

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL

**Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development
Committee**

Meeting held 18 February 2014

PRESENT: Councillors Cate McDonald (Chair), Ian Auckland (Deputy Chair), Trevor Bagshaw, Jayne Dunn, Terry Fox, Ibrar Hussain, Steve Jones, George Lindars-Hammond, Tim Rippon, Pat Midgley (Substitute Member), Diana Stimely (Substitute Member) and David Baker (Substitute Member)

.....

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

1.1 Apologies for absence were received and substitutes attended the meeting as follows:-

Apology

Substitute

Councillor Alison Brelsford
Councillor Keith Hill
Councillor Steve Wilson

Councillor David Baker
Councillor Diana Stimely
Councillor Pat Midgley

2. EXCLUSION OF PUBLIC AND PRESS

2.1 No items were identified where resolutions may be moved to exclude the public and press.

3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

3.1 Councillor Pat Midgley declared a personal interest in Agenda Item 6 – The Future of Sheffield’s Library Services – as a member of Park Community Action, who had submitted a Business Case to run Park Library as a co-delivered library.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

4.1 Petitions

The Committee received a joint paper and electronic petition from Ruth Woodhouse, containing 304 signatures, requesting the City Council and Park Community Action to protect its librarians at Park Library, in their Council posts, and call on the Council to acknowledge the essential service that Park Library provides for local residents, and to pledge finances beyond two years.

Ms Woodhouse stated that, in her opinion, there were a number of omissions and errors in the consultation report appended to the report to be submitted to the Cabinet on 19th February 2014. She made reference to flaws in the

consultation process, specifically regarding the lack of opportunity for children, who comprised a large percentage of library users, to comment. Ms Woodhouse considered that the proposed model did not fit adequately for the City, both financially or ethically.

The Committee noted the receipt of the petition, which would be taken into consideration as part of its determination to be made at this meeting.

4.2 Petitions Submitted to the Council Meeting on 8th January 2014

The following, who were either lead petitioners of, or speakers to, petitions objecting to either the closure of individual libraries or the closure of libraries in the City in general, were invited, at the request of the Committee, to provide any information, over and above what had been reported at the Council meeting, as follows:-

4.2.1 Will Hiorns (Park)

Mr Hiorns referred to the likelihood of the eventual closure of 40% of the City's libraries, therefore resulting in an immediate loss of 40% of staff. He focused on the City Council's legal duty to provide an efficient and comprehensive library service, referring specifically to the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 and to the views of Mr Francis Bennion, a distinguished Barrister and retired law lecturer at Oxford, and who was widely regarded as Britain's leading writer on all aspects of statute law. Mr Hiorns stated that the Council's proposals were illegal based on Mr Bennion's legal interpretation, details of which were circulated to Members of the Committee.

4.2.2 Mike Davis (Greenhill)

Mike Davis referred to the rigorous campaign by local residents to retain Greenhill Library, which was the area's only civic building, and stated that he would like to see all the City's libraries kept open, and led by professional librarians, with support from volunteers. He stated that the current proposals did not appear to bear any relation to the outcomes following the original consultation undertaken in 2012. In support of this, he referred to the fact that 60% of people who had responded as part of the consultation in 2012, had indicated that they would not like to see any library closures, and stated that despite this, such support had not appeared to have informed the present proposals. He concluded by referring to his request that the consultation exercise should not be simply a 'tick box' exercise, pointing out that he had been promised this would not be the case.

4.2.3 Kate Elliott (Walkley)

Ms Elliott stated that the Walkley Library building was handed to the City for the benefit of the public. The library was well-used and well-run, which she considered was due to the exceptional service provided by the library staff. Ms Elliott considered that the current proposals were not suitable on the basis

that if Walkley, and the two nearest libraries were to be closed, either now or in the future, the nearest hub library was Hillsborough, which was too far away. She concluded by stating that she, along with many others, were not happy with the short-term, funding proposals in connection with the independent libraries, indicating that it was simply a case of prolonging their closure.

