

Agenda Item 3

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield S1 2HH, on Wednesday 5 December 2012, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor John Campbell)
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Vickie Priestley)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore John Robson Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> Keith Hill Joe Otten Colin Ross	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Isobel Bowler Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Clive Skelton Roy Munn	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Garry Weatherall Steve Wilson Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Anders Hanson Nikki Bond
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Roger Davison Diana Stimely Penny Baker	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> John Campbell Martin Lawton Lynn Rooney
4	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	13	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Alan Law Chris Weldon Shelia Constance	22	<i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i> Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Price Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Shaffaq Mohammed Stuart Wattam Jayne Dunn	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Andrew Sangar Janice Sidebottom Sue Alston	23	<i>Southey Ward</i> Leigh Bramall Tony Damms Gill Furniss
6	<i>Burngreave Ward</i> Jackie Drayton Ibrar Hussain Talib Hussain	15	<i>Gleadless Valley Ward</i> Cate McDonald Tim Rippon Steve Jones	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Vickie Priestley Katie Condliffe
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Jillian Creasy Mohammad Maroof Robert Murphy	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Bob McCann	25	<i>Stockbridge & Upper Don Ward</i> Alison Brelford Philip Wood Richard Crowther
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Sylvia Anginotti Geoff Smith Rob Frost	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Janet Bragg Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond	26	<i>Walkey Ward</i> Ben Curran Nikki Sharpe Neale Gibson
9	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Harry Harpham Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea	18	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Jenny Armstrong Terry Fox Pat Midgley	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> Trevor Bagshaw Alf Meade Adam Hurst
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Qurban Hussain, Helen Mirfin Boukouris, Denise Reaney and Ray Satur.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Bryan Lodge declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item of business number 11 on the Council Summons (concerning City Centre Parking) because he owns a business in the City centre.

Councillor Ben Curran declared a personal interest in item of business number 10 on the Council Summons (concerning Food Banks) because he is a Trustee of Ben's Centre.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that the minutes of the meeting held on 7 November 2012 be approved as a correct record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Petitions

(a) Petition requesting the Government to condemn recent attempts to cause offence to Muslim communities

Council received a petition requesting the Government to condemn recent attempts to cause offence to Muslim communities.

On behalf of the petitioners, Mohammed Ali addressed the Council. He referred to a film, which had been posted on the You Tube website, which caused deliberate offence to people in the Muslim community and he said that such actions had heightened tensions in communities. He stated that, in Sheffield, the Federation of Mosques had worked with the community and South Yorkshire Police toward a collective approach to building a peaceful society. The petition collected signatures from all Mosques in the City and requested the condemnation of the content of the film which had been posted on You Tube. He asked that this be brought to the Government's attention by the Council and local MPs.

Mr Ali requested that the Council send a message to the Federation of Mosques that it would seek changes to the law relating to respect for people's religious beliefs and does not tolerate people making hateful comments concerning a particular religion.

The Council referred the petition to the Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore), who thanked the Federation of Mosques for bringing the petition to Council. Councillor Dore stated that she believed that Council were united in joining the petitioners in their outrage, particularly in relation to the content of the film to which Mr Ali had referred.

Councillor Dore referred to existing laws relating to racial hatred and stated that she was aware that the film makers had been questioned by the authorities. In relation to community cohesion, she stated that Sheffield was privileged to have a Muslim community and she praised the way in which the community worked with the Council and other agencies to ensure that we have a safe City.

Councillor Dore referred to the power of film as a medium to reach a mass audience, but believed that this particular case showed the potentially damaging use of film. She stated that people that incite racial or religious hatred should be treated in a robust manner. The Council would write to all of the responsible Secretaries of State in relation to this matter, including the Secretary of State for Culture, Media and Sport, and will also write to Sheffield MPs.

(b) Petition objecting to the withdrawal of zero fare bus passes for children attending Church schools

The Council received a petition objecting to the withdrawal of zero fare bus passes for children attending church schools.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Jim Conway who referred to anxiety felt by the Catholic community concerning the withdrawal of zero fare bus passes for children attending church schools. The local authority had previously given assurances that free transport would be provided for children attending schools following previous secondary school closures. He stated that this was the basis of trust between the City's elected representatives and the Catholic community.

Free transport for children attending Catholic schools should be provided in line with that provided to pupils attending other schools and he asked why those in the Catholic community should be treated less well. In addition, families on low incomes would be the most disadvantaged by the proposals, especially if the family income was marginally above that which gave entitlement to free school meals. The Equalities Impact Assessment states that there would be adverse impact on some Catholic families in particular.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families (Councillor Jackie Drayton). Councillor Drayton stated that she agreed that the situation was distressing but emphasised that no Councillor wished to discriminate against people of the Catholic faith. The Council had statutory duties in relation to school transport but because of the current financial situation it was having to look at all discretionary provision. She stated that circumstances had changed since the time of the agreement

relating to school closures made in 1976. The Government were making reductions to the Council budget, including a reduction of £6 million from the Early Intervention Grant. The funding reductions were disproportionately affecting places in the north of England.

Councillor Drayton stated that she had read all of the letters and other email correspondence that had been received as part of the consultation and responded to the points that had been raised. She asked if it was possible for schools and the Diocese to come together to consider whether it would be possible to create a hardship fund to help families that are in financial hardship to ensure that their children can continue to attend their school. She added that she valued the work of Catholic schools and the role of people of the Catholic faith in community life and charity projects. It was noted that other faith groups were also alleging that they were being discriminated against in the proposals relating to bus passes. However, the Council needed to look at the budget as a whole.

(c) Petition requesting the restoration of street art on Eyre Sreet

The Council received a petition containing 12 signatures and requesting the restoration of street art on Eyre Street.

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

(d) Petition requesting the acquisition of land adjacent to 43 Westbrook Road, Chapeltown, by Thorncliffe Cricket and Social Club

The Council received a petition containing 5 signatures and requesting the acquisition of land adjacent to 43 Westbrook Road, Chapeltown, by Thorncliffe Cricket and Social Club.

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

(e) Petition requesting the Council not to reverse the ban on Heavy Goods Vehicles (HGVs) on Bocking Lane

The Council received a petition containing 390 signatures requesting the Council not to reverse the ban on HGVs using Bocking Lane.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Stuart Smith. Mr Smith referred to the ban on Heavy Goods Vehicles using Bocking Lane, which was introduced in 2010/11 and the use of Abbey Lane as a preferred route to accommodate HGVs as it was not tree lined and had a comparatively gentle gradient. He was not aware of a change in circumstances which might lead to a reversal of the ban on Bocking Lane. With reference to the school on Abbey Lane, he considered that relatively few HGVs used Abbey Lane during school periods and referred to a survey in September 2011, which showed that there were fewer HGVs using Abbey Lane in 2011 than in 2004. He

stated that petitioners would like to see wider discussion with Derbyshire County Council and reiterated that a reversal of the original HGV ban should not be made on health and safety grounds.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development (Councillor Leigh Bramall). Councillor Bramall stated that he appreciated the situation for residents of Bocking Lane, although it was also recognised that people would have different feelings on this matter, depending on where they lived. It would therefore not be responsible to make a decision on the matter in isolation. Councillor Bramall made reference to a Cabinet Highways Committee in June 2011 at which a petition was received proposing an HGV ban on Abbey Lane. There had been a displacement of vehicles onto Abbey Lane from Bocking Lane, due to the restrictions on Bocking Lane. Road safety, particularly around schools, was a priority for the Council and he was also mindful that there was a primary school on Abbey Lane outside which the road narrowed.

A proposed compromise was put to the Community Assembly to maintain the HGV ban on Bocking Lane between the hours of 7pm and 7am and to remove the ban during the daytime, so as to provide respite for Abbey Lane. Notably, Ward Councillors for residents living on the affected roads had put forward opposing views on the issue, depending on which group of residents they represented. HGV counts taken on Abbey Lane had recorded a significant increase in volumes. The proposed compromise, to be considered at the meeting of the Cabinet Highways Committee on 13 December, was an attempt to recognise the views expressed by residents of both Bocking Lane and Abbey Lane.

(f) Petition opposing cuts to community based Study Support for young people

The Council received a petition containing 685 signatures opposing cuts to community-based study support for young people.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Miriam Yafai, who referred to proposed cuts to the provision of Study Support and making particular mention of the Study Support Consortium in Burngreave. People attending Study Support included those from disadvantage backgrounds and the project offered help to people in raising achievement. Study Support developed vital skills such as English and Maths and English as a second language and was supported by three qualified teachers. Students at University and those in Further Education also attended the project. People who might otherwise be disengaged from education became engaged through the project.

She said that she feared for the future, given rising youth unemployment and increases in university tuition fees and withdrawal of Education Maintenance Allowance; and asked what future there was for younger people? Study Support provided a way for young people to raise their GCSE grades, for example.

The Burngreave project was in discussion with schools with a view to providing services to support learning

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families (Councillor Jackie Drayton). Councillor Drayton stated that she believed Miriam to be a wonderful role model for other young people and that study support schemes such as that in Burngreave do a brilliant job in supporting young people and families across the City. The Council had extended funding from the end of March until July 2013 to ensure activities continued until the end of term. There were statutory duties which the Council was obliged to meet for both younger people, disabled people and older people and, only once these were provided for could the Council then look to provide or commission additional services.

She stated that the Government had introduced the Pupil Premium, which was paid direct to schools, although it was effectively funded from other existing budgets, and amounted to approximately £400 per pupil, for those children eligible for free school meals and would rise to £900 per pupil in 2013. Sir Michael Wilshaw, the Chief Inspector of Schools, had questioned whether this funding had been used directly for the benefit of the most disadvantaged school pupils, and that in the future, it should be used for things like study support. She added that officers were working to broker discussions between schools and study support to help them gain funding in the future. She also stated that funding for study support last year had come from Early Intervention Grant which was being cut by £6.5 million this year and being subsumed into the main Council budget allocation which was also being cut.

(g) Petition requesting the Council to restore the Education Maintenance Allowance for students in Sheffield

The Council received a petition containing 1247 signatures, requesting the Council to restore the Education Maintenance Allowance for students in Sheffield.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Chaz Lockett, who stated that the Government had ceased payment of the Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA) to students aged 16-18 in full time education. For some, the result was that they were forced to discontinue their studies. He stated that the Council was able to help and could do so by using the money in its financial reserves. He felt that young people were growing up in a world where politics meant cuts, broken promises and corruption. He added that people would support local politicians if they stood up to the Government. It was noted that two London boroughs had provided an equivalent to the EMA to young people aged 16 to 19 years.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families (Councillor Jackie Drayton). Councillor Drayton stated that the Council did protest at the Government's decision to cease the Education Maintenance Allowance from 2011. A national bursary of £180

million to help the most vulnerable young people in further education has been introduced in its place. Sheffield had received a portion of this amount, which is distributed to eligible students in the City. However, Councillor Drayton stated that she considered the EMA to be more effective in keeping young people aged 16 to 19 years in education.

