opposition group opposed these plans at the Council's Budget Meeting in March and identified alternative funds to meet these savings; and
- (f) calls upon the Administration to drop these proposals and maintain a safe and comprehensive gritting service for the city.

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

- (a) notes that Sheffield City Council is now into its fourth year of unprecedented cuts by this Government, which includes the Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP, noting that, so far, the Council has had to find savings of £238 million and by next year it will have lost half of its direct government funding;
- (b) regrets that there is still millions of pounds worth of cuts to come at the same time that the Government, which includes Nick Clegg, has protected some of the wealthiest areas of the country in the South of England, some of whom are receiving next to no cuts;
- (c) notes the Administration's proposals for the Winter Maintenance Service will reduce the amount spent on gritting by £100,000 and, following these changes, the Council will still provide an effective Winter Maintenance Service that reaches the vast majority of people within the city;
- (d) confirms that no areas will be cut off and 50% of all roads will still be gritted;
- (e) is shocked at the hypocrisy of the main opposition group and remembers

the appalling record of the previous Administration who sold 200 tonnes of grit to Rotherham and later complained to the Government that they were short of grit;

- (f) further confirms that making cuts to gritting is not something the present Administration want to do and would not be doing this if there was a genuine alternative;
- (g) regrets that when the Council is facing the level of cuts that this Government, which includes the Deputy Prime Minister, are imposing on it, there is not a single service in the Council that is being protected from cuts, except child safeguarding;
- (h) believes that for the main opposition group and Deputy Prime Minister to fully support the cuts to Sheffield and then pretend to be outraged about their consequences is nothing more than a cynical and hypocritical political act of cowardice;
- (i) regrets that due to the cuts, like many other areas, Sheffield is now being forced to cut its gritting routes and if the Deputy Prime Minister genuinely cared about stopping these changes to gritting he is the only person in the city who could give us the funding we need not to do this; and
- (j) confirms that if the Government gave the Council back the money it has cut, the Administration would very happily withdraw these proposals immediately and believes this issue is a test of the Deputy Prime Minister and main opposition group if they want to stand up for this city or defend what this Council believes is a right wing government.

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 paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (g) of the Amendment (61) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Brian Webster, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Chris Weldon, Steve Jones, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair

Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.

- Against paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (g) of the Amendment (18) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley.
- Abstained on paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (g) of the Amendment (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon).
- For paragraphs (d), (e), (f), (h), (i) and (j) of the Amendment (57) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Chris Weldon, Steve Jones, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Jack Clarkson, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.
- Against paragraphs (d), (e), (f), (h), (i) and (j) of the Amendment (18) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe

and Vickie Priestley.

Abstained on paragraphs (d), (e), (f), (h), (i) and (j) of the Amendment (5) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) and Councillors Brian Webster, Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy and Sarah Jane Smalley.

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 Sheffield City Council is now into its fourth year of unprecedented cuts by this Government, which includes the Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP, noting that, so far, the Council has had to find savings of £238 million and by next year it will have lost half of its direct government funding;
- (b) regrets that there is still millions of pounds worth of cuts to come at the same time that the Government, which includes Nick Clegg, has protected some of the wealthiest areas of the country in the South of England, some of whom are receiving next to no cuts;
- (c) notes the Administration's proposals for the Winter Maintenance Service will reduce the amount spent on gritting by £100,000 and, following these changes, the Council will still provide an effective Winter Maintenance Service that reaches the vast majority of people within the city;
- (d) confirms that no areas will be cut off and 50% of all roads will still be gritted;
- (e) is shocked at the hypocrisy of the main opposition group and remembers the appalling record of the previous Administration who sold 200 tonnes of grit to Rotherham and later complained to the Government that they were short of grit;
- (f) further confirms that making cuts to gritting is not something the present Administration want to do and would not be doing this if there was a genuine alternative;
- (g) regrets that when the Council is facing the level of cuts that this Government, which includes the Deputy Prime Minister, are imposing on it, there is not a single service in the Council that is being protected from cuts, except child safeguarding;
- (h) believes that for the main opposition group and Deputy Prime Minister to fully support the cuts to Sheffield and then pretend to be outraged about their consequences is nothing more than a cynical and hypocritical political act of cowardice;
- (i) regrets that due to the cuts, like many other areas, Sheffield is now being

forced to cut its gritting routes and if the Deputy Prime Minister genuinely cared about stopping these changes to gritting he is the only person in the city who could give us the funding we need not to do this; and

- (j) confirms that if the Government gave the Council back the money it has cut, the Administration would very happily withdraw these proposals immediately and believes this issue is a test of the Deputy Prime Minister and main opposition group if they want to stand up for this city or defend what this Council believes is a right wing government.