4.2.4 Andy Shallice (City Wide Closures)

Mr Shallice referred to the results of the latest consultation exercise, indicating that, whilst it stated that 39% of survey respondents answered with 'Yes' or 'Yes with reservations' that the proposals, as a whole, were fair and reasonable, it did not state that 61% of respondents were against the proposals. He also made the point that those respondents who were most affected by the proposals were the least positive in their overall responses, with such groups including older people, children and young people, people with disabilities and people from ethnic minority groups. In terms of volunteers, Mr Shallice stated that, as part of the consultation in 2012, a high number of respondents had indicated that they were in favour of volunteers supporting full-time library staff, whereas in the current proposals, it was evident that such volunteers would be replacing full-time staff. He concluded by referring to the human resource implications of the proposals, expressing concern at the fact that there was very little emphasis in the report in terms of how such a high number of volunteers would be supported.

4.3 Public Questions

Questions were received from members of the public, as follows:-

4.3.1 Peter Hartley

- (a) How many more people of Sheffield have to object, on top of the 22,000 plus that have already objected, to the proposed cuts to the library budget before this Committee changes its policy instead of blindly following the party line?
- (b) How can you justify calling yourself a Scrutiny Committee, when I suspect you will just note the report on the libraries report before you? (A proper Scrutiny Committee would call before them experts in the field of Sheffield libraries themselves, as well as the people who use these libraries).

Mr Hartley requested a written response to his questions.

4.3.2 Annette Hobson

Considering the political affiliation of some members of this Committee, including the Chair, can we really expect that the proposals put forward by Sheffield City Council will be fully scrutinized and that the decisions being

made will be made with what is best for the people of Sheffield?

4.3.3 Marcus O'Hagan

- (a) Had the Council assessed the costs of the proposed change and the eventual possible library closures? Why are these questions not being answered when all the issues should have been considered by the Council as part of the process? Doesn't this show the process was ill-managed and has failed? How can the consultation be considered complete when valid questions from citizens who are concerned at the loss of important facilities have not been answered?
- (b) The Council is required to act in a fair manner, is committed to fairness and required by law to provide an efficient and comprehensive library service. How can a service be fulfilling that requirement when the entire north west quadrant may be stripped of its libraries?
- (c) What consideration and provision has been made for the possibility that an independent library may fail? Will such a library return to Council control or will it close?
- (d) Is it the duty of the Scrutiny Committee to ensure the Council is acting fairly and is not risking costly legal action? If the answer is yes, then should this Committee not require the departments involved to complete a genuine consultation before a decision is made? Don't the minor modifications made which in no way answer the overwhelming opposition to the original proposals show clearly that the consultation is a sham?
- (e) As key stakeholders, library professionals should be playing a key role in this process. How have this group been involved?

4.3.4 Will Hiorns

- (a) Can the Council move to a more fair model that spreads the pain, and pledge to revive the service in future when resources allow?
- (b) In what real, practical ways has feedback from children informed and shaped the proposal at any stage of the review and how does it respect their particular needs?
- (c) The survey in 2012 showed that many people said that activities should concentrate on activities for children and young people, supporting homework and encouraging reading and educational attainment. How does this square with the proposal where children will be so heavily hit by closures of their local libraries? How can the proposals contain such lack of basic logic?

- (d) Will the Committee please strongly recommend that the Council be honest with the public in all future communications on public services?
- (e) Does this Committee believe that a week is long enough for us to read the revised proposal, due to the size of the report, and then have an informed debate with a Council, who won't even answer our questions when given months of time? Is this adequate consultation and does it meet the requirements of the Gunning principles?

4.3.5 Patrick Coghlan

Could the Council find the resources to second a professional librarian to help for the first year or two?

4.3.6 Hugh Cotton

- (a) Does the Committee consider the proposals a fair and efficient use of resources?
- (b) After the Committee's decision, is the Council prepared to agree to keep looking with flexibility and fairness at the issue of where paid professional staff are placed so that independent and co-delivered libraries can also have the benefit of them?

4.3.7 Irene Harrison

What will the volunteers actually be actually volunteering for, how will they be trained and who will arrange the training for them over the next three years and thereafter? Will personal information be available to volunteers, and will it be possible to hold them to a confidentiality agreement as with paid library staff, bearing in mind there is likely to be quite a high turnover of people wanting to do this work initially, but very likely to drop as time goes on?

4.3.8 Katharine Harbord

- (a) How are the hub libraries going to be linked to the other non-hub libraries? If they are receiving the bulk of funding and staffing, will they be providing the extra service for the users in areas deprived of their present library service? If the hub libraries are not to have more users and groups, why should they receive so much more of the limited resources?
- (b) How will the Council review its stance and ensure that all the threatened libraries are creatively resourced with support from qualified librarians by, for example, running every library on a co-delivered basis?

