

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



**1. STATEMENT CONCERNING HILLSBOROUGH**

Prior to the commencement of the business of the meeting, the Lord Mayor (Councillor John Campbell) made the following statement concerning the release of the Hillsborough Independent Panel report:

“As this is the first Full Council meeting since the release of the Hillsborough Independent Panel report, I wish to make a short statement before we move on to the business of this meeting.

I am sure that I speak on behalf of everyone in the Council Chamber and in our City in saying that we welcome the release of this information, it is right that the truth has finally been revealed. The findings have vindicated the families in their 23-year struggle to establish the truth; that Liverpool fans were not responsible for the terrible tragedy that occurred in 1989. We hope that this will now enable the families of those who lost loved ones to finally find truth and justice.

The Council has pledged its continued co-operation with any further inquiries and investigations and has apologised for the failings of this Council at the time. I would like to reiterate this apology today.

We will continue to extend the arm of friendship to the bereaved families and the people of Liverpool and will now observe a minute’s silence to pay our respects to the people who lost their lives on that fateful day and their families who have struggled to find the truth for so many years.”

**2. FORMER COUNCILLOR FRANK TAYLOR**

The Lord Mayor stated that, in observing a minute’s silence, Members of the City Council would also acknowledge the recent sad death of former Councillor Frank Taylor. Members of the Council would have the opportunity later during the meeting to pay tribute to him.

The Council observed a minute’s silence.

**3. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Ray Satur, Keith Hill and Colin Ross.

**4. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Karen McGowan declared a personal interest in Notice of Motion numbered 8 on the Council Summons as she is employed at the University of Sheffield. Councillor Jackie Drayton declared a personal interest in Notice

of Motion numbered 15 on the agenda as she is appointed to the University Technical College Board.

## **5. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING**

The minutes of the special meeting of Council held on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2012 and the ordinary meeting held on 5<sup>th</sup> September 2012 were both approved as a correct record.

## **6. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS**

### **6.1 Petitions**

#### Petition requesting pedestrian crossing facilities at Fitzwilliam Street

The Council received a petition containing 55 signatures, requesting pedestrian crossing facilities at Fitzwilliam Street, near the exit from the Headford and Egerton Estates.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Gareth Slater, who stated that, whilst there had been few accidents so far, there was concern about pedestrian safety and the addition of crossing facilities would improve both access and public safety.

The Council referred the petition to the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development (Councillor Leigh Bramall) who stated that the Council received a large number of requests for pedestrian crossings. These were assessed according to several factors, including the danger to pedestrian safety at the particular location. The petition would be forwarded to the Council's Highways officers so that work could be undertaken and a judgement made concerning the proposal. He commented that the amount of money available for safety improvement schemes under the Local Transport Plan had been reduced by the Government by 50 percent.

### **6.2 Public Questions**

#### (a) Public Question in relation to Abbeyfield Park House

Mr Tim Neal, Chair of the Friends of Abbeyfield Park, referred to the threat of closure of the Abbeyfield Park House, a Grade 2 listed building, in view of its extreme state of disrepair. He felt that the building had, in the past, been a valuable community asset and was an integral part of the Park and its closure would be an unacceptable loss of facility to the local community. He referred to the need to prevent the boarding up of the House as this would be detrimental to the appearance of the Park as was evidenced by the derelict appearance of other buildings nearby such as Osborne House and the former Burngreave Working Mens' Club.

He stated that the Burngreave Messenger local newspaper and other voluntary and community groups used the House. Mr Neal asked, in light of the Localism Bill and its requirement to consult with residents on the use of community assets, (a) would the Council assure the local community in Burngreave that it would maintain Abbeyfield Park House in order to keep it open for community use until such time that a sustainable plan for the House is developed (b) what consultation would the Council enter into on the use of the House and, in particular, who would be involved in the consultation (c) was their a timetable for a decision on the future of the House and (d) could the Council provide further information on the potential for the work required to the House being undertaken by a company other than Kier, the outcome of the recent audit of Council community assets and the extent to which their would be community input into future plans for the House?

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources (Councillor Bryan Lodge) responded that there was great concern about the condition of some of the Council's community assets and Council officers were examining the condition and use of these assets and the cost of bringing them up to a satisfactory state of repair on a value for money basis. In terms of identifying where investment in assets could be best utilised in Burngreave, Abbeyfield House had been identified as being under used and that there was capacity elsewhere in the area to accommodate the requirements of local groups for meeting space.

He added that there was a need to identify users of these facilities and for Friend's Groups to help lead the restoration of these facilities. As far as the Audit of Assets was concerned, it was early in the process and he was reluctant to specify a timescale for the repair of any facility as this could raise hopes and expectations which might not be realised. However, Councillor Lodge assured Mr Neal that the Council were required to undertake the necessary repairs through Kier Property Services and, therefore, were unable to ask others to do the work.

He knew that Councillors from the Burngreave ward had had been involved in discussions with Properties and Facilities officers, who would, in the near future, be exploring options for the future of the House. However, he cautioned that the roof of the building was in a poor state of repair and would cost approximately £150,000 and, in the current climate it would be difficult to identify funding in the Council's Capital Programme, although officers would continue to investigate sources of funding. Currently, there were no proposals to board up the House but a sustainable plan would be sought with tenants', residents and Ward Councillors with whom he would raise the issues included in Mr Neal's question.

(b) Accreditation, procurement and mismanagement

Karen Greenhalgh asked how the Council intended to respond to the following points relating to the insulation scheme on the Hanover/ Lansdowne estate.

1. There is a plethora of information about British Board of Agreement (BBA) and ETA accredited systems with regard to insulated solid wall installation. The scheme on Hanover/Lansdowne is a hybrid of BBA accredited products allegedly installed by Inca accredited sub-contractors. Can the Council provide the certificate of accreditation for the project?
2. All systems are accredited to be put on a masonry wall, not class 3-high fire risk Smartply, as the wall. Is it acceptable to increase the fire risk?
3. Smartply is now being called a 'bracing' product when in fact it is being used as the wall. Would you please ensure the technical specification is sent to me?
4. It appears that building control played a large role to engineer the scheme being delivered in this manner. Why was I never told who to ask when I began questioning about this overpriced scheme?
5. In light of Sir Richard Branson successfully challenging a £15 million per bidder procurement process successfully, what remedial action is this Council going to take with their outdated procurement process which has delivered:
  - (i) inefficient management i.e. a scheme begun on an estate eligible for only 50% CESP (Community Energy Saving Programme) funding in preference to the 100% funded estate. (We have it in writing 2 contractors could work on the estate simultaneously.)
  - (ii) The Cabinet Minister for housing appears to think being in the 5% for the entire country is Not poor enough and redistributed CESP funding to the 'more needy.'
  - (iii) The 'Green Deal' officially began October 1st 2012. Many leaseholders qualify for ECO i.e. funding from the energy companies for expensive solid wall insulation, gratis to low income households. What is the Council going to do to ensure this is accessed for this Hanover/Lansdowne project?

Does the Council still think it is still acceptable to do nothing to assist 78 'working poor' to access vital funding?

In response, the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods (Councillor Harry Harpham) stated that the questions which had been asked were quite technical ones and he did not have the information to answer all of them at the Council meeting. He requested that Karen Greenhalgh leave details of her questions with an officer. If an answer to a question had not been previously provided to her, he would answer it in writing.

