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 4 November 2015, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Talib Hussain)
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Denise Fox)

1 *Arbourthorne Ward*
Julie Dore
Mike Drabble
Jack Scott

2 *Beauchief & Greenhill Ward*
Julie Gledhill
Roy Munn
Richard Shaw

3 *Beighton Ward*
Helen Mirfin-Boukouris
Chris Rosling-Josephs
Ian Saunders

4 *Birley Ward*
Denise Fox
Bryan Lodge
Karen McGowan

5 *Broomhill Ward*
Jayne Dunn
Aodan Marken
Brian Webster

6 *Burngreave Ward*
Jackie Drayton
Ibrar Hussain
Talib Hussain

7 *Central Ward*
Lewis Dagnall
Robert Murphy
Sarah Jane Smalley

8 *Crookes Ward*
Rob Frost
Anne Murphy
Geoff Smith

9 *Darnall Ward*
Mazher Iqbal
Mary Lea

10 *Dore & Totley Ward*
Joe Otten
Colin Ross
Martin Smith

11 *East Ecclesfield Ward*
Pauline Andrews
Steve Wilson
Joyce Wright

12 *Ecclesall Ward*
Penny Baker
Shaffaq Mohammed

13 *Firth Park Ward*
Sheila Constance
Alan Law
Garry Weatherall

14 *Fulwood Ward*
Sue Alston
Andrew Sangar
Cliff Woodcraft

15 *Gleadless Valley Ward*
Steve Jones
Cate McDonald
Chris Peace

16 *Graves Park Ward*
Steve Ayris
Denise Reaney

17 *Hillsborough Ward*
Bob Johnson
George Lindars-Hammond
Josie Paszek

18 *Manor Castle Ward*
Jenny Armstrong
Terry Fox
Pat Midgley

19 *Mosborough Ward*
David Barker
Tony Downing

20 *Nether Edge Ward*
Nasima Akther
Mohammad Maroof

21 *Richmond Ward*
John Campbell
Lynn Rooney
Paul Wood

22 *Shiregreen & Brightside Ward*
Peter Price
Sioned-Mair Richards
Peter Rippon

23 *Southey Ward*
Leigh Bramall
Tony Damms
Gill Furniss

24 *Stannington Ward*
David Baker
Katie Condliffe
Vickie Priestley

25 *Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward*
Jack Clarkson
Richard Crowther
Keith Davis

26 *Walkley Ward*
Olivia Blake
Ben Curran
Neale Gibson

27 *West Ecclesfield Ward*
John Booker
Adam Hurst
Zoe Sykes

28 *Woodhouse Ward*
Mick Rooney
Jackie Satur
Ray Satur

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ian Auckland, Nikki Bond, Isobel Bowler, Roger Davison, Gill Furniss and Dianne Hurst.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillors Josie Paszek and Adam Hurst declared personal interests in item 6 on the Summons (Representation, Delegated Authority and Related Issues), as they were appointed to the Sheffield Health and Social Care NHS Foundation Trust Council of Governors.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Peter Rippon, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 7th October 2015 be approved as a true and accurate record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Petitions

4.1.1 Petition Objecting to Planning Application – Residential Development on Land at the Rear of Pleasant Road

The Council received a petition containing 76 signatures objecting to the planning application regarding residential development at the rear of Pleasant Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by David Walker. Mr Walker informed the Council that parking and access on Pleasant Road was already difficult and that the proposed development would worsen this situation. The proposal would also involve the removal of mature trees, which the petitioners believed should be preserved. He commented that some detail on the drawings submitted as part of the planning application appeared to be incorrect and invited planning officers to visit the site.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing. Councillor Dunn stated that the petition would be submitted to the Planning and Highways Committee, which judged each application on its merits.

4.1.2 Petition Requesting Double Yellow Lines on Norton Church Road

The Council received an electronic petition containing 21 signatures requesting double yellow lines on Norton Church Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Mike Farbrother. Mr

Farbrother stated that Norton Church Road led to a vicarage and 25 other properties. There were parking problems and difficulties for vehicular access, including refuse vehicles and emergency vehicles and the road was also used to access Graves Park. The petition requested double yellow lines at entrance points to alleviate the problems regarding access to people's homes and that it was done when the road was resurfaced.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport. Councillor Fox requested that Mr Farbrother provide his contact details and said that he would speak with him further regarding the petition and issues on Norton Church Road.

4.1.3 Petition Requesting Help in Connection with the 83/83A Bus Service Route Diversions

The Council received a petition containing six signatures requesting help in connection with the 83/83A bus service route diversions.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Mary Fraser who referred to changes to the 83 and 83A bus service, which resulted in people needing to change buses and walking further, particularly affecting the journeys of older people who wished to go to the doctors, do their shopping or use other services in Burngreave. Many elderly people in Firs Hill did not have cars and she personally had recently waited 25 minutes for a bus to travel home. She asked for the Council's help on behalf of people in Firs Hill.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport. Councillor Fox stated that the Council had received a number of enquiries about changes to the bus network and these matters were being referred to the South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive and local councillors would also raise issues of concern relating to bus services. Councillor Fox stated that he would speak further with the petitioners about the matters they had raised.

4.1.4 Petition Requesting the Repainting of the Markings in the Middle of Sandygate Road

The Council received an electronic petition containing 200 signatures requesting the repainting of the markings in the middle of Sandygate Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Adam Hanrahan. Mr Hanrahan stated that the petitioners wished for the road markings on Sandygate Road to be repainted. People were not consulted regarding the changes to the position of road markings and vehicles now had to straddle the central line markings to pass parked cars. The repositioned markings meant that drivers coming downhill would always be on the wrong side of the road and he queried the potential implications for car insurance.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport. Councillor Fox said that he did not have information

concerning any consultation regarding the road markings but stated that he would reply to the petitioners.

4.2 Public Questions

4.2.1 Public Questions Concerning School Places, Holt House and Carter Knowle Schools

Matthew Genn asked if the Council could guarantee that no 3-18 years through school was proposed at Carter Knowle Road and about related evidence.

Diana Barlos asked what arrangements were in place whilst building work was carried out in and would this cause significant disruption for current pupils and will it affect their education, health and wellbeing?

Liz Cross asked whether there would be minutes available of a recent meeting which had taken place concerning school places.

Jacqueline Howarth asked why the former HSBC site at Dore had not been proposed as a site for a through school and why there had been no proposal on integrated resource units in the proposed new schools.

Emma Holley asked why outstanding infants and junior schools with a brilliant ethos would be destroyed and replaced with a through school.

Teresa Dodds asked a question concerning the Abbeydale site and Amanda Fletcher asked why both the Abbeydale and Bannerdale sites were proposed for housing when it was known that a secondary school was needed.

Nagina asked what would be done regarding congestion on Bannerdale Road and Abbeydale Road and concerns relating to the health and safety.

Ruksana Kosar stated that whilst people were aware that a secondary school was required, there was concern that existing schools were not destroyed in the process. She also expressed concern that the site for a new school should be large enough to properly accommodate children.

Rala Barlos asked why it was felt acceptable to propose that the space per pupil be reduced to 5 square metres.

Shahid Ali asked whilst parents of Holt House and Carterknowle schools were being consulted, when would the wider community also be consulted?

Sarah Tinsley asked why the capacity of High Storrs School and King Ecbert's School, which were outstanding schools, could not be increased to provide a greater number of school places.

A comment was made that Holt House school location should be retained and, whilst Carterknowle school might be merged, there should not be a secondary school on the same site.

Reference was made to the closure of Abbeydale Grange School in recent years because few local people were using the school and it being used by children from other areas in Sheffield and the question asked as to why this might not occur again?

A comment was made that children should not be taken from their existing catchment, which included High Storrs and King Ecbert's Schools and that the Council should consider developing a 16-18 academy on the Bannerdale site to leave extra places for children.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, responded to the questions and thanked people for attending the Council meeting and for becoming involved in the consultation process. She stated that the school places consultation concerned the options for school places and the Council wanted other options to come forward as a result of the consultation. The Council would consider all of the options against the criteria and then make a decision on that basis.

Workshops had taken place and more were going to happen. There was also a website, which included Frequently Asked Questions and the website was also a place where people would be able to put their views as to their preferred options. There had been a (national) birth rate increase of 25% and two areas of Sheffield, the South West and North East, were particularly affected by increases in child population.

Some primary and secondary aged children did not get into their local school and the consultation and related proposals were about increasing the number of available school places in primary and secondary schools. Whilst there were related issues and proposals for several schools, including Holt House Infant, Ecclesall Infant and Clifford school, the context for the consultation on school places was as outlined above. The Council was listening to people's views. The Council had proposed a fourth option during consultation suggesting the use of the Bannerdale Centre site, which would be considered along with any other options put forward during the consultation.

The ambition for the South West was to develop new housing and a new secondary school, protect existing green space, address traffic congestion and air quality, ensure value for money and create something which was excellent in educational terms. The Council wanted to create outstanding schools. There was considerable research regarding the proposal for 3-18 provision (e.g. paper by the National College for School Leadership outlined the opportunities presented by 3-18 provision) and some people argued it was a better model for children's education.

The impact of construction works relating to the development of a school would depend upon the extent of building works that took place. The consultation workshops were not formally minuted. However, questions and points raised were noted and captured using 'Post-it' notes and were also included on the consultation webpage.

In reference to the question concerning the HSBC site at Dore, whilst that site was not necessarily in the right place, it would be assessed along with the other options in the consultation.

No decision had been made as regards the provision of school places and it was not intended that either the outstanding leadership which was already in place or existing schools themselves should be lost as a result of any proposals being made. The Council wanted to have more, not less, outstanding schools in the City.

As regards potential traffic congestion and traffic management associated with a new school, a further consultation would need to take place regarding any planning and highways proposals.