4.3.9 Natasha Watkinson

Does the Council think one volunteer co-ordinator is sufficient to train the expected number of volunteers or could the Council provide interim professional library staff for each independent library in the first transitional year?

4.3.10 Pauline Rosser

What provision will you make for the support of experienced, professional library staff for the proposed volunteer-run libraries?

4.3.11 Kathy Whittaker

- (a) Are the Council officers aware that the planned hub network leaves an area comprising around a quarter of the City without a library and could they explain how this constitutes a comprehensive service for all those who want to use it?
- (b) Which hub library will Broomhill be relating to as an independent, and what kind of impact can we expect?

4.3.12 Richard Bradley

What evidence has the Council got that community libraries work in the long-term, say in 10-20 years?

4.3.13 Mark Parnell

- (a) The Indices of Multiple Deprivation (IMD) and literacy components of the Needs Assessment uses the average IMD from the Super Output Areas which intersect each library. However, the Office for National Statistics guidance warns against doing this type of analysis (because of the transformations that have been applied to the data). How can the Council justify using an incorrect method to calculate IMD for these two demographic needs variables?
- (b) The ranking for the BME and low attaining pupils data sets are incorrectly ranked. Has the Council addressed these issues, as it appears that it can lead to a change in the 11 hub libraries on the list?
- (c) The Council uses visits as a use of the performance measure, but does not take any account of the actual opening hours, therefore how can it compare the number of visitors that Stannington or Tinsley libraries have (open 21 hours per week) with Ecclesall library (open for 43 hours per week)?
- (d) The Needs Assessment uses proximity as a multiplier, but this has no resemblance to the actual travel times by bus to the nearest library. Is the Council aware of this discrepancy?

4.3.14 Katy Cossham

In view of the acknowledged (Council's Equality Impact Assessment) negative impact to all library users and, in particular, protected groups, such as disabled people and young people, would the Council consider keeping libraries open and bringing in other Council services under the same roof?

4.3.15 Ruth Woodhouse

- (a) Can Councillors please note my request on behalf of campaigners for more time to digest and respond to the lengthy proposals published last week?
- (b) The Equality Act 2010 states that 'a public authority must eliminate discrimination' and 'advance equality of opportunity between persons who share relevant protected characteristics and persons who do not share it'. It is clear from the surveys and the report that this will not be possible with this model. How would the Council manage to achieve this within the three-tier system?
- (c) How are school visits to continue City-wide without staff, and what measures will the Council take to avoid the loss of this essential service across the City?
- (d) Many Sheffield libraries now manage on a 21 hour week which, whilst not ideal, by cutting opening hours elsewhere, a library service for all would be retained, which could be extended again in the future. Is it not time to explore this alternative model, so we share staff and the burden of cuts, and support vulnerable groups across the City?

4.3.16 Caroline Waudby

If the Council cuts ties with Walkley Library and the other local libraries earmarked for 'independence', will it move to review the situation in one year, with a view to taking these libraries back under Council control?

4.3.17 John Chapman

What contingency plans are in place if the independent libraries fail, both within the first three years and after this period?

4.3.18 Chris Reece

Has the Council made contingency plans with one or more commercial companies to take over the libraries if the independent groups decide to withdraw their business plans?

4.3.19 Alan Wellings

- (a) Does the Authority accept responsibility for providing a comprehensive and efficient library service? If so, what minimum provision does it judge necessary to satisfy this?
- (b) What does the Authority plan to do if any volunteer-run library proves unsustainable?

4.3.20 Michael Stern

One of the proposed hub libraries – Woodseats – has been described as ‘dilapidated’, with a leaking roof which prevents computers from being used in wet weather. Has the Council given consideration to the physical state of the proposed hub libraries?

4.3.21 Mel Smart

- (a) How can Sheffield fulfil its statutory obligations to provide a library service to those people living in sparsely populated rural areas?
- (b) Would the Schools’ Library Service be able to offer additional support for Bradfield Dungworth School, as room to store an adequate variety of books for ages 4 to 11 is limited, maybe by visiting and changing the book stock more frequently?
- (c) Could Stannington Library be allocated extra funding to offer some help to all those who at present use the Mobile Library Service by becoming a rural hub for this vast area or through some kind of outreach service from Stannington?
- (d) Could the Home Library Service be extended to those who are housebound, not by infirmity, but by the sheer lack of any public transport in their area?