Councillor Harpham stated that, for clarity, there had been considerable investment of £5 million in the Hanover and Lansdowne estates which did not present a fire risk. The questioners' comparison with the difficulties concerning the West Coast Mainline was not a useful one. The Council had consulted with residents, tenants and leaseholders before starting the programme of work on Lansdowne/Hanover. Additionally, there had been discussions with those leaseholders who had not been satisfied with the scope of the work.

In relation to help for people who were finding it difficult to pay their bills, the Council sent information to help people to understand the help that was available from the Council and other organisations. The Council was also helping as many people as possible to avoid fuel poverty and as the Cabinet Member, it was his responsibility to help keep as many people out of fuel poverty as possible, given the current economic circumstances.

He would answer the remaining questions in writing, as stated previously.

(c) Public questions concerning outsourcing of public services

Nigel Slack referred to the extent of profits made by private companies which ran public services on behalf of public sector organisations; the proportion of public funds which represented private company profit and dividends paid to shareholders; and the level of public oversight in how public money was spent.

Mr Slack asked the Council to undertake a root and branch re-evaluation of its attitude to outsourcing and put firm policies in place to limit its scope and to extend its transparency and accountability. He referred to suggestions which he could contribute.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources (Councillor Bryan Lodge) stated that he was aware that Mr Slack had discussed matters with Council Officers and had received details of how the Council outsourced services to companies in the private sector and the ways in which it holds such companies to account.

There was analysis concerning average level of profit represented in contracts, which in some cases was 7 percent, but only 2 to 3 percent in others. The City Council benchmarked to make sure that it achieved best value in relation to contracts which were outsourced. The benefits of outsourced services included modernising and improvements to services and the involvement of third sector partners.

In house or partnering service models were used where they provided the best value for money. It was also not assumed that services, once outsourced, would remain so. The Council had in place robust procedures in terms of objectives, performance measures, quality standards, contract management processes and governance and was viewed as a role model for other local authorities.

Accountability was provided for by the Chief Executive and Executive Directors and elected Members who held services and the Directors to account through the Council's Scrutiny Committees.

Some information was commercially confidential and could only be made public with the consent of the companies concerned.

The City Council was interested in improving efficiency and Councillor Lodge asked Mr Slack to share the suggestions, which he had referred to in his question.

(d) Public Question concerning prostitution in the Kelham Island area

Gareth Slater asked what was being done about the increasing incidence of prostitution in the Kelham Island area. He referred to the partnership approach which had been taken in relation to the issue previously and to comments by a local business which was concerned about opening beyond normal daytime hours.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods (Councillor Harry Harpham) stated that he thought that prostitution was under control in the Kelham Island area. He would ask the police to investigate Mr Slater's concerns and particularly to look at the fear and anti social behaviour caused by men who cruised around the area.

(e) Public question concerning flood defences at Kelham Island

Gareth Slater asked what was being done in relation to flood defences in the Kelham Island area and he referred to dredging which had been undertaken previously and improvements to the flood wall.

In response, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene (Councillor Jack Scott) thanked those who worked as flood wardens in the City. He stated that he would respond to Mr Slater separately, in writing, in relation to dredging in the Kelham Island area.

Councillor Scott referred to the Nursery Street Pocket Park development, which included design elements that would contribute to the mitigation of flooding in the Lower Don. He also referred to the role of the Riverside Stewardship Company.

The Council would complete its River Strategy later this year, which would look at de-culverting some of the City's rivers, thereby not forcing water through narrow channels.

The Lower Don Valley Action Plan, which Councillor Scott said he could make available to Mr Slater, outlined some options which might be pursued jointly with other organisations such as the Chamber of Commerce, including the creation of a business improvement district. Businesses were



an important part of a future solution to mitigate against flooding.

The South Yorkshire Forest Partnership was examining improvement to the catchment of water in the Peak District moorland around Sheffield, including the contribution of woodland. Discussions were also being held with Yorkshire Water and the City's Streets Ahead programme included the maintenance of gullies to ensure these were regularly emptied and that debris did not build up, to improve water drainage. However, in the case of a 1 in 200 year flood event, there was still a risk of flooding.

(f) Public Questions concerning documents sent to the Information Commissioner

Martin Brighton referred to statements made to the Information Commissioner's Office (ICO) by the Council. He asked if elected Members of the Council thought it acceptable that documents created by the Council's Legal department and released to the Commissioner contained lies? He also referred to statements saying that he had a history of multiple questions on a subject and prevented other people from asking public questions. He asked what the Council would do to right the wrongs he now outlined and ensure that the ICO was told the truth and that such behaviour is not repeated.

In response, the Leader of the Council (Councillor Julie Dore) stated that Mr Brighton's questions referred to specific instances of where information was sent to the Information Commissioner, the accuracy of which she could not comment upon. Councillor Dore stated that if Mr Brighton pointed out to her what information he believed to be false or incorrect, then she would look into the matter. Some of the matters raised might be down to interpretation.

Councillor Dore referred to the time limits for public questions at the Council's public meetings, and Members of the public who asked questions were asked to be mindful that other people should also have their opportunity to ask a question. She stated that she recognised that Mr Brighton was indeed mindful of other people's right to speak on most occasions.

**7. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

**7.1 Urgent Business**

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

**7.2 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.

7.3 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).

**8. 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 and Highways Committee Substitute Members | - Remove Councillor Denise Reaney to create a vacancy |
| Standing Advisory Council for Religious Education  | - Councillor Alison Brelsford to fill a vacancy       |
| Corporate Parenting Panel                          | - Councillor Penny Baker to fill a vacancy            |
| Cycle Forum  | - Councillor Ian Auckland to fill a vacancy           |
| East End Strategy Group                            | - Councillor Ian Auckland to fill a vacancy           |
| Environmental Performance Working Party            | - Councillor Joe Otten to fill a vacancy              |
| Fairer Charging Commission                         | - Councillor Denise Reaney to fill a vacancy          |
| Monitoring and Advisory Board (Adult Services)     | - Councillor Denise Reaney to fill a vacancy          |
| Motorists Forum                                    | - Councillor Ian Auckland to fill a vacancy           |
| Pedestrians Forum                                  | - Councillor Ian Auckland to fill a vacancy           |
| Walking Forum                                      | - Councillor Trevor Bagshaw to fill a vacancy         |

Allotments and Leisure Gardens Advisory Group - Councillor Garry Weatherall to replace Councillor Steve Wilson

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

Sheffield Industrial Museums Trust - Councillor Geoff Smith to replace Councillor Ben Curran

South Yorkshire Forest Partnership Steering Group - Councillor Leigh Bramall to replace Councillor Isobel Bowler

Learning Disabilities Partnership Board - Councillor Diana Stimely to fill a vacancy

Mental Health Partnership Board - Councillor Diana Stimely to fill a vacancy

Parkwood Landfill Liaison Group - Councillor Trevor Bagshaw to fill a vacancy

Sheffield First for Health and Wellbeing - Councillor Roger Davison to fill a vacancy

Sheffield Health and Social Care Foundation Trust – Council of Governors - Councillor Roger Davison to fill a vacancy

Sheffield Tobacco Control Programme Accountable Board - Councillor Andrew Sangar to fill a vacancy

South Yorkshire Trading Standards Joint Committee - Councillor Trevor Bagshaw to fill a vacancy