Councillor Drayton outlined the demographic changes over time, which had to be understood when considering primary and secondary school places for the future.

In relation to the sustainability of any newly created school and the circumstances in relation to Abbeydale Grange School, Councillor Drayton commented that, at the end, parents did not opt to send their children there. Whatever option was chosen for new school provision, a school would need to have the confidence of parents. Work would be done in partnership with existing schools to create a new school that people wished for their children to go to.

Councillor Drayton stated that there was no reason that an integrated education resource could not be considered in the new school but this would have to be part of the city wide strategy for provision for children with Special Educational Needs and Disabilities (SEND). She encouraged people to take the opportunity of attending workshops on the South West and North East consultation on school places and to put their points of view on the consultation webpage.

4.2.2 Public Question Concerning Smithywood

Nigel Slack referred to the rejection of an application to change the status of Smithywood into a village green. He stated that the ancient woodland was now at risk from the developers of a motorway service station. He commented that a piece of Sheffield heritage may be destroyed for corporate profits and based on shaky economic benefits and an alleged prize of minimum wage employment for the likes of McDonalds, Starbucks and so on.

He referred to a statement by developer concerning the need for a service area on the grounds of road safety, which he stated was inflammatory and was not supported by statistics, including that in 2014 only 48 fatalities were attributed to fatigue on all roads throughout the UK. (RoSPA)

Mr Slack asked if the Council would undertake to ensure that any planning application based on suggested safety benefits was independently verified rather than relying on statements from the applicant; and following the decision on village green status, what is the expected decision date for the planning

application?

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Housing, stated that the planning submission would be assessed by the Council's planning officers and no date had as yet been set for the Planning and Highways Committee at which this matter would be considered. This information would be made available on the Council website.

4.2.3 Public Questions Concerning Investment in the Sheffield Retail Quarter

Nigel Slack stated that following the Chancellor and his entourage of civic leaders visiting China recently, there had been suggestions that the investment for Sheffield's New Retail Quarter may come from that country.

He commented that China's poor record on human rights was well known and referred to a recent Guardian article, concerning the Chinese President's visit.
Mr Slack asked if the City would temper support for human rights and state oppression for an expedient investment in the New Retail Quarter.

Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business Skills and Development and Deputy Leader of the Council, stated that a number of parties had expressed an interest in investing in the Sheffield Retail Quarter. Sheffield had sister city relationship with two cities in China, which was a place with diverse communities and China as a whole should not be judged only by the actions of its government.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that the pretext for the visit to China by the Chancellor and others (including herself) was in promoting opportunities for investment in the North of England, including in Sheffield, which was a major contributor to the concept of a 'Northern Powerhouse', together with Leeds and Manchester. The Sheffield Retail Quarter (SRQ) was among other potential investment opportunities, and it did not necessarily follow that the SRQ would be chosen by a potential investor following that visit. However, she considered that there was a duty to take such opportunities to promote Sheffield.

4.2.4 Public Questions Concerning Devolution Deal

Nigel Slack stated that, at the last City Region Combined Authority meeting there was a report, to the meeting but not the public, on the proposed Sheffield City Region Combined Authority (SCRCA) consultation in respect of the new 'devolution' deal. He said that he had concerns over this consultation proposal. The consultation was intended to happen during November and December, though details are still sketchy as to exactly when.

He stated that this was a period when most people are completely distracted and absorbed by preparations and celebrations for Christmas, which was not the best time to engage the public in the complex issues around devolution.

Mr Slack said that the consultation itself seemed designed to promote a positive spin on the 'deal' with comments like "good deal", "supported by the private

sector", "City Region at the forefront of the Northern Powerhouses", "leading the way", "new money – new powers", "protects sovereignty of Councils", "residents and businesses well served by negotiations".

He asked: should consultations be neutral or biased; and would Council be conducting its own consultation, in addition to this flawed SCRCA consultation, before they present the 'devolution' proposal to Council for a vote? If so, will Council ensure this is neutral and balanced?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that with reference to the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority (SCRCA) meeting, she did not recall a part of that meeting that was not held in public and following clarification by Mr Slack, it was made clear that he had referred to the pre-meeting.

The City Region believed it had achieved the best outcomes from the negotiations with Government on a deal for the Region. The proposals would be presented to elected members for consideration and would be the subject of consultation with the public and other stakeholders. What needed to be considered was how the consultation should be undertaken. Councillor Dore stated that she would put the recommendations made by Sheffield to the City Region as to how (as a region) consultation might take place with stakeholders, including business and public sector organisations.

The consultation period was short and the timetable had been set by the Government as being from November to January. The consultation should be informed and factual. Information made available during the consultation should also make it clear what was being signed up to and include anything that was being given away. The matter would be considered by the Council following, and informed by, the consultation process. The issue of devolution was to be considered by the Council's Overview and Scrutiny Management Committee and Councillor Dore said that she would also attend that Committee meeting.

4.2.5 Public Question Concerning Trees

Nigel Slack asked whether the Council had seen the article from Sheffield Hallam University entitled "6 reasons to stop the 'Sheffield Chainsaw Massacre'", which involved the academic, Professor Ian Rotherham, an expert whose views the Council used to take note of and whose analysis had been used in answers to his questions in the past. He asked why the Council was no longer listening to Professor Rotherham and whether it could be that Amey's profits make it expedient to find an expert that agrees with their decisions on felling. He asked if the independent review panel would take evidence just from Council sources or from outside the Council and the contractor?

Councillor Terry Fox, the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport, stated that there were a number of experts in relation to trees. It would be a decision of the Chair and Independent Panel as to the evidence that they wished to consider and the Council would not have input into that issue. He was confident that the Council policy and procedure with regard to highways trees was correct.

4.2.6 Public Questions Concerning Devolution

Martin Brighton stated that last Sunday, Labour's John Healey said 'No mayor', but would 'swallow' imposition. Then Tory Julian Sturdy said he was 'not sure' that an elected executive mayor was the right way to go, but would 'swallow' imposition. Then, a film was shown of Mr Osborne saying that an elected executive mayor would not be enforced, which echoed what had been voted upon during the previous week in Parliament. He asked why the Council was going ahead with an elected executive mayor.

Mr Brighton stated that in answer to a previous question about devolving democracy, the Council wrote to him claiming that the current Northern Powerhouse deal would enhance citizen democracy. He asked given that the people have already said 'No' to an elected executive mayor, how can such a statement be sustained?

Mr Brighton stated that the fourth principle of the Northern Powerhouse states that it shall be 'involving the local people in how the Northern Region is run'. He asked, given this Council's track record of the past two decades and its intransigence over the elected executive mayor issue, how does this Council propose to genuinely engage in meaningful consultation with local people in the decision-making processes that affect their lives and their neighbourhoods?

Mr Brighton asked: where is the democratic boundary between imposed decisions made by the Council without citizen consultation, or even despite the expressed contrary decision of citizens, and the Council's respect for and compliance with the will of those citizens?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, referred to answers which she had given in response to questions earlier in the meeting concerning devolution. The Council was not currently going ahead with implementing an elected mayor. The decision regarding an elected mayor for the City Region and proposals for devolution would depend upon the outcome of consultation and was subject to a decision by Council.

The Northern Powerhouse 'deal' was about investment in the North of the country and could enhance democracy in so far as powers would be devolved from Westminster to a local level. The consultation process was yet to be determined. Decision making and democracy was not an exact science. The boundary as to whether or not consultation should take place was not precise and in some circumstances consultation was mandatory, whilst in others, it might be said to be expected. Where consultation was mandatory or expected, the Council would make sure that such consultation happened and where the Council believed that consultation was appropriate, it would consult accordingly. Councillor Dore confirmed that there would be consultation regarding the proposals for devolution in the City Region.

4.2.7 Public Question Concerning Accountability

Martin Brighton asked whether this Council's Cabinet was accountable to this chamber, either through a claimed collective responsibility or individually. He said that this was asked because Council documents were revealed showing that the FOI (Freedom of Information) department was encouraging the Housing department to break the FOI Act. "The Cabinet's written response was to follow the policy of Deny and Lie about the existence of its own documents, followed by attacking this citizen, instead of immediately investigating such a serious crime."

Mr Brighton asked: does this Chamber support such behaviour by the Cabinet?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated in response that she would refute the statements which Mr Brighton had made in his question.

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 Peter Rippon, that (a) approval be given to the following changes to the memberships of Boards, etc.

Cabinet Highways Committee	-	Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to replace Councillor Isobel Bowler
Safer and Stronger Communities Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee	-	Councillor Peter Rippon to fill a vacancy
Audit Committee	-	Councillor Josie Paszek to replace Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards
Senior Officer Employment Committee	-	Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to fill a vacancy
Corporate Joint Committee with Trade Unions	-	Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to replace Councillor Isobel Bowler
Communities Portfolio Joint Consultative Committee	-	Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to replace Councillor Isobel Bowler

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

Ecclesall Bierlow Poors' Land Charity	-	Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed to fill a vacancy
Sheffield Carers and Young Carers Board	-	Councillor Olivia Blake to replace Councillor Jenny Armstrong
Sheffield Safer and Sustainable Communities Partnership	-	Councillor Sioned-Mair Richards to replace Councillor Isobel Bowler

(c) Councillor Mary Lea is appointed as the Council's Mental Health Champion.

(d) Councillor Leigh Bramall is nominated to serve as a Non-Executive Director of the Sheffield Health and Social Care Trust.

7. DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC HEALTH REPORT FOR SHEFFIELD (2015)

The Council received a presentation by the Interim Director of Public Health, Stephen Horsley, concerning the Director of Public Health Annual Report 2015, entitled *Transforming Public Health.*

The Annual Report provided a profile of health and wellbeing in Sheffield and reviewed how Sheffield compared to other core cities and the rest of England. It identified areas for improvement. Examples were provided of how Council

resources as a whole were being used to achieve the City's aspiration of improving health and wellbeing in Sheffield to be amongst the best in England. The report described a number of priorities for action during the next 12 months and made a further three recommendations to improve the health of the local population.

National indicators produced by Public Health England were used to provide a detailed picture of how long people live and how healthy they were in comparison with other core cities and the England average.

Life expectancy was improving and the gender gap was narrowing. For women, average life expectancy at birth (2011-13) was 82.4 years and for men it was 78.8 years. However, life expectancy in Sheffield fell short of the England average of 83.1 and 79.4 years respectively but it was amongst the best of the major cities in England. Inequality in life expectancy between the most and least deprived (women and men) remained unchanged in the last ten years.

The presentation looked at the wider determinants of health, which were social-economic factors which influenced health and which included poverty, employment, environment, housing and crime and safety. Improvement was required in areas including child poverty, school readiness, pupil absence, 16 to18 year olds not in education, employment or training, violent crime and fuel poverty.

The presentation outlined areas of health improvement or healthy lifestyle choices and mental wellbeing including teenage conceptions, where the City had seen a sustained reduction in the rate of conceptions in girls aged under 18 years, although it remained higher than the national average.

In relation to health protection, the incidence of Tuberculosis in Sheffield had increased and was higher than the England average. Sheffield was seeking to develop a Tuberculosis screening programme.

The rate of premature mortality from cancer at 159.9 per 100,000 population in 2011-13 was significantly higher than the national average of 144.4 per 100,000. Approximately 58% of those deaths were considered to be preventable, either by changes in lifestyle or screening programmes and early detection and treatment.

A number of public health programmes and initiatives were identified, which it was believed had the potential to transform health and wellbeing in Sheffield and for which there was evidence that a local authority can have a major impact on the population's health. Detailed priorities for action were provided within the following broad areas:

- More children ready for learning and life
- Improved mental and emotional wellbeing
- Better housing conditions
- Tackling the underlying causes of health inequalities
- Helping people who face barriers to get a job

- Maintaining a healthy weight throughout life

Stephen Horsley concluded by setting out the following three recommendations:

- The Health and Wellbeing Board should establish a local baseline measure of wellbeing for the City and use this to track change over time and variation across the different communities in Sheffield
- The Council should provide products which assist residents to reduce the cost of their home energy and the amount they use
- The Health and Wellbeing Board should ensure schools in Sheffield give all children the opportunity to participate in appropriate exercise.

Members of the Council asked questions and commented upon issues raised by the Director of Public Health's Annual Report and presentation.

Question Is there evidence that what was being done in relation to obesity was working and do we need to be doing more or implementing other initiatives; and how might physical activity be built into people's lives.

Answer There was evidence to suggest that some programmes relating to reducing obesity worked effectively, but this was not the case for all existing programmes. The public health review, which was being undertaken at present, would give consideration to alternative initiatives or programmes. There was evidence that sufficient exercise at age 45 to 60 may result in increased mobility later in life at age 60 to 70 and also improved people's quality of life.

Question There was pressure on people to eat the wrong type of foods, but also pressure to be thin, which might have a negative effect on a person's self - image and mental wellbeing and it could be that someone of a certain weight was healthy at that weight.

Answer Attention should also be given to people who were underweight. There were a number of health conditions associated with being obese or overweight, including diabetes and obesity was a significant problem in the adult and child population. Nearly 60% of the adult population were overweight or obese. People needed to be supported to live healthy lifestyles or lose weight.

Question In relation to obesity, was enough being done to influence national policy and what more could be done to provide people with advice on foods which were bad for them? Reference was made to the idea of a tax on sugar.

Answer It was the responsibility of the public sector to influence others and many things associated with healthier lifestyles were not necessarily expensive. For instance, it cost less to stop smoking and to eat less or consume less alcohol. Some forms of exercise could also be free. It was possible to build upon work

already being done in communities and alternative approaches would also be considered.

Question How much Public Health funding is spent on prevention and what level of shift in the allocation of such spend would be desirable?

Answer The public health budget had moved from the former Primary Care Trusts to local authorities and this included a number of treatment elements, such as sexual health. The budget was divided approximately equally between prevention and treatment. Ideally, a greater proportion would be spent on prevention. However, the Council also used other components of its budget in ways which supported health and wellbeing and contributed to prevention, such as the City's parks and swimming facilities. There was a need to look at preventative work to ascertain that it was effective.

Question What might the Council do to influence national government to change legislation in relation to things such as the obesogenic environment and other policy levers that can really help people to change behaviours relating to diet and smoking, for example.

Answer Legislative change was required as regards the prevalence of smoking. There might be reluctance to apply a tax to foods containing sugar and there were also commercial pressures to consider. Directors of Public Health and Public Health England were in a position to engage government to bring about support for change and there were also things which could be done locally.

Question What was the extent of confidence that the Community Wellbeing Programme and others were supporting the most vulnerable people, for example older people; and in relation to GP Practice Champions, was this proving successful?

Answer Work had been done in Sheffield communities and GPs attended community meetings and there might be an extension of such practice. However, it was not certain that all vulnerable people were being supported at a neighbourhood level. There was also evidence that the act of volunteering was good for people's health and wellbeing and it was desirable to increase volunteering activity in communities. GPs wished to have more Health Champions. The Community Wellbeing Programme was a good base, upon which to build and local Councillors also had an important role to play in local areas as community leaders.

Question With regards young people's mental health, which was affected by factors including economic austerity and poverty, how might young people be encouraged to participate in community development and actively engage in volunteering?

Answer The Council was working on a project jointly with the Department of Work and Pensions to help people and especially those who were long term unemployed, into work and such activity could be resourced and built into community programmes.

Question Despite reductions in some areas, inequalities in health were not really changing. How will the outcomes of programmes and initiatives be measured to make sure these were effective and were having impact and can there be greater precision in relation to measuring and targeting?

Answer There had been targeting of activity, for example, stop smoking programmes had been targeted at manual workers and pregnant women. There was also a significant counter effort to encourage people to smoke. Particular wards in the City had also been targeted in relation to smoking cessation. However, the City had not been as successful in reducing health inequalities as people may have liked and there was a similar national trend. There was a need to examine in what ways the public health budget linked to other areas of the Council's work.

Question Was there evidence of the effects of poverty and inequality on early life and related implications of the welfare reforms and would it be possible to produce a half-yearly progress report on the action plan?

Answer Reductions in the available resources affected all aspects of the Council's work and the effects of budget cuts would need to be monitored. Progress reports on actions would be provided to Members. There was useful information at ward level in relation to smoking, obesity and alcohol and further information could be provided for Members, who could play a vital role in their respective wards.

Question Was there evidence about the amount of time children and young people spend on computer games at the expense of physical activity and the relationship this may have with weight and health. The cost of some gym memberships was also high, whilst it was acknowledged that Activity Sheffield was doing a very good job.

Answer The increased use of computers or similar devices and the effect on physical activity was something which could be examined.

Question Average life expectancy continued to follow the national trend of increase. How might improvements continue? The number of children walking to school was low, and was something which might be investigated.

Answer The public health review was in progress and this would look at whether resources were being used in the best way possible. It was important that the Council and the Clinical Commissioning Group develop a joint strategy in order to tackle issues together. The Clinical Commissioning Group wished to review how it interacted with the City Council. It was necessary to concentrate on a smaller number of initiatives to improve people's health and wellbeing. There were actions that the Council might take which would help improve health and wellbeing by introducing bylaws, encouraging walking to school and reducing parking around schools and in other areas such as licensing.

Question Some school based programmes such as sports coaches had ceased in

recent years. In terms of changing lifestyle choices and behaviours, there could be a greater emphasis on children and young people, especially in terms of exercise in the school curriculum and this could be followed through by Ofsted. There were still marked inequalities between areas of the City.

Answer There were contrasts in health and wellbeing between different areas of Sheffield. Much had been done in relation to giving children a better start. There was evidence of successful outcomes if certain actions were taken with regard to children at an early age and the Council would need to examine whether resources should be used to support children earlier in their lives.

Question What was happening in relation to young people's mental and emotional health and what was the effect of government cuts? There were particular issues regarding the health of people in black and minority ethnic communities.

Answer Particular strategic areas would be examined, but together with the circumstances for the whole City. The Council tried to make sure that children had access to services for their health and more could be done specifically regarding mental health and emotional wellbeing.

The Lord Mayor, on behalf of the Council, thanked Stephen Horsley for presenting his report and for answering Members' questions.

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Peter Price, that this Council:

(a) notes the information contained in the Interim Director of Public Health's report, expresses support for the three specific recommendations on improving the health of the local population, and thanks the Interim Director for his presentation;

(b) (i) believes that this report provides further evidence on the link between deprivation and ill health;

(ii) therefore opposes the Government's cuts to public health funding and the continuation of the approach under the Coalition Government that cuts are being experienced by areas with the highest levels of deprivation at the same time as some of the healthiest and wealthiest areas of the country receive no cuts at all; and

(iii) therefore requests that a copy of this resolution be forwarded to the Secretary of State for Health and to the six Sheffield MPs.

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

For Paragraph (a) of the Motion (71)	-	The Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain), The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley, Rob Frost, Geoff Smith, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Penny Baker, Shaffaq Mohammed, Alan Law, Garry Weatherall, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Mohammad Maroof, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, David Baker, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.
Against Paragraph (a) of the Motion (0)	-	Nil
Abstained on Paragraph (a) of the Motion (0)	-	Nil
For Paragraph (b) of the Motion (53)		The Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain), The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Geoff Smith, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Alan Law, Garry Weatherall, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Mohammad Maroof, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter

	Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Richard Crowther, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.
Against Paragraph (b) of the Motion (0)	
Abstained on Paragraph (b) of the Motion (18)	Councillors Richard Shaw, Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney and David Baker and Keith Davis.

8. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR GEORGE LINDARS-HAMMOND

Tax Credits

It was moved by Councillor George Lindars-Hammond, seconded by Councillor Adam Hurst, that this Council:-

(a) is appalled by the Government's decision to cut tax credits which will reduce the incomes of over 3 million working families, including 27,000 in Sheffield, by an average of £1,300 a year from April 2016;

(b) believes the Government's decision to cut tax credits clearly shows that the Conservatives are not on the side of working people, and that attempts to rebrand themselves as the 'workers' party' are nothing more than empty rhetoric;

(c) notes that there was no mention of cutting tax credits in the Conservative Party manifesto and recalls that the Prime Minister explicitly ruled out cuts to tax credits in the run up to the General Election on BBC Question Time on 30th April 2015;

(d) notes research from the Resolution Foundation which found that the proposed cuts to tax credits will immediately push a further 200,000 children into poverty;

(e) further notes comments made by Paul Johnson, Director of the Institute for Fiscal Studies, who said it was "arithmetically impossible" for the increase in the minimum wage to compensate for the loss in tax credits;

(f) believes that these cuts to the income of working families on low wages are unjustifiable, particularly given cuts to inheritance tax and to the top rate of

income tax; and

(g) calls on the Government to heed the House of Lords' opposition to these cuts and to reverse in full the proposed reductions to tax credits.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Steve Ayris, 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:-

(a) regrets the Government's plan to slash Tax Credits from 1st April 2016;

(b) notes that despite massive public opposition, and opposition from Conservative backbenchers, the Government attempted to press ahead with these unnecessary ideological cuts that will hit the working poor hardest;

(c) notes that if the proposed changes to Tax Credits were implemented:-

(i) 25,000 families in Sheffield are set to lose out an average £750 a year in Tax Credits; and

(ii) 40,000 children in our area would be forced to live in poorer households, reducing their life chances and making it harder for their parents to make ends meet;

(d) notes that cutting Tax Credits was not in the Conservative Party manifesto, and the Prime Minister explicitly ruled them out during the General Election campaign, meaning the Government does not have a mandate to carry this out;

(e) regrets that these Government proposals have got to this stage after the Welfare Reform and Work Bill passed through the House of Commons, which 184 Labour MPs failed to oppose, including 4 of the 5 Sheffield Labour MPs;

(f) notes that the Labour Party has repeatedly wavered on their position on tax credit cuts and two Shadow Cabinet Ministers, MPs Diane Abbott and Seema Malhotra, have been unable to say that the Labour Party would reverse the cuts;

(g) believes the Labour Lords amendment which was passed on Monday 26th October 2015 to delay the cuts by three years and implement 'transitional measures' is a step in the right direction but it does not go far enough and will be of little solace to hardworking people on low incomes when the Government's proposals are implemented in three years' time;

(h) notes that the Liberal Democrat peers tabled a 'fatal motion' to kill off Tax Credit changes for good but this was defeated because Labour members in the House of Lords did not support it; and

(i) therefore, calls on the Council to write to The Baroness Smith of Basildon, Shadow Leader in the House of Lords, regretting the decision of Labour Peers to only delay Tax Credit cuts.

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

(Note: Councillors Pauline Andrews, John Booker and Keith Davis voted for paragraphs (a) to (f) and (i) and abstained on paragraphs (g) and (h) of the above amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

It was then moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Aodan Marken, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (g) and (h) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraph (g) as a new paragraph (i):-

(g) agrees with comments made by the Green Peer, Jenny Jones, that the Government's cuts to tax credits are "unthinking, uncaring and cruel", and commends Baroness Jones and all other members of the House of Lords who opposed these cuts;

(h) further, agrees with Baroness Jones' comments that, "It is regrettable that it falls upon an unelected body to hold this Government to account – but until we have a fully elected second chamber, Peers must continue to properly scrutinise this kind of deeply damaging legislation".

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

Following a Right of Reply by Councillor George Lindars Hammond, the original Motion was then put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) is appalled by the Government's decision to cut tax credits which will reduce the incomes of over 3 million working families, including 27,000 in Sheffield, by an average of £1,300 a year from April 2016;

(b) believes the Government's decision to cut tax credits clearly shows that the Conservatives are not on the side of working people, and that attempts to rebrand themselves as the 'workers' party' are nothing more than empty rhetoric;

(c) notes that there was no mention of cutting tax credits in the Conservative Party manifesto and recalls that the Prime Minister explicitly ruled out cuts to tax credits in the run up to the General Election on BBC Question Time on 30th April 2015;

(d) notes research from the Resolution Foundation which found that the proposed cuts to tax credits will immediately push a further 200,000 children into poverty;

(e) further notes comments made by Paul Johnson, Director of the Institute for Fiscal Studies, who said it was "arithmetically impossible" for the increase in the minimum wage to compensate for the loss in tax credits;

(f) believes that these cuts to the income of working families on low wages are unjustifiable, particularly given cuts to inheritance tax and to the top rate of income tax; and

(g) calls on the Government to heed the House of Lords' opposition to these cuts and to reverse in full the proposed reductions to tax credits.

9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR TERRY FOX

UK Steel Industry (1)

It was moved by Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, that this Council

(a) notes with sadness the announcement of the closure of the Redcar blast furnace and the news that Tata Steel is to cut 1,200 jobs across the UK, including many within Sheffield City Region;

(b) further notes:

(i) the huge contribution the steel industry makes to the UK economy, employing 34,500 people across the sector and countless more in supply chains, and achieving exports worth £6bn in 2014;

(ii) the challenging global steel market, in particular an over-supply of steel on the international market, which has pushed prices down; and

(iii) that UK Steel, trade unions and Members of Parliament have been calling for months for the Government to act to protect the industry;

(c) condemns the Government for their inaction and their willingness to let British industry bear the brunt of global economic headwinds without protection;

(d) believes the Government's inaction shows they lack an industrial strategy and have no interest in supporting strategic national industries like steel; and

(e) calls on the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills to intervene directly to save steel plants at risk of closure in the short term, and to develop an active industrial strategy to support the UK steel industry over the long term.

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

(a) notes the loss of over 4,000 jobs in the steel industry during this year, most recently due to cuts from Tata Steel, which axed 1,200 jobs last week, including 550 in South Yorkshire, and the closure of the SSI plant in Redcar which meant 1,700 job losses;

(b) notes the UK steel industry is in crisis due to a number of factors, including the influx of cheap steel from China, rising energy costs, and a strong pound;

(c) notes the British steel industry's close relationship with Sheffield, renowned as the 'Steel City' due to its historic role in the development of the manufacturing of steel, and that jobs in the steel industry are still important to the City Region;

(d) notes that during the Coalition, the Government got permission from the European Commission to compensate steel companies for high energy costs, and further notes the comments of the former Business Secretary, Vince Cable, on 21st October 2015 that 'The Treasury is sitting on [this] money.';

(e) believes that if the UK is to maintain its strategic capacity to manufacture steel, the Government must act fast;

(f) regrets the lack of action by the Government in recent months and believes that the recent announcement of a £3 million contribution towards re-training workers laid off by Tata Steel in Scunthorpe and £80 million towards redundancy and re-training for steel workers in Redcar is tokenistic and will do nothing to prevent further closures;

(g) believes that Labour Shadow Chancellor, John McDonnell MP's proposal to nationalise the steel industry is ideological, irresponsible and unnecessary, and that efforts to help the steel industry should be focussed on levelling the playing field for the UK steel industry to compete internationally;

(h) calls on the Government to:-

  (i) use the UK's diplomatic relationship with China to address the issue of over production of steel; and

  (ii) pass on the money agreed with the European Commission to compensate steel companies for high energy costs to alleviate some of the pressure on the industry; and

(i) requests that a copy of this motion be forwarded to the Chancellor of the

Exchequer, the Rt. Hon. George Osborne MP.

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

Following a Right of Reply by Councillor Terry Fox, the original Motion was put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) notes with sadness the announcement of the closure of the Redcar blast furnace and the news that Tata Steel is to cut 1,200 jobs across the UK, including many within Sheffield City Region;

(b) further notes:

(i) the huge contribution the steel industry makes to the UK economy, employing 34,500 people across the sector and countless more in supply chains, and achieving exports worth £6bn in 2014;

(ii) the challenging global steel market, in particular an over-supply of steel on the international market, which has pushed prices down; and

(iii) that UK Steel, trade unions and Members of Parliament have been calling for months for the Government to act to protect the industry;

(c) condemns the Government for their inaction and their willingness to let British industry bear the brunt of global economic headwinds without protection;

(d) believes the Government's inaction shows they lack an industrial strategy and have no interest in supporting strategic national industries like steel; and

(e) calls on the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills to intervene directly to save steel plants at risk of closure in the short term, and to develop an active industrial strategy to support the UK steel industry over the long term.

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

For the Motion (69) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain), The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Denise Fox) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Julie Gledhill, Roy Munn, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Aodan Marken, Brian

Webster, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Lewis Dagnall, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley, Rob Frost, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Penny Baker, Shaffaq Mohammed, Alan Law, Garry Weatherall, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Chris Peace, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Tony Downing, Nasima Akther, Mohammad Maroof, John Campbell, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Peter Rippon, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, David Baker, Richard Crowther, Keith Davis, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Zoe Sykes, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.