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

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL

New Retail Quarter

It was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Neale Gibson, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the recent steps the Council has taken to drive forward the city's New Retail Quarter through securing the land and property needed to develop the scheme;
- (b) notes that this is the latest of a series of actions by the present Administration to unlock this crucial project for Sheffield including:
- (i) securing the New Development Deal to inject funds into the retail quarter to bridge the financial gap facing the scheme;
 - (ii) subsequently re-starting work with Hammerson to re-confirm retailer appetite to locate in a New Retail Quarter;
 - (iii) parting company with Hammerson when they would not commit to start construction; and
 - (iv) taking control of the scheme as a Council, working to redesign a new scheme that is viable and fit for purpose in the long term, and taking real action to make the scheme happen;
- (c) welcomes the news that over 20 developers have expressed an interest in the retail quarter and believes this is positive news which demonstrates viability and confidence in the new scheme;
- (d) contrasts this action to the claims of inaction by the new leader of the Liberal Democrat Group on the Council, and regrets that once more, this shows how the Liberal Democrats talk Sheffield down rather than welcome positive news;

- (e) notes that the leader of the largest opposition group's comments are all the more incredible given the three wasted years of inaction, delay and dither of the previous Administration between 2008 and 2011 when barely anything happened;
- (f) welcomes comments by the Executive Director of the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce "The Chamber is absolutely delighted to see such a positive move on this project. It is a critical development for the city and we applaud the extremely positive message this sends and the ambitious timescale it lays out.";
- (g) also welcomes the continued development underway on The Moor;
- (h) further welcomes the news that a new IKEA store will be coming to Sheffield; and
- (i) believes that these are important positive developments for the city's economy and looks forward to more details of how the Retail Quarter will be progressed being submitted to the July Cabinet meeting.

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

- (a) expresses disappointment at the three wasted years that the Council believes this Administration have presided over, with little progress on the New Retail Quarter having been achieved;
- (b) recalls that the main opposition group called for the Council to get tough with Hammerson, but instead the Administration dithered and delayed for months before finally taking action;
- (c) welcomes the latest steps forward towards development but believes Sheffielders will not be satisfied until concrete work is seen on the ground;
- (d) highlights that the latest progress has only been possible because of the Sheffield City Deal, pioneered and pushed through by the Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP;
- (e) contrasts the lack of progress on the New Retail Quarter with the re-development of The Moor, secured by the last Administration and proceeding at pace;
- (f) supports the decision of the Council's Planning and Highways Committee to unanimously approve a planning application for an Ikea superstore;
- (g) is pleased that this case did not see a repeat of the disastrous and costly

rejection of a Next superstore by members of the majority group, which saw the Council hit with a £60,000 bill in appeal costs and labelled as “closing its doors” to business; and

- (h) regrets that despite this latest announcement, the Council continues to attract an “anti-business” label and calls on the Administration to work with businesses rather than against them.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the recent steps the Council has taken to drive forward the city’s New Retail Quarter through securing the land and property needed to develop the scheme;
- (b) notes that this is the latest of a series of actions by the present Administration to unlock this crucial project for Sheffield including:
 - (i) securing the New Development Deal to inject funds into the retail quarter to bridge the financial gap facing the scheme;
 - (ii) subsequently re-starting work with Hammerson to re-confirm retailer appetite to locate in a New Retail Quarter;
 - (iii) parting company with Hammerson when they would not commit to start construction; and
 - (iv) taking control of the scheme as a Council, working to redesign a new scheme that is viable and fit for purpose in the long term, and taking real action to make the scheme happen;
- (c) welcomes the news that over 20 developers have expressed an interest in the retail quarter and believes this is positive news which demonstrates viability and confidence in the new scheme;
- (d) contrasts this action to the claims of inaction by the new leader of the Liberal Democrat Group on the Council, and regrets that once more, this shows how the Liberal Democrats talk Sheffield down rather than welcome positive news;
- (e) notes that the leader of the largest opposition group's comments are all the more incredible given the three wasted years of inaction, delay and dither of the previous Administration between 2008 and 2011 when barely anything happened;
- (f) welcomes comments by the Executive Director of the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce “The Chamber is absolutely delighted to see such a positive

move on this project. It is a critical development for the city and we applaud the extremely positive message this sends and the ambitious timescale it lays out.”;