5. THE FUTURE OF SHEFFIELD'S LIBRARY SERVICES

5.1 The Committee considered a report of the Executive Director, Communities, entitled “The Future of Sheffield’s Library Services”, containing proposals on a new operation model for the City’s community libraries, following an extensive consultation exercise. The Council, at its meeting held on 8th January, 2014, and at which 12 petitions objecting to the possible closure of libraries across the City were received and a debate on the library review was held, requested that a report on the outcome of the library review consultation be submitted to this Committee, prior to its consideration by the Cabinet. The Committee therefore gave consideration to the Cabinet report, which contained a number of appendices, including the Library Review Consultation Report.

5.2 Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion, reported briefly on the history and background in respect of the proposals as

detailed in the Cabinet report. The Libraries, Archives and Information Service review began with the establishment of a Members Task and Finish Group in July 2011, and concluded with the report now being considered, which was to be submitted to the Cabinet at its meeting held on 19th February 2014. He stated that the proposals contained in the report had not been informed solely by the recent Government budget cuts, although such cuts had played a major part in the proposals now being made. Since 2010, as a direct result of cuts to local authority budgets, approximately 400 libraries nationwide had been closed and, following the Government's recent budget cuts, this Council had been forced to make an additional £80 million of savings over the next few years. The Libraries, Archives and Information Service alone had been requested to identify savings of £1.6 million. As a result of the budget cuts, it had been determined that the Library Service, in its current format, could no longer continue, and that the Council was no longer able to provide an efficient library service. He stressed that no Members of the Council wanted to see libraries closed but, as a result of the budget cuts, they had been forced to make a number of very difficult decisions. The Council had arranged a detailed consultation exercise in terms of the proposals and, as part of this process, Councillor Iqbal and officers from the Libraries, Archives and Information Service had visited a number of libraries across the City to listen to the views of library users.

- 5.3 In response to the questions raised regarding the legality of the proposals, specifically with regard to the Council's duty to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service, Councillor Iqbal stated that although the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964 required all Councils to provide a comprehensive and efficient library service, there were no criteria in terms of how such a service should be delivered and on this basis, the Council was of the opinion that, despite the Service being considerably reduced, it would still constitute a comprehensive and efficient service. The Council had given consideration to the Brent Council judgement and was confident that the proposals being put forward represented a viable option.
- 5.4 Steve Eccleston, Assistant Director, Legal Services, added that Members and officers were all aware that any changes proposed could only be made following a fair and objective assessment of what the public wanted in terms of a library service. The consultation process had provided a detailed insight in terms of informing the proposals being made. Mr Eccleston confirmed that the "Gunning criteria" set out what good consultation should include, and it was his view that these had been met. With reference to the legal arguments being put forward by Francis Bennion, Mr Eccleston stated that, in his opinion, he disagreed with Mr Bennion's interpretation, and his views were not implied by the statute in public law. He added that, as the City's needs changed, the Council was within its legal rights to change the Library Service.
- 5.5 In response to further questions from members of the public and Members of the Committee, Councillor Iqbal stated that, as part of the review process, he and a number of Council officers had visited a number of local authorities to look at examples of good practice in terms of the delivery of their library

services. It was evident that the interpretation of the Public Libraries and Museums Act 1964, by the local authorities, differed considerably. He made specific reference to the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA), attached as an appendix to the report, which assessed the impact of the proposals on a range of people with what were termed 'protected characteristics' under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, and also issues relating to poverty, deprivation and financial inclusion. He made reference to the legal action taken by local residents following library closures, which included action against Brent Council and the review in terms of Wirral MBC. A summary of the key points from the Wirral review had been presented to Councillors. The key learning from this was the importance of a Needs Assessment underpinning any changes to the library service.

5.6 In connection with the Needs Assessment, Councillor Iqbal stated that whilst it was accepted that some of the library buildings were in very poor condition, it had been decided that it would not be fair to use this as part of the criteria. As part of the Needs Assessment, the Council had taken into account the number of registered users, the number of books and materials issued, the number of People's Network sessions and the number of library visits. In addition, the assessment also considered the demographic needs of those people who lived, worked or studied in each library area, including the needs of older people, children and young people, people with a disability, people from minority ethnic backgrounds, people facing deprivation and people with literacy needs. Based on the principles of the Fairness Commission, demographic need had been weighted twice due to the huge inequalities across the City.

