



Council

Wednesday 25 March 2015

2.00 pm

**Council Chamber, Town Hall,
Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH**

The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend

COUNCIL

Wednesday 25 March 2015, at 2.00 pm
Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH

The Press and Public are Welcome to Attend

MEMBERS OF THE COUNCIL

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Peter Rippon)
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Talib Hussain)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Mike Drabble Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Isobel Bowler Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Roy Munn Richard Shaw	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Steve Wilson Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Nasima Akther Nikki Bond Qurban Hussain
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison Diana Stimely	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> John Campbell Lynn Rooney Paul Wood
4	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	13	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Sheila Constance Alan Law Chris Weldon	22	<i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Stuart Wattam Brian Webster	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	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> Steve Jones Cate McDonald Tim Rippon	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Jillian Creasy Robert Murphy Sarah Jane Smalley	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Steve Ayris Denise Reaney	25	<i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Philip Wood
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Rob Frost Anne Murphy Geoff Smith	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran 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> John Booker Adam Hurst Alf Meade
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Ray Satur

John Mothersole

Chief Executive

Contact:

Paul Robinson, Democratic Services

Tel: 0114 2734029

paul.robinson@sheffield.gov.uk

PUBLIC ACCESS TO THE MEETING

The Council is composed of 84 Councillors with one-third elected three years in four. Councillors are democratically accountable to the residents of their Ward. The overriding duty of Councillors is to the whole community, but they have a special duty to their constituents, including those who did not vote for them

All Councillors meet together as the Council. Here Councillors decide the Council's overall policies and set the budget each year. The Council appoints the Leader and at its Annual Meeting will appoint Councillors to serve on its Committees. It also appoints representatives to serve on joint bodies and external organisations.

A copy of the agenda and reports is available on the Council's website at www.sheffield.gov.uk. You can also see the reports to be discussed at the meeting if you call at the First Point Reception, Town Hall, Pinstone Street entrance. The Reception is open between 9.00 am and 5.00 pm, Monday to Thursday and between 9.00 am and 4.45 pm. on Friday. You may not be allowed to see some reports because they contain confidential information. These items are usually marked * on the agenda.

Members of the public have the right to ask questions or submit petitions to Council meetings and recording is allowed under the direction of the Chair. Please see the website or contact Democratic Services for further information regarding public questions and petitions and details of the Council's protocol on audio/visual recording and photography at council meetings.

Council meetings are normally open to the public but sometimes the Council may have to discuss an item in private. If this happens, you will be asked to leave. Any private items are normally left until last. If you would like to attend the meeting please report to the First Point Reception desk where you will be directed to the meeting room.

FACILITIES

There are public toilets available, with wheelchair access, on the ground floor of the Town Hall. Induction loop facilities are available in meeting rooms.

Access for people with mobility difficulties can be obtained through the ramp on the side to the main Town Hall entrance.

**COUNCIL AGENDA
25 MARCH 2015**

Order of Business

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Members to declare any interests they have in the business to be considered at the meeting.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETINGS

To receive the record of the proceedings of the ordinary meeting of the Council held on 4th February 2015 and the special meeting of the Council held on 6th March 2015, and to approve the accuracy thereof.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

To receive any questions or petitions from the public, or communications submitted by the Lord Mayor or the Chief Executive and to pass such resolutions thereon as the Council Procedure Rules permit and as may be deemed expedient.

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

5.1 Questions relating to urgent business – Council Procedure Rule 16.6(ii).

5.2 Supplementary questions on written questions submitted at this meeting – Council Procedure Rule 16.4.

5.3 Questions on the discharge of the functions of the South Yorkshire Joint Authorities for Fire and Rescue and Pensions – Section 41 of the Local Government Act 1985 – Council Procedure Rule 16.6(i).