(c) it be noted that, in accordance with the authority given by the City Council at its annual meeting held on 16<sup>th</sup> May 2012, the Chief Executive had authorised the following appointment on 13<sup>th</sup> September, 2012:-

South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority - Councillor Mazher Iqbal to replace Councillor Harry Harpham

## **9. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING ECONOMIC RECOVERY**

It was moved by Councillor Adam Hurst, seconded by Councillor Tony Downing, that this Council:-

- (a) acknowledges that the Government public sector net borrowing was £14.4bn in August, the biggest deficit for the month since records began with borrowing currently 22% more than last year;
- (b) notes we are experiencing the slowest economic recovery in modern memory due to this Government's mis-management of economic policy;
- (c) regrets that for August 2012, corporation tax receipts fell by 2.1% and benefits payments rose by 4.9% showing that Government cuts are forcing more people into the welfare system and stifling the success of businesses;
- (d) believes these figures make it more likely that the Government will fail to achieve its aim of wiping out the structural budget deficit by 2015;
- (e) is dismayed at the failure of the Regional Growth Fund (RGF) to boost growth in the economy; in a report from The Commons Public Accounts Committee the RGF was called "nothing short of scandalous" criticising the Government's management of the Fund after finding that only £60m of the £1.4bn fund had reached front-line projects;
- (f) holds the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Business Innovation and Skills responsible for the failings;
- (g) recognises that quantitative easing is not enough to stimulate the economy, the Government must do more to stimulate growth;
- (h) regrets that because of the Government's mis-management of the economy, with slower growth and higher unemployment, spending reductions are now set to continue beyond the current Parliament;
- (i) believes that the Government should now change course and take action to secure growth and supports Labour's five-point growth plan for jobs and growth which includes:
  - (i) repealing the bank bonus tax and using the money to build 25,000 affordable homes and guarantee a job for 100,000 young people;
  - (ii) bringing forward long term investment projects, such as schools, roads and transport, to create jobs;
  - (iii) reversing the Government's VAT rise now for a temporary period;
  - (iv) an immediate one-year cut in VAT to 5% on home

improvements, repairs and maintenance; and

- (v) a one-year national insurance tax break for every small firm which takes on extra workers;
- (j) is aware that child poverty is rising as a result of the failure of this Government to manage the economy; more than one in four children in the UK lives in poverty, many in working families; under current Government policies, child poverty is projected to rise from 2012/13 with an expected 300,000 more children living in poverty by 2015/16 and this upward trend is expected to continue with 4.2 million children projected to be living in poverty by 2020;
- (k) notes the irony of the Liberal Democrat Party, who's Leader has backed a cut in the top rate of tax resulting in a £3 billion tax cut for millionaires in the Budget while asking millions of pensioners and families to pay more, holding their annual conference around the theme "fair tax in tough times";
- (l) believes there is nothing fair about a family with children paying an average £511 extra from changes the Government has brought in this year, while millionaires will get a £40,000 tax cut next year and believes that the Liberal Democrats will be judged on what they do, not what they say;
- (m) calls on the Government, which has created a double dip recession and is continuing to borrow more, missing its own targets while continuing to hit hard working families through tax rises and spending cuts, at the same time as they are cutting taxes for millionaires, to change course; and
- (n) directs that a copy of this motion is sent to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Business Innovation and Skills

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

- (a) believes no-one should underestimate the economic mess left by the last Government as a result of the light touch banking regulation masterminded by Rt Hon Gordon Brown MP and Rt Hon Ed Balls MP;
- (b) notes the previous Government's questionable ability to handle public finances, increasing the national deficit year-on-year from 2001 onwards, reaching a total of £43bn prior to the economic crash;

- (c) however, notes the commitment of the last Government to halve the deficit by 2014, by pledging £82bn worth of cuts, alongside recent statements by the Rt Hon Ed Balls MP, confirming a Labour Government would be “ruthless” about cutting public spending if Labour wins the next election;
- (d) supports the decisive action taken by the Coalition Government, which has seen the structural deficit cut by a quarter since 2010, allowing the United Kingdom to avoid a loss of confidence experienced in Greece, Ireland and Italy;
- (e) welcomes the Sheffield City Region Deal, which has the potential to deliver 4,000 new apprenticeships, 2,000 employees with new training, and 12,000 new jobs at the City’s enterprise zone, which has been named the most attractive for businesses in the United Kingdom;
- (f) further welcomes the hundreds of millions of pounds of investment in the region’s infrastructure, including the recent announcement of the electrification of the Midland Main Line, the start of the Streets Ahead project, and the financial backing for a Sheffield University Technical College;
- (g) furthermore, commends the Government’s commitment to increase the income tax threshold to £10,000, cutting the tax bill of 24 million people and taking 2 million low paid workers out of income tax;
- (h) contrasts this to the last Government, who scrapped the 10p tax rate, doubling the tax bill for some of the lowest paid in the country and allowed hedge fund managers to pay less tax than their cleaners;
- (i) embraces recent comments made by the Deputy Prime Minister at the Liberal Democrat Conference, which encourage moves towards additional taxes on the very wealthy;
- (j) furthermore, welcomes the vote of representatives at the Liberal Democrat Conference, which endorsed the Government’s deficit reduction strategy; and
- (k) however, would still like to see the Coalition go further in promoting a more Liberal economy and therefore supports proposals discussed at the Conference including:
  - (i) developing a more sustainable banking industry;
  - (ii) further rebalancing the economy from the City of London to Northern cities like Sheffield;
  - (iii) increasing the powers of the Green Investment Bank;
  - (iv) increasing the numbers of mutuals, co-operatives and

- (v) employee owned businesses; and  
ring fencing the Government's science budget.

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

Motion to move to next business

During the debate, it was moved by Councillor Jillian Creasy, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that the Council does now proceed to next business.

On being put to the vote, the motion 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 deletion of paragraph (i) and the addition of a new paragraph (i) as follows:-
  - (i) acknowledges that Labour's five point plan, whilst well intentioned, is a sticking plaster for a national economy that needs real reform for social and economic benefit and therefore believes the Government should implement a package of measures including:
    - (i) setting up a people's bank that is locally managed, which offers a sustainable local service to small businesses and residents;
    - (ii) investing massively in a Green New Deal, creating a million new jobs and turning Britain into a world leader in sustainable industries;
    - (iii) abolishing the upper limit for national insurance contributions and cutting tax avoidance and evasion, gaining £20 billion each year and making sure that those who are able to pay do so;
    - (iv) abolishing VAT relief on financial services, aviation fuel and gambling, gaining £12 billion each year and removing Government subsidies to socially and environmentally damaging activities; and
    - (v) re-investing in public services, recognising that austerity only leads to lost tax revenue, lost vital services, lost demand for private and third sector contracts, and a social blight of poverty and unemployment;
2. the deletion of paragraph (n) and the addition of new paragraphs (n) to (r) as follows:-

- (n) directs that a copy of this Motion is sent to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Business Innovation and Skills;
- (o) notes that there is currently a consultation on the economic future of Sheffield;
- (p) believes it is important that all communities are engaged and involved in the economic future of Sheffield;
- (q) believes that there needs to be a sustainable approach to business and enterprise that concentrates on the vital role of the local economy in providing employment and routes to social well-being; and
- (r) recognises the important role Sheffield City Council can play in encouraging fairly paid, secure employment that is the desire of those most in need in the City.