With reference to the Council's financial reserves, the Authority had to act responsibly and had allocated some of the reserves to help mitigate the effects of other funding reductions. For instance, the completion of school building schemes which were formerly part of the Building Schools for the Future (BSF) programme. The context for the Council was the funding cuts of £50 million, which it had to make in 2013/14 and the related employee reductions, brought about by nationally led budget cuts to local government.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources (Councillor Bryan Lodge) stated that the Council was required by law to maintain a financial reserve and there were commitments which were allocated, including the payment of employee redundancies and responding to the Government's financial settlement. The Council had to act responsibly and for the benefit of the City.

(h) Petition objecting to the experimental Traffic Regulation Order regarding taxi ranks on Rockingham Street

The Council received a petition containing 95 signatures objecting to the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order regarding taxi ranks on Rockingham Street.

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

(i) Petition objecting to the experimental Traffic Regulation Order regarding taxi ranks on Carver Street

The Council received a petition containing 13 signatures objecting to the Experimental Traffic Regulation Order regarding taxi ranks on Carver Street.

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

(j) Petition requesting the Council to give households with young children priority for ground floor accommodation

The Council received a petition containing 27 signatures requesting the Council to give households with young children priority for ground floor accommodation.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods (Councillor Harry Harpham).

4.2 Public Questions

(a) Public Questions on School Bus Travel and Catchment Areas

(i) Anne Donnelly asked why the Council did not think it was being discriminatory against parents and children on the basis of religion through the withdrawal of free bus passes to those children travelling to and from denominational schools?

(ii) Sally Alleway asked, as she would no longer be able to afford the bus fares to Notre Dame School, should free bus passes be withdrawn. She felt that, in light of the fact that she had failed to receive a guarantee that her two children could secure places at King Ecgbert school, which was their local school, the Council's proposal that all children could be offered a place at their local school was not correct. Could this be confirmed?

(iii) Josephine Cain stated that, two months after submitting her application for a place at Notre Dame school for her daughter, she was advised by the Local Education Authority to look for other schools and, therefore, she had contacted three local schools with a view to visiting them. None of them were keen to show her round. She asked how she was able to make an informed decision on the future education of her daughter, if nobody was interested.

(iv) Josephine Cain referred to the fact that she had previously inspected a catchment area map at the Local Education Authority Offices and asked why the use of the map had been abandoned and further, why had All Saints and Notre Dame secondary schools and primary schools not been advised of the abandonment of the map, misleading parents in applying for places at local schools?

(v) Daniel Lafferty asked, did the Council not think that it was choosing an easy target in cutting funding for transport for catholic schools, particularly when Councillors receive discretionary bus passes?

(vi) Brendan O'Connell stated that he lived on the outskirts of the City and that cutting the free bus passes for faith schools would affect his brother's means of transport to school as well as costing his parents much more. He asked how his parents were expected to manage to pay these costs and was not this discrimination against those who wished to pursue education in a faith school?

(vii) Edward Sides referred to the fact that students from Abbeydale Grange School had received priority consideration over other students in applying for schools that were deemed to be full. He asked whether pupils in the area of the former Abbeydale Grange School, who had selected Notre Dame School, would be able to re-select which school they would like to attend and, if it is not their local school, would they be awarded free transport?

(viii) Katrina Love asked why the Council had decided to cut the zero fare? She was a student at Notre Dame and had two siblings who also attended there and should the free bus pass be taken away, the cost of transport to school for all of them would be unaffordable for her parents, leaving them to

walk over six miles per day. She asked what alternatives the Council had considered for students in her position.

(ix) Sue Markham stated that she believed all 84 Councillors received a free bus pass amounting to approximately £480 per annum for each Councillor and she asked whether the Council would like to comment on this in light of the lack of any consultation on the matter.

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families (Councillor Jackie Drayton) responded that the law stated that local authorities had a duty to have regard to parents' religious belief based on preference. In particular, Article 2 of the European Convention on Human Rights states that no person shall be denied the right to education and that the state shall respect the rights of parents to ensure that education and teaching conforms to their own religious convictions. However, this did not confirm the right to study at a specific school. Free bus passes were provided for children attending Catholic schools under the Council's discretionary powers so the withdrawal of such passes was not unfair. Moreover, the Council could not provide a guarantee of a specific school place.

Councillor Drayton added in reference to the question from Mrs Cain, if she would care to leave details of the schools which had shown a lack of interest in her daughter's application for a place, she would contact them to ask them show her round the school. The alleged attitude of the three schools in showing a lack of interest was totally unacceptable.

In terms of helping young people in the Abbeydale area, to find an alternative local school to a faith school, she recognised that when Abbeydale Grange was closed down, assistance was provided to help young people to find a suitable alternative school. She would ask officers to examine if this sort of assistance could be provided in circumstances where young people were having difficulties in accessing their preferred faith school.

With regard to the catchment area map, she stated that, according to officers, none of the Catholic primary schools were catchment schools and All Saints and Notre Dame schools did not have a defined geographical area for Admissions purposes. They operated an open Admissions policy based upon faith or feeder schools rather than on an address, which was the case for those schools which operated a catchment school policy.

Councillor Drayton stated that, as far as she was concerned, there were no easy targets in terms savings and the Council was contemplating some difficult decisions and scrutinising every penny it spent. With regard to travelling from the outskirts of the City, Councillor Drayton stated that there had been some misinformation and scaremongering. The issue concerning discounted travel for children attending denominational schools did not impact in any way on school buses which would still operate. For example, the school bus from Stocksbridge would still operate to All Saints and Notre Dame schools. The current proposals purely dealt with discounted bus passes. She had written to Bishop John, Sheffield Diocese of Hallam, suggesting that all

those families who were eligible should be encouraged to take advantage of free school meals as well as a pass for bus travel.

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore) added that the assertion that all 84 Members of the City Council received free bus passes was not true and that information on Councillors' allowances was available on the Council's web site. Allowances included a Basic Allowance, Special Responsibility Allowance and travel expenses and the payment of these had also been part of the Council's budget savings over the past two years and Members would continue to look for further savings with regards the budget for elected Members.

(b) Public questions relating to Heavy Goods Vehicle (HGV) ban on Bocking Lane

(i) Mr D. Hodgson asked how it was proposed to enforce the HGV ban on Bocking Lane between 7.00 p.m. and 7.00 a.m.

(ii) Mr C. Newton asked why the Council was considering relaxing the ban on HGV lorries on Bocking Lane in light of the noise and pollution that such a decision would create?

(iii) Norma Archdale asked whether the Council would, if it decided to lift the ban, consider installing traffic calming measures such as speed humps, traffic lights, pedestrian crossings etc to reduce the speed of traffic on Bocking Lane.

(iv) Keith Archdale asked Councillors to bear in mind that, in respect to concerns about HGVs travelling along Abbey Lane outside the school, schools opened 5 days per week and 38 weeks per year and were affected approximately 20 minutes in the morning and 20 minutes in the afternoon; whereas, the effects of the removal of the HGV ban on Bocking Lane would be felt 24 hours per day, 365 days a year.

(v) Heather Parys asked why the Council was trying to re-route HGVs from a class "B" road to Bocking Lane, which was a previously unclassified road, recently reclassified as a "C" road? She commented that the traffic flow had been recorded as 20, 700 vehicles in a 12 hour period (the highest for a "C" road) whereas, Abbey Lane experienced a quarter of this. She asked should not the Council be looking to reduce the traffic on Bocking Lane, not adding to it.

Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development (Councillor Leigh Bramall) responded that there were a number of roads experiencing high levels of congestion but, following investigation of routes used by HGVs across the City, Council officers had come to the conclusion that the compromise of allowing HGVs to use Bocking Lane during the daytime and banning them during the evening and overnight, was the only available compromise.

Councillor Bramall hoped that leaving the ban in place on Bocking Lane

between 7.00 p.m. and 7.00 a.m. would provide some respite for residents. He added that there was no perfect solution to this problem and it would be difficult to satisfy all residents in the area. With respect to traffic calming, if the Cabinet Highways Committee agreed, further improvements could be considered but, in the meantime officers would monitor traffic, including HGVs and would take the necessary action to reduce the speed of traffic if necessary.

Councillor Bramall indicated that some residents were asking why a review of the HGV ban on Bocking lane was being carried out so soon, after implementation. The Council had to take a holistic view of the movement of traffic around the City. Officers had monitored the effects of the ban across the City since its introduction and an external piece of work had been carried out to identify a solution to the problems of HGV traffic in the City and around the Bocking Lane and Abbey Lane area and this had revealed that there was no solution that met the requirements of the both the residents of Abbey Lane and Bocking Lane.

The Council did not wish to increase noise and pollution and was actively seeking to reduce the problem across the City. However, the Council had taken account of the needs of the school on Abbey Lane and residents on Abbey Lane as well as those residents on Bocking Lane and Councillor Bramall stressed there was no perfect solution. He added that any ban on HGV traffic was enforced by the South Yorkshire Police with the Council's support, but not on a permanent basis. However, he had observed that the current ban, whilst not well enforced, had led to a reduction of traffic on Bocking Lane.

Councillor Bramall stated that he was not aware of when the traffic counts referred to had been undertaken. However, a survey of traffic since the ban on Bocking Lane had been introduced had shown a significant increase in HGV traffic on Abbey Lane and a consequent reduction on Bocking Lane. The Council was trying to strike a balance between keeping children attending Abbey Lane School safe, whilst retaining periodic respite from HGV traffic for both residents of Bocking Lane and Abbey Lane.

(b) Public Questions relating to Energy and Coal Extraction – Former Hesley Wood tip

(i) Jean Howe referred to the petition submitted to the Council at its meeting in November, opposing proposals requesting the granting of planning permission for the extraction of coal on the site of the former Hesley Wood tip and asked what was the Council's policy regarding reducing the carbon footprint and how did the policy fit with the extraction of coal?

(ii) Geoff Driver suggested that, if large amounts of coal imported into Immingham and transported by (more environmentally friendly) rail to power stations, this could save residents of Chapelton and Ecclesfield from the increased risk of air pollution and flood as well as eliminating the requirement for a large amount of HGV traffic transporting coal extracted from the former

Hesley Wood tip.

(iii) Ian Newton-Smith stated that Eggborough and Drax power stations were committed to converting to Biomass by 2017, so was it appropriate to extract coal and, in particular, participate in coal cleaning operations in Sheffield with its inherent health and pollution problems and increased risk of flooding in a residential area which is already prone to flooding?

(iv) Maureen Edwards referred to the many coal spoil heaps around the City and to the activities of RecyCoal that is extracting coal from such spoil heaps. She asked did the Council consider this activity as a form of extreme energy extraction and, if so, why?

(v) Mick Harrison asked did the Council think it was a good idea to cut down thousands of trees in order to extract coal in an Air Quality area such as Chapeltown?

Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene (Councillor Jack Scott) agreed that there needed to be a move away from coal to the exploration of other sources of energy. He believed that Sheffield was well placed in this respect and the City Council could work with the University to find new low carbon solutions. He understood the points that had been made in relation to the extraction of coal and stated that climate change was the biggest challenge faced by society and people who were poor were most likely to be adversely affected by the consequences of climate change.