- (g) also welcomes the continued development underway on The Moor;
- (h) further welcomes the news that a new IKEA store will be coming to Sheffield; and
- (i) believes that these are important positive developments for the city’s economy and looks forward to more details of how the Retail Quarter will be progressed being submitted to the July Cabinet meeting.

(Note: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (a), (c) and (f) to (i) and against Paragraphs (b), (d) and (e) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

2. Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted for Paragraph (a) and abstained on Paragraphs (b) to (i) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR HARRY HARPAM

Orgreave Truth and Justice Campaign

It was moved by Councillor Harry Harpham, seconded by Councillor Terry Fox, that this Council:-

- (a) supports the Orgreave Truth and Justice Campaign in its aim of securing a full public inquiry into the policing at the Orgreave Coking Plant, South Yorkshire, during the 1984-85 miners’ strike;
- (b) notes with some disappointment the unacceptably slow pace of the current scoping exercise being conducted by the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) to determine whether an investigation into police misconduct should take place;
- (c) also notes that the remit of the IPCC does not extend to cover the political context that this Council believes empowered the police and facilitated their actions and conduct;
- (d) condemns any actions that may subsequently be found to have constituted police brutality and arrests of miners on “trumped up” charges;

- (e) believes that only a full public inquiry will have the capacity to reveal the truth about policing of Orgreave, and enable any injustices committed there to be acknowledged and addressed; and
- (f) calls on the Government to support now, and instigate, a full public inquiry into the policing of the 1984-85 miners' strike.

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

1. the deletion of paragraphs (c), (e) and (f);
 2. the re-lettering of paragraph (d) as a new paragraph (c); and
 3. the addition of new paragraphs (d) and (e) as follows:-
- (d) notes the comments of the Rt. Hon. David Blunkett MP who stated on 16th June 2014 that "I would take some convincing that another agonising internal inquiry would shed more light than is already known"; and
 - (e) believes the IPCC should be allowed to conclude their inquiry before any further decisions are made.

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) supports the Orgreave Truth and Justice Campaign in its aim of securing a full public inquiry into the policing at the Orgreave Coking Plant, South Yorkshire, during the 1984-85 miners' strike;
- (b) notes with some disappointment the unacceptably slow pace of the current scoping exercise being conducted by the Independent Police Complaints Commission (IPCC) to determine whether an investigation into police misconduct should take place;
- (c) also notes that the remit of the IPCC does not extend to cover the political context that this Council believes empowered the police and facilitated their actions and conduct;
- (d) condemns any actions that may subsequently be found to have constituted police brutality and arrests of miners on "trumped up" charges;
- (e) believes that only a full public inquiry will have the capacity to reveal the truth about policing of Orgreave, and enable any injustices committed there to be acknowledged and addressed; and

- (f) calls on the Government to support now, and instigate, a full public inquiry into the policing of the 1984-85 miners' strike.

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

- For paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) of the Motion (76) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Simon Clement-Jones, Roy Munn, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Brian Webster, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Rob Frost, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Chris Weldon, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Jones, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.
- Against paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) of the Motion (0) - Nil
- Abstained on paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) of the Motion (4) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) and Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson and John Booker.
- For paragraphs (c), (e) and (f) of the Motion (58) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne

Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Brian Webster, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Chris Weldon, Steve Jones, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.

Against paragraphs (c), (e) and (f) of the Motion (18) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley.

