

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 April 2013, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

**PRESENT**

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

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

**1. COUNCILLOR JANICE SIDEBOTTOM**

The Lord Mayor (Councillor John Campbell) announced the sad death of Councillor Janice Sidebottom. Members of the Council observed a minute's silence in her memory. Later in the meeting, Members of the Council paid tribute to Janice.

**2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE**

Apologies for absence were received from Councillors Trevor Bagshaw, Sioned Mair Richards, Stuart Wattam, Steve Wilson and Philip Wood.

**3. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

Councillor Denise Fox declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 17 on the Summons (notice of motion concerning refused asylum seekers) as she is an employee of the United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA).

Councillor Terry Fox declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 17 on the Summons (notice of motion concerning refused asylum seekers) as his spouse is an employee of the United Kingdom Border Agency (UKBA).

Councillor Martin Lawton declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in item 7 (Sheffield Local Plan) on the Summons (and specifically amendment numbered 3 on the List of Amendments concerning Norton Oakes, Norton) as his home address was located in that area.

**4. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS**

The minutes of the meeting of Council held on 6<sup>th</sup> February 2013 and the Special Meeting (Budget) held on 1<sup>st</sup> March 2013 were approved as correct records.

**5. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS**

**5.1 Lord Mayor's Communications**

St Luke's Hospice

The Lord Mayor (Councillor John Campbell) informed Council of the two visits which he had made to St Luke's Hospice during his term of office and spoke of the work of the Hospice in caring for patients and supporting families. Further information about the charity had been made available for Members at the Lord Mayor's request.

Fairtrade Fortnight

The Lord Mayor (Councillor John Campbell) introduced a video presentation, produced by pupils of King Egbert's School, and shown at the launch of Fairtrade fortnight on 22 March 2013.

## 5.2 Petitions

### (a) Petition Objecting to the Closure of Public Toilets

The Council received an electronic petition, containing 20 signatures, objecting to the proposed closure of public toilets.

Jennifer Allinson addressed the Council on behalf of the petitioners and stated that it was important that the public toilets were retained in places including parks and open spaces such as at Fox House. It would be more difficult for people to access these areas without such facilities in place. She asked whether the Council could examine the potential for local community based groups and volunteers to look after public toilets instead, rather than resorting to closing them. If the facilities were closed, there was concern that the surrounding areas may become degraded and depressed.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Isobel Bowler, Cabinet Member for Culture, Leisure and Sport. Councillor Bowler stated that she agreed with the petitioners in many ways and that the closure of public toilets was not something that the Council had sought to do and, in fact, the Council had previously invested in public toilets. The Council wished to protect public toilets in parks and was also speaking with other organisations, including the parish councils in connection with the maintenance of public toilets. However, it was not completely straightforward as there were health and safety considerations and the Council was responsible for the safety of people using the facilities. The annual cost of each facility was between £8K and £10K.

### (b) Petition Requesting the Right of Way to Rother Valley

The Council received a petition containing 394 signatures requesting the Right of Way to Rother Valley.

Eric Staniland made representations on behalf of the petitioners. He stated that the public Right of Way to Rother Valley had existed for 100 years. However, a local business had erected gates across the entrance and had stated that they had closed the entrance for reasons of health and safety. People in Beighton who had signed the petition believed that the right of way should be kept open for present and future generations. The Transpennine Way was at the end point of the Right of Way.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development. Councillor Bramall stated that he had spoken with local Councillor Ian Saunders regarding this matter, which had also been discussed at a public meeting. The Council was

considering what it could do in relation to the issues raised. He added that it was important that people were encouraged to provide evidence regarding the Right of Way.

(c) Petition Requesting the Implementation of Cycle Specific Road Safety Audits

The Council received a petition containing nine signatures and requesting the implementation of cycle specific road safety audits for highways schemes.

Matt Turner addressed the Council on behalf of the petitioners. He stated that, in 2007, a Notice of Motion was passed by the Council in connection with the carrying out of cycle audits on highways schemes and the consideration of cycles in the design of schemes. He stated that the Council did not operate this practice and asked that it be introduced.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development. Councillor Bramall stated that the Council had made a commitment to conduct cycle audits and an officer was to be put in post to undertake them. The Streets Ahead work was being prioritized in the first instance, although the audits would be done.

(d) Petition Objecting to lack of consultation regarding selective licensing in Page Hall/Fir Vale

The Council received a petition containing 94 signatures, objecting to lack of consultation regarding selective licensing in Page Hall and Fir Vale.

Ahsan Ashraf addressed the Council on behalf of the petitioners. He stated that landlords had not been consulted on the proposal to introduce selective licensing in Page Hall and Firvale and it was felt that information should be provided in order that people be given opportunity to comment. He stated that he had become aware of the scheme by reading an article in the Burngreave Messenger. Landlords considered that the Council needed to engage with them so decisions could be made which were right for the local area.

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

Public Questions concerning selective licensing

Questions were asked by Mr Mohammed Rafique, Mr Asad Hanif and Mr Mamood relating to proposals for a selective licensing scheme in Firvale and Page Hall, as follows:

It was believed that the scheme would have a negative impact upon house prices in the area and that banks may refuse to provide competitive mortgages as houses will be deemed high risk. In addition, home and car insurance could increase for those in an area selected for the scheme.

Selective licensing was only allowed where it would address issues such as low

housing demand or anti-social behaviour. What new powers did selective licensing give, which are not already available to the Police to tackle anti-social behaviour?

Thirdly, reference was made to rises in food and energy prices and potential reductions in the value of benefits that people might receive. There was concern that additional costs were being passed to tenants and the poorest people in the community would be most affected. It was stated that most landlords were responsible and did a good job.

In response to the petition and the questions above, Councillor Harry Harpham stated that the consultation was due to begin in the next few weeks. Landlords would be consulted about the proposals. He agreed that the vast majority of landlords were very good and provided a much needed service with decent and well-kept housing. However, a small proportion of landlords do not offer the type of quality housing that the Council wished to see.

Councillor Harpham said that he knew that there were problems with the quality of accommodation and landlords in the Firvale area. Poor housing made the area unattractive and very vulnerable people were exploited and were being put at risk. Several other local authorities had introduced selective licensing, for example Salford had piloted a scheme and were seeking to expand it. There was no evidence that house prices would fall or that landlords would be driven out of business as a result. He confirmed that landlords would be properly informed and asked about the proposals and that the Council would work with landlords, with the aim of tackling bad landlords and dealing with anti-social behaviour.

(e) Petition Objecting to the Mandatory Requirement for the Installation of CCTV Recording Equipment in Hackney Carriage and Private Hire Licenced Vehicles

The Council received a petition containing 906 signatures and objecting to the mandatory requirement for the installation of closed circuit television (CCTV) recording equipment in Hackney Carriage and Private Hire licenced vehicles.

Hafeas Rehman addressed the Council on behalf of the petitioners and stated that petitioners believed the introduction of mandatory CCTV in taxi vehicles was unnecessary as there was an existing voluntary scheme to help safeguard both drivers and the public. In the past 10 years, the taxi trade associations and the Council's officers had worked together effectively to produce the best quality drivers and it was disappointing to now be told that drivers were not trusted and to have to come direct to the Council in this way and present a petition. Taxi drivers were ambassadors for the City and yet they were being made to feel as if they were degraded.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Isobel Bowler, Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure.

Public Questions concerning the introduction of CCTV in licensed taxi vehicles

The following questions were asked concerning the introduction of CCTV in

Private Hire and Hackney Carriage vehicles:

Why was the introduction of CCTV being made mandatory, when there was not proof that it reduced serious crime? At an earlier meeting of the taxi trade and the Council, it was agreed that CCTV would be introduced voluntarily and at the Licensing Committee meeting on 5<sup>th</sup> February 2013, half of the trade representatives were not present and only 3 Councillors had been present. Why was the taxi forum disbanded when it helped members of the taxi trade and made for better working relations with the Council.

Drivers were also being affected by the economic conditions and it was the wrong time to introduce such a scheme. The best way would be to develop good practice which all parties could sign up to.

Arshad Ali stated that there was already a voluntary agreement in place regarding the use of CCTV in taxi vehicles and asked what was wrong with that arrangement and was there evidence to suggest that drivers have used or misused the present system to their own advantage?

Azar Hussain stated that he had voluntarily fitted CCTV in his Hackney Carriage vehicle and asked what were the specification requirements of the new system and would they require him to purchase an alternative system? He asked why there was a need for change if no complaints have been made regarding the abuse of the current system?

Mohammed Khan raised the issue of public and driver safety and asked what the Council was doing to protect drivers from passengers who did not pay their fare. He stated that it was unclear, given enquiries he had made with the police, as to whether failure to pay a fare was a criminal or civil matter and asked for the Council to clarify the position.

A question was asked concerning what consultation had been carried out with the public with regards to them being monitored by CCTV and the potential for their conversations being recorded during a journey

Niaz Saddiq stated that CCTV might violate a person's privacy, for example, some drivers used their vehicle for their own private use when they were not at work.

Mr Nawaz asked what would happen in circumstances when the CCTV was not functioning and an incident occurred and what would be the repercussions for the driver?

Tariq Sajawal stated that, although it had been said that the introduction of CCTV in vehicles was good for public safety, there were other vehicles operating in the City which were unlicensed, which could potentially have an adverse effect on public safety and that drivers plying for hire was also an issue of great concern.

Mr Usman stated that all taxi drivers were required have a Criminal Records Bureau check and asked why additional monitoring of drivers was needed.

A driver referred to his experience as a driver of 23 years and to an incident when he had received verbal abuse and had been spat upon by two female passengers who had refused to pay their fares. He was advised by the police not to pursue the perpetrators or take the matter further. He asked, if a camera had not functioned to record an incident such as this, what could have been done.

In response to the petition and the questions, Councillor Isobel Bowler, Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure, stated that the Council was listening to taxi drivers. She said that Sheffield has some of the best drivers in the country, although there were some drivers who were not as good and they could cause potential damage to the reputation of others. The Council was responsible for the safety of the public and was determined that mandatory CCTV would be introduced in licensed vehicles. However, there was a significant amount of detail to be worked upon and consultation done with the taxi trade. The Chair of the Licensing Committee, Councillor John Robson, would be making himself available to meet with the taxi trade.