(NB. Minutes of recent meetings of the two South Yorkshire Joint Authorities have been made available to all Members of the Council via the following link -

<http://sheffielddemocracy.moderngov.co.uk/ecCatDisplay.aspx?sch=doc&cat=13165&path=0>)

6. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

To consider any changes to the memberships and arrangements for meetings of Committees etc., delegated authority, and the appointment of representatives to serve on other bodies.

7. REVISED PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH STANDARDS COMPLAINTS

Report of the Chief Executive.

8. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR GEOFF SMITH

That this Council:

- (a) notes the recent report by the Kings Fund which provided a damning critique on the Government's NHS reforms, claiming they have been 'damaging and distracting';
- (b) notes that this follows reports last year that the Government did not understand its own NHS reforms, which were described by Government sources as a "total car crash" and a "huge strategic error";
- (c) regrets that:
 - (i) despite promising no top down reorganisation, this Government wasted £3 billion on doing just that, funding which could have been spent on front line services;
 - (ii) this Government has laid off 9,000 frontline NHS staff;
 - (iii) this Government has cut 9,746 hospital beds;
 - (iv) this Government has overseen a crisis in A&E with the worst waiting times for over 10 years; and
 - (v) this Government has neglected GP services, with one in four people now having to wait over a week to see their family doctor; and
- (d) believes that Sheffield needs a fresh alternative approach to the NHS and supports the following proposals by Labour:
 - (i) provide £2.5 billion additional investment per year into the NHS paid for through higher taxes on tobacco companies and a Mansion Tax on properties worth over £2 million;
 - (ii) repeal this Government's NHS Health and Social Care Act and reverse the damaging changes which have caused such chaos across the health service;

- (iii) recruit 20,000 more nurses, 8,000 more GPs and 3,000 more midwives;
- (iv) guarantee that you can get an appointment at your GP within 48 hours;
- (v) accept the NHS independent pay review recommendations and make sure NHS staff get the respect and support they deserve;
- (vi) make sure the NHS is exempt from the Transatlantic Trade Investment Partnership, protecting local services from big American companies; and
- (vii) plans to integrate health and social care.

9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR HELEN MIRFIN-BOUKOURIS

That this Council:

- (a) agrees that paying taxes is a duty for all citizens and believes in the benefits national taxes give to society;
- (b) notes that tax revenues fund the majority of the country's healthcare services, schools, pensions and judicial system, as well as roads, armed forces and social infrastructure;
- (c) also notes the substantial academic research which shows that societies with healthy economies, more equality, social protection, and intervention to protect vulnerable groups, have smaller undeclared economies which leads to more tax being collected for the benefit of all;
- (d) is disappointed that under this current Conservative/Liberal Democrat Government, the gap between tax owed and tax collected, according to HMRC, is a staggering £34 billion, with prosecutions at an unacceptably low level;
- (e) questions why, when the House of Commons Public Accounts Committee has held many hearings into tax avoidance, there has been no subsequent investigations by HM Treasury?;
- (f) notes that the billions of pounds in uncollected taxes sits alongside a programme of Government cuts which has seen vulnerable people being victimized by a myriad of economic hardships and that taking a tougher stance on tax avoidance and evasion could mean an end to austerity;

- (g) reminds members of the current Government that the work of the tax authority (HMRC) is under their control and as such it is their responsibility to ensure there are sufficient, well trained staff within HMRC to carry out the important function of tax collection for the benefit of all citizens;
- (h) therefore welcomes the commitment by The Rt. Hon, Ed Miliband MP, that a future Labour government would instigate an immediate independent review into the culture and practices of HMRC in regard to tax avoidance;
- (i) recognises that for many small businesses and start-ups, taxes can prevent them from growing and stifle innovation;
- (j) is therefore pleased to hear that a Labour government would put small business first in line for tax cuts and the support they need to invest and raise productivity for the benefit of all;
- (k) believes that a more positive communication strategy by HMRC to the general public would assist in making people aware of what their taxes pay for and encourage more compliance, and that the public also need to feel confident that those that evade tax will be pursued and prosecuted;
- (l) as such, urges the Government to tighten up loopholes which allows business and wealthy individuals to avoid paying their fair share and cheating the rest of society; and
- (m) requests that a copy of this Motion be forwarded to The Rt. Hon. George Osborne MP, Chancellor of the Exchequer, and The Rt. Hon. Ed Balls MP, Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer.

10. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR COLIN ROSS

That this Council:

- (a) would like to thank the Liberal Democrats in government and The Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg, MP for Sheffield Hallam, for their good work in government, creating a stronger economy and fairer society in the UK by:
 - (i) creating 1.8 million more jobs, of which $\frac{3}{4}$ are full time jobs;
 - (ii) cutting income tax by £800 for 25 million low and middle income earners;
 - (iii) protecting the schools budget and providing an extra £2.5 billion for disadvantaged kids;
 - (iv) providing free child care to all 3 and 4 year olds and 40% of

2 year olds from the most deprived backgrounds;

- (v) investing in work and training through two million apprenticeships;
 - (vi) introducing shared parental leave, allowing fathers to spend more time with their children and helping women back into work;
 - (vii) improving services across the NHS, with 6,000 more doctors and increasing the availability of specialist cancer drugs through the Cancer Drugs Fund; and
 - (viii) taking mental health seriously, putting £400m extra into early intervention;
- (b) would also like to thank the MP for Sheffield Hallam for using his position to get the best for Sheffield and would like to highlight the following Government investments in our area:
- (i) £1.2 billion for the Streets Ahead programme, which will see every road, pavement and streetlight in the City repaired;
 - (ii) £5.4 million to provide Free Early Learning for disadvantaged two-year-olds, £25 million for Sheffield schools through the Pupil Premium and £5 million for Sheffield City Region to support young people into jobs;
 - (iii) millions of pounds invested in Sheffield's trams, trains and buses, alongside commitments to electrify the Midland Mainline and a new High Speed Rail station in Sheffield;
 - (iv) bringing the British Business Bank to Sheffield;
 - (v) the latest growth deal, delivered by Liberal Democrats in Government, which has secured a £320 million cash boost for Sheffield City Region and will create over 28,000 jobs and training for 40,000 people;
 - (vi) notes that the Sheffield City Region Growth Deal is the fifth largest in the country and will specifically deliver:
 - (A) infrastructure investment, including improvements to Sheffield city-centre and an extended airport link road to Doncaster-Sheffield Airport;
 - (B) £130 million Skills Bank, which will provide training for 40,000 people in the Sheffield City Region, including between 5,000 and 7,500 apprentices; and

- (C) upgrades to Further Education facilities and a brand new academy run by British Glass to be based in Sheffield; and
- (c) notes that a future Liberal Democrat Government would:
 - (i) balance the cyclically-adjusted current budget by 2017/18, on time and fairly, protecting the economic recovery, and bring down Britain's debt as a share of national income;
 - (ii) cut Income Tax by £400 for low and middle earners, easing the squeeze on household budgets;
 - (iii) invest to make the UK a world leader in green and hi-tech manufacturing, continuing the Regional Growth Fund and expanding apprenticeships;
 - (iv) cut energy bills and create jobs through a national programme to insulate homes, with a Council Tax cut if people take part;
 - (v) pass 'Five Green Laws' to protect green spaces, trees and wildlife, improve energy efficiency and resource efficiency, reduce waste, promote clean green transport and ensure Britain leads the fight against climate change;
 - (vi) ensure every child is taught by a qualified teacher, raising educational standards to world class levels and protecting spending on nurseries, schools and colleges;
 - (vii) give 16-21 year olds two-thirds off their bus fares so they can afford to travel to college or work;
 - (viii) guarantee pensioners the best ever system for increasing the state pension by legislating for the Liberal Democrats' 'triple lock' of uprating by the higher of earnings growth, prices growth or 2.5%; and
 - (ix) introduce a new Carer's Bonus so carers can take a proper break every year.