In relation to the Drax Power Station, Councillor Scott acknowledged that we should reduce the demand for coal. He had received information on the views of residents in Chapeltown regarding this issue. However, there was a planning application process to follow in this case and it was right that the Planning Committee approached the planning application in an unbiased manner and form a view. He had not spoken to the developer of the scheme and, therefore, he was reluctant to give a view on the scheme as he had only heard one side of the argument. He was, however, working with local Councillors to ensure that the West and North Planning and Highways Committee took account of the views of local people.

Councillor Scott stated that he did not consider the coal extraction scheme proposed on the site of the former Hesley Wood tip to be a form of "extreme energy", which refers to the extraction of fossil fuels, through highly intensive means, such as tar sand or deep sea water mining.

He stated that a solution would be sought which suited Sheffield's interests. The points raised about the demolition of trees, maintenance of air quality and flooding were all matters for the Planning and Highways Committee to take a view on. The Committee would seek strong assurances from the developer on this type of issue. Councillor Scott added that he would be happy to visit the area with local Councillors to discuss local concerns with residents.

(c) Public Questions relating to Study Support

(i) Lisa Swift (on behalf of Rukhsana Shabene) commented that study support was a valuable provision and needed to continue. She stated that her child had benefitted from it and she asked where would children go, if such support ceased.

(ii) Sam Morecroft suggested that the Council had £168 million in its Reserves. He asked would the Council use some of these Reserves to fund the payment of Education Maintenance Allowance (EMA). If it was not prepared to do this, what would this money be used for?

(iii) Arran Benjamin asked what the Council were doing to help support young people to access decent education and employment?

(iv) Richard Brown referred to cuts in education for young people and particularly cuts in adult education and the EMA, as well as the introduction of tuition fees for those over the age of 25, wishing to take Level 3 qualifications, making it harder for unemployed people to re-train. He asked what the Council was going to do for the increasing number of young people who were being affected by funding reductions. He referred to his own experience of attending the Northern College and the risk to the College posed by the introduction of tuition fees for people aged over 25. He asked what was the Council going to do for young people in Sheffield.

(v) Lisa Swift (on behalf of Abtisam Mohammed) referred to the closure of Children's Centres in deprived areas of the City and asked how it was proposed to support parents to get back into work?

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources (Councillor Bryan Lodge) responded that it was too simplistic to suggest that the Council's Reserves be used in the way suggested. The Council had approximately £10.8 million of unallocated financial reserve to cover risks throughout the year. The unearmarked reserve fund represented about 2.3% of the Council's budget and that was considered reasonable. It would be irresponsible to operate without a reserve in place.

Councillor Lodge added that both the current and previous Administrations had also earmarked other elements of the Council's reserve to meet known liabilities. These were used to support such programmes as the Highways Private Finance Initiative (PFI), Building Schools for the Future and Decent Homes and also redundancy payments to those staff leaving the Council. He stated that the level of reserves was a prudent figure based upon a calculation of the risks to which the Council may be exposed in the coming year.

He found a questioner's reference to the current Administration as "willing executioners" offensive and stated that no Councillor had become a Councillor to make cuts. He added that the City's 84 Councillors had been duly elected through the democratic process and invited people to stand for election if they so wished, and to refrain from meaningless sound bites and the heckling of Councillors as just witnessed.

Councillor Jackie Drayton (Cabinet member for Children, Young People and Families) stated that Study Support was funded by the Early Intervention Grant from the Government. This grant also funded early years provision, youth activities and support for families of children with disabilities and had been cut by £6.8 million. Government support had now been transferred directly to schools, through the Pupil Premium and funding had been given for Free Early Learning for 2 year olds and particular groups of 3 and 4 year olds. However, she could not say that cuts in early years funding would not affect families in Sheffield.

Councillor Drayton added that, in answer to the assertion made that there would be no difference if the Council had a Conservative Administration rather than a Labour Administration, this was wrong. According to national evidence, if you were a Conservative-led Council, you received more funding from central Government. She contended that Northern cities were facing disproportionate cuts to their budgets than those in the South.

In terms of improving access to decent education and supporting young people into employment, the Council's policy was to make sure every school was a great school and this had been evidenced by the biggest improvements in education being made in the most disadvantaged areas. The Council had also ensured that support was provided to establish an apprenticeship scheme, which had provided 200 Apprenticeships for young people to provide them with skills and training.

Councillor Drayton said that the Northern College had been established by the four South Yorkshire Metropolitan District Councils to provide educational opportunities for working class people. However, adult education had, like many other services, been the subject of Government cuts and the Council would have to review what it could do to support adult education, if that was possible.

(d) Public Question on Councillor Attendance at Sheffield Homes Housing Forums

Mick Daniels asked whether Councillors were aware that, when they were elected, they had the opportunity of attending Sheffield Homes Housing Forums. In asking his questions, Mr Daniels commented that the attendance of Councillors at the Forums had declined and he questioned why this had happened.

Councillor Harry Harpham (Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods) responded that he could not speak for every Councillor, but he attended such meetings. However, he felt he could say that all Councillors were dedicated to serving the people they represented but they might be unable to attend every meeting to which they were invited. Following the transfer of responsibility for Council housing back to the Council, there was a need for discussion about how tenants and Councillors could work together better to create the best housing service in the country. Within these discussions, consideration should

be given to the need to find more innovative ways of delivering services across the City through Community Assemblies or Housing Forums.

(e) Public Question concerning the Police and Crime Commissioner.

Mr Nigel Slack commented that the recent Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC) elections demonstrated the Government's detachment from the real lives of the majority of the population. He stated that we now have a PCC that was elected by less than 1 in 13 of the electorate (7.5%) and yet will influence the way the Police operate for over 1.3 million citizens throughout South Yorkshire.

He stated that the statistics suggest that, of the 60 Labour Members in the chamber, only 5 voted for the successful candidate. It would, therefore, be somewhat hypocritical for these same members to vote to congratulate the Labour candidate on his totally undemocratic election. The new PCC will operate with no mandate for his decisions, and was already failing to live up to his manifesto promises.

Mr Slack referred to the official PCC site for South Yorkshire and what he termed 'political grandstanding', including a story of the PCC hitting the ground running. However, the site's 'transparency' tab states that in three weeks, the PCC has apparently had no meetings, attended no events and appears to have none planned for the foreseeable future.

Mr Slack asked (i) could the Council tell him who will represent Sheffield on the PCC's Scrutiny Panel and from which political parties they will come; (ii) will the Panel also remind him that failure to make this post work effectively will mean further erosion of the low esteem in which all politicians are currently held and be detrimental to the safety of the public; and (iii) will the Panel immediately admonish the PCC for failing to match up to his election promises?

Councillor Julie Dore (The Leader of the Council) responded that she might have to disagree with Mr Slack's definition of "democracy" as the PCC for South Yorkshire had been democratically elected and, therefore, had a mandate. She referred Mr Slack to a motion to be considered later in the meeting which concerned the recent outcome of the PCC elections and not supporting the system of PCCs which had been imposed by the Government.

She added that the Council's representatives on the Scrutiny Panel comprised Councillors Harry Harpham, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Talib Hussain and Sylvia Anginotti together with Councillors from the other South Yorkshire Local Authorities.

In terms of the Scrutiny Panel 'admonishing' the PCC, Councillor Dore indicated them that she could not speak for the Panel Members. However, although she was prepared to take criticism, Mr Slack's comments and questions, including those made below concerning outsourcing were unhelpful for local democracy and raising the level of esteem that local

politicians were held in.

(f) Public Question on Review of Outsourcing policies.

Nigel Slack asked, in light of Councillor Penny Baker's motion later in this meeting, will the Council look again at the suggestion that the Council needs to undertake a root and branch review of its policies with respect to outsourcing?

In asking his question, Mr Slack commented that the fact that the Council has been rated as one of the best for transparency does not mean that they are very good at it. It simply means they are the best of a bad bunch. He stated that the Localism Act appeared to be designed to give all the responsibilities to local Government without the resources to carry them out effectively.

He further commented that the Council was lucky enough to have a professional commercial management department, but they still need and should be given a similarly well developed and considered range of policies to guide their operations. He felt a review is necessary and would be beneficial in protecting the Council and its staff from accusations of incompetence.

Councillor Bryan Lodge (Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources) responded that he was pleased Mr Slack had recognised the professionalism of the Council's commercial department. However, he did not agree with Mr Slack's comment that the Council was best of a 'bad bunch' as regards transparency. He stated that Sheffield was held in high regard and was used as a good example to other local authorities. He agreed that the Localism Act sought to increase local authority responsibilities without the adequate funding and stated that the Chancellor's Autumn Statement would require a further 1% cut in local authority budgets next year.

However, Councillor Lodge disagreed with Mr Slack, that there should be a root and branch review and stood by what he had said previously that the Council had strong policies and procedures in place on procurement and contracting and that officers were working within them and, therefore, it would not be good value for money to carry out a review.

(Note: Mr Slack indicated the withdrawal of his third question on the Political and Constitutional Reform Committee, indicating that he would pursue the matter directly with the appropriate Member/s)

(g) Public questions concerning the Hillsborough Disaster, Information, future of Council Housing Ballot, Freedom of Speech and Fostering

Martin Brighton asked the following questions and responses were provided by Members of the Cabinet as follows:

(i) The Hillsborough Disaster

Recent publicity exposed 23 years of alleged cover-up and silence by the

police over the Hillsborough Disaster. There appears to be no mirror investigation into the leading local Council elected members, senior officers, or Police Authority members of the time. If there has been such an investigation, where can we see the results, and if not, why not?

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore) responded that the Hillsborough Disaster was the subject of a further Inquiry and the Council would co-operate fully with that Inquiry and further requests for evidence.

(ii) Supply of Information

Would all elected Members please consider the wisdom of racking up enormous costs to the ratepayer of the Council's repeated futile attempts at keeping secret the information that, if provided fully at the time of asking, would cost virtually nothing to provide?

The Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods (Councillor Harry Harpham) responded that legal advice had informed the decision taken and he believed that it had been correct to refuse the Freedom of Information request, although the Information Commissioner had disagreed.

(iii) Future of Council Housing Ballot

We have seen that tenants were denied both sides of an argument and even then only given partial information before being asked to come to a decision about Council housing. Regardless of the outcome of the Council's ongoing legal action to prevent disclosure of information to tenants will all Members please consider the wisdom of voluntarily striking out the tenant ballot result before being forced to do so?

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore) responded that the tenants' ballot had been supported by a well organised tenant consultation process, providing opportunities for balancing the arguments. The ballot and ensuing decision had been recognised by the Government as a local matter and they had indicated that they would not intervene. She added that the Council had complied with the Government's guidance on consultation and that the ballot figures were robust and tenants had made their views known loud and clear.

(iv) Freedom of Speech

Many here today will be aware of the paraphrased quote:
"I may not agree with what you say but I will defend to the death your right to say it." What is the consensus view of this chamber on this issue?

The Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore) responded that she believed in freedom of speech and she referred to the recent Leveson Inquiry into the role of the press and the police in alleged phone-hacking and that she would await with interest the impact of the Inquiry's recommendations on areas such as Freedom of Speech.

The Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods (Councillor Harry Harpham) added that he believed that limits on free speech were, sometimes, necessary and that he would not defend to the death the right to say anything in any arena and to anybody.

(v) Fostering case in Rotherham

How will this Council demonstrate to the decent citizens of Sheffield that what happened in Rotherham over the political interference with fostering can never happen here?

The Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families (Councillor Jackie Drayton) responded that she did not know the details of the Rotherham case so couldn't comment on it but believed strongly that the young people coming into local authority care were very vulnerable and the Local Authority had a duty to safeguard them. She stated that they should in no way be used in political way and she stated that the matter Mr Brighton referred to would never happen in Sheffield.

Councillor Julie Dore added that the matter referred to in Mr Brighton's question was a matter of speculation and not fact. She had been a Member of the Fostering Panel in Sheffield for several years and the Panel was bound by the strictest confidentiality.

(Note: The Chief Executive advised the Council that the alleged 'political interference' referred to in Mr Brighton's question was, at this point in time, speculation and not established fact.)

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

5.1 Urgent Business

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

5.2 Questions

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

5.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

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

6. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

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

Planning Policy Advisory Group - Councillors Leigh Bramall and Chris Rosling-Josephs to fill vacancies; and

(b) approval be given to the appointment of representatives to serve on other bodies as follows:-

Mental Health Partnership Board - Councillor Clive Skelton to replace Councillor David Barker.

Southey/Owlerton Area Regeneration Board - Councillor Adam Hurst to replace Councillor Leigh Bramall.

7. GAMBLING ACT 2005 - STATEMENT OF PRINCIPLES (POLICY)

RESOLVED: That on the Motion of Councillor Isobel Bowler, seconded by Councillor Steven Wilson, and as recommended by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 21st November, 2012, the Statement of Principles (Policy) to be published under the Gambling Act 2005, as detailed in the report now submitted, be approved.

8. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PENNY BAKER

THE MANAGEMENT OF COUNCIL HOUSING

It was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Bob McCann, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the vote of tenants on the Future of Council Housing, which showed overwhelming support to return the management of Council housing to the Council;
- (b) reaffirms that the previous Administration had no preferred option for the management of Council housing and was dedicated to putting tenants in control of their future;
- (c) notes the ruling of the Information Commissioner that documents relating to the change, specifically the Project Business Case, should have been released when requested;

- (d) notes the report in The Sheffield Star on 16th November, 2012, which accused the Council of trying to “suppress publication of the report”, claimed the Council has “very serious questions” to answer, and stated that “

“There were legitimate concerns [the Council] should have put before the tenants in an open and honest way – rather than to have tried to sweep it under the carpet and resist making it public”;

- (e) believes the current Administration, and in particular the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, misled tenants by failing to provide them with fair, impartial and balanced information;
- (f) is disappointed that it appears that the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods did not trust the tenants of this City to make an informed judgement and regrets that, as a result of his Administration’s reckless actions, the vote may now be open to legal challenge;
- (g) feels that the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods has made a mockery of the Leader of the Council’s pledge that her Administration would be open and transparent; and
- (h) believes that the seriousness of these failings warrants an independent investigation and recommends that one is instigated without delay.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Harry Harpham, seconded by Councillor Tony Damms, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (h) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (j) as follows:-

- (b) remembers that the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods was fully committed to listening to the result of the ballot and stated that the most important views were those of tenants;
- (c) believes that information provided throughout the consultation process was thoroughly fair, impartial and balanced, which was demonstrated through the literature produced and events held where tenants were given information on both an Arms Length Management Organisation and an in-house model;
- (d) notes that the consultation exercise and information supplied through the process was assessed against Government guidance and complied with this guidance;
- (e) notes that the information referred to in media reports was not included in the consultation as it was created at the start of the process and refers to proposals the Council is no longer working towards;
- (f) accepts that, as this information is now out of date and does not relate to the proposal taken to tenants, the document was not released for

reasons of good intention and was part of an attempt to ensure that tenants were given accurate information based on realistic, deliverable proposals instead of supplying information about proposals that were not being considered;

- (g) regrets that the previous Administration demonstrated no leadership or vision for the future of Council housing and believes that the reason they remained silent on the issue for so long was to cover up what this Council believes was their secret preferred option of stock transfer, which they consistently refused to rule out despite overwhelming opposition amongst Sheffield tenants;
- (h) remembers the previous Administration's shocking and incompetent mismanagement of Council housing which included fiascos such as the Sheffield Homes Board Game and the Decent Homes scandal which caused outrage amongst tenants;
- (i) believes that the main opposition group stand for no values except for merciless political opportunism and are merely seeking to exploit this issue for political gain without any genuine interests in the future of Council housing or the welfare of tenants; and
- (j) welcomes that the present Administration will continue to stand up for Sheffield tenants and are getting on with the job of transferring housing management to the Council, which will result in a better service through joining up with other Council services, providing greater democratic accountability, and making savings to management and back office costs, building on the housing service that Sheffield Homes has provided over the last eight years to provide a service that works even more effectively, in line with what our tenants and staff have told us they want.

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

After a right of reply from Councillor Penny Baker, the original Motion, as amended, was put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the vote of tenants on the Future of Council Housing, which showed overwhelming support to return the management of Council housing to the Council;
- (b) remembers that the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods was fully committed to listening to the result of the ballot and stated that the most important views were those of tenants;
- (c) believes that information provided throughout the consultation process was thoroughly fair, impartial and balanced, which was demonstrated through the literature produced and events held where tenants were

- given information on both an Arms Length Management Organisation and an in-house model;
- (d) notes that the consultation exercise and information supplied through the process was assessed against Government guidance and complied with this guidance;
 - (e) notes that the information referred to in media reports was not included in the consultation as it was created at the start of the process and refers to proposals the Council is no longer working towards;
 - (f) accepts that, as this information is now out of date and does not relate to the proposal taken to tenants, the document was not released for reasons of good intention and was part of an attempt to ensure that tenants were given accurate information based on realistic, deliverable proposals instead of supplying information about proposals that were not being considered;
 - (g) regrets that the previous Administration demonstrated no leadership or vision for the future of Council housing and believes that the reason they remained silent on the issue for so long was to cover up what this Council believes was their secret preferred option of stock transfer, which they consistently refused to rule out despite overwhelming opposition amongst Sheffield tenants;
 - (h) remembers the previous Administration's shocking and incompetent mismanagement of Council housing which included fiascos such as the Sheffield Homes Board Game and the Decent Homes scandal which caused outrage amongst tenants;
 - (i) believes that the main opposition group stand for no values except for merciless political opportunism and are merely seeking to exploit this issue for political gain without any genuine interests in the future of Council housing or the welfare of tenants; and
 - (j) welcomes that the present Administration will continue to stand up for Sheffield tenants and are getting on with the job of transferring housing management to the Council, which will result in a better service through joining up with other Council services, providing greater democratic accountability, and making savings to management and back office costs, building on the housing service that Sheffield Homes has provided over the last eight years to provide a service that works even more effectively, in line with what our tenants and staff have told us they want.

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Keith Hill, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Janice Sidebottom, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor

Bagshaw voted for Paragraph (a) and against all of the remaining Paragraphs of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL

DEVELOPING THE LOCAL ECONOMY

It was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Bob Johnson, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that developing the local economy and bringing the jobs, industries and businesses of the future to our area is a central challenge facing Sheffield and fully supports, advocates and endorses the key priority of the present Administration of being a business friendly Council with a focus on jobs;
- (b) supports the present Administration's ambition for Sheffield to be the most business friendly city in the UK, through supporting businesses to succeed in Sheffield, offering support to help start and grow businesses and taking care of businesses using Council services;
- (c) notes that the present Administration and key members of the business community have worked hard to developed constructive and productive relationships and believes that this partnership working has never been stronger, something key to supporting job creation and business development in the City;
- (d) further welcomes that one of the first actions of the present Administration was to hold a business summit to listen to the views and asks of the business community and notes that the Council now holds three business summits every year;
- (e) welcomes the introduction of other measures to engage with the business community including a business visits programme, aimed at sharing information about the Council and business and to listen to what the Council can do better to support business;
- (f) notes that Sheffield is primarily a small and medium sized enterprise economy, with 97% of the business base employing fewer than 50 employees and to develop the local economy it is essential to help businesses grow, and help new businesses to start up, in addition to ensuring established businesses are sustained;
- (g) welcomes the focus of the present Administration on skills as key to supporting business and creating jobs in the City, noting the importance of providing the right skills to meet business needs and to support growth and provide a better future for Sheffield's people;

- (h) further welcomes work with local businesses to create employment opportunities for young people and wholeheartedly supports the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme where the Council has worked with many small businesses offering a subsidy to get young people into employment alongside the opportunity to study for a Level 2 qualification;
- (i) remembers this is in stark contrast to the previous Administration who's Leader broke a promise to commit £1 million of Council resources to support the previous Government's Future Jobs Fund;
- (j) is proud that the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme pioneered the City Deal for skills which adopts the model used in the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme to create 4,000 apprenticeships in small and medium sized enterprises by 2016 and welcomes that the vision of the present Administration is responsible for this;
- (k) further welcomes the present Administration's Keep Sheffield Working Fund which supports projects facilitating job creation such as the recently announced export scheme, helping Sheffield business expand into international markets and welcomes the collaboration between the Council, Sheffield Chamber of Commerce, South Yorkshire International Trade Forum and UK Trade and Investment in supporting the project;
- (l) welcomes the commitment of the present Administration to the regeneration of the City Centre and supports their efforts to reinvigorate the Sevenstone development, which had been held back under the previous Administration and by the present Government's abysmal economic mismanagement;
- (m) regrets that the development was hindered by this present Government, of which the Member of Parliament for Sheffield Hallam is Deputy Prime Minister, whose lack of commitment to the development was demonstrated through their decision to cut £12 million of support to the development as one of their first actions in Government and believes that actions speak louder than the Deputy Prime Minister's empty words;
- (n) recalls with regret that the previous Administration completely failed to stand up for Sheffield when this decision was taken at the same time the Secretary of State for Business Innovation and Skills cancelled the £80 million loan for Sheffield Forgemasters and regrets that the main opposition group continue to put party interests before the City;
- (o) regrets that this Government's short sighted economic approach was again demonstrated recently through their refusal to invest in proposals for a 650MW "clean coal" power station at Hatfield Colliery, near Doncaster, with public money and recalls that the scheme had

previously been picked out by the EU as the most advanced Carbon, Capture and Storage project in Europe, putting it in pole position for a grant of around £250m from Brussels;

- (p) supports the development of the Moor Market and welcomes that work on the market is currently progressing well and welcomes the recent positive reports about the wider development of The Moor in the local media;
- (q) further supports the decision of the present Administration to support local market traders through reversing the shocking decision of the previous Administration to remove the subsidy on the rents for market traders, leading to a huge increase in rents for traders and recalls comments from traders that this move could have left Sheffield without any market at all;
- (r) further supports other measures supporting City Centre traders such as the introduction of a Shopper Rate for car parking over the Christmas period and the Chapel Walk project which aims to give start up businesses support to become stand alone High Street retailers;
- (s) further supports the actions taken by the present Administration to clamp down on street trading in the City Centre which threatens many businesses and is extremely concerned about reports that the Liberal Democrat MP, Jo Swinson, is advocating giving 'pedlars' a new freedom to trade and believes that this has the potential to sabotage the work undertaken by the present Administration to eradicate this practice and believes that this policy would be anti-business;
- (t) notes the consultation on the economic growth strategy for Sheffield and welcomes the vision articulated for Sheffield's economy which includes a dynamic private sector, world class, high technology sectors, a skilled and productive workforce, an unrivalled quality of place, an inclusive economy and an enhanced reputation; and
- (u) resolves to continue to work to support the local economy and to develop the economic strategy working with local businesses to bring much needed jobs and business growth to the City.