There was not a proposal to introduce voice recording as part of the scheme. Councillor Bowler acknowledged that some drivers were victims of abuse and assault.

The Council had a responsibility to the traveling public to ensure their safety and the proposed introduction of CCTV in taxis was in support of this obligation. CCTV images would be used as evidence in certain circumstances and she believed that it would be of benefit to taxi drivers and to the public. The details of the scheme would be decided in consultation with the taxi trade.

(f) Petition Requesting that Newfield Green Library Remains Open

The Council received a petition containing 160 signatures requesting that Newfield Green Library remains open.

There was no speaker to the petition and the Council referred the petition to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion.

(g) Petition Requesting Stannington Library to be Kept Open

The Council received a petition containing 716 signatures requesting that Stannington Library be kept open.

There was no speaker to the petition and the Council referred the petition to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, Cabinet Member for Communities and Inclusion.

5.3 Public Questions

(a) Public questions concerning open space

Richard Pearson asked whether the added protection given to countryside that was not in the greenbelt by the adopted Core Strategy Policy CS 72 should be

honoured.

Vonny Watts referred to the refusal of the Council to withdraw a piece of land at Canterbury Crescent, Fulwood, from the Local Plan to provide affordable housing. She stated that this refusal was despite the fact that the site had protected species, was steeply sloping and poorly drained and there had been 31 objections submitted. She believed that the developer did not meet the criteria of affordable housing in this case and, more generally considered that the Council was listening to developers above the wishes of local people.

The Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, Councillor Leigh Bramall, responded that he was not aware of the specific details of the Canterbury Crescent site. The national planning policy framework required the Council to provide a 5 year supply of viable housing sites, although in the current climate there were few house builders coming forward to develop sites. Sites needed to be identified which were attractive to developers so the Council could demonstrate that it had the requisite 5 year housing supply.

The Council had green site policies to safeguard green sites and ninety per cent of development would take place on redeveloped or Brownfield sites. The proposals before Council at this meeting aimed to control and limit the number of green sites that the Council had to put forward as development land.

(b) Public question concerning green waste

Sue Johns stated that she had previously volunteered with the Hillsborough Forum, which was a focal point for the collection of green sacks for recycling garden waste, for which there was a high demand. The sacks were discontinued and whilst there were some drawbacks, the previous system worked reasonably well.

She asked if there were plans to reintroduce a similar service and what progress had been made towards implementation.

The Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene, Councillor Jack Scott, stated that Sheffield had a good story to tell in relation to recycling and reduced amounts of waste to landfill. He stated that more could be done and that the Council was working with Veolia to this end.

Councillor Scott stated that the Council was to commence a city-wide green bin service for which there would be a £60 charge for the year, including the cost of the bin. This scheme would be at no cost to the Council and the collected waste material would be composted at a local treatment facility. If people wished to receive the service, they would need to sign up for it.

(c) Public questions concerning the 'bedroom tax'

Michelle Turner asked why a disabled person living in two bedroom adapted accommodation should have to downsize, when the property they will move into would cost more in rent and would also have to be adapted at great expense to



the Council, when their existing accommodation was suitable. She asked if the Cabinet Member agreed that this was a false economy?

Robert Carston asked if was true that disabled people will be affected by the 'bedroom tax' and, if so, was this situation fair?

Vaquas Rehman asked what the Council could do to help those targeted by the Government through the 'bedroom tax' and if the Council would debate this issue at this meeting.

Mohammed Asif asked how many people would be affected by the 'bedroom tax' in Sheffield? He asked, if there were not enough smaller properties, did the Council think that this would lead to an increase in homelessness?

Ms S Frost, on behalf of the Benefits Justice Campaign, asked whether the Council would pledge the following:

- No action to enforce the bedroom tax
- No action against tenants who get rent arrears solely due to benefit cuts
- No intimidation or pressure on tenants to move
- No issue of Notices Seeking Possession on the same basis and no Court hearings
- Withdraw demand for 23 per cent Council Tax from low paid, unemployed and disabled people
- No enforcement of same and no Court hearings
- No action against Council employees who decline to work on enforcing these unjust benefit cuts
- Follow the examples of other councils who have decided not to evict tenants who cannot pay the 'bedroom tax' and who have not passed a cut in Council tax funding onto the poorest people in the City.

Martin Brighton stated that other councils said that they would not evict any tenants who fall into arrears because of the 'bedroom tax' and asked if the Council would evict anyone who falls into arrears because of the bedroom tax? He also asked if the Council had received any indication from any source, that if Labour were elected to government, they would scrap the bedroom tax?

In response to the questions, Councillor Harry Harpham, the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, stated that he agreed with the points made by Ms Frost. The policies relating to the 'bedroom tax' were made by the Government, which affected hardworking families and people who were disabled. The Council was acting to help to mitigate the effects of the welfare reforms which had been introduced. Councillor Harpham gave examples to illustrate the implications of the bedroom tax, such as for families where it would be detrimental for two siblings to share a bedroom because one had a medical condition, or a case of a wife who was also carer needing to sleep in a separate room due their partner's condition. There was evidence that the bedroom tax would not work and the Council had made representations to Government to say that it was not practical. He pledged that the Council would stand with the campaign to oppose the changes to housing benefit or bedroom tax.

(d) Public questions concerning Early Year's services from the Community Childcare Group

Chrissy Meleady asked several questions in reference to a statement which she also submitted relating to Early Year's services:

Given all of the above [statement], the Sheffield City Council is asked why were the specified codes, policies, guidance, laws and requirements not adhered to in regard to each and every concern, complaint and request issued to the Council as threaded through the above and as submitted to the Council previously? How could this be allowed to happen? How can it be addressed and by whom and by when?

How could Sheffield City Council take a stance of dereliction of duty towards those complaining of being ill-treated as per the above, they raised very serious concerns, complaints, requests for formal independent investigation and for Sheffield community not for profit provisions to secure block purchase placements as other local authorities are doing. What tools were deployed in these considerations/deliberations/assessments? What was the outcome and how was this shared with the sector concerned?

It is understood by the families and communities that in previous years the early years department of the Sheffield City Council had sizeable underspends. From 2007, to the present day, what were these annually and what happened to these revenue and capital underspends?

Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families responded and referred to allegations which had been part of the questions and accompanying statement. She stated that the appropriate people were not necessarily present in the Chamber to answer the issues raised.

She confirmed that Chrissy Meleady had written to her and that the matters raised were being investigated and the Council had a legal process that it was required to follow. She requested that the allegations be submitted to the Council, together with evidence.

In reference to the point raised concerning revenue and capital underspends, Councillor Drayton stated that capital work was undertaken over a 3 year period in schools for such projects as replacement toilets, windows and boilers and some funding was used over several academic years to enable the repairs to be done over the summer period. The financial resources necessary were profiled in the budget, although in some schools, the work remained to be done. This was not funding that could be used for another purpose. Some re-profiling could be done, although that would have implications for major repairs in schools, in relation to which, there was a £125 million backlog.

In relation to early years, there was a component of funding for free early learning which could be used for capital improvements in nurseries to ensure that providers could deliver places for free early learning for 2 year olds.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, stated that where there was slippage in relation to capital programmes and as these were rolled out, funding would be carried forward into the next financial year. Some projects were in the capital programme which would bring savings in future years.

A formal written response would be provided to the questions submitted.

(e) Public questions concerning Streets Ahead and outsourcing contractors

Nigel Slack referred to a matter which he had raised at the Cabinet meeting in November 2012 concerning redaction of information. He stated that he was still awaiting a response, having also raised the matter at Cabinet on 13 February 2013. He asked for a date by which he might expect a response to the question.

Mr Slack also asked the Council to include as part of the end of year figures, a breakdown of the monies spent on outsourcing as a total for the year, broken down into the types of contractor and including, where possible, the percentage profits involved.

In response, Councillor Julie Dore stated that she understood that the Chief Executive had spoken with Mr Slack about the reasons for the redaction of the documents to which he now referred. The Council was looking to see if it could provide a less redacted version of the document within the next 10 working days.

Councillor Bryan Lodge, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, stated that he would discuss the potential for including additional information about contractors in the year end report and would provide a written response to Mr Slack.

(f) Public question concerning the former Jessops Hospital

Nigel Slack referred to a newspaper article concerning the approval for demolition of the Edwardian wing of the former Jessops Hospital. He asked:

How can the Council now prevent the destruction of other listed buildings after setting this precedent?

How can we have confidence in the work of the Council's conservation officers if the Council will not listen to them?

Can the Council confirm that meetings were held between the University and senior Council Officers, who they were, the subject of the meetings and whether they were minuted and if the minutes were public? If not, why not?

Why should we believe the forecasts (projected gains) of the University and what can the Council do to monitor these forecasts and, more importantly what will they do if the forecasts are wrong?

In response, Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills

and Development, stated that meetings were held between Council officers and the applicant. He said that he would write to Mr Slack with answers to the specific questions that he had asked. It was part of a planning officer's job to meet with applicants in relation to planning schemes. Whilst there were people with conservation expertise, their views were not always absolute and the Council's planning department had to make a balanced judgement in relation to each planning application on its own merits.

Councillor Bramall added that the Council had done a lot of work as regards conservation and a local list had been developed and conservation areas were adopted in some places. Some schemes had been noted by English Heritage. The decision relating to the former Jessops Hospital had not been taken on the basis of construction jobs but had taken into account the City's wider economy.

(g) Public questions concerning housing consultation groups and stock transfer

Martin Brighton stated that, at a previous Full Council, the question of the release of minutes of the meetings of the eight housing consultation groups was raised and agreed in principle. Since then, one formal request from another tenant was refused, the response being to the effect of "You don't need them". Given the public agreement of the Cabinet Member for Housing, will he please see to it that they are made available – preferably on the Council's website.

Secondly, Mr Brighton referred to a City Wide Housing Consultation meeting, at which it was unanimously agreed, with one abstention, that the Cabinet Member for Housing write to the Minister for Housing, objecting in the strongest possible terms to the housing proposals. He asked, when could tenants see the letter, following the City-Wide meeting, and the reply of the Minister?

Thirdly, Mr Brighton asked: can this Council categorically and unequivocally state that, as far as this Council is concerned, Stock Transfer, in any form, is off the agenda.