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR HELEN MIRFIN-BOUKOURIS

That this Council:

- (a) recognises the tremendous record of the previous Government on animal welfare issues, including banning hunting with dogs;
- (b) is proud that due to Labour's stance on this barbaric 'sport', 2015

sees the 10th anniversary of the ban, which has the highest number of convictions, above all other wild mammal legislation;

- (c) notes that while in Government, the Labour Party did much to end cruel and unnecessary suffering of animals by banning fur farming, securing an end to cosmetic testing and introducing the Animal Welfare Act;
- (d) finds The Rt. Hon. David Cameron MP's promise that a future Conservative government would allow a 'free vote' on repealing the ban on fox hunting as yet another example of how out of touch this Government is, with the majority of British people being in favour of the ban;
- (e) also notes that Nigel Farage, Leader of UKIP, has taken part in hunts and UKIP have said that they would repeal the 2004 Hunting Act;
- (f) wholeheartedly agrees with The Rt. Hon. Ed Miliband MP, Leader of the Labour Party, that "we have a moral duty to treat animals we share this planet with in a humane and compassionate way";
- (g) welcomes the Labour Party's manifesto pledge to ban wild animals in circuses, reduce animal cruelty on shooting estates, review rules on breeding and selling of dogs and cats, end the badger cull and defend the Hunting Act, and to lead the fight against global animal cruelty; and
- (h) requests that a copy of this Motion be forwarded to all Sheffield MPs and ask that they offer their support to animal welfare and commit to vote against any proposal to repeal the 2004 Hunting Act.

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR HARRY HARPHAM

That this Council:

- (a) shares the legitimate concerns expressed by "whistle-blowers" and other stakeholders regarding the Board of the Yorkshire Ambulance Service, the possible risk to patients being created by their failings and allegations of "whistle-blowers" being targeted and gagged;
- (b) notes with concern that:
 - (i) Yorkshire Ambulance Service has failed to achieve the national target for emergency response times in 11 out of the last 12 months (correct to October 2014);
 - (ii) Emergency Care Assistants have been sent out to urgent and emergency calls with no qualified paramedic, putting patients' lives at risk;

- (iii) there are significant cuts to paramedics (15%) and the ambulance fleet (10%) being planned; and
- (iv) “Whistle-blowers” have alleged that emergency call-out data has been manipulated to reach targets;
- (c) calls on the Care Quality Commission to take enforcement action to ensure the safety of patients and relevant national standards are met;
- (d) pledges to oppose any application made by the Board of the Yorkshire Ambulance Service to become a Foundation Trust with greater powers, whilst the issues outlined remain unresolved; and
- (e) demands that the Board of the Yorkshire Ambulance Service:
 - (i) stops the planned cuts to paramedics and ambulances that put patients at risk; and
 - (ii) reinstates all Trade Union rights and protects “whistle-blowers”.

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOE OTTEN

That this Council:

- (a) notes the greater pressures on the NHS and care services due to an ageing population;
- (b) believes that integrating health and social care services will ease pressure on hospitals and help to improve home care services for patients who need it;
- (c) thanks the Government for the introduction of the Better Care Fund, made up of £3.8 billion of local services to improve care for the elderly and vulnerable to join up health and care services around the needs of patients, so that people can stay at home more and be in hospital less;
- (d) further thanks the Government for the introduction of the first ever limit of personal liability on the cost of social care, so older people no longer have to sell their home to pay for their care;
- (e) welcomes the recent news of the planned devolution of Manchester’s NHS budget to the Greater Manchester Combined Authority; and
- (f) therefore calls for the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority to work towards winning a similar deal for the Sheffield City Region.