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

1. the deletion of paragraphs (c) to (f) and (h) to (u);
2. the re-lettering of paragraph (g) as a new paragraph (h);
3. the addition of the new paragraphs (c) to (g) and (i) to (p) as follows:-
 - (c) however, regrets that yet again the actions of the current Administration do not live up to their rhetoric;

- (d) recalls that when the majority group were last in control of the Council, Sheffield was labelled the worst place to do business in South Yorkshire;
- (e) notes that, even since adopting their business-friendly mantra, the current Administration have rejected a number of policies that would have supported local businesses, including:
 - (i) creating a Sheffield Investment Fund to help local business access finance;
 - (ii) bringing forward a Cabinet report on meeting the Sheffield Chamber of Commerce three point manifesto;
 - (iii) repeating the previous Administration's free parking scheme in district and local centres;
 - (iv) providing additional parking capacity for Millhouses traders over the Christmas period; and
 - (v) containing economic impacts of decisions in all future Cabinet reports;
- (f) contrasts this record with that of the previous Administration, who introduced the following policies:
 - (i) created First Point for Business;
 - (ii) reformed the Council's Planning Department and Transport & Highways Department to make them more responsive to local businesses;
 - (iii) initiated Showcase Sheffield and Buy Local policies;
 - (iv) funded a £250,000 Economic Fighting Fund and a BiG initiative, which helped people to set up in business and supported sustainable business growth;
 - (v) organised "Access to Finance" summits;
 - (vi) supported schemes to encourage footfall in the city-centre such as the Food Festival, Tramlines, a Christmas ice-rink and the Wheel of Sheffield; and
 - (vii) helped to develop a Local Enterprise Partnership for Sheffield, described as one of the strongest bids in the country;
- (g) believes these actions, among many others, helped to transform

Sheffield – in the opinion of local businesses – from the worst place to do business in South Yorkshire to the best;

- (i) reiterates that all participants on the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme will receive at least Level 2 training, which will be funded by the Coalition Government, and thanks the Government for this support;
- (j) reminds Members that it was the main opposition group that first suggested doubling the number of young people on the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme;
- (k) is pleased that a radical apprenticeship scheme forms a key pillar of the Government's City Deal with Sheffield and thanks Liberal Democrats in Government, in particular the Deputy Prime Minister, for helping to secure the deal;
- (l) believes the Sheffield City Deal is a radical agreement and the boldest step the Government have taken to truly put the region in the driving seat for economic growth;
- (m) however, for the avoidance of doubt, highlights the following Government measures which have also supported the local economy:
 - (i) £65 million that was recently awarded within Sheffield City Region, as part of the third round of the Government's Regional Growth Fund, following similarly successful bids in the first two rounds;
 - (ii) an enterprise zone for Sheffield City Region, which could produce as many as 12,000 new jobs;
 - (iii) £9.9 million for the construction of Sheffield University Technical College, which will provide the next generation of Sheffields with the skills the City requires;
 - (iv) £1.2 billion to allow Sheffield's Streets Ahead project to proceed;
 - (v) millions of pounds invested in Sheffield's buses, trams, trains and highways;
 - (vi) millions of pounds to support construction and infrastructure through the New Homes Bonus and the Growing Places Fund; and
 - (vii) over £100,000 through the High Street Innovation Fund, which will fund the Administration's Chapel Walk project.

- (n) furthermore, welcomes the Tax Increment Financing that the Government has made available that should enable the Sevenstones development to progress and hopes the current Administration will ensure work is finally started on the project;
- (o) believes the current Administration continue to use our great city as a political battering ram against the Government, instead of supporting jobs and the local economy; and
- (p) recommends the current Administration adopt a mature and constructive relationship with the Government to ensure Sheffielders get the best possible deal.

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

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

1. the insertion of a new paragraph (g) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (g) to (k) as new paragraphs (h) to (l):-
 - (g) notes however that a large proportion of the Council's contracted out services are with a handful of multinational companies whose profits leave the City rather than being reinvested in the local economy;
2. the deletion of original paragraphs (l) and (m) and the addition of a new paragraph (m) as follows:-
 - (m) believes it is time to rethink the future of the city centre and to look away from multinational shopping chains and towards the needs of local shops and businesses, a wider range of entertainment and greater resilience in terms of community cohesion, energy supply and flooding;
3. the deletion of original paragraph (o) and the addition of a new paragraph (o) as follows:-
 - (o) will work to attract all possible funding to the City for projects which increase energy efficiency, sustainability and self sufficiency and which create jobs in the green economy.

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

After a right of reply from Councillor Leigh Bramall, the original Motion was put to the vote and carried, as follows:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that developing the local economy and bringing the jobs,

industries and businesses of the future to our area is a central challenge facing Sheffield and fully supports, advocates and endorses the key priority of the present Administration of being a business friendly Council with a focus on jobs;

- (b) supports the present Administration's ambition for Sheffield to be the most business friendly city in the UK, through supporting businesses to succeed in Sheffield, offering support to help start and grow businesses and taking care of businesses using Council services;
- (c) notes that the present Administration and key members of the business community have worked hard to develop constructive and productive relationships and believes that this partnership working has never been stronger, something key to supporting job creation and business development in the City;
- (d) further welcomes that one of the first actions of the present Administration was to hold a business summit to listen to the views and asks of the business community and notes that the Council now holds three business summits every year;
- (e) welcomes the introduction of other measures to engage with the business community including a business visits programme, aimed at sharing information about the Council and business and to listen to what the Council can do better to support business;
- (f) notes that Sheffield is primarily a small and medium sized enterprise economy, with 97% of the business base employing fewer than 50 employees and to develop the local economy it is essential to help businesses grow, and help new businesses to start up, in addition to ensuring established businesses are sustained;
- (g) welcomes the focus of the present Administration on skills as key to supporting business and creating jobs in the City, noting the importance of providing the right skills to meet business needs and to support growth and provide a better future for Sheffield's people;
- (h) further welcomes work with local businesses to create employment opportunities for young people and wholeheartedly supports the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme where the Council has worked with many small businesses offering a subsidy to get young people into employment alongside the opportunity to study for a Level 2 qualification;
- (i) remembers this is in stark contrast to the previous Administration who's Leader broke a promise to commit £1 million of Council resources to support the previous Government's Future Jobs Fund;
- (j) is proud that the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme pioneered the City Deal for skills which adopts the model used in the Sheffield

Apprenticeship Programme to create 4,000 apprenticeships in small and medium sized enterprises by 2016 and welcomes that the vision of the present Administration is responsible for this;

- (k) further welcomes the present Administration's Keep Sheffield Working Fund which supports projects facilitating job creation such as the recently announced export scheme, helping Sheffield business expand into international markets and welcomes the collaboration between the Council, Sheffield Chamber of Commerce, South Yorkshire International Trade Forum and UK Trade and Investment in supporting the project;
- (l) welcomes the commitment of the present Administration to the regeneration of the City Centre and supports their efforts to reinvigorate the Sevenstone development, which had been held back under the previous Administration and by the present Government's abysmal economic mismanagement;
- (m) regrets that the development was hindered by this present Government, of which the Member of Parliament for Sheffield Hallam is Deputy Prime Minister, whose lack of commitment to the development was demonstrated through their decision to cut £12 million of support to the development as one of their first actions in Government and believes that actions speak louder than the Deputy Prime Minister's empty words;
- (n) recalls with regret that the previous Administration completely failed to stand up for Sheffield when this decision was taken at the same time the Secretary of State for Business Innovation and Skills cancelled the £80 million loan for Sheffield Forgemasters and regrets that the main opposition group continue to put party interests before the City;
- (o) regrets that this Government's short sighted economic approach was again demonstrated recently through their refusal to invest in proposals for a 650MW "clean coal" power station at Hatfield Colliery, near Doncaster, with public money and recalls that the scheme had previously been picked out by the EU as the most advanced Carbon Capture and Storage project in Europe, putting it in pole position for a grant of around £250m from Brussels;
- (p) supports the development of the Moor Market and welcomes that work on the market is currently progressing well and welcomes the recent positive reports about the wider development of The Moor in the local media;
- (q) further supports the decision of the present Administration to support local market traders through reversing the shocking decision of the previous Administration to remove the subsidy on the rents for market traders, leading to a huge increase in rents for traders and recalls comments from traders that this move could have left Sheffield without

- any market at all;
- (r) further supports other measures supporting City Centre traders such as the introduction of a Shopper Rate for car parking over the Christmas period and the Chapel Walk project which aims to give start up businesses support to become stand alone High Street retailers;
 - (s) further supports the actions taken by the present Administration to clamp down on street trading in the City Centre which threatens many businesses and is extremely concerned about reports that the Liberal Democrat MP, Jo Swinson, is advocating giving 'pedlars' a new freedom to trade and believes that this has the potential to sabotage the work undertaken by the present Administration to eradicate this practice and believes that this policy would be anti-business;
 - (t) notes the consultation on the economic growth strategy for Sheffield and welcomes the vision articulated for Sheffield's economy which includes a dynamic private sector, world class, high technology sectors, a skilled and productive workforce, an unrivalled quality of place, an inclusive economy and an enhanced reputation; and
 - (u) resolves to continue to work to support the local economy and to develop the economic strategy working with local businesses to bring much needed jobs and business growth to the City.

(Note: 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Keith Hill, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Janice Sidebottom, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted for Paragraphs (a) (b) (f) (g) (h) (p) (t) and (u); and against Paragraphs (c), (d), (e), (l), (j), (k), (l), (m), (n), (o), (q), (r) and (s) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) to (h), (j), (k), (p) (q) (s) (t) and (u); against Paragraph (o) and abstained on Paragraphs (i), (l), (m), (n) and (r) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHEILA CONSTANCE

FOOD BANKS

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

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SIMON CLEMENT JONES
CHRISTMAS SHOPPER CAR PARKING CHARGES

It was moved by Councillor Simon Clement Jones, seconded by Councillor Diana Stimely, that this Council:-

- (a) believes that Christmas trading provides an important boost and seasonal cheer to local businesses, particularly retailers in Sheffield's City and District Centres;
- (b) notes that other local authorities, including neighbouring Rotherham and Barnsley and nearby Chesterfield, have announced that they will be offering free parking in the run up to Christmas this year;
- (c) recalls the budget amendment of the main opposition group, which proposed to allocate funds for the provision of free Christmas parking;
- (d) welcomes the decision to cut parking charges but believes if the current Administration were serious about their pledge to be "business-friendly" they would go further and provide a repeat of the previous Administration's free Christmas parking scheme in Sheffield's City and District Centres;
- (e) furthermore questions the decision of Town Hall "scrooges" to deny traders in Millhouses additional parking provision over the Christmas period; and
- (f) calls upon the Administration to reconsider their Christmas parking policy with immediate effect.