In response to the questions, Councillor Harry Harpham, the Cabinet Member for Homes and Regeneration, stated that it was his understanding that it was agreed that the minutes of the housing consultation groups would be made public. In relation to the housing proposals, Councilor Harpham stated that he wrote a letter to the Minister, Eric Pickles MP and believed that both the letter and the response from the Minister had been made public. He said that he would make sure it was in the public domain. Finally, he stated that, while this Administration was in power, stock transfer was off the agenda and will not come back on it.

5.4 Petitions Requiring Debate

5.4.1 Petition regarding the former Sheffield Airport site

The Council received a petition containing 5289 signatures, calling on the City Council to "urgently ensure that any redevelopment of the site of the former City Airport (including further destruction of its infrastructure) is proscribed until an independent public inquiry is held to look into the

potential for its future use as a facility for commercial aviation.”

The petition contained more than 5000 signatures and, at the request of the lead petitioner, under the Council’s Petitions Scheme, the petition was the subject of a public debate by the Council.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Neville Martin and Gordon Millward. Mr Martin referred to the proposed redevelopment of the former City airport site as a business park.

It was considered that the reasons given for not seeking to re-open the airport were misleading and that there were certain myths as regards the airport. In contrast, air operators would be prepared to fly from a Sheffield airport. A business park, as had been proposed would not by itself create wealth and jobs and, in fact, there was a significant amount of redundant commercial property in the City. An airport would help provide a greater profile for Sheffield and facilitate travel and business relating to trade fares and conferences.

Mr Martin suggested that the Robin Hood Airport could not provide the services which Sheffield needed, although the two airports could work in tandem, with a City airport offering services including city-hopping and business travel.

The Local Enterprise Partnership was to bid for a proportion of funding to support a Local Enterprise Zone and he called on the Council to undertake a public inquiry to look at issues relating to the City airport. He also asked for the consideration of any planning application for the site to be delayed until the outcome of such an inquiry was known.

Gordon Millward, on behalf of the Federation of Small Businesses, referred to advanced and creative industries and to the ‘green shoots’ of economic recovery as evident in the Advanced Manufacturing Park and which needed to be nurtured. Transport links to the region were important and were needed to make sure that South Yorkshire was in a healthy position in the economic recovery and there was a danger that the City would be left behind without good access links for global markets and trade, access to an international hub airport and fast connections to the Capital. He stated that the necessary finance could be found through the Local Enterprise Partnership. The petitioners were seeking a commitment from the City Council in support of an inquiry into the feasibility of an airport and the retention of the former airport site until such an inquiry has taken place.

Members of the City Council debated the issues raised by the petition, as summarised below.

- The Council had a positive working relationship with the Federation of Small Businesses, although it disagreed with the Federation as regard the development of an airport. The Council did not have powers to halt the business park development on the site of the former airport,

which was in private ownership.

- There were constraints at the former airport site which affect its viability.
- The Council would have to underwrite potential operating losses, which may be for an extended period, for example, London City Airport took some 15 years to cease making a loss.
- The Robin Hood Airport had the potential to be a good airport, but was hampered by relatively poor access at the present time. However, the Regional Growth funding was to be used to improve the road transport link and reduce the journey time from Sheffield to the Airport to 30 minutes.
- Any aircraft was able to operate from the Robin Hood Airport and it was capable of fulfilling the requirements of an international airport.
- Whilst there was agreement that an airport was advantageous, Sheffield's economy actually grew after the closure of the Sheffield City Airport.
- Major airports such as Manchester and London were on the outskirts of the metropolitan area and Robin Hood Airport was comparable in journey time from Sheffield. It was necessary to have quick and simple rail and road transport to the Airport.
- The original Sheffield City Airport was subject to unfortunate timing of 9/11, which affected air travel and operators and witnessed a decline in airport trade.
- The use of public money for the development of an airport in Sheffield was not a viable option.
- The Council could give its positive encouragement to see whether the airport could be successfully run as a commercial enterprise and the development of a business plan.
- The Council did benefit from discussion with and listening to those in the business community through such groupings as the Business Advisory Panel.
- People were affected by aircraft as they lived or worked on the flight path.
- The name and branding of the Robin Hood Airport was an issue which needed to be resolved.
- The Sheffield City Region was important and a combined authority

approach was needed to implement the City Deal, for example.

- There may be potential for an airport to compliment Robin Hood Airport, providing business flights

After a right of reply from the lead petitioner, the City Council considered courses of action available in response to the petition. The following two proposals were moved in response to the petition received relating to a Sheffield airport and the subsequent debate.

It was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that this Council:

- (a) thanks the petitioners for presenting the petition;
- (b) confirms that the Council is not in a position to determine the future of the former Airport Site, as the sale of the site is a matter for the Airport Business Park and any potential buyer, but that the Council will not oppose a private sector solution;
- (c) understands that to return the site to a functioning and commercially viable airport would require a huge investment of tens of millions of pounds and believes the Council is in no position to underwrite any losses, especially at a time when it is faced with Government cuts; and
- (d) welcomes the development of the FARRS Link Road, supported by the Local Enterprise Partnership, which will mean that Doncaster/Sheffield Airport will be accessible in approximately 30 minutes from Sheffield City Centre by car.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council:

- (a) Thanks the petitioners for the incredible effort they have undertaken to raise the profile of this issue.
- (b) Believes that, if the Council is serious about its business-friendly image, it needs to address concerns raised by small business.
- (c) Therefore hopes the Council will work closely with any private consortium to facilitate discussions and support any privately funded bid that aims to re-open Sheffield City Airport as a commercially viable venture.
- (d) Suggests that a cost effective enquiry would be to refer the matter to the Economic and Environmental Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee

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

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) took the chair for the above item of business, the Lord Mayor having vacated the Chair.)

#### 5.4.2 Petition opposing Library closures

The Council received a petition, containing 10,348 signatures, objecting to proposed community library closures. The wording of the petition was as follows:-

*“We the undersigned call upon Sheffield City Council to keep our libraries open.”*

The petition contained more than 5000 signatures and, at the request of the lead petitioner, under the Council’s Petitions Scheme, the petition was the subject of a public debate by the Council.

On behalf of the petitioners, Diane Leek addressed the Council and stated that she was saddened that the potential closure of libraries was on the agenda. She referred to the depth of feeling people had for the City’s libraries. Concern was expressed that there was not enough detailed information available publicly concerning the future of libraries and a number of questions had not been answered, including which libraries were likely to close. Libraries had evolved and they offered a variety of services to communities and served to bring people in communities together. If such local services ceased, it would be difficult to stop the demise of other services. She asked the Council to look again at the decision and to consult further and provide more detailed information.

Members of the City Council debated the issues raised by the petition, as summarised below.

- The Council was doing all that it could to keep libraries open. Expenditure on libraries was to be reduced from £6.4 to £4.8 million. Consultation on the future of libraries in 2012 attracted 6000 responses. In January, individuals and groups from the not for profit and private sectors and were asked for ideas and to identify where and how they could help libraries as part of a call for action. The consultation would close on 8 April.
- Libraries were an asset at the heart of communities and were a place for old and young people to go to access information. They promoted literacy and a love of reading and were important in bringing about digital inclusion.
- Different ways of running libraries were being explored and the Arts Council and Local Government Association had published guidance on this subject. If volunteers were used to help run libraries, there would also be costs in terms of management and training.
- Libraries such as Woodseats had been redeveloped and included retail units.
- Over 200 libraries in England had closed since 2011 and about 300 more were under threat.



- Potential providers would need to know more detail as part of the call for action. A variety of options could be explored to sustain library services, including a trust model or expanding libraries to include other services. There were community based models in Sheffield, such as the Zest Healthy Living Centre, which incorporated the library.
- Members commented on whether more time might be made available to consult and develop proposals. Principles of future library services might include the protection of libraries in the most deprived areas, availability of information technology and a core team of Council staff to run libraries.
- The petition was an indication of how much people loved their libraries and children and young people benefited from reading, access to information for studies and development of a love of reading.
- Staff knowledge and skills were integral to a successful library. Library resources were necessary to support reading groups and activities such as parents reading with their children. Libraries were important in helping to improve educational attainment.
- Libraries were a place of haven for people and they supported other activities such as knitting clubs. Supporters and friends of libraries should also be recognised and thanked.

After a right of reply from the lead petitioner, the City Council considered courses of action available in response to the petition. The following two proposals were moved in response to the petition received relating to Libraries and the subsequent debate.

It was moved by Councillor Alison Brelsford, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council:

- (a) Thanks the petitioners
- (b) Regrets the decision of Labour Councillors to support a plan, which could see 14 of Sheffield's beloved libraries close
- (c) Notes that at the same meeting as the plan was agreed, Labour Councillors voted to allocate 2.2 million for City Centre Civic Accommodation.
- (d) Is disappointed that the administration will not reverse plans to cut £370,000 from the libraries budget next year.
- (e) Deplores the complete lack of detail given in the prospectus that makes it difficult for individuals or groups to put forward proposals.
- (f) Urges the administration to reveal which libraries are safe from closure.
- (g) Insists that more time is given to work with communities to develop

proposals.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that this Council:

- (a) thanks the petitioners for presenting the petition;
- (b) welcomes the present Administration's ongoing attempts to keep Libraries open through working with communities, businesses and entrepreneurs to find alternative ways of delivering library services;
- (c) fully opposes the Government's unprecedented and unfair cuts to Sheffield City Council and regrets that the Council has had to make savings of £140million over the past two years with a further £50million for 2013/14;
- (d) regrets that the cuts are impacting on services across the Council and, like councils across the country, Sheffield has to make reductions in all services including library budgets; and
- (e) resolves to continue to do everything possible to keep libraries open, working with local communities, and will take forward expressions of interest as part of the Library Review.