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER

That this Council:-

- (a) believes that a commercially viable, fully operational airport in Sheffield would be an enormous asset for the city;
- (b) notes that Sheffield City Airport was built as a CAP168 code 2C airport as per the agreement between The Sheffield Development Corporation (SDC), Glenlivet Ltd and Tinsley Park Ltd, dated 27th October 1995 and subsequent lease of August 1997; and that the definition of "Airport" for the purposes of the agreement is laid out in Article 106 of the Air Navigation Order of 1989 and is consistent with the definition as originally laid out in clause 1.17 of the agreement between SDC and British Steel Corporation;
- (c) further notes that in 1997, Sheffield City Airport opened as a CAT 5, code 2C airport, which means it should have had, and maintained, all the facilities needed to cope with an aircraft capable of carrying up to 115 passengers;
- (d) also notes that the Airport started commercial services some three years earlier than originally planned, with the successful introduction on 16th February 1998, of KLM's three times daily Amsterdam service, which was an instant success, with KLM saying it was their best start-up service ever, and that services followed to Jersey, London, Dublin, Belfast and Brussels and in 1998, 75,157 passengers passed through its terminal;
- (e) recognises that Sheffield Development Corporation estimated it would take at least seven years after opening before the airport would make any return on capital, and that this fact was well known and, indeed, as early as 1990, had been referred to by the SDC;
- (f) is interested to know how Peel Holdings and the airport operator, just eight weeks after them acquiring one half share of the Airport, were allowed to start downgrading it; for example (i) at the end of September 2001 they reduced airport Rescue and Fire Fighting Services cover from a CAT 5 to a CAT 3, (ii) by the end of September 2002 they reduced cover from CAT 3 to a CAT 1 and also turned off the Instrument Landing System (ILS) and (iii) at the end of August 2002 they started turning the terminal building into a business centre (offices);
- (g) strongly asserts that rules and regulations should be abided by, and the closure of Sheffield City Airport was done in a most unsatisfactory manner, causing Sheffield one of its worst civic lost opportunities; and

- (h) further notes that Sheffield City Airport closed to all traffic in 2008, and that an area of eighty acres of prime development land, described as the best site on the M1 corridor between Leeds and Leicester, was transferred to Sheffield Business Parks Ltd, for a notional £1.00, which has never been collected.

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR NIKKI BOND

That this Council:

- (a) understands the deeply impactful nature of hate crimes and the importance of tackling hate crime in our city of Sanctuary;
- (b) welcomes proposals by Shadow Home Secretary, The Rt. Hon. Yvette Cooper MP, that a future Labour Government will tackle the rise in antisemitism, Islamophobia, homophobia, transphobia and abuse of disabled people in the UK, by making homophobic and disability hate crimes an aggravated criminal offence, ensuring that the Police treat such offences in the same way as racist hate crimes;
- (c) deplores proposals by UKIP to remove the race legislation within the Equality Act as this will exacerbate the level of race hate crime in our society, which was recorded as 536 incidents across South Yorkshire in 2013/14 and far exceeds other types of hate crime;
- (d) condemns the homophobic and misogynistic comments of a former Conservative candidate who tweeted his hateful views in response to news of an important research project into femicide, and believes there is no place for this type of attitude in Sheffield;
- (e) welcomes Sheffield City Council's inclusion of gender as a category for hate crime and recognises the importance of defining hate crime as prejudice against people of protected characteristics and other recognisable groups;
- (f) recognises the work done by the Council to tackle hate crime by working in partnership with the Police and other agencies to encourage reporting through Third Party reporting centres;
- (g) acknowledges that the level of reporting of hate crime in Sheffield is not an accurate portrayal of the number of hate crime incidents and that more needs to be done to help people feel comfortable to report, with this including better promotion and publicity of Third Party reporting centres, and an increased number of them; and
- (h) welcomes the organisation of a hate crime workshop in June, organised through the Equality Hub Network, where there will be an opportunity to learn more about Third Party reporting centres and

how to set one up, and encourages Sheffield citizens to attend the workshop in order to discuss how to tackle hate crime and make it easier to report.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "John Netherde", with a long horizontal flourish underneath.