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

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Janice Sidebottom, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted for Paragraph 2 and against Paragraph 1 of amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) acknowledges that the Government public sector net borrowing was £14.4bn in August, the biggest deficit for the month since records began with borrowing currently 22% more than last year;
- (b) notes we are experiencing the slowest economic recovery in modern memory due to this Government's mis-management of economic policy;
- (c) regrets that for August 2012, corporation tax receipts fell by 2.1% and benefits payments rose by 4.9% showing that Government cuts are forcing more people into the welfare system and stifling the success of businesses;
- (d) believes these figures make it more likely that the Government will fail to achieve its aim of wiping out the structural budget deficit by



2015;

- (e) is dismayed at the failure of the Regional Growth Fund (RGF) to boost growth in the economy; in a report from The Commons Public Accounts Committee the RGF was called “nothing short of scandalous” criticising the Government’s management of the Fund after finding that only £60m of the £1.4bn fund had reached front-line projects;
- (f) holds the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Business Innovation and Skills responsible for the failings;
- (g) recognises that quantitative easing is not enough to stimulate the economy, the Government must do more to stimulate growth;
- (h) regrets that because of the Government’s mis-management of the economy, with slower growth and higher unemployment, spending reductions are now set to continue beyond the current Parliament;
- (i) believes that the Government should now change course and take action to secure growth and supports Labour’s five-point growth plan for jobs and growth which includes:
  - (i) repealing the bank bonus tax and using the money to build 25,000 affordable homes and guarantee a job for 100,000 young people;
  - (ii) bringing forward long term investment projects, such as schools, roads and transport, to create jobs;
  - (iii) reversing the Government’s VAT rise now for a temporary period;
  - (iv) an immediate one-year cut in VAT to 5% on home improvements, repairs and maintenance; and
  - (v) a one-year national insurance tax break for every small firm which takes on extra workers;
- (j) is aware that child poverty is rising as a result of the failure of this Government to manage the economy; more than one in four children in the UK lives in poverty, many in working families; under current Government policies, child poverty is projected to rise from 2012/13 with an expected 300,000 more children living in poverty by 2015/16 and this upward trend is expected to continue with 4.2 million children projected to be living in poverty by 2020;
- (k) notes the irony of the Liberal Democrat Party, who’s Leader has backed a cut in the top rate of tax resulting in a £3 billion tax cut for

millionaires in the Budget while asking millions of pensioners and families to pay more, holding their annual conference around the theme “fair tax in tough times”;

- (l) believes there is nothing fair about a family with children paying an average £511 extra from changes the Government has brought in this year, while millionaires will get a £40,000 tax cut next year and believes that the Liberal Democrats will be judged on what they do, not what they say;
- (m) calls on the Government, which has created a double dip recession and is continuing to borrow more, missing its own targets while continuing to hit hard working families through tax rises and spending cuts, at the same time as they are cutting taxes for millionaires, to change course; and
- (n) directs that a copy of this motion is sent to the Chancellor of the Exchequer, the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government and the Secretary of State for Business Innovation and Skills

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

**10. FORMER COUNCILLOR FRANK TAYLOR**

Members of the Council paid tribute to former Councillor Frank Taylor, who had recently died. He was a City Council Member for both the Intake Ward and Gleadless Valley Ward.

**11. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING EDUCATION REFORM**

It was moved by Councillor Jackie Drayton, seconded by Councillor Jenny Armstrong, that this Council:

- (a) believes this Government is making a shambles of education reform;
- (b) is disappointed that the new English Baccalaureate Certificate seems to have been thought up without proper consultation with unions, teachers or school leaders and are not based on evidence or on expert opinion from education professionals or businesses and that the Secretary of State for Education (the Rt. Hon. Michael Gove, MP), should have engaged with experts and companies to ensure young people get the skills for jobs of the future;
- (c) is concerned that the new system will create a two tier system that will see many leave school with no or inferior qualifications and notes

a source quoted in the Mail on Sunday suggesting that the long term objective is to bring back a two tier system: "Schools will be given time to raise their game and adjust to that. If they can't, or decide their pupils simply aren't up to taking the new exam they may be forced to find a different option. That could reopen the debate about having another, less difficult exam.'

- (d) worries that students with learning difficulties have been overlooked in these proposals; the British Dyslexia Association said a renewed emphasis on exams rather than coursework and the breaking of two-year studies into smaller units and the extra stress associated with once-and-for-all exams could disadvantage candidates with some learning difficulties; the changes would also damage their chances of going on to higher education;
- (e) is concerned that the over emphasis on academic subjects will marginalise sport and arts and this approach has already been demonstrated through changing focus away from vocational education, cuts to support for vocational education services and cuts to funding to support work experience placements;
- (f) believes that these changes are out of date, from a Conservative-led Government totally out of touch with modern Britain and will produce an elitist system;
- (g) thinks that GCSE English exam papers should be remarked in England as they were in Wales; many students will struggle to go on to further education due to receiving lower than expected grades in English;
- (h) notes a recent report from Ofsted indicating that the Pupil Premium is not working in the way it was intended, because it fails to offset the cuts the Government has made to the schools budget, the report highlights that only 1 in 10 head teachers say the Pupil Premium is having a significant effect on supporting pupils from less well-off backgrounds, and that the funding is being used to plug holes in schools budgets, created by the biggest cuts in education spending since the 1950s; and
- (i) believes that this Government is making it difficult for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds to get the education they deserve and directs that a copy of this motion be sent to the Secretary of State for Education to relay these concerns to Government.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Joe Otten, 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) welcomes plans to reform Key Stage 4 examination, which have

been backed by a number of experts including Sir Mike Tomlinson, the former Chief Inspector of Schools;

- (b) however, reiterates its opposition to a two-tier system of examination;
- (c) therefore, lauds the notable policy changes secured by Liberal Democrats in Government, as set out in a report of The Financial Times on September 17<sup>th</sup> 2012, which include:
  - (i) avoiding the re-introduction of a two-tier system, by ensuring weaker pupils will not be entered into simpler exams; and
  - (ii) no return to “norm-referencing”, a process whereby grades are awarded to a fixed number of pupils;
- (d) further commends Liberal Democrats in Government for securing the Pupil Premium, which has seen £11.4 million invested into Sheffield schools this academic year, a figure which will continue to grow year-on-year;
- (e) notes recent comments by Lord Andrew Adonis, Minister of State for Education during the last Government, in which he stated, “I wish we had introduced the Pupil Premium”;
- (f) supports the moves by the Coalition Government to boost vocational education, including:
  - (i) increasing spending on apprenticeships in its first year by £250 million – a 50% increase on the previous Government’s commitments;
  - (ii) implementing a £1 billion Youth Contract, to tackle unemployment among 16-24 year-olds; and
  - (iii) providing financial backing for a Sheffield University Technical College, which will deliver vital skills and training to the next generation of Sheffielders; and
- (g) also welcomes announcements made at the recent Liberal Democrat Conference, which will help support disadvantaged children and young people, including:
  - (i) a further £100m to repeat the successful Summer Schools programme in 2013 and 2014;
  - (ii) an increase in the Pupil Premium entitlement to £900 a year for each disadvantaged child; and
  - (iii) an additional £50 million a year to provide extra tuition to 11-year-olds who are struggling with poor maths and reading skills.