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

## **6. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS**

### **6.1 Urgent Business**

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

### **6.2 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.

### **6.3 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).

## **7. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES**

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

- (a) in accordance with the provisions of The NHS Bodies and Local Authorities (Partnership Arrangements, Care Trusts, Public Health and Local Healthwatch) Regulations 2012 and as set out the arrangements for the handling and consideration of complaints in respect of health as well as who should be responsible for complaints arrangements:-
  - (i) confirms the Chief Executive as the designated “Responsible Person” to be responsible for ensuring compliance with the arrangements under the Regulations, and in particular ensuring that the action is taken in light of the outcome of the complaint;
  - (ii) authorises the duties and responsibilities of the Chief Executive as the Responsible Person to be undertaken by such officer as the Chief Executive determines;
  - (iii) confirms the Complaints Manager (Customer Services) as the designated “Complaints Manager” pursuant to the Regulations responsible for managing the procedures for handling and considering complaints in accordance with those Regulations.
- (b) notes 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:-

Economic and Environmental - Councillor Jillian Creasy to replace  
Wellbeing Scrutiny and Policy Councillor Robert Murphy  
Development Committee
- (c) notes the resignation, with effect from 25<sup>th</sup> January 2013, of Paulette Kennedy from her role as a Parent Governor representative on the Children, Young People and Family Support Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee.

**8. SHEFFIELD LOCAL PLAN : PRE-SUBMISSION VERSION OF CITY POLICIES AND SITES DOCUMENT AND PROPOSALS MAP**

It was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Harry Harpham, that the recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting on 27<sup>th</sup> February 2013, concerning the Sheffield Local Plan: Pre-Submission Version of City Policies and Sites Document and Proposals Map, be confirmed.

“RESOLVED: That Cabinet:-

- (a) endorses the current version of the City Policies and Sites document and Proposals Map for publication;

- (b) refers this report and the documents to the next (non-budget) meeting of the full Council for approval for publication, invitation of formal representations and submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government; and
- (c) authorises the Executive Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Business Skills and Development to take all necessary procedural steps following the formal representations to enable the schedule of any changes to the document and Proposals Map to be submitted to the Secretary of State.”

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Sue Alston, as an amendment that the recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> February, 2013 in relation to the City Policies and Sites document and Proposals Map, be replaced by the following resolution:-

“That this Council opposes the allocation of green field land at Canterbury Crescent for up to fifteen houses, and therefore directs the Executive Director of Place to undertake further work on the report before submitting new proposals.”

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

It was then moved by Councillor David Baker, seconded by Councillor Katie Condliffe, as an amendment, that the recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> February, 2013 in relation to the City Policies and Sites document and Proposals Map, be replaced by the following resolution:-

“That this Council opposes the allocation of green field land at Worrall for up to fifty-five houses and green field land in Stannington for twenty houses, and therefore directs the Executive Director of Place to undertake further work on the report before submitting new proposals.”

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

It was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Denise Reaney, as an amendment, that the recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> February, 2013 in relation to the City Policies and Sites document and Proposals Map, be replaced by the following resolution:-

“That this Council opposes the allocation of green field land in Norton for up to fifty houses and designation as Housing Area of land at Norton Oakes, Norton, and therefore directs the Executive Director of Place to undertake further work on the report before submitting new proposals.”

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

It was moved by Councillor Alison Brelsford, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment that the recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting held on 27<sup>th</sup> February, 2013 in relation to the City Policies and Sites document

and Proposals Map, be replaced by the following resolution:-

“That this Council opposes the allocation of green field land in Oughtibridge for up to forty houses and green field land in Stocksbridge for fifty houses, and therefore directs the Executive Director of Place to undertake further work on the report before submitting new proposals.”

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) endorses the current version of the City Policies and Sites document and Proposals Map for publication;</li><li>(b) gives approval for publication, invitation of formal representations and submission to the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government; and</li><li>(c) authorises the Executive Director of Place, in consultation with the Cabinet Member with responsibility for Business, Skills and Development to take all necessary procedural steps following the formal representations to enable the schedule of any changes to the document and Proposals Map to be submitted to the Secretary of State.</li></ul>
--

(Note: Councillor Martin Lawton, having declared a disclosable pecuniary interest in relation to amendment 3 of the above item, took no part in the discussion or voting thereon.)

## **9. SHEFFIELD CITY REGION AUTHORITY**

It was moved by Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Leigh Bramall, that the recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting on 20<sup>th</sup> March 2013, concerning the Sheffield City Region Authority be confirmed.

“RESOLVED: That Cabinet recommends to the City Council at its meeting on 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2013 that it :-

- (a) endorses the findings of the Governance Review document referred to in Appendix 1, specifically that, establishing a SCR Authority would improve the exercise of statutory functions in relation to economic development, regeneration and transport in the SCR leading to an enhancement of the economic conditions and performance of the SCR;
- (b) endorses the submission to Government of a Scheme for the establishment of a Sheffield City Region Combined Authority on the basis of the draft annexed at Appendix 2 (the Scheme);

- (c) agrees that the City Council will formally become a constituent member of the SCR Authority, sharing appropriate economic development and transport powers with the SCR Authority, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (LDEDCA) and the Local Transport Act 2008(LTA); and
- (d) authorises the Director of Legal and Governance to agree the terms of and enter into any documentation required to enable the City Council to become a constituent member of the SCR Authority.”

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, as an amendment, that the recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting held on 20<sup>th</sup> March, 2013 in relation to the establishment of a Sheffield City Region Authority, be approved subject to the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (d) and the addition of a new paragraph (b) as follows:-

- (b) directs the Director of Legal & Governance to undertake further work to ensure the new bodies maintain political proportionality.

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

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

For the amendment (20) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, and Alison Brelsford.

Against the amendment (54) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor John Campbell) and Councillors Julie Dore, John Robson, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling Josephs, Helen Mirfin Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussian, Mohammad Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars Hammond, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, Martin Lawton, Peter Price, Peter Rippon, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Neale Gibson, Nikki

Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade,  
Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Abstained on the - Councillor Keith Hill.  
amendment (1)

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

- RESOLVED: That this Council:-
- (a) endorses the findings of the Governance Review document referred to in Appendix 1, specifically that, establishing a Sheffield City Region (SCR) Authority would improve the exercise of statutory functions in relation to economic development, regeneration and transport in the SCR leading to an enhancement of the economic conditions and performance of the SCR;
  - (b) endorses the submission to Government of a Scheme for the establishment of a Sheffield City Region Combined Authority on the basis of the draft annexed at Appendix 2 (the Scheme);
  - (c) agrees that the City Council will formally become a constituent member of the SCR Authority, sharing appropriate economic development and transport powers with the SCR Authority, in accordance with the provisions of the Local Democracy, Economic Development and Construction Act 2009 (LDEDCA) and the Local Transport Act 2008(LTA); and
  - (d) authorises the Director of Legal and Governance to agree the terms of and enter into any documentation required to enable the City Council to become a constituent member of the SCR Authority.

The votes on the above motion were ordered to be recorded and were as follows:-

- For the motion(73) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor John Campbell), the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Julie Dore, John Robson, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Simon Clement Jones, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling Josephs, Helen Mirfin Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Shaffaq Mohammed, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussain, Mohammed Maroof, Rob Frost, Geoff Smith, Sylvia Anginotti, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Keith Hill, Joyce Wright, Garry Weatherall, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Sue Alston, Andrew Sanger, Steve Jones, Tim

Rippon, Cate McDonald, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, George Lindars-Hammond, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Terry Fox, Anthony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Anders Hanson, Lynn Rooney, Martin Lawton, Peter Rippon, Peter Price, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Richard Crowther, Alison Brelsford, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Against the motion (0) - Nil.

Abstained on the motion (2) - Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy.

**10. MODERNISATION OF PLANNING AND HIGHWAYS AND CABINET HIGHWAYS COMMITTEES**

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Leigh Bramall seconded by Councillor Bryan Lodge, that the following recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting held on 20th March, 2013, concerning the modernisation of Planning and Highways and Cabinet Highways Committees, be approved:-

RESOLVED: that this Council:-

- (a) approves that, from May 2013, the existing two Area Planning and Highways Committees be combined into a single Planning Committee for the whole City; and
- (b) agrees that the digital presentation of planning application reports with an enhanced format be introduced at the first meeting of the new, modernised Planning Committee, following any pilot testing that officers deem necessary.

**11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR HARRY HARPHAM**

At the request of Councillor Harry Harpham (the mover of the motion) and with the consent of the Council, the Notice of Motion Numbered 10 on the Summons for this meeting was withdrawn.

**12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JACK SCOTT**

**Energy Costs**



It was moved by Councillor Jack Scott, seconded by Councillor Jayne Dunn, that this Council:-

- (a) notes with alarm that average fuel bills have increased by £300 since the Coalition Government came to power;
- (b) further notes that funding for insulation and fuel poverty projects has been cut significantly by the Government, with the end of Warm Front and other grants;
- (c) further notes the extremely short-sighted Government decision not to invest in green technology projects, such as South Yorkshire's Carbon Capture Scheme in Hatfield;
- (d) further notes the Government's much-vaunted Green Deal could represent a positive approach, but has been appallingly mismanaged and subject to numerous unnecessary delays;
- (e) recalls the huge success of the Free Insulation Scheme, funded through investment from the previous Government and initiated by the previous Labour Administration, which delivered improvements to over 28,000 Sheffield homes, reduced carbon emissions by 22,000 tonnes and secured energy savings to Sheffield people worth over £3.9m per year;
- (f) celebrates that the current Administration has secured resources to undertake 100 - 150 physical improvements to heating (including insulation, central heating, replacement boilers and draught-proofing where this is still needed);
- (g) further celebrates that the Administration has secured a package of support and advice, targeted where it is needed, which will include information on how to use less energy, heating controls, cold weather payments, assistance with tackling any fuel debts and benefits advice and help with energy tariffs;
- (h) hopes that the positive outcomes the Administration will achieve will help to inform future schemes that further reduce fuel poverty in the City and calls on the Government to take significantly more action to tackle high energy bills;
- (i) notes the launch of the Big Sheffield Switch;
- (j) urges Sheffield residents to sign up to the scheme, which creates a mechanism for as many people as possible to register their interest in moving their energy provider through an auction held with energy supply companies;
- (k) recognises the strength in banding together to secure a much better energy deal;
- (l) understands that the people with most to gain are those who've never previously 'switched' (around 50% of the population), especially those on

pre-payment meters or accounts that are just on standard tariffs;