Against the Motion (0) - Nil

Abstained on the Motion (0) - Nil

10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED

Tax Credits (2)

It was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Steve Ayris, that this Council:-

(a) regrets the Government's plan to slash Tax Credits from 1st April 2016;

(b) notes that despite massive public opposition, and opposition from Conservative backbenchers, the Government attempted to press ahead with these unnecessary ideological cuts that will hit the working poor hardest;

(c) notes that if the proposed changes to Tax Credits were implemented:-

(i) 25,000 families in Sheffield are set to lose out an average £750 a year in Tax Credits; and

(ii) 40,000 children in our area would be forced to live in poorer households, reducing their life chances and making it harder for their parents to make ends meet;

(d) notes that cutting Tax Credits was not in the Conservative Party manifesto,

and the Prime Minister explicitly ruled them out during the General Election campaign, meaning the Government does not have a mandate to carry this out;

(e) regrets that these Government proposals have got to this stage after the Welfare Reform and Work Bill passed through the House of Commons, which 184 Labour MPs failed to oppose, including 4 of the 5 Sheffield Labour MPs;

(f) notes that the Labour Party has repeatedly wavered on their position on tax credit cuts and two Shadow Cabinet Ministers, MPs Diane Abbott and Seema Malhotra, have been unable to say that the Labour Party would reverse the cuts;

(g) believes the Labour Lords amendment which was passed on Monday 26th October 2015 to delay the cuts by three years and implement 'transitional measures' is a step in the right direction but it does not go far enough and will be of little solace to hardworking people on low incomes when the Government's proposals are implemented in three years' time;

(h) notes that the Liberal Democrat peers tabled a 'fatal motion' to kill off Tax Credit changes for good but this was defeated because Labour members in the House of Lords did not support it; and

(i) therefore, calls on the Council to write to The Baroness Smith of Basildon, Shadow Leader in the House of Lords, regretting the decision of Labour peers to only delay Tax Credit cuts.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor George Lindars-Hammond, seconded by Councillor Adam Hurst, 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:-

(a) is appalled by the Government's decision to cut tax credits which will reduce the incomes of over 3 million working families, including 27,000 in Sheffield, by an average of £1,300 a year from April 2016;

(b) believes the Government's decision to cut tax credits clearly shows that the Conservatives are not on the side of working people, and that attempts to rebrand themselves as the 'workers' party' are nothing more than empty rhetoric;

(c) notes that there was no mention of cutting tax credits in the Conservative Party manifesto and recalls that the Prime Minister explicitly ruled out cuts to tax credits in the run up to the General Election on BBC Question Time on 30 April 2015;

(d) notes research from the Resolution Foundation which found that the proposed cuts to tax credits will immediately push a further 200,000 children into poverty;

(e) further notes comments made by Paul Johnson, Director of the Institute for Fiscal Studies, who said it was "arithmetically impossible" for the increase in the minimum wage to compensate for the loss in tax credits;

(f) believes that these cuts to the income of working families on low wages are unjustifiable, particularly given cuts to inheritance tax and to the top rate of income tax; and

(g) calls on the Government to heed the House of Lords' opposition to these cuts and to reverse in full the proposed reductions to tax credits.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (i) and (j) as follows, and the relettering of original paragraph (i) as a new paragraph (k):-

(i) agrees with comments made by the Green Peer, Jenny Jones, that the Government's cuts to tax credits are "unthinking, uncaring and cruel", and commends Baroness Jones and all other members of the House of Lords who opposed these cuts;

(j) further, agrees with Baroness Jones' comments that, "It is regrettable that it falls upon an unelected body to hold this Government to account – but until we have a fully elected second chamber, Peers must continue to properly scrutinise this kind of deeply damaging legislation".

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) is appalled by the Government's decision to cut tax credits which will reduce the incomes of over 3 million working families, including 27,000 in Sheffield, by an average of £1,300 a year from April 2016;

(b) believes the Government's decision to cut tax credits clearly shows that the Conservatives are not on the side of working people, and that attempts to rebrand themselves as the 'workers' party' are nothing more than empty rhetoric;

(c) notes that there was no mention of cutting tax credits in the Conservative Party manifesto and recalls that the Prime Minister explicitly ruled out cuts to tax credits in the run up to the General Election on BBC Question Time on 30 April 2015;

(d) notes research from the Resolution Foundation which found that the proposed cuts to tax credits will immediately push a further 200,000 children into poverty;

(e) further notes comments made by Paul Johnson, Director of the Institute for Fiscal Studies, who said it was "arithmetically impossible" for the increase in the minimum wage to compensate for the loss in tax credits;

(f) believes that these cuts to the income of working families on low wages are unjustifiable, particularly given cuts to inheritance tax and to the top rate of income tax; and

(g) calls on the Government to heed the House of Lords' opposition to these cuts and to reverse in full the proposed reductions to tax credits.

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL

Outdoor Economy

It was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Steve Wilson, that this Council:-

(a) welcomes this Administration's efforts to develop Sheffield's outdoor economy, including The Outdoor City Strategy currently out for public consultation;

(b) is proud that Sheffield hosted the European Outdoor Summit at the City Hall between 13th to 15th October 2015, attended by more than 300 delegates from across the globe;

(c) recognises the potential of the outdoor economy to help to attract and retain people with the knowledge and skills to drive our key industries, including advanced manufacturing;

(d) believes that:

(i) Sheffield has the potential to establish itself as a leader in outdoor recreation, given its unique natural assets, high rate of participation in outdoor activities, and high number of outdoor businesses; and

(ii) developing the 'Outdoor City' brand will help to boost tourism and attract people to the city; and

(e) notes research carried out last year by the Sport Industry Research Centre at Sheffield Hallam University which found that outdoor recreation in Sheffield generates more than £53m in economic output a year, in addition to engaging people in outdoor activity and generating significant health benefits.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Steve Ayris, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (f) and (g) as follows

(f) believes that, despite the Administration's 'Outdoor City' rhetoric, their recent actions have put green spaces in the city at risk and are a cause for concern, noting such actions as:-

(i) the Council's Planning and Highways Committee approving the decision to expand school provision in Tinsley by building a new school on Tinsley Green Recreational Ground despite this being the only green open space in the Tinsley area;

(ii) allowing what is believed to be 117 green belt sites to be at risk of development as part of the 'Call for Housing Sites', and refusing to disclose the locations of these sites;

(iii) selling off Cobnar Cottage, part of Graves Park – gifted to the people of Sheffield by J. G. Graves back in 1925;

(iv) allowing Amey to fell many mature, healthy highway trees as part of the Streets Ahead programme;

(v) the Council's Planning and Highways Committee granting permission for a coal-cleaning operation at Hesley Wood, resulting in hundreds of trees being destroyed; and

(vi) declaring green land within the Beauchief Abbey Conservation Area as surplus, risking development; and

(g) therefore calls on the Administration to:

(i) reconsider more sympathetic engineering solutions to preserve highway tree stock;

(ii) publish the list of 117 sites in the Green Belt at risk from development;

(iii) do more to encourage development on brownfield sites; and

(iv) reassure the public that no more park land will be sold off or developed.

(Note: With the agreement of Council, and at the request of Councillor Steve Ayris (the mover of the amendment), paragraph (f) (ii) above as published in the "List of Amendments Received by the Chief Executive" circulated at the meeting, was altered, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.9, by the addition of the words "what is believed to be" after the word "allowing".)

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

It was then moved by Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley, seconded by Councillor Aodan Marken, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (f) to (k) as follows

(f) welcomes the Administration's recognition that action needs to be taken to make Sheffield a more pleasant city in which to spend time outdoors and to enable people to be active;

(g) recognises the potential of a more pleasant urban environment and better mobility for both residents and visitors to Sheffield;

(h) believes that a true 'Outdoor City' should be a Sheffield where people enjoy spending time outdoors as part of daily life, not only as part of sport and recreation;

(i) believes that enabling people to undertake physical exercise as part of daily life by walking and cycling for transport will deliver far-reaching benefits over and above those that can be achieved by an 'Outdoor City' focused on recreation alone;

(j) believes that a true 'Outdoor City' must be a place where ordinary people can walk and cycle safely and that, to enable this to happen, a high quality cycle network should be built to give people a genuine choice to cycle instead of driving and to allow ordinary people to cycle protected from motor traffic, and that this must be designed to be usable by all; and

(k) stresses that planning and delivering a high quality cycle network must be progressed as a priority in order to meet the Council's aims of increasing the percentage of journeys made by bicycle to 10% in 2025.

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) welcomes this Administration's efforts to develop Sheffield's outdoor economy, including The Outdoor City Strategy currently out for public consultation;

(b) is proud that Sheffield hosted the European Outdoor Summit at the City Hall between 13th to 15th October 2015, attended by more than 300 delegates from across the globe;

(c) recognises the potential of the outdoor economy to help to attract and retain people with the knowledge and skills to drive our key industries, including advanced manufacturing;

(d) believes that:

(i) Sheffield has the potential to establish itself as a leader in outdoor recreation, given its unique natural assets, high rate of participation in outdoor activities, and high number of outdoor businesses; and

(ii) developing the 'Outdoor City' brand will help to boost tourism and attract people to the city; and

(e) notes research carried out last year by the Sport Industry Research Centre at Sheffield Hallam University which found that outdoor recreation in Sheffield generates more than £53m in economic output a year, in addition to engaging people in outdoor activity and generating significant health benefits.