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

- (b) is pleased to promote the Christmas shopper parking rate of £3 for 6 hours, which will apply to selected city centre car parks, and is a discount from the current rates of up to £9.30 for 6 hours in city centre car parks;
- (c) notes that the Administration is offering this discounted rate despite devastating Government cuts to the Council's budget, to support businesses over the Christmas period;
- (d) notes that parking changes came into force after the Christmas lights switch on, meaning the rate has been in place from Monday 19th November and will be in place throughout the Christmas period, not

just on Wednesday evenings and Saturdays like the previous Administration's schemes when they were in power;

- (e) is committed to being a business friendly Council and believes it is vital for our City's economy to have a vibrant city centre, which is why the current Administration is taking action to support businesses in the short term through reduced parking charges and projects like Chapel Walk; and
- (f) is also committed to securing the City's long term future through key projects such as the Moor redevelopment and continuing its work to deliver Sevenstone.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes that Christmas trading provides an important boost and seasonal cheer to local businesses, particularly retailers in Sheffield's City and District Centres;
- (b) is pleased to promote the Christmas shopper parking rate of £3 for 6 hours, which will apply to selected city centre car parks, and is a discount from the current rates of up to £9.30 for 6 hours in city centre car parks;
- (c) notes that the Administration is offering this discounted rate despite devastating Government cuts to the Council's budget, to support businesses over the Christmas period;
- (d) notes that parking changes came into force after the Christmas lights switch on, meaning the rate has been in place from Monday 19th November and will be in place throughout the Christmas period, not just on Wednesday evenings and Saturdays like the previous Administration's schemes when they were in power;
- (e) is committed to being a business friendly Council and believes it is vital for our City's economy to have a vibrant city centre, which is why the current Administration is taking action to support businesses in the short term through reduced parking charges and projects like Chapel Walk; and
- (f) is also committed to securing the City's long term future through key projects such as the Moor redevelopment and continuing its work to deliver Sevenstone.

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR HARRY HARPHAM

POLICE AND CRIME COMMISSIONER ELECTIONS

It was moved by Councillor Harry Harpham, seconded by Councillor Ibrar Hussain, that this Council:-

- (a) congratulates the new Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), Shaun Wright, for his election victory last month;
- (b) notes that Commissioner Wright won the election with 51% of the vote;
- (c) believes this Coalition Government policy was a complete shambles;
- (d) regrets that these elections cost £75m and saw the lowest ever turnout in a national poll;
- (e) is not surprised that with all ballots counted, turnout was approximately 14.9%;
- (f) believes the PCC elections were wrongly timed, under publicised and lacked the support to make the elections credible;
- (g) is concerned that the Electoral Commission described it as "a concern for everyone who cares about democracy";
- (h) believes that the cost of the elections could have paid for thousands of frontline police officers;
- (i) is concerned that since the election, two Chief Constables have already resigned from their posts, suggesting the new position does not work well with the existing structure;
- (j) will work with our new PCC to ensure the vision that "people of South Yorkshire can live, work and learn in a place of safety and peace" is a reality;
- (k) supports the Commissioner in his aim to further develop neighbourhood policing, make sure victims and witnesses get a better deal, renew our focus on preventing crime and re-offending and ensure better co-ordination, communication and partnership between agencies; and
- (l) believes that despite the shambles of the PCC Elections, the Council is committed to working together with our elected PCC to ensure the safety of local residents and the effective running of South Yorkshire Police.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Sylvia Anginotti, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be

amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the substitution of the following words therefor:-

- (a) notes that the three largest political parties in Britain went into the 2010 general election, pledging to make local police forces more responsive and accountable;
- (b) maintains that the best way of achieving this would have been through the Liberal Democrat plan for directly-elected police authorities and retains concerns about the consequences of placing too much power in the hands of one individual;
- (c) believes that, at the national level, the Police and Crime Commissioner elections held on November 15th were poorly managed and could have been promoted in a much more effective manner;
- (d) hopes that South Yorkshire's first Police and Crime Commissioner will work hard to protect front-line services, and refuse to use our great city as a pawn in national political spats;
- (e) encourages South Yorkshire's first Police and Crime Commissioner to not waste money that could have been spent on front-line services, appointing a Deputy Commissioner; and
- (f) furthermore, calls upon members on the new Police and Crime Panel to effectively hold the new Commissioner to account and ensure Sheffield gets a fair deal from South Yorkshire police.

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

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

1. the deletion of paragraphs (a) and (b) and the re-lettering of paragraphs (c) to (e) as new paragraphs (a) to (c);
2. the addition of a new paragraph (d) as follows:-
 - (d) notes there was a significant number of spoilt ballot papers;
3. the deletion of original paragraph (f) and the addition of new paragraphs (e) to (i) as follows:-
 - (e) believes the post of Police Commissioner goes against the Government's stated agenda of bringing power closer to local people;
 - (f) believes that it is wrong that the head of local police commissioning should be a single person drawn from a single political party;

- (g) further believes that it is impossible for such a person to fully represent the many diverse communities in South Yorkshire;
 - (h) believes that the post would have been better served by a good independent candidate, but believes the high cost of the deposit and lack of free post mailing prevented such a possibility;
 - (i) believes the public has shown contempt for the position of Police Commissioner and the role should be abolished as soon as possible;
4. the re-lettering of original paragraphs (g) to (l) as new paragraphs (j) to (o);
5. the addition of a new paragraph (p) as follows:-
- (p) resolves to send a copy of this motion to all Sheffield MPs and the Home Secretary.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) congratulates the new Police and Crime Commissioner (PCC), Shaun Wright, for his election victory last month;
- (b) notes that Commissioner Wright won the election with 51% of the vote;
- (c) believes this Coalition Government policy was a complete shambles;
- (d) regrets that these elections cost £75m and saw the lowest ever turnout in a national poll;
- (e) is not surprised that with all ballots counted, turnout was approximately 14.9%;
- (f) believes the PCC elections were wrongly timed, under publicised and lacked the support to make the elections credible;
- (g) is concerned that the Electoral Commission described it as "a concern for everyone who cares about democracy";
- (h) believes that the cost of the elections could have paid for thousands of frontline police officers;
- (i) is concerned that since the election, two Chief Constables have already resigned from their posts, suggesting the new position does not work

- well with the existing structure;
- (j) will work with our new PCC to ensure the vision that “people of South Yorkshire can live, work and learn in a place of safety and peace” is a reality;
 - (k) supports the Commissioner in his aim to further develop neighbourhood policing, make sure victims and witnesses get a better deal, renew our focus on preventing crime and re-offending and ensure better co-ordination, communication and partnership between agencies; and
 - (l) believes that despite the shambles of the PCC Elections, the Council is committed to working together with our elected PCC to ensure the safety of local residents and the effective running of South Yorkshire Police.

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Keith Hill, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Janice Sidebottom, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted for Paragraphs (j) and (l) and against all of the remaining Paragraphs of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR NEALE GIBSON

ISRAELI AND PALESTINIAN CONFLICT

It was moved by Councillor Neale Gibson, seconded by Councillor Jackie Drayton, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the news that a ceasefire between Israel and Hamas has now been agreed;
- (b) hopes this temporary ceasefire can be turned into a durable peace;
- (c) condemns the recent violence which resulted in the death of 158 people including women and children;
- (d) supports calls for a full scale UN diplomatic initiative to end the violence, urging the Secretary General of the United Nations to travel to the region and believes sustained international engagement will be vital in helping to bring this conflict to an end;
- (e) believes this is due to deeper causes of the latest crisis, reflecting the failure over years and decades to achieve a two-state solution;
- (f) is thankful that a full-scale ground invasion was avoided as it would

have been a disaster for the peoples of both Gaza and Israel, risking escalating the death toll and further damaging the hope for peace and security;

- (g) believes that real security for the citizens of Israel and Gaza will only be achieved through the re-invigoration of a serious political dialogue, aimed at establishing a lasting and regional peace; and
- (h) further believes that now the violence has stopped, talking should start so that progress can be made towards agreeing a negotiated two-state solution which will bring the security and peace that the people of the region deserve.

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

- (i) welcomes that the UN has given the Palestinian Authority non-member observer status;
- (j) regrets that this was immediately followed by Israel announcing the establishment of more illegal settlements; and
- (k) congratulates the Sheffield Palestine Solidarity Campaign for organising Palestine Culture Week and for their continuing humanitarian support for the Palestinian people.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the news that a ceasefire between Israel and Hamas has now been agreed;
- (b) hopes this temporary ceasefire can be turned into a durable peace;
- (c) condemns the recent violence which resulted in the death of 158 people including women and children;
- (d) supports calls for a full scale UN diplomatic initiative to end the violence, urging the Secretary General of the United Nations to travel to the region and believes sustained international engagement will be vital in helping to bring this conflict to an end;
- (e) believes this is due to deeper causes of the latest crisis, reflecting the failure over years and decades to achieve a two-state solution;

- (f) is thankful that a full-scale ground invasion was avoided as it would have been a disaster for the peoples of both Gaza and Israel, risking escalating the death toll and further damaging the hope for peace and security;
- (g) believes that real security for the citizens of Israel and Gaza will only be achieved through the re-invigoration of a serious political dialogue, aimed at establishing a lasting and regional peace;
- (h) further believes that now the violence has stopped, talking should start so that progress can be made towards agreeing a negotiated two-state solution which will bring the security and peace that the people of the region deserve;
- (i) welcomes that the UN has given the Palestinian Authority non-member observer status;
- (j) regrets that this was immediately followed by Israel announcing the establishment of more illegal settlements; and
- (k) congratulates the Sheffield Palestine Solidarity Campaign for organising Palestine Culture Week and for their continuing humanitarian support for the Palestinian people.