- (m) celebrates that the significant public campaign for this scheme is at no direct cost to the Council;
- (n) believes that the “Big Sheffield Switch” further demonstrates the ability of the public sector to make lasting improvements to people’s lives and what can be achieved when people co-operate together;
- (o) recognises that the previous Administration utterly failed to undertake a collective energy scheme and warmly anticipates further Sheffield collective energy schemes in the future; and
- (p) concludes that the above actions, combined with reduced waste generation, significant increases in recycling and a clear commitment to bring forward Sheffield’s first Climate Change Adaptation Strategy, highlight Sheffield’s place as a leading environmental city.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor David Baker, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words “That this Council” and the substitution of the following words therefor:-

- (a) supports the steps taken by the Rt. Hon. Ed Davey, M.P., the Secretary of State for Energy and Climate Change, to promote collective switching across the UK;
- (b) is pleased to see the Council has accepted the Government’s challenge and encourages all residents to sign up to Big Sheffield Switch;
- (c) welcomes the ground-breaking Green Deal, first proposed by Liberal Democrats, which the Council’s Cabinet Member for Environment described as “fantastic news for Sheffield”;
- (d) supports further actions the Coalition Government is taking to tackle fuel poverty, including:
  - (i) reversing the previous Government’s planned cut to Cold Weather Payments, which are targeted at the most vulnerable;
  - (ii) reducing fuel bills for 2 million families by up to £130 through the Warm Home Discount; and
  - (iii) rolling out a ‘smart meter’ programme, which helps people save money and ensures energy companies meet demand more efficiently;
- (e) notes research by the Department of Energy & Climate Change, which demonstrates that the Coalition Government’s climate change policies will save consumers roughly £166 in energy bills by 2020;

- (f) highlights the importance of Liberal Democrats in Government forcing Conservative Ministers to take warnings of climate change seriously, something that has been sadly ignored by previous Governments;
- (g) recalls the previous Administration's Decentralised Energy City Strategy, which set out a bold vision to make energy self-sufficient and allow the City to "adapt to future changes to our climate";
- (h) furthermore, commends the previous Administration's Free Insulation Scheme, through which over 28,000 homes in Sheffield are already benefiting from warmer homes and cheaper energy bills; and
- (i) requests that the Administration publishes a Cabinet Report on current progress against the Council's Decentralised Energy City Strategy.

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

(Note: Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy voted for paragraph (i) and abstained on all the remaining paragraphs of the amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

It was then moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, seconded by Councillor Jillian Creasy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of a new paragraph (p) as follows, and the re-lettering of original paragraph (p) as a new paragraph (q):-

"(p) understands the need for Sheffield to contribute to energy generation and requests the current Administration to reopen the feasibility study into a windfarm at Westwood Country Park which was halted by the previous Administration."

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:

- (a) notes with alarm that average fuel bills have increased by £300 since the Coalition Government came to power;
- (b) further notes that funding for insulation and fuel poverty projects has been cut significantly by the Government, with the end of Warm Front and other grants;
- (c) further notes the extremely short-sighted Government decision not to invest in green technology projects, such as South Yorkshire's Carbon Capture Scheme in Hatfield;
- (d) further notes the Government's much-vaunted Green Deal could represent a positive approach, but has been appallingly mismanaged and

subject to numerous unnecessary delays;

- (e) recalls the huge success of the Free Insulation Scheme, funded through investment from the previous Government and initiated by the previous Labour Administration, which delivered improvements to over 28,000 Sheffield homes, reduced carbon emissions by 22,000 tonnes and secured energy savings to Sheffield people worth over £3.9m per year;
- (f) celebrates that the current Administration has secured resources to undertake 100 - 150 physical improvements to heating (including insulation, central heating, replacement boilers and draught-proofing where this is still needed);
- (g) further celebrates that the Administration has secured a package of support and advice, targeted where it is needed, which will include information on how to use less energy, heating controls, cold weather payments, assistance with tackling any fuel debts and benefits advice and help with energy tariffs;
- (h) hopes that the positive outcomes the Administration will achieve will help to inform future schemes that further reduce fuel poverty in the City and calls on the Government to take significantly more action to tackle high energy bills;
- (i) notes the launch of the Big Sheffield Switch;
- (j) urges Sheffield residents to sign up to the scheme, which creates a mechanism for as many people as possible to register their interest in moving their energy provider through an auction held with energy supply companies;
- (k) recognises the strength in banding together to secure a much better energy deal;
- (l) understands that the people with most to gain are those who've never previously 'switched' (around 50% of the population), especially those on pre-payment meters or accounts that are just on standard tariffs;
- (m) celebrates that the significant public campaign for this scheme is at no direct cost to the Council;
- (n) believes that the "Big Sheffield Switch" further demonstrates the ability of the public sector to make lasting improvements to people's lives and what can be achieved when people co-operate together;
- (o) recognises that the previous Administration utterly failed to undertake a collective energy scheme and warmly anticipates further Sheffield collective energy schemes in the future; and
- (p) concludes that the above actions, combined with reduced waste generation, significant increases in recycling and a clear commitment to bring forward Sheffield's first Climate Change Adaptation Strategy,

highlight Sheffield's place as a leading environmental city.
--

(Note: 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, and Alison Brelsford voted for paragraphs (i) to (n) and against paragraphs (a) to (h) and (o) to (p) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy voted for paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) to (o), against paragraph (p); and abstained on paragraph (c) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

### **13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SHAFFAQ MOHAMMED**

#### **Parking Permit Charges**

It was moved by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, seconded by Councillor Anders Hanson, that this Council:-

- (a) recalls the campaign by the now Labour MP for Sheffield Central, Paul Blomfield, *No Ifs, No Buts, No Profits. Lower the Permit Prices;*
- (b) notes that as a result of this Administration's budgets, parking permit charges have been hiked by 260%;
- (c) confirms that this hike will not only hit struggling families but also damage small businesses across Sheffield; and
- (d) believes it is wrong for the Administration to fleece local motorists to pay for their political pet projects and calls upon the Administration to reverse this year's hike, with a view to returning to the lower price in future years.

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

- (a) notes that the imposition of damaging cuts by the Coalition Government means that the budget position today is completely different from 2009/10, and therefore regrets that it is no longer sustainable to maintain parking zone permit prices at levels below those first set when parking permit zones were introduced;
- (b) notes that the previous Administration doubled on-street parking charges in permit parking zones in their 2010 budget;

- (c) further notes that the main opposition group also recently put forward a scheme that would have seen parking for small businesses given to residents during Streets Ahead works, with potentially devastating consequences for trade in local district centres, and recalls the total opposition to the plan by the Federation for Small Businesses;
- (d) recalls that the main opposition group opposed increases in resident permit charges last year, however notes they cynically abandoned this pledge in their budget proposal;
- (e) believes this demonstrates the total hypocrisy and short term view that the Liberal Democrats have demonstrated, not just locally but nationally, on issues such as tuition fees and the VAT tax bombshell; and
- (f) therefore believes it is clear the Liberal Democrats are more interested in their own party's short term interests than the long term welfare of Sheffield and cannot be trusted to take long term, responsible decisions.

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:

That this Council:-

- (a) notes that the imposition of damaging cuts by the Coalition Government means that the budget position today is completely different from 2009/10, and therefore regrets that it is no longer sustainable to maintain parking zone permit prices at levels below those first set when parking permit zones were introduced;
- (b) notes that the previous Administration doubled on-street parking charges in permit parking zones in their 2010 budget;
- (c) further notes that the main opposition group also recently put forward a scheme that would have seen parking for small businesses given to residents during Streets Ahead works, with potentially devastating consequences for trade in local district centres, and recalls the total opposition to the plan by the Federation for Small Businesses;
- (d) recalls that the main opposition group opposed increases in resident permit charges last year, however notes they cynically abandoned this pledge in their budget proposal;
- (e) believes this demonstrates the total hypocrisy and short term view that the Liberal Democrats have demonstrated, not just locally but nationally, on issues such as tuition fees and the VAT tax bombshell; and
- (f) therefore believes it is clear the Liberal Democrats are more interested in their own party's short term interests than the long term welfare of

Sheffield and cannot be trusted to take long term, responsible decisions.

(Note: Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy voted for paragraphs (b) and (d), against paragraphs (a) and (c) and abstained on paragraphs (e) and (f) and asked for this to be recorded.)

**14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR NIKKI BOND**

**Violence Against Women and the Effects on Women of Government Policies**

It was moved by Councillor Nikki Bond, seconded by Councillor Neale Gibson, that this Council:-

- (a) is proud to have supported the One Billion Rising (Sheffield) campaign and its events on 14th / 15th February 2013 to raise awareness about violence against women and girls;
- (b) pledges to make this issue a priority for the next 12 months, through the following measures:
  - (i) to continue to provide support to the local Sheffield Rising 2013 movement through the Women's Network and other relevant areas of Council activity;
  - (ii) to promote the voice and influence of women and girls who are victims of violence and the local organisations which work to support them;
  - (iii) to support initiatives in schools and colleges promoting consciousness about - and zero tolerance to - violence in relationships among young people; and
  - (iv) to collaborate with other public bodies in seeking ways to address the problem and find solutions;
- (c) condemns the Coalition Government for the effect that their policies are having on women;
- (d) notes that there are more millionaires than women in the Coalition Cabinet and their misogynistic policies are having a massively disproportionate effect on women;
- (e) recalls that in April 2012 unemployment amongst women stood at 1.4 million, the highest level in 25 years;
- (f) knows that women make up a high proportion of public sector workers and are more likely to claim benefits such as working tax credits, etc;
- (g) notes that research by the GMB has shown that women account for 76%

of the drop in the number of employees in the South East;

- (h) believes that the cuts are having a disproportionate effect on women; the cuts hit women harder because:
  - (i) many women have pregnancy and maternity needs;
  - (ii) women are far more likely to be lone parents (92% of lone parents are women);
  - (iii) women are more likely to be the primary carers for children, frail older people, sick and disabled people;
  - (iv) women are more likely to be the victims of domestic and sexual violence;
  - (v) women live longer, often spending the final years of their lives alone; and
  - (vi) women are, on average, financially poorer than men – particularly so in later life;
- (i) recalls that the Home Secretary, The Rt. Hon Theresa May MP, has publically warned that the cuts could hit women hardest;
- (j) notes that the Fawcett Society have challenged the budget from last year claiming it failed in its duty to assess whether it would impact on women unfairly; and
- (k) calls upon the Coalition Government to review benefit cuts and pension reforms that directly affect women disproportionately; women are entitled to a fair deal.