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACKIE DRAYTON

Adult Education Funding

It was moved by Councillor Jackie Drayton, seconded by Councillor Anne Murphy, that this Council:-

(a) notes with regret that the Government has cut adult education spending by 24% this year, and that this is on top of a £1bn reduction in real terms between 2013/14 and 2009/10 under the Liberal Democrat Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills, which resulted in 17% fewer adult learners;

(b) believes that:

(i) adult education and skills is life-changing for many people; as well as helping people into employment, it improves health and wellbeing, contributes to social inclusion, and helps to build more resilient communities;

(ii) strategic, long-term investment in adult education and skills is needed to improve the skills base to drive productivity growth;

(iii) by making further cuts to adult education and skills, the Government would be closing the door in the face of people trying to improve their prospects; and

(iv) further cuts in post-16 education will have a disproportionate impact on disadvantaged groups, which will increase disadvantage and undermine equality of opportunity;

(c) is concerned that the cuts suggested for the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills of between 25-40% as part of the Government's upcoming Comprehensive Spending Review will have a serious impact on the sustainability of adult education in Sheffield and across the UK; and

(d) calls on the Government to protect the adult education budget, in particular Adult and Community Learning, from further cuts.

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

1. the deletion in paragraph (a) of all the words after the words “by 24% this year”; and

2. the addition of new paragraphs (b) and (c) as follows, and the relettering of original paragraphs (b) to (d) as new paragraphs (d) to (f):-

    (b) recognises that adult education has been underfunded for too long by successive Governments;

    (c) notes Liberal Democrat manifesto pledges to:-

        (i) establish a cross-party commission to secure a long-term settlement for the public funding of reskilling and lifelong learning;

        (ii) set up a review into the VAT treatment of Sixth Form Colleges and FE Colleges to ensure fair treatment in relation to the schools sector; and

        (iii) extend the current UK budget protection for education to include 16-19 provision.

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

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy and Sarah Jane Smalley voted for Paragraphs 1 and 2(b) and abstained on Paragraph 2(c) of the above amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

It was then moved by Councillor Aodan Marken, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new sub-clause (v) in paragraph (b) as follows:-

(b)(v) funding the teaching of English as a Second Language (ESOL) is a particularly cost-effective way of integrating communities and removing inequalities and that cuts to this area of funding significantly increase disadvantage and undermine equality of opportunity;

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) notes with regret that the Government has cut adult education spending by 24% this year, and that this is on top of a £1bn reduction in real terms between 2013/14 and 2009/10 under the Liberal Democrat Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills, which resulted in 17% fewer adult learners;

(b) believes that:

(i) adult education and skills is life-changing for many people; as well as helping people into employment, it improves health and wellbeing, contributes to social inclusion, and helps to build more resilient communities;

(ii) strategic, long-term investment in adult education and skills is needed to improve the skills base to drive productivity growth;

(iii) by making further cuts to adult education and skills, the Government would be closing the door in the face of people trying to improve their prospects;

(iv) further cuts in post-16 education will have a disproportionate impact on disadvantaged groups, which will increase disadvantage and undermine equality of opportunity; and

(v) funding the teaching of English as a Second Language (ESOL) is a particularly cost-effective way of integrating communities and removing inequalities and that cuts to this area of funding significantly increase disadvantage and undermine equality of opportunity;

(c) is concerned that the cuts suggested for the Department for Business, Innovation and Skills of between 25-40% as part of the Government's upcoming Comprehensive Spending Review will have a serious impact on the sustainability of adult education in Sheffield and across the UK; and

(d) calls on the Government to protect the adult education budget, in particular Adult and Community Learning, from further cuts

(Note: Councillors Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (b) to (d) and against Paragraph (a) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ANDREW SANGAR

UK Steel Industry (2)

It was moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, that this Council:-

(a) notes the loss of over 4,000 jobs in the steel industry during this year, most recently due to cuts from Tata Steel, which axed 1,200 jobs last week, including 550 in South Yorkshire, and the closure of the SSI plant in Redcar which meant 1,700 job losses;

(b) notes the UK steel industry is in crisis due to a number of factors, including the influx of cheap steel from China, rising energy costs, and a strong pound;

(c) notes the British steel industry's close relationship with Sheffield, renowned as the 'Steel City' due to its historic role in the development of the manufacturing of steel, and that jobs in the steel industry are still important to the City Region;

(d) notes that during the Coalition, the Government got permission from the European Commission to compensate steel companies for high energy costs, and further notes the comments of the former Business Secretary, Vince Cable, on 21st October 2015 that 'The Treasury is sitting on [this] money.';

(e) believes that if the UK is to maintain its strategic capacity to manufacture steel, the Government must act fast;

(f) regrets the lack of action by the Government in recent months and believes that the recent announcement of a £3 million contribution towards re-training workers laid off by Tata Steel in Scunthorpe and £80 million towards redundancy and re-training for steel workers in Redcar is tokenistic and will do nothing to prevent further closures;

(g) believes that Labour Shadow Chancellor, John McDonnell MP's proposal to nationalise the steel industry is ideological, irresponsible and unnecessary, and that efforts to help the steel industry should be focussed on levelling the playing field for the UK steel industry to compete internationally;

(h) calls on the Government to:-

  (i) use the UK's diplomatic relationship with China to address the issue of over production of steel; and

  (ii) pass on the money agreed with the European Commission to compensate steel companies for high energy costs to alleviate some of the pressure on the industry; and

(i) requests that a copy of this motion be forwarded to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Rt. Hon. George Osborne MP.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

(a) notes with sadness the announcement of the closure of the Redcar blast furnace and the news that Tata Steel is to cut 1,200 jobs across the UK, including many within Sheffield City Region;

(b) further notes:

(i) the huge contribution the steel industry makes to the UK economy, employing 34,500 people across the sector and countless more in supply chains, and achieving exports worth £6bn in 2014;

(ii) the challenging global steel market, in particular an over-supply of steel on the international market, which has pushed prices down; and

(iii) that UK Steel, trade unions and Members of Parliament have been calling for months for the Government to act to protect the industry;

(c) condemns the Government for their inaction and their willingness to let British industry bear the brunt of global economic headwinds without protection;

(d) believes the Government's inaction shows they lack an industrial strategy and have no interest in supporting strategic national industries like steel; and

(e) calls on the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills to intervene directly to save steel plants at risk of closure in the short term, and to develop an active industrial strategy to support the UK steel industry over the long term.

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

The original Motion, as amended, was then put as a Substantive Motion and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) notes with sadness the announcement of the closure of the Redcar blast furnace and the news that Tata Steel is to cut 1,200 jobs across the UK, including many within Sheffield City Region;

(b) further notes:

(i) the huge contribution the steel industry makes to the UK economy, employing 34,500 people across the sector and countless more in supply chains, and achieving exports worth £6bn in 2014;

(ii) the challenging global steel market, in particular an over-supply of steel on the international market, which has pushed prices down; and

(iii) that UK Steel, trade unions and Members of Parliament have been calling for months for the Government to act to protect the industry;

(c) condemns the Government for their inaction and their willingness to let British industry bear the brunt of global economic headwinds without protection;

(d) believes the Government's inaction shows they lack an industrial strategy and have no interest in supporting strategic national industries like steel; and

(e) calls on the Secretary of State for Business, Innovation and Skills to intervene directly to save steel plants at risk of closure in the short term, and to develop an active industrial strategy to support the UK steel industry over the long term.

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BRIAN WEBSTER

Sheffield City Region Elected Mayor

It was moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, that this Council:-

(a) notes that on 2nd October, 2015 the Leader of the Council joined other local authority leaders from South Yorkshire, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in signing a 'devolution deal' for the Sheffield City Region;

(b) notes that among the reported benefits of this deal is a pledge of an extra £900m over 30 years from central government for the Sheffield City Region, equating to £30m per year, but notes that this amount is not nearly enough to offset the substantial cuts that central government has imposed on Sheffield and other local authorities in the SCR over the past five years;

(c) notes that as part of the 'devolution deal', it is proposed that there will be an elected Mayor for the Sheffield City Region from 2017, and believes that this is regrettable and a backwards step for local democracy;

(d) recalls that in a 2012 referendum the people of Sheffield voted decisively against having an elected Mayor for Sheffield City Council, and believes that this demonstrates strong public feeling in this city against the centralisation of executive powers in the hands of a single individual;

(e) notes comments by the Labour Shadow Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government (reported in the Yorkshire Post on 13th

October 2015) that the imposition of a Mayor on the Sheffield City Region and other areas is “what you would imagine in a dictatorship, not a democracy”, and agrees with the sentiment that elected Mayors should not be imposed on either local authorities or cross-authority areas without clear public support, for example via referenda;

(f) therefore considers it disappointing that local authorities across the Sheffield City Region, including those that are Labour-led, are failing to stand up to what this Council believes to be the Chancellor of the Exchequer’s unreasonable demands with respect to the imposition of a City Region Mayor;

(g) believes that while radical devolution of power to local authorities and cross-authority areas is necessary to counter the traditional concentration of power at Westminster, the current proposals for Sheffield City Region represent a step in the wrong direction both for the future of the local area and for local democracy;

(h) welcomes the ‘Democracy Matters’ initiative of the Electoral Reform Society and a number of UK universities, including the University of Sheffield, which will see two pilot ‘Citizens’ Assemblies’ “[debating] a range of options for Britain’s constitutional future”, is proud that Sheffield has been chosen to host one of these two pilot Assemblies, and believes that these provide a far more positive model for future discussions over devolution than the negotiations that the Administration conducted behind closed doors in agreeing the Sheffield City Region devolution deal with central government; and

(i) therefore:

(i) calls upon the Administration to rethink its plans to accept the imposition of a City Region Mayor without a further referendum having established this as the will of the people of Sheffield;

(ii) calls upon central government to ensure that, wherever devolution deals with local authorities call for the establishment of elected Mayors, central government funding is provided to cover the costs of holding referenda to determine whether this has the support of local people; and

(iii) given the significant and far-reaching implications that this deal is likely to have on the development of Sheffield’s economy and governance for decades to come, urges all political groups on Sheffield City Council to demonstrate their commitment to democracy by giving Members a free vote on the Sheffield City Region devolution deal when that deal comes before this Council for debate and approval.