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

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

- (i) is disappointed at the news that there were almost 30,000 fewer applications for university places this year due to the increase in tuition fees to £9000 per year, making further education unaffordable and undesirable for many students;
- (j) regrets that the Government's decision to treble fees has clearly deterred people from applying to university;

Motion to move to next business

During the debate, it was moved by Councillor David Baker, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, that the Council does now proceed to next business.

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

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes this Government is making a shambles of education reform;
- (b) is disappointed that the new English Baccalaureate Certificate seems to have been thought up without proper consultation with unions, teachers or school leaders and are not based on evidence or on expert opinion from education professionals or businesses and that the Secretary of State for Education (the Rt. Hon. Michael Gove, MP), should have engaged with experts and companies to ensure young people get the skills for jobs of the future;
- (c) is concerned that the new system will create a two tier system that will see many leave school with no or inferior qualifications and notes a source quoted in the Mail on Sunday suggesting that the long term objective is to bring back a two tier system: "Schools will be given time to raise their game and adjust to that. If they can't, or decide their pupils simply aren't up to taking the new exam they may be forced to find a different option. That could reopen the debate about having another, less difficult exam";
- (d) worries that students with learning difficulties have been overlooked in these proposals; the British Dyslexia Association said a renewed

emphasis on exams rather than coursework and the breaking of two-year studies into smaller units and the extra stress associated with once-and-for-all exams could disadvantage candidates with some learning difficulties; the changes would also damage their chances of going on to higher education;

- (e) is concerned that the over emphasis on academic subjects will marginalise sport and arts and this approach has already been demonstrated through changing focus away from vocational education, cuts to support for vocational education services and cuts to funding to support work experience placements;
- (f) believes that these changes are out of date, from a Conservative-led Government totally out of touch with modern Britain and will produce an elitist system;
- (g) thinks that GCSE English exam papers should be remarked in England as they were in Wales; many students will struggle to go on to further education due to receiving lower than expected grades in English;
- (h) notes a recent report from Ofsted indicating that the Pupil Premium is not working in the way it was intended, because it fails to offset the cuts the Government has made to the schools budget, the report highlights that only 1 in 10 head teachers say the Pupil Premium is having a significant effect on supporting pupils from less well-off backgrounds, and that the funding is being used to plug holes in schools' budgets, created by the biggest cuts in education spending since the 1950s;
- (i) is disappointed at the news that there were almost 30,000 fewer applications for university places this year due to the increase in tuition fees to £9000 per year, making further education unaffordable and undesirable for many students;
- (j) regrets that the Government's decision to treble fees has clearly deterred people from applying to university; and
- (k) believes that this Government is making it difficult for pupils from disadvantaged backgrounds to get the education they deserve and directs that a copy of this motion be sent to the Secretary of State for Education to relay these concerns to Government.

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

## **12. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING BROADBAND SERVICES**

It was moved by Councillor Alison Brelsford, seconded by Councillor Trevor Bagshaw, that this Council:-

- (a) believes a superfast broadband network will be the foundation of a new British economic dynamism, creating hundreds of thousands of jobs and adding billions to our Gross Domestic Product;
- (b) supports the commitment of the Coalition Government to ensure the UK has the best broadband network in Europe by 2015;
- (c) however, notes the recent report of The Country Land and Business Association, which claims that up to a fifth of people in rural areas still do not have adequate broadband services and that economic development in rural areas is being put at risk because of failures to provide adequate access to the internet;
- (d) recalls the Council's Rural Communities Strategy 2010-13, which commits to finding solutions for rural communities that did not have adequate broadband access;
- (e) understands that many rural communities in Sheffield still do not have adequate broadband access; and
- (f) therefore, directs the Chief Executive to bring a report to the Council's Cabinet detailing progress in delivering broadband for rural communities and setting out future steps the Council can take to ensure access is fully rolled-out.

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

- 1. the addition of the words “, however, regrets that this has not been matched by the necessary resources to deliver this commitment” at the end of paragraph (b);
- 2. the addition of new paragraphs (c) and (d) as follows and the relettering of original paragraphs (c) to (f) as new paragraphs (e) to (h);
- (c) notes research from the London School of Economics indicating that Government targets on broadband are unlikely to be met due to a £1.1 billion funding gap;
- (d) regrets that in the Government's recent announcement to award broadband funding to Belfast, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, Edinburgh, Leeds, Bradford, London, Manchester and Newcastle, Sheffield received nothing despite bidding into the scheme and believes that Sheffield should have received this funding;

3. the deletion in new paragraph (f) of all the words after the words “recalls the” and their substitution by the words “Digital Region project which has built a 350 mile fibre optic network across the entire region, including rural communities”;
4. the deletion in new paragraph (g) of the word “rural” and the addition of the words “including in rural communities, despite the progression of the Digital Region Project” at the end of that paragraph; and
5. the insertion between the words “broadband” and “for” in new paragraph (h), of the words “through the Digital Region Project, including implications”.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes a superfast broadband network will be the foundation of a new British economic dynamism, creating hundreds of thousands of jobs and adding billions to our Gross Domestic Product;
- (b) supports the commitment of the Coalition Government to ensure the UK has the best broadband network in Europe by 2015, however, regrets that this has not been matched by the necessary resources to deliver this commitment;
- (c) notes research from the London School of Economics indicating that Government targets on broadband are unlikely to be met due to a £1.1 billion funding gap;
- (d) regrets that in the Government’s recent announcement to award broadband funding to Belfast, Birmingham, Bristol, Cardiff, Edinburgh, Leeds, Bradford, London, Manchester and Newcastle, Sheffield received nothing despite bidding into the scheme and believes that Sheffield should have received this funding;
- (e) however, notes the recent report of The Country Land and Business Association, which claims that up to a fifth of people in rural areas still do not have adequate broadband services and that economic development in rural areas is being put at risk because of failures to provide adequate access to the internet;
- (f) recalls the Digital Region project which has built a 350 mile fibre optic network across the entire region, including rural communities;



- (g) understands that many communities in Sheffield still do not have adequate broadband access, including in rural communities, despite the progression of the Digital Region Project; and
- (h) therefore, directs the Chief Executive to bring a report to the Council's Cabinet detailing progress in delivering broadband through the Digital Region Project, including implications for rural communities and setting out future steps the Council can take to ensure access is fully rolled-out.

(Note: 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Janice Sidebottom, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted for Paragraphs (a) and (e) to (h) and against Paragraphs (b) (c) and (d) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Jillian Creasy and Robert Murphy voted for Paragraphs (b) to (h) and abstained on Paragraph (a) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

### **13. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING ACCESS TO AFFORDABLE CREDIT**

It was moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Cate McDonald, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the UK-wide campaign to end 'legal loan sharking';
- (b) believes that the lack of access to affordable credit is socially and economically damaging; unaffordable credit is causing a myriad of unwanted effects such as poorer diets, colder homes, rent, council tax and utility arrears, depression (which impacts on job seeking behaviour) and poor health;
- (c) is aware that some loan and credit companies are charging annual interest rates equivalent to over 2500% (despite the Bank of England base rate being just 0.5%); borrowing at these rates repeatedly tips customers into inescapable cycles of debt and poverty;
- (d) further notes that unaffordable credit is extracting wealth from the most deprived communities;
- (e) anticipates that the situation is likely to get worse as wages are not increasing at the rate of inflation and an increasing number on low incomes are accessing 'pay day' loans and at the same time people will struggle to adjust to universal credit payments which will be paid monthly, resulting in thousands of residents struggling to balance their personal finances;