Whereupon it was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Alison Brelsford, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (c) to (k) and the addition of new paragraphs (c) and (d) as follows:-

- (c) supports measures the Coalition Government has taken to tackle domestic violence, including enforcing serious case review for deaths related to domestic violence, and use of the international aid budget to address domestic violence abroad; and
- (d) regrets the need of the mover of the motion to cloud the very important issue of domestic violence with party-political point-scoring.

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

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



RESOLVED: That this Council:

- (a) is proud to have supported the One Billion Rising (Sheffield) campaign and its events on 14th / 15th February 2013 to raise awareness about violence against women and girls;
- (b) pledges to make this issue a priority for the next 12 months, through the following measures:
  - (i) to continue to provide support to the local Sheffield Rising 2013 movement through the Women's Network and other relevant areas of Council activity;
  - (ii) to promote the voice and influence of women and girls who are victims of violence and the local organisations which work to support them;
  - (iii) to support initiatives in schools and colleges promoting consciousness about - and zero tolerance to - violence in relationships among young people; and
  - (iv) to collaborate with other public bodies in seeking ways to address the problem and find solutions;
- (c) condemns the Coalition Government for the effect that their policies are having on women;
- (d) notes that there are more millionaires than women in the Coalition Cabinet and their misogynistic policies are having a massively disproportionate effect on women;
- (e) recalls that in April 2012 unemployment amongst women stood at 1.4 million, the highest level in 25 years;
- (f) knows that women make up a high proportion of public sector workers and are more likely to claim benefits such as working tax credits, etc;
- (g) notes that research by the GMB has shown that women account for 76% of the drop in the number of employees in the South East;
- (h) believes that the cuts are having a disproportionate effect on women; the cuts hit women harder because:
  - (i) many women have pregnancy and maternity needs;
  - (ii) women are far more likely to be lone parents (92% of lone parents are women);
  - (iii) women are more likely to be the primary carers for children, frail older people, sick and disabled people;
  - (iv) women are more likely to be the victims of domestic and sexual

- violence;
- (v) women live longer, often spending the final years of their lives alone; and
  - (vi) women are, on average, financially poorer than men – particularly so in later life;
- (i) recalls that the Home Secretary, The Rt. Hon Theresa May MP, has publically warned that the cuts could hit women hardest;
  - (j) notes that the Fawcett Society have challenged the budget from last year claiming it failed in its duty to assess whether it would impact on women unfairly; and
  - (k) calls upon the Coalition Government to review benefit cuts and pension reforms that directly affect women disproportionately; women are entitled to a fair deal.

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, and Alison Brelsford voted for paragraphs (a) and (b) and abstained on paragraphs (c) to (k) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

**15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE**

**Star Walk and the Women of Steel**

- RESOLVED: on the motion of Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Sue Alston, that this Council:
- (a) fully supports the Star Walk which aims to raise £150,000 for a Women of Steel statue;
  - (b) believes these women deserve a permanent memorial in recognition of the women who worked in the steel mills during two world wars;
  - (c) recognises that these women are an inspiration - our city is extremely proud of their achievements;
  - (d) notes that the statue designed by world renowned artist Martin Jennings would be a permanent reminder of the Women of Steel;
  - (e) urges all Sheffield City Council councillors and members of the public to sign up to the Star Walk in Hillsborough Park on Sunday, 28 April 2013;
  - (f) reminds people that the walk is only one mile and will be completed by

many of the Women of Steel who are now in their 80s and 90s and that the walk is open to people of all ages and will be a great day out for all the family;

- (g) is aware that entry is £10 for adults and £5 for children, with all money raised going to the Women of Steel Statue Appeal;
- (h) would like to thank Kit Sollitt, Kathleen Roberts, Ruby Gasgoine and Dorothy Slingsby who have been the leading voices behind the campaign – taking the appeal for official recognition to Downing Street and the Ministry of Defence; and
- (i) notes that further fundraising activities are planned for the future and urges everyone to get behind this campaign to recognise these amazing women.

## **16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR DIANA STIMELY**

### **Local District Centres**

It was moved by Councillor Diana Stimely, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, that this Council:-

- (a) believes thriving high streets across Sheffield's communities are vital to both the City's economy and its wellbeing;
- (b) welcomes the actions taken by the previous Administration to support local high streets through the Thriving Local and District Centres programme;
- (c) furthermore, thanks the Government for allocating Sheffield £100,000 through the High Street Innovation Fund, alongside £10,000 for Banner Cross traders;
- (d) feels the current Administration have treated small retailers and local high streets with contempt, demonstrated by their failure to tackle parking problems in both Banner Cross and Millhouses;
- (e) recalls the main opposition group's budget amendment, which would have doubled investment for local centres, reversed parking permit hikes for small businesses and provided free parking on Saturdays at district centres; and
- (f) urges the Administration to address the issues facing local centres and high streets with an immediate Cabinet Report setting out steps to be taken.

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

paragraphs (b) to (j) as follows:-

- (b) notes that money to support Local District Centres, funded by the previous Government, has been cut by the present Coalition Government;
- (c) recalls that the Liberal Democrat Group have already back tracked on reversing increases in parking permit prices, in addition to their decision to double on street parking charges in permit parking zones in their 2010 budget;
- (d) is currently consulting on a pay back scheme trial in Broomhill, to support local district centres whilst protecting Council budgets;
- (e) notes that the main opposition group's budget proposal for free parking uses one-off funds allocated by the current Administration for schemes to grow the economy over the medium term, and fails to deliver sustainable support to district centres;
- (f) believes that the best way to help traders during the longest recession on record is to grow the economy – benefiting companies, jobs and trade;
- (g) believes that the local Liberal Democrats have failed to come up with one single initiative over the past two years, as the Government cuts have had to be implemented, that seeks to drive long term sustainable growth while recognising the increasingly difficult budget position the Council faces;
- (h) further notes that the main opposition group's proposed budget would have moved money away from key schemes to grow the economy over the medium to long term;
- (i) therefore believes that this is yet another example of short term promises made for their own political gain; and
- (j) re-affirms this Administration's commitment to make decisions for the long term well being of the City and the economy – despite the Government's focus on cutting local government budgets.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Jillian Creasy, seconded by Councillor Robert Murphy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (f) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (j) as follows:-

- (b) notes that the Government has allocated Sheffield £100,000 through the High Street Innovation Fund, alongside £10,000 for Banner Cross traders;
- (c) further notes that £64,000 of this money has already been allocated to fund just four apprentice positions, indicating that, whilst worthwhile, this funding is a drop in the ocean compared to the challenges faced by local

high streets;

- (d) notes that, whilst the investment in Banner Cross is very welcome, current construction of a Sainsbury's store within this local centre threatens the viability of one of the most diverse and thriving District Centres in the City, and that the impact of the proposed Sainsbury's store in Crookesmoor would have a similar impact on that Centre;
- (e) regrets that the Core Strategy (policy CS34) and provisional City Policies and Sites document (policy C4.16) encourages the opening of superstores in District Centres, regardless of need and the importance of diversity in local shops, as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework (paragraph 23);
- (f) notes that the impact assessment for a supermarket similar to that currently planned at Banner Cross, adjacent to the District Centre, predicted takings for local shops would fall by around 15% but that no impact assessment for the scheme within the District Centre was required;
- (g) instructs officers to explore options for the provision of impact assessments for all supermarket developments (or development over an agreed floorspace threshold), whether within or outwith District Centres;
- (h) notes the New Economics Foundation "Reimagine Your High Street" initiative, which seeks to create low carbon, socially vibrant local economies by combating the growth of national chain stores, and asks that officers and Members work with Community Forums and other neighbourhood groups to support this initiative;
- (i) welcomes the new supermarkets watchdog that will regulate how supermarkets purchase their food but believes this will be inadequate, on its own, to keep supermarket growth in check and tackle the perceived abuse of planning procedure, land-banking and product pricing that powerful supermarkets engage in; and
- (j) therefore, asks the Chief Executive to write to Government and request that Councils are indemnified against the legal costs of 'vexatious' supermarket planning disputes.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) believes thriving high streets across Sheffield's communities are vital to both the City's economy and its wellbeing;
- (b) notes that money to support Local District Centres, funded by the previous

- Government, has been cut by the present Coalition Government;
- (c) recalls that the Liberal Democrat Group have already back tracked on reversing increases in parking permit prices, in addition to their decision to double on street parking charges in permit parking zones in their 2010 budget;
  - (d) is currently consulting on a pay back scheme trial in Broomhill, to support local district centres whilst protecting Council budgets;
  - (e) notes that the main opposition group's budget proposal for free parking uses one-off funds allocated by the current Administration for schemes to grow the economy over the medium term, and fails to deliver sustainable support to district centres;
  - (f) believes that the best way to help traders during the longest recession on record is to grow the economy – benefiting companies, jobs and trade;
  - (g) believes that the local Liberal Democrats have failed to come up with one single initiative over the past two years, as the Government cuts have had to be implemented, that seeks to drive long term sustainable growth while recognising the increasingly difficult budget position the Council faces;
  - (h) further notes that the main opposition group's proposed budget would have moved money away from key schemes to grow the economy over the medium to long term;
  - (i) therefore believes that this is yet another example of short term promises made for their own political gain; and
  - (j) re-affirms this Administration's commitment to make decisions for the long term well being of the City and the economy – despite the Government's focus on cutting local government budgets.

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

## **17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JILLIAN CREASY**

### **Early Years**

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

- (a) notes that the Authority is projecting to spend £45m less than budgeted for in its Capital Programme for 2012-13 by the end of March 2013;
- (b) notes that this sum – comparable to the entire budget cut in 2012-13 –

was budgeted for and remains unspent;

- (c) notes the unspent £3.903 million arising from “underspending on project estimates” and “other variations” within the Children, Young People and Families (CYPF) portfolio alone would more than pay for the entire cuts to Early Years services;
- (d) reiterates the finding in the report to Cabinet on 21<sup>st</sup> March 2012 - that the 0 to 5 Early Years are “the most important period in a child’s growth and development and can make a significant difference to a child’s future life chances. The quality of health, care and education that young children experience during these years is critical to ensure that they have the best start in life. As well as being welcoming of children, irrespective of need, parents said the most important feature they look for in a setting is one that shows they really care about the children in their care and take seriously the responsibilities that parents place on them to care for their child.”; and
- (e) requests officers within CYPF and finance to explore ways of using at least part of this capital sum to help child care settings prepare themselves for the transition to providing Free Early Learning for two-year-olds.