Chief Executive

Dated this 17 day of March 2015

The next meeting of the Council will be its Annual General Meeting on 20 May 2015 at the Town Hall

The next ordinary meeting of the Council will be held on 3 June 2015 at the Town Hall

ADVICE TO MEMBERS ON DECLARING INTERESTS AT MEETINGS

If you are present at a meeting of the Council, of its executive or any committee of the executive, or of any committee, sub-committee, joint committee, or joint sub-committee of the authority, and you have a **Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI)** relating to any business that will be considered at the meeting, you must not:

- participate in any discussion of the business at the meeting, or if you become aware of your Disclosable Pecuniary Interest during the meeting, participate further in any discussion of the business, or
- participate in any vote or further vote taken on the matter at the meeting.

These prohibitions apply to any form of participation, including speaking as a member of the public.

You **must**:

- leave the room (in accordance with the Members' Code of Conduct)
- make a verbal declaration of the existence and nature of any DPI at any meeting at which you are present at which an item of business which affects or relates to the subject matter of that interest is under consideration, at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent.
- declare it to the meeting and notify the Council's Monitoring Officer within 28 days, if the DPI is not already registered.

If you have any of the following pecuniary interests, they are your **disclosable pecuniary interests** under the new national rules. You have a pecuniary interest if you, or your spouse or civil partner, have a pecuniary interest.

- Any employment, office, trade, profession or vocation carried on for profit or gain, which you, or your spouse or civil partner undertakes.
- Any payment or provision of any other financial benefit (other than from your council or authority) made or provided within the relevant period* in respect of any expenses incurred by you in carrying out duties as a member, or towards your election expenses. This includes any payment or financial benefit from a trade union within the meaning of the Trade Union and Labour Relations (Consolidation) Act 1992.

*The relevant period is the 12 months ending on the day when you tell the Monitoring Officer about your disclosable pecuniary interests.

- Any contract which is made between you, or your spouse or your civil partner (or a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest) and your council or authority –
 - under which goods or services are to be provided or works are to be executed; and
 - which has not been fully discharged.

- Any beneficial interest in land which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, have and which is within the area of your council or authority.
- Any licence (alone or jointly with others) which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, holds to occupy land in the area of your council or authority for a month or longer.
- Any tenancy where (to your knowledge) –
 - the landlord is your council or authority; and
 - the tenant is a body in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest.
- Any beneficial interest which you, or your spouse or your civil partner has in securities of a body where -
 - (a) that body (to your knowledge) has a place of business or land in the area of your council or authority; and
 - (b) either -
 - the total nominal value of the securities exceeds £25,000 or one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that body; or
 - if the share capital of that body is of more than one class, the total nominal value of the shares of any one class in which you, or your spouse or your civil partner, has a beneficial interest exceeds one hundredth of the total issued share capital of that class.

If you attend a meeting at which any item of business is to be considered and you are aware that you have a **personal interest** in the matter which does not amount to a DPI, you must make verbal declaration of the existence and nature of that interest at or before the consideration of the item of business or as soon as the interest becomes apparent. You should leave the room if your continued presence is incompatible with the 7 Principles of Public Life (selflessness; integrity; objectivity; accountability; openness; honesty; and leadership).

You have a personal interest where –

- a decision in relation to that business might reasonably be regarded as affecting the well-being or financial standing (including interests in land and easements over land) of you or a member of your family or a person or an organisation with whom you have a close association to a greater extent than it would affect the majority of the Council Tax payers, ratepayers or inhabitants of the ward or electoral area for which you have been elected or otherwise of the Authority's administrative area, or
- it relates to or is likely to affect any of the interests that are defined as DPIs but are in respect of a member of your family (other than a partner) or a person with whom you have a close association.

Guidance on declarations of interest, incorporating regulations published by the Government in relation to Disclosable Pecuniary Interests, has been circulated to you previously.