Abstained on paragraphs (c), (e) and (f) of the Motion (4) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) and Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson and John Booker

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR IAN AUCKLAND

High Speed Rail

It was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Richard Shaw, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that the Government's current proposals for a new High Speed Rail line include a station in Sheffield and highlights this as a key achievement of Liberal Democrats in Government;
- (b) recalls that the main opposition group were the first councillors to champion Sheffield Victoria as a potential location for a High Speed Rail station;
- (c) notes with disappointment the original Government proposal, which recommended a station at Meadowhall, but confirms that Liberal Democrat councillors have continued to lobby for a city-centre location and have kept officers informed on any progress;

- (d) welcomes statements from Liberal Democrats in Government that the location remains under consideration, including Transport Minister, Baroness Kramer, who said the location was “up for debate” and Deputy Prime Minister, The Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP, who said “the door isn’t closed on the possibility of a city centre location”;
- (e) regrets that South Yorkshire Labour politicians remain hopelessly divided on the proposed location, with damaging spats reported in the local media;
- (f) expresses dismay that one Sheffield City Region Labour MP is opposing the entire High Speed Rail project and furthermore believes the Shadow Chancellor is threatening the future of the project with his cavalier outbursts; and
- (g) calls upon all Members to unite behind the High Speed Rail project which, regardless of the final location, will bring significant benefits to Sheffield and to continue to lobby for a city-centre location.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (h) to (k) as follows:-

- (h) for the avoidance of doubt, believes that Sheffield’s station on the High Speed 2 rail line should be located in the city-centre;
- (i) welcomes the latest proposal for a High Speed 3 rail project for an east-west line in the north of England and believes it is vital that Sheffield benefits from improved transport infrastructure to other northern cities;
- (j) backs Nick Clegg’s vision for a ‘northern golden triangle’ of Manchester, Leeds and Sheffield to drive economic growth in the north; and
- (k) believes it is Liberal Democrats who have led the charge in government to rebalance our economy so that it benefits 100,000 square miles of the country, rather than just one square mile in the City of London.

On being put to the vote, Paragraphs (h) and (i) of the above amendment were carried and Paragraphs (j) and (k) were negated.

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

For paragraphs (h) and (i) of the Amendment (72) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Simon Clement-Jones, Roy Munn, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Rob Frost, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Joe Otten, Colin Ross,

Martin Smith, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Chris Weldon, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Jones, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.

- Against paragraphs (h) and (i) of the Amendment (3) - Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson and John Booker.
- Abstained on paragraphs (h) and (i) of the Amendment (5) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) and Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster.
- For paragraphs (j) and (k) of the Amendment (18) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley.
- Against paragraphs (j) and (k) of the Amendment (57) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Chris Weldon, Steve Jones, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel

Bowler, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.

Abstained on paragraphs (j) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) and (k) of the Amendment (5) and Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster.

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

- (a) reiterates support for a High Speed Rail Station in Sheffield and one that is located in the city centre, noting that the present Administration's position on this issue has been unwavering;
- (b) notes that the main three political parties have supported HS2 and welcomes this continued cross party support for the project first initiated by the previous government and continued by the Coalition;
- (c) welcomes the actions of the present Administration to support HS2, including work with the Core Cities Group to support HS2 on a national stage; the Leader of the Council's participation on the HS2 Growth Task Force which produced a report stating that stations should be located where they will generate the maximum economic benefits; and numerous meetings with Ministers making the case for a city centre station location;
- (d) confirms that the benefits of the city centre location over Meadowhall include 6,500 additional jobs and potentially up to £5 billion additional economic growth;
- (e) regrets the main opposition group's silence, until recently, on the issue of HS2 station location following the Government announcement that its preferred station location for Sheffield City Region is at Meadowhall after they had previously engaged local businesses to campaign for a Victoria station;
- (f) confirms that the main opposition group have voted against two motions in the past year which confirm the Council's support for a city centre station location;

- (g) welcomes any potential u-turn by the Deputy Prime Minister, however, notes that the Government's current proposal remains a parkway station at Meadowhall which is not in Sheffield's best interests;
- (h) recalls comments made by the Deputy Prime Minister in an event earlier this year where he said "So take your choice but I think that an option which is more expensive, slower, likely to be liable to lead to less regular usage in the future, will destroy more homes and be environmentally destructive. You know. To put it mildly I think there is a good case to be made, therefore locating it at Meadowhall makes sense.";
- (i) believes these comments from the Deputy Prime Minister are completely wrong and confirms that a city centre station is in the best interests of Sheffield;
- (j) welcomes that the main opposition group have now performed a u-turn on their u-turn on station location and hopes that in the future they will put the interests of Sheffield before the political blushes of the Deputy Prime Minister; and
- (k) continues to support HS2 and a city centre station location for Sheffield and regrets that the main opposition group have attempted to make this issue a party political football.