Whereupon it was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (c) to (e) and the addition of new paragraphs (c) to (f) as follows:-

- (c) notes that this underspend is not an unprecedented phenomenon;
- (d) believes a proportion of this underspend should be allocated to “shovel-ready” capital projects in culture, leisure and park facilities;
- (e) highlights that these projects will not only improve services but boost the local economy; and
- (f) furthermore, recommends that a number of future allocations in the capital programme should be reviewed, including the £2.2 million earmarked for City Centre Civic Accommodation.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Jackie Drayton, 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, along with eminent Early Years specialists, including Dame Tickell, the decision made by this Coalition Government to cut £7.4m from the Early Intervention Grant;

- (b) further regrets that the Government has taken away funding from early intervention and prevention, 'wraparound' services to children and families and redistributed it to the Deputy Prime Minister's pet project of 'free learning for two year olds';
- (c) reminds the smallest opposition party that capital programme funding cannot be used to fund revenue spending;
- (d) notes that capital schemes in the Children, Young People and Families portfolio are mostly two or three years projects running over academic years and any profile spend is not an actual 'underspend' but just accounts for the difference in the academic and financial years;
- (e) also reminds the smallest opposition group that any attempt to take money away means that schools across the City would not get their 'promised' improvements, including to boilers, windows and toilets; and
- (f) is committed to working with providers to enable them to develop sustainable business plans for their organisations and help them to access all other relevant funding.

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) regrets, along with eminent Early Years specialists, including Dame Tickell, the decision made by this Coalition Government to cut £7.4m from the Early Intervention Grant;
- (b) further regrets that the Government has taken away funding from early intervention and prevention, 'wraparound' services to children and families and redistributed it to the Deputy Prime Minister's pet project of 'free learning for two year olds';
- (c) reminds the smallest opposition party that capital programme funding cannot be used to fund revenue spending;
- (d) notes that capital schemes in the Children, Young People and Families portfolio are mostly two or three years projects running over academic years and any profile spend is not an actual 'underspend' but just accounts for the difference in the academic and financial years;
- (e) also reminds the smallest opposition group that any attempt to take money away means that schools across the City would not get their 'promised' improvements, including to boilers, windows and toilets; and



- (f) is committed to working with providers to enable them to develop sustainable business plans for their organisations and help them to access all other relevant funding.

(Note: 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, and Alison Brelsford voted for paragraphs (c) to (f) and against paragraphs (a) and (b) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy voted paragraphs (a) and (b) and against paragraphs (c) to (f) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR GEOFF SMITH**

### **Refused Asylum Seekers**

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Geoff Smith, seconded by Councillor Sylvia Anginotti, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the initiatives by Glasgow & Bristol City Councils in passing a motion highlighting concerns about refused asylum seekers and the lack of support for them in the UK;
- (b) commends the work with refused asylum seekers in Sheffield by organisations such as City of Sanctuary, Northern Refugee Centre, SYMAAG and ASSIST;
- (c) shares the concerns raised by groups working with refused asylum seekers about the levels of destitution in Sheffield and the associated problems this creates; and
- (d) asserts that if Sheffield's proud declaration as the country's first City of Sanctuary is to be meaningful and worthy of its fine words, we must act to improve this situation in the following ways;
  - (i) the Leader of the Council writes to the Home Secretary and Chief Executive of the UK Border Agency seeking changes to their policy toward refused asylum seekers; and
  - (ii) the Leader of the Council sends a copy of this letter to:
    - 1. The Home Affairs Select Committee for consideration during its inquiry into Asylum;
    - 2. Sheffield MPs to support the content of this motion and to raise the matter in the House of Commons; and

3. The Local Government Association to encourage other councils in the UK to follow Sheffield's lead.

**19. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SUE ALSTON**

**Outdoor Education**

It was moved by Councillor Sue Alston, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, that this Council:-

- (a) highlights the important service provided by Mayfield Environmental Education Centre;
- (b) expresses disappointment that the opposition group's budget amendment, which would have reversed an £8,000 cut to the Centre, was voted down by Labour Councillors;
- (c) believes that this cut, alongside the Administration's lack of support, poses a serious threat to the future of the Centre and outdoor education in Sheffield; and
- (d) calls upon the Administration to reconsider its reduction in funding for Mayfield Environmental Education Centre.

Whereupon it was moved by Councillor Jackie Drayton, seconded by Councillor Denise Fox, 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) recognises the importance of Outdoor Education and its part in raising attainment and expectations and enabling enriching experiences of many children and young people across the City;
- (b) notes with concern that this Government is making unprecedented and unfair cuts to Sheffield City Council and that the Council has had to make savings of £140 million over the past two years with a further £50 million for 2013/14 and also the additional £7.4m cut to the Early Intervention Grant which specifically funded revenue work with children and young people;
- (c) regrets that Mayfield Environmental Education Centre is not being used by school groups in the City;
- (d) notes that despite providing funding last year to keep the Centre open and supporting a campaign to find a sustainable future for the Centre, a viable solution has not been found;

- (e) welcomes the Administration's capital investment in the Thornbridge Outdoor Education Centre, especially enabling the Centre to adapt to provide more activities for disabled children and their families; and
- (f) is pleased to support Thornbridge Outdoors so it continues to provide access to the exciting outdoor opportunities for all children and young people in 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 importance of Outdoor Education and its part in raising attainment and expectations and enabling enriching experiences of many children and young people across the City;
- (b) notes with concern that this Government is making unprecedented and unfair cuts to Sheffield City Council and that the Council has had to make savings of £140 million over the past two years with a further £50 million for 2013/14 and also the additional £7.4m cut to the Early Intervention Grant which specifically funded revenue work with children and young people;
- (c) regrets that Mayfield Environmental Education Centre is not being used by school groups in the City;
- (d) notes that despite providing funding last year to keep the Centre open and supporting a campaign to find a sustainable future for the Centre, a viable solution has not been found;
- (e) welcomes the Administration's capital investment in the Thornbridge Outdoor Education Centre, especially enabling the Centre to adapt to provide more activities for disabled children and their families; and
- (f) is pleased to support Thornbridge Outdoors so it continues to provide access to the exciting outdoor opportunities for all children and young people in Sheffield.

(Note: 1. The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, and Alison Brelsford voted for paragraphs (a), (e) and (f) and against the remaining paragraphs of the substantive motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy voted paragraphs (a), (b), (e) and (f) and abstained on paragraphs (c) to (d) of the substantive motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

## **20. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SIMON CLEMENT-JONES**

### **Taxation Changes**

It was moved by Councillor Simon Clement-Jones, seconded by Councillor Shaffaq Mohammed, that this Council:-

- (a) recalls the Liberal Democrat manifesto commitment in 2010 to raise the income tax threshold to £10,000;
- (b) notes that from April, as a result of Liberal Democrats in Government, the income tax paid by a full-time worker on the minimum wage will be almost halved thanks to the increase in the income tax threshold;
- (c) is pleased to see that the Coalition Government has gone further in the 2013 Budget by confirming the income tax threshold will increase by a further £560 to £10,000 from April 2014, one year earlier than planned;
- (d) welcomes that as a result of Liberal Democrat influence since 2010, 195,000 workers in Sheffield will see a £700 tax cut, while 21,280 low paid workers will have been lifted out of income tax altogether; and
- (e) furthermore, notes that the Coalition Government have ensured the super rich pay their fair share by cracking down on tax avoidance; putting a tax on private jets, increasing Capital Gains Tax for higher rate taxpayers, and blocking inheritance tax breaks.

Whereupon it was moved by Councillor Bryan Lodge, seconded by Councillor Ian Saunders, 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 Government is giving with one hand but taking away much, much more with the other;
- (b) notes that April's increase in the personal allowance doesn't make up for what families have already lost in terms of tax and benefit changes;
- (c) further notes that when the impact of higher VAT and cuts to things like tax credits are taken into account, research has demonstrated that a family with one earner and two children on £20,000 will be £381 a year worse off in 2013-14 and £600 a year worse off in 2014-15;
- (d) believes that the real priority of this Government is to support the 13,000 millionaires who are set to get an average tax cut of £100,000 in just a

few weeks' time;

- (e) opposes the Government's decision to cut the top rate of income tax;
- (f) regrets that the Liberal Democrats have abandoned so many of their manifesto promises and have forfeited their principles for power; and
- (g) believes that the Liberal Democrats have been duplicitous and requests that they hold their coalition partners to account rather than supporting their unfair and damaging policies in government.

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

(Note: Councillors Robert Murphy and Jillian Creasy voted for paragraphs (a), (b), (c) and (e) and abstained on paragraphs (d), (f) and (g) 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:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) regrets that the Government is giving with one hand but taking away much, much more with the other;
- (b) notes that April's increase in the personal allowance doesn't make up for what families have already lost in terms of tax and benefit changes;
- (c) further notes that when the impact of higher VAT and cuts to things like tax credits are taken into account, research has demonstrated that a family with one earner and two children on £20,000 will be £381 a year worse off in 2013-14 and £600 a year worse off in 2014-15;
- (d) believes that the real priority of this Government is to support the 13,000 millionaires who are set to get an average tax cut of £100,000 in just a few weeks' time;
- (e) opposes the Government's decision to cut the top rate of income tax;
- (f) regrets that the Liberal Democrats have abandoned so many of their manifesto promises and have forfeited their principles for power; and
- (g) believes that the Liberal Democrats have been duplicitous and requests that they hold their coalition partners to account rather than supporting their unfair and damaging policies in government.