You should identify any potential interest you may have relating to business to be considered at the meeting. This will help you and anyone that you ask for advice to fully consider all the circumstances before deciding what action you should take.

In certain circumstances the Council may grant a **dispensation** to permit a Member to take part in the business of the Authority even if the member has a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest relating to that business.

To obtain a dispensation, you must write to the Monitoring Officer at least 48 hours before the meeting in question, explaining why a dispensation is sought and desirable, and specifying the period of time for which it is sought. The Monitoring Officer may consult with the Independent Person or the Council's Standards Committee in relation to a request for dispensation.

Further advice can be obtained from Gillian Duckworth, Director of Legal and Governance on 0114 2734018 or email gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk.

This page is intentionally left blank

Agenda Item 3

Minutes of the Meeting of the Council of the City of Sheffield held in the Council Chamber, Town Hall, Pinstone Street, Sheffield, S1 2HH, on Wednesday 4 February 2015, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Talib Hussain)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Mike Drabble Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Isobel Bowler Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Roy Munn Richard Shaw	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Steve Wilson Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Nasima Akther Nikki Bond Qurban Hussain
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison Diana Stimely	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> John Campbell Lynn Rooney Paul Wood
4	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	13	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Sheila Constance Alan Law Chris Weldon	22	<i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Stuart Wattam Brian Webster	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	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> Steve Jones Cate McDonald Tim Rippon	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Jillian Creasy Robert Murphy Sarah Jane Smalley	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Steve Ayris Denise Reaney	25	<i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Philip Wood
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Rob Frost Anne Murphy Geoff Smith	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran Neale Gibson
9	<i>Darnall Ward</i> Harry Harpham Mazher Iqbal Mary Lea	18	<i>Manor Castle Ward</i> Terry Fox Pat Midgley	27	<i>West Ecclesfield Ward</i> John Booker Adam Hurst Alf Meade
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Ray Satur

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from the Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) and Councillors Jenny Armstrong, David Baker and Ian Saunders.

In the absence of the Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon) the Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) chaired the meeting.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Councillor Joe Otten declared a personal interest in item of business number 19 on the Council Summons (Notice of Motion Concerning Health: Primary Care Funding) on the grounds that his wife is a General Practitioner.

3. MINUTES OF PREVIOUS COUNCIL MEETING

Resolved: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that the minutes of the meeting of the Council held on 7 January 2015 be approved as a true and accurate record.

4. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

4.1 Petitions

4.1.1 Petition Requesting the Council to Consider Moving to a System of All-Out Elections Every Four Years

The Council received an electronic petition containing 31 signatures, requesting the Council to consider moving to a system of all-out elections every four years.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Vicky Seddon who stated that the Council was requested to consider moving from elections by thirds to all out elections every 4 years. She stated that not only would this save money but it would better respect and reflect communities. Community cohesion was important and may be lost if ward size was the main criteria for determining ward boundaries. Thankfully, Sheffield had not experienced extreme community tensions which had led to riots in other places. She said that Community Assemblies had been an important way of hearing local people so they were better represented in the political system. All out elections would serve to change the number of councillors to reflect local communities.

Many places had adopted a system of elections every 4 years, including in Wales, Scotland and London Boroughs and there was evidence of a small improvement in voter turnout. This was a decision that was within the Council's own power and would require a two thirds majority, requiring cross party working. An all-out election would take place in 2016 in any case following the outcome of the

boundary review.

The Council referred the petition to the Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore. Councillor Dore responded by thanking the petitioners and Sheffield for Democracy for their contribution to the Boundary Review. The Review considered the boundaries, number of councillors in each ward and the electoral timetable. The review was to conclude in the Autumn and had involved all political parties and the public. The ward boundaries in the City were determined by the Boundary Commission. Councillor Dore stated that she accepted some of the comments which had been made and said that she was proud of the strong community cohesion in the City.