5.7 James Henderson, Director of Policy, Performance and Communications, elaborated on the Needs Assessment process, indicating that the Council had used two sets of indicators to come up with an overall score for each library. These indicator sets were "Use of Library Services" and "Demographic Needs". Mr Henderson confirmed that the demographic needs element had been given twice the weight in the light of the Authority's requirements to consider discrimination and equality issues. This overall score had been combined with information about the proximity of each library to its nearest neighbour, and the number of registered library users, to give the final rankings, which determined the 11 hub libraries. Although a few minor issues had been identified in terms of the data, following consultation, officers had checked these, which had resulted in there being no change to the overall list of 11 hub libraries. However, there had been some changes to the order of libraries within this list. Mr Henderson stated that the Council was therefore confident in the process used. Whilst it was accepted that there was no specific indicator of rurality as part of the Needs Assessment, this would have been considered as part of the distance criteria. Also, children and young people had been taken into consideration as part of the Needs Assessment, in terms of attainment levels and the education and skills domain of the indices of deprivation. Mr Henderson concluded by stating that the Council was confident that the data and statistics, as well as the process used as part of the Needs Assessment, represented a fair and robust

process in connection with how the libraries were prioritised in terms of their rankings.

- 5.8 In response to the issues raised by Mark Parnell, relating to the proximity criteria, as part of the Needs Assessment, specifically regarding how the Council had calculated the travel distances between the libraries, Councillor Iqbal stated that he and relevant Council officers had met with Mr Parnell to discuss his concerns, and had provided an explanation as to how the distances had been calculated. He explained that the distances had been based on the advice received from the bus/tram companies.
- 5.9 Further to the questions from members of the public and Members of the Committee on the consultation process, Councillor Iqbal referred to the summary of the consultation exercise undertaken in 2013/14, as well as the detailed consultation report set out in Appendix 'C' to the Cabinet report now submitted. He stated that the consultation had been detailed and fair, and had achieved the aim of ensuring as many people of Sheffield as possible were aware of the proposals for the future of the City's library services, and were able to have their say. He made reference to the budget cuts within both the Council's Libraries, Archives and Information and Community Services, and considered that the Council had done as much as it could in terms of consulting with the public, despite current financial restraints. He stated that the Council had relied considerably on the social media, as well as the excellent work of Members and officers. Kate Register, Quality and Improvement Development Manager, Communities, responded to the comments on the lack of consultation with children and young people, acknowledging that it was difficult to make consultation meaningful to school children, particularly young children. However, to overcome this, specific consultation work had been commissioned to ensure that children and young people were able to have a say. Sheffield Futures had also been commissioned to undertake engagement with young people of secondary school age, up to the age of 25, and the Children's Involvement Team had been commissioned to undertake work with children from primary school age. Information about the consultation had also been made available to all schools in the City. A number of schools had arranged for their pupils to write letters and draw pictures, and all of these had been read and included within the consultation results. In addition, the main survey included 12 free text boxes and many people had chosen to make comments there, about the impact on children and young people. Officers had analysed approximately 90,000 text boxes in all, and comments about children and libraries had been included in the consultation report. Councillor Iqbal made reference to the consultation undertaken in 2012, referring specifically to the efforts made to engage with non-library users. It was considered important that there was clear correlation between the results of the consultation undertaken in 2012 and the proposals now being made in respect of the future of the library service. Councillor Iqbal stated that mitigating actions had been included in the Equality Impact Assessment (EIA), which was appended to the Cabinet report, to ensure that no-one would be adversely affected by the proposals. Details of the equality implications, including how the EIA assessed the

impact of the proposals on a range of people with what were termed 'protected characteristics' under Section 149 of the Equality Act 2010, as well as issues relating to poverty, deprivation and financial inclusion, were detailed in the Cabinet report.