- (f) believes it is the responsibility of all levels of government to try to ensure affordable credit for all, and therefore pledges to use best practice to promote financial literacy and affordable lending; this will help to ensure that wealth stays in the local economy;
- (g) pledges to help promote credit unions which are community based organisations offering access to affordable credit and promoting saving in Sheffield;
- (h) calls on the Government to introduce caps on the total lending rates that can be charged for providing credit; and
- (i) believes that cleaning up the finance industry is essential to a sustainable economic recovery.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Alison Brelsford, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (g) as follows and the re-lettering of original paragraphs (g) to (i) as new paragraphs (h) to (j):-

- (g) welcomes the Government's commitment to investing £38m in helping Credit Unions to modernise and expand;

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

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

|  |
|--|
| <p>RESOLVED: That this Council:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>(a) welcomes the UK-wide campaign to end 'legal loan sharking';</li><li>(b) believes that the lack of access to affordable credit is socially and economically damaging; unaffordable credit is causing a myriad of unwanted effects such as poorer diets, colder homes, rent, council tax and utility arrears, depression (which impacts on job seeking behaviour) and poor health;</li><li>(c) is aware that some loan and credit companies are charging annual interest rates equivalent to over 2500% (despite the Bank of England base rate being just 0.5%); borrowing at these rates repeatedly tips customers into inescapable cycles of debt and poverty;</li><li>(d) further notes that unaffordable credit is extracting wealth from the most deprived communities;</li><li>(e) anticipates that the situation is likely to get worse as wages are not increasing at the rate of inflation and an increasing number on low incomes are accessing 'pay day' loans and at the same time people</li></ul> |
|--|

will struggle to adjust to universal credit payments which will be paid monthly, resulting in thousands of residents struggling to balance their personal finances;

- (f) believes it is the responsibility of all levels of government to try to ensure affordable credit for all, and therefore pledges to use best practice to promote financial literacy and affordable lending; this will help to ensure that wealth stays in the local economy;
- (g) pledges to help promote credit unions which are community based organisations offering access to affordable credit and promoting saving in Sheffield;
- (h) calls on the Government to introduce caps on the total lending rates that can be charged for providing credit; and
- (i) believes that cleaning up the finance industry is essential to a sustainable economic recovery.

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

#### **14. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING CARRIAGE OF BICYCLES ON TRAMS AND TRAINS**

It was moved by Councillor Peter Price, seconded by Councillor Ben Curran, that this Council: recognises the fact that many European cities allow bicycles on their trams and also local trains using the rail network, all without any reported problems, and therefore supports 'The Sheffield Cycle Forum' campaign to call upon the partners on the Tram Train pilot project which is to be trialed on the new proposed link between Sheffield and Rotherham, to allow the carrying of bicycles as part of that pilot and requests that the South Yorkshire Integrated Transport Authority make representations to Stagecoach indicating support for this campaign.

Whereupon, it was 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 the "(a)" after the words "That this Council" and the deletion of all the words after the words "to allow the carrying of bicycles as part of that pilot" at the end of that paragraph; and
2. the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (i) as follows:-
  - (b) recalls that in a motion passed unanimously in June 2012, which welcomed investment in a tram/train pilot for Sheffield and Rotherham, the Council also resolved to make efforts to ensure that

bicycles would be carried on the new tram/trains;

- (c) is disappointed to learn that, due to Stagecoach's conditions of carriage, it is now anticipated that bicycles will not be carried;
- (d) notes that heavy rail franchises are expected, as a general principle, to carry bicycles;
- (e) believes that, as this is a national pilot, it is vital that the feasibility of carrying bicycles on tram/trains is tested and that Sheffield leads the way in terms of integrated transport;
- (f) notes that chairs and buggies needed by vulnerable travellers such as disabled people and young children would have priority over bicycles in the same way as they do on trains;
- (g) calls on Stagecoach to amend the conditions of carriage to accommodate the carriage of bicycles on the trial tram-trains;
- (h) calls on the Department for Transport, which is promoting the pilot, South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive which is leading on delivery, and the other partners, namely Network Rail and Northern Rail, to also bring pressure to bear on Stagecoach to resolve this issue; and
- (i) requests that copies of this motion be sent to the Chief Executives of Stagecoach, all the bodies named in paragraph (g) above, the Leader of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council and all MPs representing Rotherham and Sheffield.

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) recognises the fact that many European cities allow bicycles on their trams and also local trains using the rail network, all without any reported problems, and therefore supports 'The Sheffield Cycle Forum' campaign to call upon the partners on the Tram Train pilot project which is to be trialed on the new proposed link between Sheffield and Rotherham, to allow the carrying of bicycles as part of that pilot ;
- (b) recalls that in a motion passed unanimously in June 2012, which welcomed investment in a tram/train pilot for Sheffield and Rotherham, the Council also resolved to make efforts to ensure that bicycles would be carried on the new tram/trains;

- (c) is disappointed to learn that, due to Stagecoach's conditions of carriage, it is now anticipated that bicycles will not be carried;
- (d) notes that heavy rail franchises are expected, as a general principle, to carry bicycles;
- (e) believes that, as this is a national pilot, it is vital that the feasibility of carrying bicycles on tram/trains is tested and that Sheffield leads the way in terms of integrated transport;
- (f) notes that chairs and buggies needed by vulnerable travellers such as disabled people and young children would have priority over bicycles in the same way as they do on trains;
- (g) calls on Stagecoach to amend the conditions of carriage to accommodate the carriage of bicycles on the trial tram-trains;
- (h) calls on the Department for Transport, which is promoting the pilot, South Yorkshire Passenger Transport Executive which is leading on delivery, and the other partners, namely Network Rail and Northern Rail, to also bring pressure to bear on Stagecoach to resolve this issue; and
- (i) requests that copies of this motion be sent to the Chief Executives of Stagecoach, all the bodies named in paragraph (h) above, the Leader of Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council and all MPs representing Rotherham and Sheffield.

**15. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING HOUSEHOLD WASTE RECYCLING CENTRES**

It was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, that this Council:-

- (a) recalls the decision of the incoming Administration in May 2012 to reduce the budget for Household Waste Recycling Centres by a further £204,000;
- (b) understands that Blackstock Road has the highest tonnage of any recycling centre, and is therefore dismayed at the Administration's decision to close Blackstock Road three days a week, while another centre remains open seven days a week;
- (c) notes reports of queues of more than 100 cars, which have formed outside Blackstock Road Recycling Centre, causing serious concerns for road safety;
- (d) furthermore, believes the introduction of fortnightly black bin collections, the ceasing of other recycling services, and the failure to

avoid repeated strikes, has only served to exacerbate the situation;

- (e) regrets the Administration's treatment of residents in the south and south-west of the City who use the Blackstock Road Recycling Centre, and believes the Administration has made insufficient effort to mitigate the effects of this unfair decision; and
- (f) challenges the Administration to reconsider the unfair reduction in hours at Blackstock Road and provide the service that local people deserve.