(Note: With the agreement of Council and at the request of Councillor Julie Dore, Paragraph (f) of the above Amendment (as presented in the List of Amendments) was altered by the deletion of the word "numerous" and its substitution by the word "two".)

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) reiterates support for a High Speed Rail Station in Sheffield and one that is located in the city centre, noting that the present Administration's position on this issue has been unwavering;
- (b) notes that the main three political parties have supported HS2 and welcomes this continued cross party support for the project first initiated by the previous government and continued by the Coalition;
- (c) welcomes the actions of the present Administration to support HS2, including work with the Core Cities Group to support HS2 on a national stage; the Leader of the Council's participation on the HS2 Growth Task Force which produced a report stating that stations should be located where they will generate the maximum economic benefits; and numerous meetings with Ministers making the case for a city centre station location;

- (d) confirms that the benefits of the city centre location over Meadowhall include 6,500 additional jobs and potentially up to £5 billion additional economic growth;
- (e) regrets the main opposition group's silence, until recently, on the issue of HS2 station location following the Government announcement that its preferred station location for Sheffield City Region is at Meadowhall after they had previously engaged local businesses to campaign for a Victoria station;
- (f) confirms that the main opposition group have voted against two motions in the past year which confirm the Council's support for a city centre station location;
- (g) welcomes any potential u-turn by the Deputy Prime Minister, however, notes that the Government's current proposal remains a parkway station at Meadowhall which is not in Sheffield's best interests;
- (h) recalls comments made by the Deputy Prime Minister in an event earlier this year where he said "So take your choice but I think that an option which is more expensive, slower, likely to be liable to lead to less regular usage in the future, will destroy more homes and be environmentally destructive. You know. To put it mildly I think there is a good case to be made, therefore locating it at Meadowhall makes sense.";
- (i) believes these comments from the Deputy Prime Minister are completely wrong and confirms that a city centre station is in the best interests of Sheffield;
- (j) welcomes that the main opposition group have now performed a u-turn on their u-turn on station location and hopes that in the future they will put the interests of Sheffield before the political blushes of the Deputy Prime Minister; and
- (k) continues to support HS2 and a city centre station location for Sheffield and regrets that the main opposition group have attempted to make this issue a party political football.
- (l) for the avoidance of doubt, believes that Sheffield's station on the High Speed 2 rail line should be located in the city-centre;
- (m) welcomes the latest proposal for a High Speed 3 rail project for an east-west line in the north of England and believes it is vital that Sheffield benefits from improved transport infrastructure to other northern cities;

(Note: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs

(b), (c), (d), (l) and (m) and against Paragraphs (a) and (e) to (k) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.) .

2. Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted against Paragraphs (a) to (k) and abstained on Paragraphs (l) and (m) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ROBERT MURPHY

Contractors and Breaches of Human Rights

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Robert Murphy, seconded by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, that this Council:-

(a) notes the Foreign and Commonwealth Office calls on “businesses and civil society” to help give effect to its “Good Business” action plan, which includes the aim that:

“... human rights related matters are reflected appropriately when purchasing goods, works and services.

Under the public procurement rules public bodies may exclude tenderers from bidding for a contract opportunity in certain circumstances, including where there is information showing grave misconduct by a company in the course of its business or profession. Such misconduct might arise in cases where there are breaches of human rights. In addition, UK public bodies are required to have due regard for equality-related issues in their procurement activity.”

(b) is concerned at significant reports of human rights breaches across the world by large corporations; and

(c) confirms that this Council, in so far as it is legally able to do so, should exclude from contract opportunities any company where there is evidence of a poor track record of breaches of human rights and equality laws.