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

1. the addition in paragraph (a) of the word “proposed” before the words “devolution deal”; and

2. the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (i) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (f) as follows:-

    (b) notes that the current Administration has campaigned against cuts to the Council’s budget and will continue to do so, but notes that severe cuts to local government have been imposed irrespective of devolution and therefore does not believe that ruling out receiving powers and funding currently held at Whitehall would benefit the city;

    (c) understands that:-

        (i) investment is still heavily directed towards London and the South East at the expense of the North and that if the Government is to genuinely deliver on their rhetoric we need to see the Spending Review rebalance this; and

        (ii) the devolution proposal is just one part of the jigsaw, and that we can only create a strong northern economy with accompanying meaningful investment in the pan- northern transport programmes such as Transport for the North;

    (d) notes that the 2012 mayoral referendum was based on an elected mayor replacing the Council Leader but with no new powers or funding and covering a geography limited to Sheffield, whereas in contrast, the current proposal is fundamentally different with a mayor covering the wider city region geography, and importantly it is only about taking powers down from the Government, not taking powers up from local councils;

    (e) notes that the Chancellor has made it clear that any devolution of powers and funding down from Whitehall to local government is dependent upon an elected mayor as proposed, so whilst locally we have made it clear that a mayor is not what we want, it would be irresponsible to dismiss it out of hand and risk leaving the city behind; and

    (f) further notes that the public will be consulted on the proposal and that the proposal is also subject to final agreement and approval by each Council within Sheffield City Region.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Colin Ross, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (h) and (i) and the addition of new paragraphs (h) to (j) as follows:-

(h) fails to see what direct benefits a directly elected mayor will bring for the Sheffield City Region, given the complex governance of the City Region;

(i) regrets the determination of the Chancellor of the Exchequer to impose a directly elected mayor on any city that wishes to pursue further devolution; and

(j) is concerned that accepting the condition of a City Region mayor at this stage of negotiations may have weakened our position to bargain for additional powers.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (j) as follows:-

(j) believes that establishing the role of an elected Sheffield City Region Mayor without taking steps such as a further referendum and a free vote for Members would risk undermining the democratic legitimacy of any elected Mayor in the eyes of their constituents even before they took office.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) notes that on 2nd October, 2015 the Leader of the Council joined other local authority leaders from South Yorkshire, and the Chancellor of the Exchequer, in signing a proposed 'devolution deal' for the Sheffield City Region;

(b) notes that the current Administration has campaigned against cuts to the Council's budget and will continue to do so, but notes that severe cuts to local government have been imposed irrespective of devolution and therefore does not believe that ruling out receiving powers and funding currently held at Whitehall would benefit the city;

(c) understands that:-

(i) investment is still heavily directed towards London and the South East at the expense of the North and that if the Government is to genuinely deliver on their rhetoric we need to see the Spending Review rebalance this; and

(ii) the devolution proposal is just one part of the jigsaw, and that we can only create a strong northern economy with accompanying

meaningful investment in the pan-northern transport programmes such as Transport for the North;

(d) notes that the 2012 mayoral referendum was based on an elected mayor replacing the Council Leader but with no new powers or funding and covering a geography limited to Sheffield, whereas in contrast, the current proposal is fundamentally different with a mayor covering the wider city region geography, and importantly it is only about taking powers down from the Government, not taking powers up from local councils;

(e) notes that the Chancellor has made it clear that any devolution of powers and funding down from Whitehall to local government is dependent upon an elected mayor as proposed, so whilst locally we have made it clear that a mayor is not what we want, it would be irresponsible to dismiss it out of hand and risk leaving the city behind; and

(f) further notes that the public will be consulted on the proposal and that the proposal is also subject to final agreement and approval by each Council within Sheffield City Region.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy and Sarah Jane Smalley voted for Paragraphs (a), (b) and (c) and against paragraphs (d), (e) and (f) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER

Energy Policy

It was moved by Councillor John Booker, seconded by Councillor Keith Davis, that this Council

(a) regrets that, over the last two decades, consecutive governments have seemingly conspired to support failing energy policies that do nothing to reduce global emissions, but bring hardship to British families, and that their "green" agenda does not make them friends of the earth, but enemies of the people;

(b) further regrets Britain's major global competitors - USA, China, India - are switching to low-cost fossil fuels, while we are forced to close perfectly good coal-fired power stations to meet unattainable targets for renewable capacity;

(c) notes the 2008 Climate Change Act drives up costs, undermines competitiveness, hits jobs and growth, and that this is the most expensive piece of legislation in British history, with the Government's own figures putting the cost of the Act at £18 billion a year over 40 years, or £720 billion between 2010 and 2050;

(d) further notes the European Union's Large Combustion Plant Directive and the planned Medium Combustion Plant Directive both have the effect of closing down secure, reliable and economical electricity generation;

(e) also notes that the British coal industry once employed one million miners, yet now all three remaining deep coal mines are set to close by 2016, at a cost of 2,000 jobs, despite having many years of productive life left and regardless of Britain's continuing need for coal, and further notes that 30 per cent of our electricity is still produced from coal and we will be dependent on fossil fuels for many more years to come;

(f) believes a commission should be set up to investigate ways to assist and rejuvenate the coal industry and seek to secure the survival and expansion of Britain's indigenous coal industry in the form of deep, opencast, and drift mining, and that the carbon floor tax should be abolished on the basis that production for coal-fired power stations is combined with carbon capture and storage;

(g) recalls that in 2014, the Government forced energy companies to add nearly £3.2 billion onto energy bills to finance their energy and climate change policies, and notes that these costs are expected to increase to a staggering £9.8 billion by 2020, amounting to an extra £197 going onto our average domestic fuel bills;

(h) demands that the Government finds a fairer way of paying our bills, by stopping energy companies charging extra for customers who use prepayment meters; and

(i) further believes Britain is sleepwalking into an energy crisis, that political doctrines, ideologies and party before the people policies will not keep the lights on, and that we all have a duty to avert this real problem and work towards a sustainable solution to our country's energy needs.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, 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:-

(a) believes that climate change poses an existential threat to mankind;

(b) believes that cooperation with other nations rather than isolation is needed to tackle shared global challenges like climate change and that Britain should be looking outwards and showing international leadership in the transition to clean energy;

(c) condemns the Government's decision to scrap subsidies for renewable sources of energy and agrees with John Cridland, Director General of the CBI, that "these changes send a worrying signal about the UK as a place for low-carbon investment";

(d) is deeply concerned that the plan to build a prototype plant to capture carbon from a coal-fired power station in North Yorkshire is under threat after Drax Group plc - a key shareholder - pulled out blaming Government cuts in renewable energy subsidies, and calls on the Government to deliver on their manifesto pledge to commit £1bn in carbon capture and storage technology;

(e) believes that Britain needs to reduce its dependence on imported fuel by investing in a new clean energy system to reduce energy bills and create the skilled jobs our economy needs, and does not think that achieving lower bills and protecting the environment are mutually exclusive goals; and

(f) further believes that energy should be democratised and welcomes the Administration's plans to explore options to set up a local energy company to tackle unfair fuel prices and bring down bills.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Sarah Jayne Smalley, 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:-

(a) regrets that successive UK governments have failed to bring forward long-term policies to deal with the related problems of energy price, security and environmental impact;

(b) further regrets that the UK has not followed the example of European partners such as Germany, which in 2014 benefited from increases in renewable energy and falls in fossil fuel generation, energy consumption and energy prices;

(c) believes reducing energy consumption through widespread energy efficiency measures is the best way to combat fuel poverty by reducing bills and increasing comfort;

(d) notes that onshore wind is now the cheapest form of electricity in the UK, according to research by Bloomberg, and further notes comments from Seb Henbest of Bloomberg that, "There's still a tendency for the general public to believe that renewables are really expensive, while coal and gas are really cheap … This is how it used to be not so long ago, but over the past five years technology costs have come down significantly, along with financing costs."

(e) notes that coal is the most damaging of all fossil fuels in terms of carbon emissions, air and water pollution;

(f) notes that while the UK currently subsidises renewable energy by approximately £3.5 billion the International Monetary Fund (IMF) has

estimated that the UK will subsidise fossil fuels by £26 billion in 2015, or £400 per person, and that the IMF further stated that eliminating this subsidy would reduce fossil fuel related deaths by 50%, reduce carbon emissions by one fifth and generate revenue; and

(g) believes this Council has a very poor record regarding renewable energy generation, which may have cost the city millions of pounds in loss of investment and potential fuel savings, and calls on the Cabinet Member for Environment and Transport to bring forward plans for an immediate improvement.

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

(Note Councillors Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (c) to (g) and against Paragraphs (a) and (b) of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) believes that climate change poses an existential threat to mankind;

(b) believes that cooperation with other nations rather than isolation is needed to tackle shared global challenges like climate change and that Britain should be looking outwards and showing international leadership in the transition to clean energy;

(c) condemns the Government's decision to scrap subsidies for renewable sources of energy and agrees with John Cridland, Director General of the CBI, that "these changes send a worrying signal about the UK as a place for low-carbon investment";

(d) is deeply concerned that the plan to build a prototype plant to capture carbon from a coal-fired power station in North Yorkshire is under threat after Drax Group plc - a key shareholder - pulled out blaming Government cuts in renewable energy subsidies, and calls on the Government to deliver on their manifesto pledge to commit £1bn in carbon capture and storage technology;

(e) believes that Britain needs to reduce its dependence on imported fuel by investing in a new clean energy system to reduce energy bills and create the skilled jobs our economy needs, and does not think that achieving lower bills and protecting the environment are mutually exclusive goals; and

(f) further believes that energy should be democratised and welcomes the Administration's plans to explore options to set up a local energy company to tackle unfair fuel prices and bring down bills.