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

- (a) regrets that the Council has had to reduce spending by £55 million in the 2012/13 budget and that by 2015/16 the Council will have £170m less to spend than it did in 2011/12 and regrets that the main opposition group continue to fully support the level of cuts imposed on the Council by the Conservative-led Government;
- (b) further regrets that to meet this unprecedented financial gap in the budget, the Council has had to reduce the opening hours of the five Household Waste Recycling Centres, however acknowledges that the previous Administration made the majority of the cuts to these Centres in the 2011/12 budget;
- (c) notes that the Council makes every effort to provide the best possible waste service, including sufficient opening hours at the Household Waste Recycling Centres to offer a sustainable service, working within the severe financial constraints imposed by the Government;
- (d) recognises that the present Administration have made several improvements to original proposals to manage the reductions in opening hours and under the revised opening hours, Sheffield's five Household Waste Recycling Centres will be open a total of 29 days every week, with all sites open on the peak days of Friday to Monday, sites open every day of the week and summer opening times until 6pm which better suits the needs of users;
- (e) notes that in their 2012/13 budget amendments, neither opposition group proposed to reverse any savings to Household Waste Recycling Centres which would be required to re-consider reductions in opening hours and believes that the late involvement of the main opposition group after the revised opening hours have already been implemented is nothing more than blatant political opportunism;

- (f) deplores the outrageously misleading and factually inaccurate accusations made in the press by the Leader of the main opposition group that the distribution of reductions in opening hours across Household Waste Recycling Centres have been politically motivated;
- (g) confirms for the record that there is absolutely no truth in the claims that the distribution of reductions in opening hours across Household Waste Recycling Centres have been politically motivated and notes the following statement by the Director of Finance and Corporate Services at SOVA - "SOVA Recycling Ltd were asked, as were all those organisations who submitted a tender to run the sites in 2011, how they proposed to allow commercial waste to be accepted at the sites. Due to the licenses under which the sites operate, household waste and commercial waste must be kept separate. This meant that a site had to be chosen which would need be closed to the public during the periods it would be accepting commercial waste. SOVA specifically chose Blackstock for this purpose, with the decision being based on its more central location, with Douglas Road being deemed unsuitable due to its layout and the fact the buildings on the site were needed to process recycling materials.";
- (h) further confirms that the only favoured area of the present Administration is the whole of Sheffield;
- (i) calls upon the Leader of the main opposition group to apologise to the people of Sheffield for what this Council regards as an attempt to mislead them by claiming that the distribution of reductions in opening hours were politically motivated;
- (j) further remembers that the Leader of the main opposition group was previously the Cabinet Member who oversaw the most shambolic mismanagement of the waste service the City has known through the introduction of blue boxes to recycle paper which angered many local people and welcomes that the present Administration are now resolving this issue across the City;
- (k) reiterates its regret for all cuts to waste services, however, recognises that they are ultimately a consequence of the Liberal Democrat Party's, led by the Member of Parliament for Sheffield Hallam, decision to support a Conservative-led Government which is heavily cutting Sheffield's budget at the same time as some of the wealthiest Councils in the Conservative heartlands receive almost no cuts at all and regrets that the Liberal Democrat Party both locally and nationally continue to refuse to stand up for Sheffield; and
- (l) regrets that when Sheffield is facing one of the most challenging periods in its history, the main opposition group continue to resort to making petty and factually inaccurate accusations in an attempt to

deflect the responsibility from the Member of Parliament for Sheffield Hallam and the Liberal Democrats who are part of a Government that is imposing unprecedented cuts to the Council's services, which is inevitably impacting on the services that are provided for Sheffield people.

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

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) regrets that the Council has had to reduce spending by £55 million in the 2012/13 budget and that by 2015/16 the Council will have £170m less to spend than it did in 2011/12 and regrets that the main opposition group continue to fully support the level of cuts imposed on the Council by the Conservative-led Government;
- (b) further regrets that to meet this unprecedented financial gap in the budget, the Council has had to reduce the opening hours of the five Household Waste Recycling Centres, however acknowledges that the previous Administration made the majority of the cuts to these Centres in the 2011/12 budget;
- (c) notes that the Council makes every effort to provide the best possible waste service, including sufficient opening hours at the Household Waste Recycling Centres to offer a sustainable service, working within the severe financial constraints imposed by the Government;
- (d) recognises that the present Administration have made several improvements to original proposals to manage the reductions in opening hours and under the revised opening hours, Sheffield's five Household Waste Recycling Centres will be open a total of 29 days every week, with all sites open on the peak days of Friday to Monday, sites open every day of the week and summer opening times until 6pm which better suits the needs of users;
- (e) notes that in their 2012/13 budget amendments, neither opposition group proposed to reverse any savings to Household Waste Recycling Centres which would be required to re-consider reductions in opening hours and believes that the late involvement of the main opposition group after the revised opening hours have already been implemented is nothing more than blatant political opportunism;



- (f) deplores the outrageously misleading and factually inaccurate accusations made in the press by the Leader of the main opposition group that the distribution of reductions in opening hours across Household Waste Recycling Centres have been politically motivated;
- (g) confirms for the record that there is absolutely no truth in the claims that the distribution of reductions in opening hours across Household Waste Recycling Centres have been politically motivated and notes the following statement by the Director of Finance and Corporate Services at SOVA - "SOVA Recycling Ltd were asked, as were all those organisations who submitted a tender to run the sites in 2011, how they proposed to allow commercial waste to be accepted at the sites. Due to the licenses under which the sites operate, household waste and commercial waste must be kept separate. This meant that a site had to be chosen which would need be closed to the public during the periods it would be accepting commercial waste. SOVA specifically chose Blackstock for this purpose, with the decision being based on its more central location, with Douglas Road being deemed unsuitable due to its layout and the fact the buildings on the site were needed to process recycling materials.";
- (h) further confirms that the only favoured area of the present Administration is the whole of Sheffield;
- (i) calls upon the Leader of the main opposition group to apologise to the people of Sheffield for what this Council regards as an attempt to mislead them by claiming that the distribution of reductions in opening hours were politically motivated;
- (j) further remembers that the Leader of the main opposition group was previously the Cabinet Member who oversaw the most shambolic mismanagement of the waste service the City has known through the introduction of blue boxes to recycle paper which angered many local people and welcomes that the present Administration are now resolving this issue across the City;
- (k) reiterates its regret for all cuts to waste services, however, recognises that they are ultimately a consequence of the Liberal Democrat Party's, led by the Member of Parliament for Sheffield Hallam, decision to support a Conservative-led Government which is heavily cutting Sheffield's budget at the same time as some of the wealthiest Councils in the Conservative heartlands receive almost no cuts at all and regrets that the Liberal Democrat Party both locally and nationally continue to refuse to stand up for Sheffield; and
- (l) regrets that when Sheffield is facing one of the most challenging

periods in its history, the main opposition group continue to resort to making petty and factually inaccurate accusations in an attempt to deflect the responsibility from the Member of Parliament for Sheffield Hallam and the Liberal Democrats who are part of a Government that is imposing unprecedented cuts to the Council's services, which is inevitably impacting on the services that are provided for Sheffield people.

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

**16. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING CARRIAGE OF BICYCLES ON TRAMS AND TRAINS (2)**

At the request of Councillor Jillian Creasy and with the consent of the Council, the Notice of Motion Numbered 13 on the Summons for this meeting was withdrawn.