17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR STEVE WILSON

World War Commemorations

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Steve Wilson, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, that this Council:-

(a) notes that August marks the centenary of the outbreak of the First World War and that the 70th anniversary of D-Day was held in June;

- (b) reiterates previous resolutions passed by the Council placing on record the recognition and appreciation of the Council to everyone involved in both World Wars and remembers the sacrifices made by Sheffield people to protect the freedom of future generations;
- (c) welcomes the range of activities being held across the city between 2014 and 2018 to commemorate the event, which include:
 - (i) War Work – Sheffield Industry and the First World War exhibition between 4 August 2014 – 31 July 2015 at Kelham Island Museum;
 - (ii) Sheffield Remembers – War Memorials from the First World War on display from 9 November 2014 at Kelham Island Museum;
 - (iii) First World War Learning Programme at Sheffield Industrial Museums Trust family activities during August 2014; and
 - (iv) the Sheffield and the First World War Exhibition at Weston Park Museum run by Museums Sheffield;
- (d) also welcomes the webpage hosted by the Council’s Archives and Local Studies department, which can be visited at www.sheffield.gov.uk/1914-1918, and includes:
 - (i) WW1 Sheffield timeline – 25 page timeline relating to Sheffield;
 - (ii) Index to Sheffield soldiers, 1914 – 1915 (from the Sheffield Daily Independent);
 - (iii) Research guide on Sheffield and WW1 – 50 page guide to Sheffield - related sources;
 - (iv) Research guide on Sheffield’s armaments industry; and
 - (v) Sheffield war memorial information; and
- (e) thanks all the organisations across the city that are involved in the work commemorating the centenary and believes that this important landmark provides a pertinent opportunity to remember and recognise the historical significance of the First World War and the sacrifices made by many people between 1914 and 1918.

18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR COLIN ROSS

Apprenticeships

It was moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Roger Davison, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that apprenticeships are one of the best ways to support young people into long-term careers;
- (b) is proud that The Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP and other Liberal Democrats have helped build a strong economy and a fairer society by delivering more apprenticeships in Government;
- (c) recalls that one of the first acts of this Government was to increase spending on apprenticeships by £250 million – a 50% increase on the previous Government's commitments;
- (d) further notes that under this Government the number of people starting apprenticeships in Sheffield has increased by 54%;
- (e) welcomes the latest announcement within the 2014 Queen's Speech that the total number of apprenticeship places will increase to 2 million by 2015; and
- (f) backs the Government's latest announcement and supports all measures to help young people in Sheffield into apprenticeships.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Sue Alston, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (g) to (k) as follows:-

- (g) welcomes recent statistics, which show there are now a record number of people in Sheffield in work;
- (h) welcomes that out of the record 345,000 people who found work in the last quarter, the majority were in full-time employment and notes that less than 20% of people currently working part-time would work full-time if they could;
- (i) welcomes that the proportion of young people in England not in education, employment or training (NEETs) has fallen to the lowest level since records began in 1994;
- (j) welcomes the expectation of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) that the British economy would grow faster in the first six months of this year than any other G7 economy; and
- (k) believes that the Liberal Democrat commitment to apprenticeships has been a key factor in achieving these outcomes.

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

(Note: Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted for Paragraphs (g) and (i) and abstained on Paragraphs (h), (j) and (k) of the above Amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

It was then moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (f) and the insertion of new paragraphs (b) to (l) as follows:-

- (b) welcomes that the present Administration have taken real action to support the development of apprenticeships in Sheffield and contrasts this with the appalling record of the previous Administration;
- (c) further welcomes that under the present Administration, Sheffield has the best record of apprenticeships amongst all the Core Cities, demonstrating that local action has played a significant role;
- (d) welcomes the creation of the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme by the present Administration, which is now entering its fourth year and was targeted at young people at greatest risk of becoming unemployed;
- (e) further welcomes the innovative approach to apprenticeships pioneered by the Sheffield City Region after the present Administration worked with partners to design a scheme which puts the control of local skills funding in the hands of local employers so the skills system can be designed to meet the needs of local businesses, producing long term benefit for the economy;
- (f) contrasts this to the appalling record of the previous Administration who broke a promise made by its Leader committing the Council to providing an extra £1 million of support to the previous Government's Future Jobs Fund;
- (g) further recalls the previous Administration's inaction on apprenticeships and believes that they have completely failed both in administration and opposition to develop any credible policies to support apprenticeships and Sheffield's young people;
- (h) regrets the continued smoke and mirrors of the Liberal Democrat Party as they try to defend their record on apprenticeships;
- (i) recalls that the Government would not have been able to abolish Education Maintenance Allowance payments without Liberal Democrat support and believes this does not support the creation of a fairer society;
- (j) recalls that the Government would not have been able to abolish the previous Government's Future Jobs Fund without Liberal Democrat support and believes this does not support the creation of a fairer society;
- (k) recalls that the Government would not have been able to treble tuition fees without Liberal Democrat support and believes this does not support the creation of a fairer society; and
- (l) is shocked that the main opposition group continue to boast about the record of the present Government who have failed young people, however,