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JILLIAN CREASY

ENERGY BILL

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

- (a) notes that, despite the urgent need to reduce carbon emissions and expand the green economy, the Energy Bill will not include a decarbonisation target for electricity production for 2030 and relies on gas power stations in the short to medium term;
- (b) recognises that the unreliable supply and high price of imported gas is likely to increase demand for UK shale gas despite the fact that the method of producing it ("fracking") makes it one of the most carbon-hungry and environmentally damaging fossil fuels, akin to tar sands and arctic drilling, which have all been described as "extreme extraction";
- (c) will lead the way in our own region by declaring our opposition to "extreme extraction" methods which involve using disproportionate amounts of energy to extract the fuel, and which destabilise and pollute the ground, water and atmosphere; and
- (d) will instead work to attract all possible funding to the City for projects which increase energy efficiency, sustainability and self sufficiency and

which create jobs in the green economy.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor David Baker, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (d) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (f) as follows:-

- (b) nevertheless welcomes the Bill as a roadmap for the UK's switch to "a low-carbon economy" and believes the Bill is a victory for Liberal Democrats in Government;
- (c) hopes that whoever forms the next Government will legislate for an effective 2030 decarbonisation target in 2016;
- (d) welcomes comments from the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change, Ed Davey MP, that "The right wing of the Tory party are trying to make out shale gas is the answer but I'm afraid the evidence does not bear it out";
- (e) believes at a local level this Council should promote green and sustainable methods of energy production; and
- (f) reaffirms its commitment to become the country's first decentralised energy city, entirely reliant on green energy produced within the City.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Jayne Dunn, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the substitution of the following words therefor:-

- (a) notes that the Energy Bill announced last week shows a complete lack of commitment by the Government to address environmental issues;
- (b) further notes that, despite the urgent need to reduce carbon emissions and expand the green economy, the Energy Bill will not include a decarbonisation target for electricity production for 2030 and relies on gas power stations in the short to medium term;
- (c) regrets that to encourage green energy, the Government is permitting an increase in energy bills of £20 a year reaching over £100 extra a year in 2020, and that this Government is putting the cost of infrastructure projects onto the already squeezed general public while energy companies make millions in profits;
- (d) further regrets that this has come at a time when energy bills have already increased on average by £200 in the last two years;
- (e) believes the energy companies should be investing in carbon reducing

projects;

- (f) is disappointed that this Government refuses to address the issue of reducing our carbon footprint, leaving targets out of the report, and believes this omission of targets is proof that the Liberal Democrats in Government have no influence over their Coalition partners to affect a policy they have previously championed;
- (g) regrets that this Government's short sighted economic approach was again demonstrated recently through their refusal to invest in proposals for a 650MW "clean coal" power station at Hatfield Colliery, near Doncaster, with public money and recalls that the scheme had previously been picked out by the EU as the most advanced Carbon Capture and Storage project in Europe, putting it in pole position for a grant of around £250m from Brussels;
- (h) further notes that this project would have put the Sheffield City Region and the Yorkshire and Humber Energy Intensive Industries on a more secure footing;
- (i) notes that by not setting targets it causes uncertainty for businesses and investors, and that the Emission Performance Standards (EPS) said the target needed to be set realistically to encourage investment;
- (j) is committed to reducing energy demand to reduce carbon emissions and reduce the burdens on family budgets;
- (k) has delivered a city-wide free insulation programme covering over 30,000 homes over the past four years and welcomes that the current Administration is now planning how to deliver even greater benefits by delivering the Green Deal and developing the City's heat networks;
- (l) welcomes the Administration's plans to undertake England's largest energy switch next year, to help Sheffield people get better deals on their energy bills;
- (m) believes it is more important than ever that the country has a competitive energy market that delivers fair prices and works in the public interest, and notes that this is why the Labour Party has called for an overhaul to the energy market and the creation of a tough new watchdog with powers to force energy companies to pass on price cuts;
- (n) urges this Government to hold the energy companies to account instead of making policy that benefits them, noting that this Energy Bill doesn't do enough to tackle the growing energy crisis that is taking hold of the country and that increasing the burden on family budgets is not fair when the energy companies are making millions in profit;
- (o) is committed to working towards the Green Deal to attract green industry to Sheffield and helping to tackle fuel poverty in the City; and

- (p) supports Ian Lavery MP who is bringing forward an Early Day Motion to debate this Bill further.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that the Energy Bill announced last week shows a complete lack of commitment by the Government to address environmental issues;
- (b) further notes that, despite the urgent need to reduce carbon emissions and expand the green economy, the Energy Bill will not include a decarbonisation target for electricity production for 2030 and relies on gas power stations in the short to medium term;
- (c) regrets that to encourage green energy, the Government is permitting an increase in energy bills of £20 a year reaching over £100 extra a year in 2020, and that this Government is putting the cost of infrastructure projects onto the already squeezed general public while energy companies make millions in profits;
- (d) further regrets that this has come at a time when energy bills have already increased on average by £200 in the last two years;
- (e) believes the energy companies should be investing in carbon reducing projects;
- (f) is disappointed that this Government refuses to address the issue of reducing our carbon footprint, leaving targets out of the report, and believes this omission of targets is proof that the Liberal Democrats in Government have no influence over their Coalition partners to affect a policy they have previously championed;
- (g) regrets that this Government's short sighted economic approach was again demonstrated recently through their refusal to invest in proposals for a 650MW "clean coal" power station at Hatfield Colliery, near Doncaster, with public money and recalls that the scheme had previously been picked out by the EU as the most advanced Carbon Capture and Storage project in Europe, putting it in pole position for a grant of around £250m from Brussels;
- (h) further notes that this project would have put the Sheffield City Region and the Yorkshire and Humber Energy Intensive Industries on a more secure footing;
- (i) notes that by not setting targets it causes uncertainty for businesses

- and investors, and that the Emission Performance Standards (EPS) said the target needed to be set realistically to encourage investment;
- (j) is committed to reducing energy demand to reduce carbon emissions and reduce the burdens on family budgets;
 - (k) has delivered a city-wide free insulation programme covering over 30,000 homes over the past four years and welcomes that the current Administration is now planning how to deliver even greater benefits by delivering the Green Deal and developing the City's heat networks;
 - (l) welcomes the Administration's plans to undertake England's largest energy switch next year, to help Sheffield people get better deals on their energy bills;
 - (m) believes it is more important than ever that the country has a competitive energy market that delivers fair prices and works in the public interest, and notes that this is why the Labour Party has called for an overhaul to the energy market and the creation of a tough new watchdog with powers to force energy companies to pass on price cuts;
 - (n) urges this Government to hold the energy companies to account instead of making policy that benefits them, noting that this Energy Bill doesn't do enough to tackle the growing energy crisis that is taking hold of the country and that increasing the burden on family budgets is not fair when the energy companies are making millions in profit;
 - (o) is committed to working towards the Green Deal to attract green industry to Sheffield and helping to tackle fuel poverty in the City; and
 - (p) supports Ian Lavery MP who is bringing forward an Early Day Motion to debate this Bill further.

(Note: 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Keith Hill, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Janice Sidebottom, Ian Auckland, Bob McCann, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted for Paragraphs (j), (k), (l) and (o) and against all of the remaining Paragraphs of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (a) to (e), (i) to (l), (n) and (o), against Paragraphs (g) and (h) and abstained on Paragraphs (f), (m) and (p) and asked for this to be recorded.)

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR ROB FROST

DEMENTIA SERVICES

It was moved by Councillor Rob Frost, seconded by Councillor Sylvia Anginotti, that this Council:-

- (a) recalls the motion proposed by Councillor Clive Skelton on 13th June 2012, which urged the current Administration to rule out the closure of Bole Hill View Dementia Resource Centre;
- (b) notes with disappointment that the current Administration have now confirmed their plan to consult on closing Bole Hill View in March 2014;
- (c) believes Bole Hill View provides an invaluable service of help and support to those who suffer from dementia and their families;
- (d) thanks those who have already publicly shared their experiences of Bole Hill View, alongside the hundreds of local people who have signed petitions in support of the Centre;
- (e) welcomes the decision of the trade union UNISON to oppose the closure of Bole Hill View; and
- (f) urges the current Administration to reassess its spending priorities in order that Bole Hill View remains open.

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

- (a) has a strong commitment to improving and developing services for people with dementia and their families and notes that the Council invests over £19m in these services in the City;
- (b) has endeavoured to protect adult social care services where it can, as part of its commitment to supporting and protecting communities and vulnerable people and notes that the spending cut for adult social care overall is less than that for many other Council services;
- (c) is aware that the policy of reviewing resource centres was started by the previous Administration, leading to a Cabinet report in 2010 which recommended that Cabinet give permission to consult on the future of Foxwood and Ravenscroft and a further recommendation was that Cabinet "recognises that further consideration will be needed on the future of all the existing resource centres and that a report should be brought to Cabinet in due course.";
- (d) notes that the consultation resulted in the closure of Foxwood and Ravenscroft in March 2011, under the previous Administration and deplores the hypocrisy and merciless political scaremongering by the

main opposition group, who demonstrably followed this policy whilst in administration;

- (e) further notes that at the same time, the implementation of self-directed support has also seen people with dementia and their families choosing to use other services for their day and respite care and this has an impact on the remaining resource centres;
- (f) regrets that due to devastating budget cuts by the Coalition Government, the Administration has been forced to consider reducing the funding for the remaining resource centres by £385k (out of a total £3.9m budget for the three resource centres) and this has led to the proposals to decommission Norbury and Bole Hill;
- (g) notes that the Administration has conducted a review of the services the Council provides for people with dementia and asked people about the services that they need, and that, working with the Sheffield Alzheimer's Society, people with dementia were asked for their views on what services are currently available, their experiences of them and where they would like to see changes, and furthermore, that carers were also invited to an event at the Town Hall as well as a 'Talk to Us' day at Sheffield Showcase exhibition space in the city centre;
- (h) is aware that the results of the feedback showed that for people with dementia and their carers, the important areas they would like to see more investment in is to support earlier access to diagnosis and treatment, better information and advice and support, more opportunities for carer breaks and the development of integrated, flexible and personalised support for people with dementia who are living at home;
- (i) is pleased that this information has been fed into a wide-ranging review of dementia services in the City and how they could be used to help Sheffield become a dementia friendly city by 2015;
- (j) notes that resulting from these proposals, the Administration can give a clear commitment that no-one who currently attends these Centres will have their overall service reduced through any changes that may happen; and
- (k) will continue to do all it can to support and protect people with dementia and their families; to consult with them; and to fund services, in the face of unprecedented cuts in the funding which this City receives from the Government.