**17. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING CARNAGE UK**

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Harry Harpham, seconded by Councillor Jayne Dunn, that this Council:-

- (a) recalls the 'Carnage UK' commercially organised bar crawls that have taken place in Sheffield in recent years which have provoked controversy, particularly noting an incident in October 2009;
- (b) notes with great concern the planned event in Sheffield on October 8<sup>th</sup> which is being advertised with the theme 'Pimps and Hoes' and believes that such a title is completely inappropriate and has caused offence;
- (c) supports comments by the Women's Officer at Sheffield University Student Union "As a representative of women students, and having worked in a refuge for women trafficked in to sexual slavery, I feel that this theme utterly trivialises violence against women - specifically violence against women in the sex industry. Just to be clear - the definition of a 'pimp' is a man who uses manipulation and or violence to coerce women (and sometimes men) in to prostitution in order to take their earnings. I am angry and disappointed that Carnage has chosen such a flagrantly sexist marketing strategy. I urge [them] to reconsider [their] theme."
- (d) notes that similar concerns have been expressed by the President of Sheffield Hallam University Student Union and Sheffield Central MP, Paul Blomfield;

- (e) continues to support the vibrant nightlife in Sheffield's many excellent bars, pubs and clubs, noting that this provides a boost to the local economy; and
- (f) welcomes the work undertaken by both Sheffield University and Sheffield Hallam University Student Unions to promote responsible drinking and encourages Carnage to refocus their approach based on this more responsible model and to take into account local feeling about their events both in the student community and amongst Sheffield people as a whole.

**18. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING UNIVERSITY TECHNICAL COLLEGE**

It was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes news that construction has begun on a University Technical College for Sheffield, one of only 18 across the country;
- (b) believes the University Technical College will provide vital training and skills for the next generation of Sheffielders, helping to tackle the chronic long-term problems of youth unemployment;
- (c) thanks the Coalition Government for providing the financial backing for the College, delivering a grant of £9.9 million;
- (d) praises companies such as Siemens Metals Technologies who have thrown their support behind the important project; and
- (e) recommends a joint meeting of the Children, Young People and Family Support and the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Committees to undertake a detailed examination to understand what further support the Council can provide to the development of the College.

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

1. the deletion of paragraph (c) and the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows:-
  - (c) however regrets that wider Government policy is changing focus away from vocational education, which is demonstrated through cutting the value of more than 3,100 vocational qualifications, cuts to support for vocational education services and cuts to funding to support work experience placements;
2. the addition of a new paragraph (e) as follows and the relettering of

the original paragraph (e) as a new paragraph (f):-

- (e) welcomes the work of all local partners to secure the University Technical College and supports the present Administration's continued focus on skills through creating the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme and 4,000 apprentices through the City Deal;

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes news that construction has begun on a University Technical College for Sheffield, one of only 18 across the country;
- (b) believes the University Technical College will provide vital training and skills for the next generation of Sheffielders, helping to tackle the chronic long-term problems of youth unemployment;
- (c) however regrets that wider Government policy is changing focus away from vocational education, which is demonstrated through cutting the value of more than 3,100 vocational qualifications, cuts to support for vocational education services and cuts to funding to support work experience placements;
- (d) praises companies such as Siemens Metals Technologies who have thrown their support behind the important project;
- (e) welcomes the work of all local partners to secure the University Technical College and supports the present Administration's continued focus on skills through creating the Sheffield Apprenticeship Programme and 4,000 apprentices through the City Deal; and
- (f) recommends a joint meeting of the Children, Young People and Family Support and the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny Committees to undertake a detailed examination to understand what further support the Council can provide to the development of the College.

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Janice Sidebottom, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Alison Brelsford and Trevor Bagshaw voted for Paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e) and (f) and against Paragraph (c) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

**19. NOTICE OF MOTION CONCERNING THE SUSTAINABLE COMMUNITIES ACT**

It was moved by Councillor Jillian Creasy, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council:-

- (a) supports the bottom up process in the Sustainable Communities Act that encourages Councils and their communities to drive the action and assistance that central Government gives to promote thriving local economies and sustainable communities;
- (b) notes that the Act enables Councils to make proposals to Government including requests for new powers or a transfer of powers or public money and function from central control to local control;
- (c) notes that Sheffield City Council was the first Council to opt in to the Act and that Government agreed to implement one of the Council's proposals, namely allowing the Council to help plan and run the Post Office network in the City, leading to a 5% growth in Post Office revenue in the City;
- (d) notes that Sheffield City Council's engagement of residents under the Act has been recognised as "excellent" and an example of best practice in Local Works' Best Practice Guide;
- (e) notes that new regulations for the Act made in June 2012 improve the process and make it more favourable for Councils in the following ways :
  - (i) Councils' proposals are submitted directly to the Government;
  - (ii) there will no longer be short listing;
  - (iii) Councils can submit proposals whenever they are ready as the process is now ongoing;
  - (iv) there will be a time limit of six months on the Government to consult and try to reach agreement with the Selector (currently the Local Government Association) regarding Councils' proposals and to then respond to those proposals; and
  - (v) Councils that choose to submit proposals may now decide how to consult and try to reach agreement with representatives of communities in their areas on what proposals to submit;
- (f) notes that the Government has formally invited all Local Authorities

to use the Act by submitting proposals;

- (g) resolves to request the Cabinet to use the Act by responding to this invitation, engaging in some form of public consultation and submitting proposals for action and assistance from central Government each year for the next three years and to then review the outcome of this activity and consider whether to continue to use the Act; and
- (h) further resolves to:
  - (i) inform the local media of this decision;
  - (ii) write to local MPs, informing them of this decision; and
  - (iii) write to Local Works informing them of this resolution to use the Act.

Whereupon it was moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Jack Scott, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the substitution in paragraph (g) of the words “the Cabinet to use” by the words “that officers bring forward a report to Cabinet detailing the resource implications and benefits of using”

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) supports the bottom up process in the Sustainable Communities Act that encourages Councils and their communities to drive the action and assistance that central Government gives to promote thriving local economies and sustainable communities;
- (b) notes that the Act enables Councils to make proposals to Government including requests for new powers or a transfer of powers or public money and function from central control to local control;
- (c) notes that Sheffield City Council was the first Council to opt in to the Act and that Government agreed to implement one of the Council’s proposals, namely allowing the Council to help plan and run the Post Office network in the City, leading to a 5% growth in Post Office revenue in the City;
- (d) notes that Sheffield City Council’s engagement of residents under the Act has been recognised as “excellent” and an example of best practice in Local Works’ Best Practice Guide;

- (e) notes that new regulations for the Act made in June 2012 improve the process and make it more favourable for Councils in the following ways :
  - (i) Councils' proposals are submitted directly to the Government;
  - (ii) there will no longer be short listing;
  - (iii) Councils can submit proposals whenever they are ready as the process is now ongoing;
  - (iv) there will be a time limit of six months on the Government to consult and try to reach agreement with the Selector (currently the Local Government Association) regarding Councils' proposals and to then respond to those proposals; and
  - (v) Councils that choose to submit proposals may now decide how to consult and try to reach agreement with representatives of communities in their areas on what proposals to submit;
- (f) notes that the Government has formally invited all Local Authorities to use the Act by submitting proposals;
- (g) resolves to request that officers bring forward a report to Cabinet detailing the resource implications and benefits of using the Act by responding to this invitation, engaging in some form of public consultation and submitting proposals for action and assistance from central Government each year for the next three years and to then review the outcome of this activity and consider whether to continue to use the Act; and
- (h) further resolves to:
  - (i) inform the local media of this decision;
  - (ii) write to local MPs, informing them of this decision; and
  - (iii) write to Local Works informing them of this resolution to use the Act.