- 5.10 In response to a number of questions regarding the proposed model, Councillor Mazher Iqbal stated that, in response to the consultation, specifically relating to the co-delivered and independent libraries, the current proposals included a long-term lease arrangement to ensure that the libraries had a sound footing, the agreement to pay for utility and other bills for each library, from the additional £262,000 identified by the Council, and providing the libraries with an option to either opt in or out of the catalogue system. In addition to this, the Council had committed to providing funding to assist those community organisations who had, or were, in the process of submitting Business Plans in connection with the future operation of the libraries. Details of how the Council planned to provide additional support for the independent libraries were set out in the Cabinet report, which included information on the provision of development support, support to manage library buildings, support to run independent libraries and the provision of an allocation of funding for each independent library to access services. A number of workshops had been organised for those groups and organisations wishing to run an independent library, which had been attended by Members, officers and third sector partners, with further workshops planned in the future to assist the groups and organisations to take their proposals further. As part of the review process, Members and officers had looked at similar models in Wakefield and Doncaster.
- 5.11 In response to further questions, Councillor Iqbal clarified that there had been a 71% take-up in terms of the School Library Service, with service provision to each school being specifically tailored to meet their individual needs. This service would continue. He also gave assurances that volunteers would receive the support and guidance required, and full details of this work were set out in the Cabinet report. In terms of Ofsted's views on the proposals, Councillor Iqbal stated that Ofsted had nothing to do with the Library Service as it was the responsibility of the Department for Culture, Media and Sport. With regard to the long-term sustainability of the co-delivered and independent libraries, Councillor Iqbal stated that he could not guarantee that funding would be available to enable the libraries to continue after three years if, in the unfortunate circumstances, they were unable to continue, on the basis that it was not possible to predict what the Council's financial position would be at that time. It was hoped that, by working with, and providing the relevant support and advice to, those community organisations wishing to run the co-delivered and independent libraries, they will prove to be sustainable in the long-term.
- 5.12 Councillor Iqbal confirmed that although it had been proposed that the Mobile Library Service would close, the Council was willing to consider any offer to run the Service on an independent basis, without on-going financial support from the Council, up to the point of closure. The decision for this was as a

result of low and declining usage, together with the high cost of providing such a service.

5.13 The Chair summed up the proceedings, indicating that she believed that Councillor Mazher Iqbal and Council officers had made every attempt to respond to the public questions and questions from Members of the Committee on the legal context, the Needs Assessment, the consultation process and the operating model.

5.14 RESOLVED: That the Committee:-

- (a) notes (i) the contents of the report now submitted, (ii) the petition now submitted, (iii) the additional comments raised by the lead petitioners in terms of the petitions submitted to the Council meeting on 8th January 2014, and (iv) the responses provided to the questions raised by members of the public and the Committee;
- (b) thanks Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion, and officers, for the responses provided to the questions raised and furthermore, thanks all the questioners and petitioners for their contributions;
- (c) is satisfied that the proposals contained in the Cabinet report can be put forward to the Cabinet at its meeting to be held on 19th February 2014; and
- (d) requests that the Executive Director, Communities, submits a report on the progress made in implementing the proposals set out in the Cabinet report, to this Committee in 12 months' time.

(NOTE: Prior to the passing of the above resolution, an alternative resolution was moved by Councillor David Baker and seconded by Councillor Trevor Bagshaw as follows:-

“That this Committee:-

- (a) underlines the importance of local libraries to Sheffielders across the City;
- (b) emphasises its belief that library closures in the City are both avoidable and unnecessary;
- (c) thanks campaigners and community groups for the efforts to help save local libraries;
- (d) highlights concerns about the Council's consultation and inconsistencies in the Council's Needs Assessment;

- (e) welcomes the announcement of additional funding for independent libraries, but confirms that under this plan, 16 libraries remain under the threat of closure;
- (f) recognises that the Library Service needs to adapt and change in order to build a sustainable model for the future;
- (g) therefore, calls on the Council to investigate better use of volunteers, community groups and joint use of premises to significantly reduce the costs of running libraries; and
- (h) to this end, recommends that all 27 community libraries remain Council-maintained.”

The votes on the alternative resolution were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

For the Resolution (4) - Councillors Ian Auckland, Trevor Bagshaw, David Baker and Diana Stimely

Against the Resolution (8) - Councillors Jayne Dunn, Terry Fox, Ibrar Hussain, Steve Jones, George Lindars-Hammond, Cate McDonald, Pat Midgley and Tim Rippon).

6. DATE OF NEXT MEETING

- 6.1 It was noted that the next meeting of the Committee would be held on Wednesday, 9th April 2014, at 4.30 pm, in the Town Hall.