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

**21. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JILLIAN CREASY**

**Bedroom Tax**

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

- (a) believes that the Government's "Bedroom Tax" is unjust and misguided and congratulates those who organised and attended simultaneous demonstrations across the country on Saturday 16th March 2013;
- (b) regrets that the Government is persisting with the policy, causing distress to thousands of families struggling to cope with cuts to social support and a difficult economic environment;
- (c) is pleased that the Government has dropped its appeal against the court ruling granting some relief to very disabled children being forced to share a bedroom;
- (d) supports the Government's decision to change rules so that foster children, students and those in the armed forces, are now no longer considered to be under-occupying, although notes these ill-planned reversals are causing further confusion and cost;
- (e) calls on Government to fully fund cases where people are no longer considered to be under occupying due to policy changes, rather than top-slicing Discretionary Housing Payment (DHP) funds;
- (f) notes that many so-called "spare bedrooms" in fact house medical equipment, or are used as a bedroom by spouses unable, due to illness, to sleep in the same room, or as a carer's room where a household member requires overnight care;
- (g) further notes that many separated parents with visiting rights need a spare room for the visits of their child(ren);
- (h) notes that Government funding for DHPs will fund around 1 in 16 households where under-occupancy applies, falling far short of supporting those in need;
- (i) notes that councillors are receiving a steady flow of casework around the legislation;
- (j) will therefore gather detailed case studies of those affected and submit these as evidence to Government on the effects of the under-occupancy measures and a case for more Government support for DHPs;
- (k) believes that costs arising from making decisions on discretionary payments will be substantial;

- (l) therefore, requests the Administration to do everything it can to inform and help residents affected by the bedroom tax and avoid eviction, for example through:
  - (i) encouraging tenants to claim the benefits they are entitled to, for example Disability Living Allowance; and
  - (ii) giving maximum practical support and choice to those tenants who do wish to move;
- (m) also requests the Administration to look into:
  - (i) whether it would be possible to reclassify bedrooms so as to avoid the tax; and
  - (ii) whether it would be feasible to ask Housing Associations and Sheffield Homes not to take eviction proceedings where arrears are solely due to unaffordability caused by the bedroom tax;
- (n) calls on the Government to abandon the Tax, and to address the housing shortage through bringing up to habitable, energy-efficient standard the approximately one million empty homes in the UK, and through an energy-efficient-house building programme, thereby providing three advantages, namely addressing the housing shortage, boosting the economy through increased employment, and providing the carbon reductions to which the Government is committed; and
- (o) directs that a copy of this motion is sent to the Prime Minister and the Secretary of State for Work and Pensions.

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

- (a) notes that the 'bedroom tax' is due to take effect from April this year;
- (b) condemns this policy which will affect anyone of working age (below 61 ½) on housing benefit deemed to be 'under-occupying' a social housing home, which equates to around 7500 homes across Sheffield;
- (c) deplores the Member of Parliament for Sheffield Hallam for allowing the Government to implement this deeply unfair policy;
- (d) notes that the following are not exempt from the bedroom tax:
  - (i) those couples who need an extra bedroom because of one of them having a medical condition or disability;

- (ii) non-resident parents who have their children to stay at weekends in the holidays;
  - (iii) families who offer regular respite support to other family members; and
  - (iv) people living in homes which have been substantially adapted at tax-payers' expense;
- (e) is committed to supporting all residents both children and adults, including those with disabilities and medical needs;
- (f) regrets that the Discretionary Payments Fund that the Government has made available is completely inadequate and is estimated to cover only a fraction of people affected by the bedroom tax and notes that this Fund is also expected to cover other welfare changes;
- (g) notes that the Government's own Equality Impact Assessment estimates that two-thirds of households affected will have a member with a disability;
- (h) further notes that many independent analysts are predicting that households will move into the private rented sector, costing more, and that care needs for many disabled people will increase, again costing more;
- (i) further notes that there is not an excess supply of small properties available for households to move into in Sheffield;
- (j) further notes the bedroom tax will unfairly hit many people, including families with disabled children or adults, families who share the care of their children and families who offer respite care to other family members;
- (k) further notes that this policy may well end up costing the public purse more;
- (l) believes that disabled people – both adults and children – deserve respect and not to be penalised for their medical needs;
- (m) values the role of non-resident parents and believes they should be encouraged to play as full a part in the lives of their children as possible;
- (n) further values and appreciates the role of families who offer respite care – and not only because it saves the taxpayer billions of pounds;
- (o) notes that Housing Associations will have difficulty in keeping arrears down, damaging services for all tenants; and
- (p) therefore resolves to:



- (i) ask the Leader to write to the Secretary of State outlining the Council's concerns and urgently requesting that the bedroom tax is scrapped; and
- (ii) ask the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods to write to Sheffield MPs outlining the concerns and asking that they lobby for their affected constituents and push for the bedroom tax to be scrapped.

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

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

For the amendment (54) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor John Campbell) and Councillors Julie Dore, John Robson, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling Josephs, Helen Mirfin Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussian, Mohammad Maroof, Geoff Smith, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Joyce Wright, Garry Weatherall, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, George Lindars Hammond, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Lynn Rooney, Martin Lawton, Peter Price, Peter Rippon, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Against the amendment (21) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Keith Hill, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, and Alison Brelsford.

Abstained on the amendment (0) -

Whereupon it was moved by Councillor Penny Baker, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the substitution of the following words therefor:-

- (a) notes that the 'bedroom tax' is due to take effect from April this year;

- (b) reiterates the opposition of the Main Opposition Group on this Council to the bedroom tax;
- (c) welcomes concessions that have already been made to the bedroom tax, notably the exemption made for members of the armed forces and foster families;
- (d) supports also the Government's decision to treble the Discretionary Housing Payment budget and provide councils with discretionary funding to help families in difficult circumstances;
- (e) believes these concessions come as a result of Liberal Democrat influence in Government and thanks Liberal Democrat Ministers for working to improve the policy;
- (f) furthermore, highlights that disabled tenants who require an additional bedroom for a non-resident carer who provides overnight care were already protected from the change;
- (g) encourages the Government to go further by agreeing additional exemptions and increasing the Discretionary Payments funding;
- (h) believes the root cause of this problem is the previous Government's failure to address the nation's housing crisis, with the building of social housing declining to the lowest figure since the Second World War under the previous Government;
- (i) notes with concern that under the previous Government seven times more prison cells were built than council homes;
- (j) further notes with dismay that under the previous Government's Housing Market Renewal Scheme, 4,590 houses in South Yorkshire were demolished, while just 2,415 were built, at a cost of £265 million;
- (k) furthermore, understands that the present Administration have so far spent just 11% of the New Homes Bonus, a fund specifically targeted at encouraging more home building; and
- (l) recommends that Sheffield follows the example of Bristol City Council by setting up a cross-party working group, to agree ways to support local residents affected by the bedroom tax.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-
-------------------------------

- (a) notes that the 'bedroom tax' is due to take effect from April this year;
- (b) condemns this policy which will affect anyone of working age (below 61 ½) on housing benefit deemed to be 'under-occupying' a social housing home, which equates to around 7500 homes across Sheffield;
- (c) deplores the Member of Parliament for Sheffield Hallam for allowing the Government to implement this deeply unfair policy;
- (d) notes that the following are not exempt from the bedroom tax:
  - (i) those couples who need an extra bedroom because of one of them having a medical condition or disability;
  - (ii) non-resident parents who have their children to stay at weekends in the holidays;
  - (iii) families who offer regular respite support to other family members; and
  - (iv) people living in homes which have been substantially adapted at tax-payers' expense;
- (e) is committed to supporting all residents both children and adults, including those with disabilities and medical needs;
- (f) regrets that the Discretionary Payments Fund that the Government has made available is completely inadequate and is estimated to cover only a fraction of people affected by the bedroom tax and notes that this Fund is also expected to cover other welfare changes;
- (g) notes that the Government's own Equality Impact Assessment estimates that two-thirds of households affected will have a member with a disability;
- (h) further notes that many independent analysts are predicting that households will move into the private rented sector, costing more, and that care needs for many disabled people will increase, again costing more;
- (i) further notes that there is not an excess supply of small properties available for households to move into in Sheffield;
- (j) further notes the bedroom tax will unfairly hit many people, including families with disabled children or adults, families who share the care of their children and families who offer respite care to other family members;
- (k) further notes that this policy may well end up costing the public purse more;

- (l) believes that disabled people – both adults and children – deserve respect and not to be penalised for their medical needs;
- (m) values the role of non-resident parents and believes they should be encouraged to play as full a part in the lives of their children as possible;
- (n) further values and appreciates the role of families who offer respite care – and not only because it saves the taxpayer billions of pounds;
- (o) notes that Housing Associations will have difficulty in keeping arrears down, damaging services for all tenants; and
- (p) therefore resolves to:
  - (i) ask the Leader to write to the Secretary of State outlining the Council's concerns and urgently requesting that the bedroom tax is scrapped; and
  - (ii) ask the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods to write to Sheffield MPs outlining the concerns and asking that they lobby for their affected constituents and push for the bedroom tax to be scrapped.

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

- For the motion (75)
- The Lord Mayor (Councillor John Campbell) and the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Julie Dore, John Robson, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Simon Clement-Jones, Clive Skelton, Ian Saunders, Chris Rosling Josephs, Helen Mirfin Boukouris, Bryan Lodge, Denise Fox, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Shaffaq Mohammed, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Talib Hussian, Robert Murphy, Jillian Creasy, Mohammad Maroof, Rob Frost, Geoff Smith, Sylvia Anginotti, Mary Lea, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Keith Hill, Joyce Wright, Garry Weatherall, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sheila Constance, Chris Weldon, Alan Law, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Steve Jones, Tim Rippon, Cate McDonald, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, George Lindars Hammond, Janet Bragg, Pat Midgley, Terry Fox, Tony Downing, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, Anders Hanson, Lynn Rooney, Martin Lawton, Peter Price, Peter Rippon, Tony Damms, Leigh Bramall, Gill Furniss, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, Richard Crowther, Alison

Brelsford, Neale Gibson, Nikki Sharpe, Ben Curran, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Jackie Satur, Mick Rooney and Ray Satur.

Against the motion (0) - Nil

Abstained on the motion - Nil  
(0)

(Note: The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Vickie Priestley) and Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Shaffaq Mohammed, Rob Frost, Sylvia Anginotti, Colin Ross, Joe Otten, Keith Hill, Penny Baker, Diana Stimely, Roger Davison, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Denise Reaney, Ian Auckland, Anders Hanson, Katie Condliffe, David Baker, and Alison Brelsford voted for paragraphs (a), (b), (d), (e) and (h) to (p); against paragraphs (c) and (f) and abstained on paragraph (g) of the Sustantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)