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) has a strong commitment to improving and developing services for people with dementia and their families and notes that the Council invests over £19m in these services in the City;
- (b) has endeavoured to protect adult social care services where it can, as part of its commitment to supporting and protecting communities and vulnerable people and notes that the spending cut for adult social care overall is less than that for many other Council services;
- (c) is aware that the policy of reviewing resource centres was started by the previous Administration, leading to a Cabinet report in 2010 which recommended that Cabinet give permission to consult on the future of Foxwood and Ravenscroft and a further recommendation was that Cabinet "recognises that further consideration will be needed on the future of all the existing resource centres and that a report should be brought to Cabinet in due course.";
- (d) notes that the consultation resulted in the closure of Foxwood and Ravenscroft in March 2011, under the previous Administration and deplores the hypocrisy and merciless political scaremongering by the main opposition group, who demonstrably followed this policy whilst in administration;
- (e) further notes that at the same time, the implementation of self-directed support has also seen people with dementia and their families choosing to use other services for their day and respite care and this has an impact on the remaining resource centres;
- (f) regrets that due to devastating budget cuts by the Coalition Government, the Administration has been forced to consider reducing the funding for the remaining resource centres by £385k (out of a total £3.9m budget for the three resource centres) and this has led to the proposals to decommission Norbury and Bole Hill;
- (g) notes that the Administration has conducted a review of the services the Council provides for people with dementia and asked people about the services that they need, and that, working with the Sheffield Alzheimer's Society, people with dementia were asked for their views on what services are currently available, their experiences of them and where they would like to see changes, and furthermore, that carers were also invited to an event at the Town Hall as well as a 'Talk to Us' day at Sheffield Showcase exhibition space in the city centre;
- (h) is aware that the results of the feedback showed that for people with dementia and their carers, the important areas they would like to see more investment in is to support earlier access to diagnosis and treatment, better information and advice and support, more opportunities for carer breaks and the development of integrated,

flexible and personalised support for people with dementia who are living at home;

- (i) is pleased that this information has been fed into a wide-ranging review of dementia services in the City and how they could be used to help Sheffield become a dementia friendly city by 2015;
- (j) notes that resulting from these proposals, the Administration can give a clear commitment that no-one who currently attends these Centres will have their overall service reduced through any changes that may happen; and
- (k) will continue to do all it can to support and protect people with dementia and their families; to consult with them; and to fund services, in the face of unprecedented cuts in the funding which this City receives from the Government.

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

16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL

REDUCING UNEMPLOYMENT

It was moved by Councillor Chris Rosling Josephs, seconded by Councillor Terry Fox, that this Council notes with great concern recently published figures indicating the failure of the Government's Work Programme, with only 3.53% of people enrolled on the scheme finding a job, missing the 5.5% target.

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

- (a) recalls the failure of the last Government to tackle the scandal of youth unemployment, with numbers rising steadily from 2004 onwards, reaching almost half a million prior to the economic crash; and
- (b) welcomes the steps the Coalition Government are taking to help and support people back into work, in particular, young people.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, 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 substitution

of the following words therefor:-

- (a) notes with great concern recently published figures indicating the failure of the Government's Work Programme, with only 3.53% of people enrolled on the scheme finding a job, missing the 5.5% target;
- (b) is concerned about the Government's model, which sees a number of third sector groups paid on results under pressure, leading them to leave the Work Programme or go out of business;
- (c) notes that despite the Work Programme, long term unemployment has continued to increase year on year and is therefore concerned that this is not the best way to help reduce unemployment;
- (d) deplores the secrecy around the statistical data around the Work Programme's success, and believes that such a policy offers little opportunity for transparency and scrutiny of the Programme and prevents actions to co-ordinate activities that would make work to reduce unemployment more effective;
- (e) expects the situation to get worse with the Government cuts to welfare, which will see tens of millions of pounds less coming into the Sheffield economy;
- (f) urges the Government to adopt innovative schemes such as the Sheffield 100 Apprenticeship Scheme to effectively reduce unemployment; and
- (g) urges the Government to immediately review the Work Programme model and take urgent action to boost the economy and create more jobs such as adopting Labour's five point plan for jobs and growth.

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 great concern recently published figures indicating the failure of the Government's Work Programme, with only 3.53% of people enrolled on the scheme finding a job, missing the 5.5% target;
- (b) is concerned about the Government's model, which sees a number of third sector groups paid on results under pressure, leading them to leave the Work Programme or go out of business;
- (c) notes that despite the Work Programme, long term unemployment has continued to increase year on year and is therefore concerned that this is not the best way to help reduce unemployment;

- (d) deplores the secrecy around the statistical data around the Work Programme's success, and believes that such a policy offers little opportunity for transparency and scrutiny of the Programme and prevents actions to co-ordinate activities that would make work to reduce unemployment more effective;
- (e) expects the situation to get worse with the Government cuts to welfare, which will see tens of millions of pounds less coming into the Sheffield economy;
- (f) urges the Government to adopt innovative schemes such as the Sheffield 100 Apprenticeship Scheme to effectively reduce unemployment; and
- (g) urges the Government to immediately review the Work Programme model and take urgent action to boost the economy and create more jobs such as adopting Labour's five point plan for jobs and growth.

17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR DAVID BAKER

WASTE COLLECTION AND RECYCLING

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

- (a) notes the slump in green waste recycling in 2012 in the peak months of April to September and believes this is a result of the current Administration's decision to end the free collection of green waste and their mismanagement of local recycling centres;
- (b) further notes the report of The Sheffield Star on 20th November 2012, which stated:

"Coun Jack Scott, Sheffield Council cabinet member responsible for environment, said the fall had coincided with the authority taking a tougher line on the problem. But he has now revealed the decrease is partly due to a change in how Sheffield Homes records figures for dumping on estates."
- (c) reminds Members that these latest embarrassments follow a string of failures under the tenure of the current Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene, including:
 - (i) a failure to effectively communicate changes, despite spending £400,000, which resulted in hundreds of families missing their first black bin collection under the new fortnightly system;
 - (ii) utter confusion over an amnesty on closed lids and additional

- sacks, which saw the Council and Veolia offering contradictory advice;
- (iii) over a thousand complaints a day during the first week of fortnightly bin collections;
 - (iv) complete mismanagement of local recycling centres and the failure to avoid strikes; and
 - (v) a swift u-turn on a proposal to offer the charged-for green bin service across the City, but only after 14,000 greens bins had already been chipped and pelleted;
- (d) believes this represents one of the most inept starts to a Cabinet career in Sheffield City Council history;
 - (e) feels that this farcical catalogue of errors was reflected in a recent poll on The Star's website, which saw 54% of local people state that waste collections were not working in Sheffield;
 - (f) notes the announcement of funds awarded under the Coalition Government's £250 million Weekly Collection Support Scheme, which saw a number of councils awarded over £10 million;
 - (g) laments the decision of the current Administration in refusing to swallow their pride and submit a more ambitious bid to the fund, which could have saved local services for thousands of Sheffielders;
 - (h) believes that the current Administration failed to stand up for Sheffield by not submitting a more ambitious bid, and regrets that it will now be extremely difficult to revert back to weekly black bin collections; and
 - (i) calls upon the Administration to undertake a genuine review of the City's waste services as opposed to the Administration's last consultation on waste services, which was criticised in the local press for its "weighted" questions.

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

- (a) fully opposes the Government's record level of cuts to Sheffield City Council, noting that the Government's cuts are targeted at Councils in the north of England whilst some of the wealthiest councils in the country receive almost no cuts at all, and which have necessitated changes to the waste management service to bring in savings of at least £4 million;
- (b) further notes the opinion of The Sheffield Star on 23rd November 2012,

which stated:

“the Lib Dems merely buried their heads in the sand and pretended the problem would go away. Labour may have taken an unpopular decision, but decisions were needed.”

- (c) is committed to supporting Sheffielders to recycle and therefore deplores the record of the previous Administration who increased recycling by less than 2.5% between 2008 and 2011 and believes this is just another example of their three wasted years;
- (d) notes that these poor recycling levels under the previous Administration are despite spending an additional £2 million on recycling services which was made possible due to the investment in local public services by the previous Government;
- (e) believes that the incompetence of the previous Administration contributed to this failure to significantly improve recycling rates, which is demonstrated by ill-thought through initiatives which clearly made it harder for Sheffielders to recycle, such as the blue boxes for paper and card, a decision made when the present Leader of the main opposition group was the Cabinet Member for waste management between 2008-2010;
- (f) welcomes the present Administration’s campaign to improve recycling in Sheffield whilst moving to Alternate Week Collections, with measures such as the roll out of flexible choice for blue bins and boxes, increasing staffing in the Veolia call centre and the work of the liaison team to support Sheffield people to use the full range of facilities available;
- (g) welcomes recent reductions in the amount of waste sent to landfill and acknowledges that this now at a record low under the present Administration;
- (h) notes the reduction in green waste recycling in 2012 in the months of April to September is a result of unprecedented wet weather, with the wettest summer on record;
- (i) notes that the Government’s fund to protect weekly collections was a public relations stunt from the start, and that Sheffield City Council wrote to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government twice and also to the Deputy Prime Minister asking for confirmation that this would give the Council the money to keep weekly collections in Sheffield, and that if the Coalition had given the Council this guarantee the Council would not have moved to alternate week collections, but the guarantee never came;
- (j) further notes that, out of 216 local authorities, only 90 are receiving funding from the bin fund, and that of these 90, there is a clear bias towards London and the South with almost two thirds of councils

receiving funding in comparison to less than 18% in the North; and

- (k) believes that despite some teething problems, the change to alternate week collection has gone smoothly, and notes that the change is now saving at least £2.4m per year, which is money the current Administration will use to protect other vital services from this Government's reckless cuts.

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) fully opposes the Government's record level of cuts to Sheffield City Council, noting that the Government's cuts are targeted at Councils in the north of England whilst some of the wealthiest councils in the country receive almost no cuts at all, and which have necessitated changes to the waste management service to bring in savings of at least £4 million;
- (b) further notes the opinion of The Sheffield Star on 23rd November 2012, which stated:

"the Lib Dems merely buried their heads in the sand and pretended the problem would go away. Labour may have taken an unpopular decision, but decisions were needed."
- (c) is committed to supporting Sheffielders to recycle and therefore deplores the record of the previous Administration who increased recycling by less than 2.5% between 2008 and 2011 and believes this is just another example of their three wasted years;
- (d) notes that these poor recycling levels under the previous Administration are despite spending an additional £2 million on recycling services which was made possible due to the investment in local public services by the previous Government;
- (e) believes that the incompetence of the previous Administration contributed to this failure to significantly improve recycling rates, which is demonstrated by ill-thought through initiatives which clearly made it harder for Sheffielders to recycle, such as the blue boxes for paper and card, a decision made when the present Leader of the main opposition group was the Cabinet Member for waste management between 2008-2010;
- (f) welcomes the present Administration's campaign to improve recycling in Sheffield whilst moving to Alternate Week Collections, with measures such as the roll out of flexible choice for blue bins and boxes, increasing

- staffing in the Veolia call centre and the work of the liaison team to support Sheffield people to use the full range of facilities available;
- (g) welcomes recent reductions in the amount of waste sent to landfill and acknowledges that this now at a record low under the present Administration;
 - (h) notes the reduction in green waste recycling in 2012 in the months of April to September is a result of unprecedented wet weather, with the wettest summer on record;
 - (i) notes that the Government's fund to protect weekly collections was a public relations stunt from the start, and that Sheffield City Council wrote to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government twice and also to the Deputy Prime Minister asking for confirmation that this would give the Council the money to keep weekly collections in Sheffield, and that if the Coalition had given the Council this guarantee the Council would not have moved to alternate week collections, but the guarantee never came;
 - (j) further notes that, out of 216 local authorities, only 90 are receiving funding from the bin fund, and that of these 90, there is a clear bias towards London and the South with almost two thirds of councils receiving funding in comparison to less than 18% in the North; and
 - (k) believes that despite some teething problems, the change to alternate week collection has gone smoothly, and notes that the change is now saving at least £2.4m per year, which is money the current Administration will use to protect other vital services from this Government's reckless cuts.

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