16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR NASIMA AKTHER

Small Business Saturday

It was moved by Councillor Nasima Akther, seconded by Councillor Mohammad Maroof, that this Council

(a) notes the enormous contribution that local, small independent businesses make to our economy and understands that small businesses are at the heart of local communities;

(b) welcomes the steps the current Administration is taking to support small businesses in Sheffield, including the Re: New scheme, and investment to revamp and improve the London Road area;

(c) believes that in the critical Christmas period, small businesses will benefit from the support of Small Business Saturday - a national campaign to encourage people to buy local and support small and independent businesses; and

(d) encourages Elected Members to support Small Business Saturday on 5th December 2015, which is expected to be the busiest shopping day of the year, by attending a celebratory event in the Sheffield Moor Market at 2.30pm on that day.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows:-

(e) calls on the Administration to repeat the success of last year and offer free parking in the city centre and local district centres in the run up to Christmas in order to help local business.

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

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley, seconded by Councillor Aodan Marken, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (e) to (h) as follows:-

(e) further, encourages Elected Members and the people of Sheffield to show their support for local and independent businesses throughout the whole year;

(f) recognises the particular importance of supporting sole traders and micro businesses, as well as those organisations focussed on social impact

rather than wealth creation, which this Council believes are key to the wellbeing of community economies, and is committed to improving and expanding the help we offer to such businesses and organisations;

(g) will continue to develop its policies on procurement, with a particular focus on:

(i) developing its capacity for procuring goods and services from local and independent businesses wherever practicable; and

(ii) ensuring that all businesses, including local and independent businesses, are given the support they need to access and navigate the tendering process; and

(h) believes that the economy is skewed unfairly in favour of large and multinational businesses, and that this is detrimental not only to small businesses but also to the local economy, and so will endeavour to work to rebalance the local economy in favour of small local businesses.

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

(Note: Councillors Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker and Vickie Priestley voted for Paragraphs (e) to (g) and against Paragraph (h) of the above amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) notes the enormous contribution that local, small independent businesses make to our economy and understands that small businesses are at the heart of local communities;

(b) welcomes the steps the current Administration is taking to support small businesses in Sheffield, including the Re:New scheme, and investment to revamp and improve the London Road area;

(c) believes that in the critical Christmas period, small businesses will benefit from the support of Small Business Saturday - a national campaign to encourage people to buy local and support small and independent businesses; and

(d) encourages Elected Members to support Small Business Saturday on 5th December 2015, which is expected to be the busiest shopping day of the year, by attending a celebratory event in the Sheffield Moor Market at 2.30pm on that day.

17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PAT MIDGLEY

City of Sanctuary Anniversary

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that this Council:-

(a) celebrates the 10th anniversary of the City of Sanctuary movement, which was founded in Sheffield in October 2005;

(b) is proud that Sheffield became the UK's first 'City of Sanctuary' for asylum-seekers and refugees in September 2007 with the support of the City Council and over 70 local community organisations;

(c) believes we are a city that takes pride in welcoming people in need of safety; and

(d) is committed to improving the experiences and opportunities of refugees and asylum seekers living in Sheffield, and enabling them to make a positive contribution to their local neighbourhoods and the city.

18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOE OTTEN

Free Christmas Parking Incentives

It was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Richard Shaw, that this Council

(a) believes thriving high streets across Sheffield's communities are vital to both the City's economy and its wellbeing;

(b) welcomes the actions taken by the previous Administration to support local high streets through the Thriving Local and District Centres programme;

(c) recognises the vital importance to local retail business in the City Centre and District Shopping Centres, of the Christmas Trading period;

(d) notes nearby competing shopping centres such as Rotherham and Chesterfield are offering free car parking incentives in the run up to Christmas;

(e) recalls the main opposition group's 2015/16 budget amendment, which, if passed, would have provided funding for reduced parking charges and investment in district centres; and

(f) therefore calls on the Administration to offer free Christmas Parking incentives applicable to the City Centre and district centres, during the forthcoming Festive Season.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Terry Fox, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraph (f) and the addition of a new paragraph (f) as follows:-

(f) welcomes the Administration's commitment to offer free Christmas Parking incentives during the forthcoming festive season.

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

The original Motion, as amended was put as a Substantive Motion in the form set out below:

That this Council:

(a) believes thriving high streets across Sheffield's communities are vital to both the City's economy and its wellbeing;

(b) welcomes the actions taken by the previous Administration to support local high streets through the Thriving Local and District Centres programme;

(c) recognises the vital importance to local retail business in the City Centre and District Shopping Centres, of the Christmas Trading period;

(d) notes nearby competing shopping centres such as Rotherham and Chesterfield are offering free car parking incentives in the run up to Christmas;

(e) recalls the main opposition group's 2015/16 budget amendment, which, if passed, would have provided funding for reduced parking charges and investment in district centres; and

(f) welcomes the Administration's commitment to offer free Christmas Parking incentives during the forthcoming festive season.

In being put to the vote, paragraphs (a), (c), (d) and (f) were carried and Paragraphs (b) and (e) were negatived, and the remaining paragraphs renumbered accordingly, resulting in the following resolution:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) believes thriving high streets across Sheffield's communities are vital to both the City's economy and its wellbeing;

(b) recognises the vital importance to local retail business in the City Centre and District Shopping Centres, of the Christmas Trading period;

(c) notes nearby competing shopping centres such as Rotherham and Chesterfield are offering free car parking incentives in the run up to

Christmas; and

(d) welcomes the Administration's commitment to offer free Christmas Parking incentives during the forthcoming festive season.

(Note: Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy and Sarah Jane Smalley voted for Paragraphs (a) to (c) and against Paragraph (d) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

19. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR MARTIN SMITH

Freedom of Information

It was moved by Councillor Martin Smith, seconded by Councillor Cliff Woodcraft, that this Council

(a) believes that the Freedom of Information Act is an essential part of our democracy and enables citizens to hold local and national government to account;

(b) agrees that Freedom of Information laws should be extended to cover private companies delivering public services and major contracts;

(c) believes that the Freedom of Information Act is under threat from the Government, with proposals to:-

(i) introduce charges for requests;

(ii) make it easier to refuse requests on cost grounds; and

(iii) strengthen Ministers' powers to veto disclosures;

(d) notes that Sheffield City Council issued refusals, either wholly or partially, on 22% of FOI requests in 2014/15, compared to 11% by Bristol City Council and 18% by both Leeds City Council and Manchester City Council;

(e) notes Sheffield City Council's refusal to answer its own Opposition Councillors' Freedom of Information requests and reveal the 117 sites either wholly or partially in the Green Belt that were submitted as part of the Call for Housing Sites;

(f) notes that unlike other Councils, such as Leeds, Sheffield City Council does not publish FOI data on a regular basis including the number of requests received and refused;

(g) regrets that Sheffield City Council has been refusing to answer tree-related FOI requests, many from people who have never previously made a request under the Freedom of Information Act, instead branding the topic

as ‘vexatious’; and

(h) therefore calls on the Council to:-

(i) publish data on FOI requests on a monthly basis;

(ii) answer tree-related FOI requests; and

(iii) write to the six Sheffield MPs requesting that they resist any attempt by the Government to water-down the provisions within the Freedom of Information Act.

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

(d) notes that:-

(i) the Council deals with each Freedom of Information request on a case by case basis and in line with the Freedom of Information Act; and

(ii) for the 2014/15 financial year, less than 1% of refusals were referred to the Information Commissioner;

(e) notes that the information relating to the main opposition group’s Freedom of Information requests on housing sites was not completed at the time the request was received, and that this information will be made available on 11th November, 2015 when the public consultation on Phase 1 of the Sheffield Local Plan is published;

(f) welcomes the Council’s intention to publish FOI data on a regular basis;

(g) notes that the Council has answered tree-related FOI requests, and is committed to continuing to work hard to respond to as many requests as is feasible, given the resources available; and

(h) will write to the six Sheffield MPs requesting that they resist any attempt by the Government to water-down the provisions within the Freedom of Information Act.

(Note: With the consent of Council and at the request of Councillor Ben Curran (the mover of the amendment), paragraph (e) above as published in the “List of Amendments Received by the Chief Executive” circulated at the meeting, was altered, in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.9, by the substitution of the word “completed” for the word “available”.)

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

(a) believes that the Freedom of Information Act is an essential part of our democracy and enables citizens to hold local and national government to account;

(b) agrees that Freedom of Information laws should be extended to cover private companies delivering public services and major contracts;

(c) believes that the Freedom of Information Act is under threat from the Government, with proposals to:-

  (i) introduce charges for requests;

  (ii) make it easier to refuse requests on cost grounds; and

  (iii) strengthen Ministers' powers to veto disclosures;

(d) notes that:-

  (i) the Council deals with each Freedom of Information request on a case by case basis and in line with the Freedom of Information Act; and

  (ii) for the 2014/15 financial year, less than 1% of refusals were referred to the Information Commissioner;

(e) notes that the information relating to the main opposition group's Freedom of Information requests on housing sites was not completed at the time the request was received, and that this information will be made available on 11th November, 2015 when the public consultation on Phase 1 of the Sheffield Local Plan is published;

(f) welcomes the Council's intention to publish FOI data on a regular basis;

(g) notes that the Council has answered tree-related FOI requests, and is committed to continuing to work hard to respond to as many requests as is feasible, given the resources available; and

(h) will write to the six Sheffield MPs requesting that they resist any attempt by the Government to water-down the provisions within the Freedom of Information Act.

(Note: 1. Councillors Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Shaffaq Mohammed, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker and Vickie Priestley voted

for Paragraphs (a), (b), (c), (f) and (h) and against Paragraphs (d), (e) and (g) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Aodan Marken, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy and Sarah Jane Smalley voted for Paragraphs (a) to (f) and (h) and against Paragraph (g) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)