welcomes any efforts to boost apprenticeships including the commitment made in the Queens Speech surrounding apprentices.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that apprenticeships are one of the best ways to support young people into long-term careers;
- (b) welcomes that the present Administration have taken real action to support the development of apprenticeships in Sheffield and contrasts this with the appalling record of the previous Administration;
- (c) further welcomes that under the present Administration, Sheffield has the best record of apprenticeships amongst all the Core Cities, demonstrating that local action has played a significant role;
- (d) welcomes the creation of the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme by the present Administration, which is now entering its fourth year and was targeted at young people at greatest risk of becoming unemployed;
- (e) further welcomes the innovative approach to apprenticeships pioneered by the Sheffield City Region after the present Administration worked with partners to design a scheme which puts the control of local skills funding in the hands of local employers so the skills system can be designed to meet the needs of local businesses, producing long term benefit for the economy;
- (f) contrasts this to the appalling record of the previous Administration who broke a promise made by its Leader committing the Council to providing an extra £1 million of support to the previous Government's Future Jobs Fund;
- (g) further recalls the previous Administration's inaction on apprenticeships and believes that they have completely failed both in administration and opposition to develop any credible policies to support apprenticeships and Sheffield's young people;
- (h) regrets the continued smoke and mirrors of the Liberal Democrat Party as they try to defend their record on apprenticeships;
- (i) recalls that the Government would not have been able to abolish Education Maintenance Allowance payments without Liberal Democrat support and believes this does not support the creation of a fairer society;
- (j) recalls that the Government would not have been able to abolish the previous Government's Future Jobs Fund without Liberal Democrat support

- and believes this does not support the creation of a fairer society;
- (k) recalls that the Government would not have been able to treble tuition fees without Liberal Democrat support and believes this does not support the creation of a fairer society; and
 - (l) is shocked that the main opposition group continue to boast about the record of the present Government who have failed young people, however, welcomes any efforts to boost apprenticeships including the commitment made in the Queens Speech surrounding apprentices.

(Note: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (a), (c), (d) and (e) and against Paragraphs (b) and (f) to (l) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

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

19. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SIMON CLEMENT-JONES

Online Market Proposal

It was moved by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, seconded by Councillor Sue Alston, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes measures to support businesses and create jobs across Sheffield;
- (b) notes the proposal to develop an online market for the Kirkgate Market in Leeds so that shoppers can purchase products from independent traders online; and
- (c) believes this would be a positive proposal to support traders in Sheffield and therefore recommends that the Administration brings a proposal to a Cabinet meeting within the next six months to consider the idea.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion in paragraph (c) of the words "recommends that the Administration brings a proposal to a Cabinet meeting within the next six months to consider the idea" and their substitution by the following words "welcomes that the Administration is already actively considering an online presence for the Market alongside many other ideas to support the Market and will consult with traders on all ideas before they are taken forward to ensure that any ideas to strengthen the Market are business friendly and meet the needs of traders and the

public.”

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 measures to support businesses and create jobs across Sheffield;
- (b) notes the proposal to develop an online market for the Kirkgate Market in Leeds so that shoppers can purchase products from independent traders online; and
- (c) believes this would be a positive proposal to support traders in Sheffield and therefore welcomes that the Administration is already actively considering an online presence for the market alongside many other ideas to support the Market and will consult with traders on all ideas before they are taken forward to ensure that any ideas to strengthen the market are business friendly and meet the needs of traders and the public.