Councillor Dore stated that the Local Area Partnerships, which replaced Community Assemblies aimed to bring together stakeholders in each local area to enable them to work together to deal with the issues particularly affecting those communities. Cabinet in the Community was also a method of engagement that had been introduced in the last few years. Nonetheless she wished to improve how the Council engaged with communities and said that the Council was open to new ideas. She reiterated her gratitude to Sheffield for Democracy for their engagement with the Council.

4.1.2 Petition Requesting Improvements to the Pedestrian Crossing Outside Ecclesall Junior School, Ringinglow Road

The Council received an electronic petition containing 1116 signatures requesting improvements to the pedestrian crossing outside Ecclesall Junior School, Ringinglow Road.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Louise Colegate. She stated that the post of School Crossing Patrol Warden at Ecclesall Junior School had been vacant since the previous post holder had left the post in September 2014. There were numerous incidents involving poor driving outside the School, with cars not stopping whilst children and parents attempted to cross the road and one vehicle had over taken another which had stopped to let people cross at a zebra crossing, which fortunately had not resulted in injuries to those using the crossing at that time. The petition had collected over 1000 signatures in seven weeks. A replacement School Crossing Patrol warden was needed and it was understood that an advertisement had been placed on 3 February.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene. Councillor Dunn confirmed that the vacancy for a School Crossing patrol Warden had been advertised and said that she hoped a successful recruitment would be made to the post. A 20 mph zone for the area was in the programme, although it was dependent upon available funding. The requests for a crossing and speed indication device would be assessed.

4.1.3 Petition Requesting Double Yellow Lines at the Junction of Westwick Road and Westwick Crescent

The Council received a petition containing 176 signatures requesting double yellow lines at the junction of Westwick Road and Westwick Crescent.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Mick Thomas who stated that the petition concerned the junction of Westwick Road and Westwick Crescent being made unsafe by vehicles parking on corners close to the junction and obscuring the view of approaching traffic. Although there were already single yellow lines, these were ignored. There had been a number of damage only accidents but there had been no reports of accidents involving injury or fatality. However, there was a real concern that it was only a matter of time before a serious accident occurred. The petition requested the painting of double yellow lines on all four corners of the junction approximately 10 to 15 metres into the adjoining roads. It was hoped that this would improve the view for motorists. Local shopkeepers had expressed the view that this would not interfere with access to their businesses.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene. Councillor Dunn confirmed that double yellow lines would be installed at the junction, having spoken with Council Officers about this matter.

4.1.4 Petition Requesting the Council's Support for Chapeltown Juniors FC in Taking the Tenancy of Steel City Sports Ground

The Council received a petition containing 596 signatures requesting the Council's support for Chapeltown Juniors FC in taking the tenancy of Steel City Sports Ground.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Mark Ashforth who stated that Chapeltown Juniors FC comprised 8 teams with approximately 120 players aged between 6 and 18 years. The football club had rented pitches from Sheffield Parks and Countryside for some 20 years the quality of which had slowly degraded. Top soil had been requested in order that the surface of the pitch could be maintained and it could be kept in a playable condition. However, the pitches in Ecclesfield Park were also used by other more senior teams and this caused further damage to the playing surface and meant that it was sometimes dangerous for young players.

Chapeltown Juniors would like to relocate to the Steel City Sports Ground and take over the lease from the City Council for the Steel City Sports Ground and clubhouse on Shiregreen Lane. Support for the initiative had been forthcoming from local elected members, including Councillors Alan Law and Pauline Andrews. The Council Parks and Countryside Service and local Football Association were involved in the project and were also keen to continue other sports at the Sports Ground. It was also hoped that the club house could be reopened to give a base for activities including dance and bingo and that access to football could be widened so as to include females and disabled people. In order to make a bid for Lottery funding, the football club would need a tenancy and letter of comfort. The Steel City site was in disrepair at this time and it was intended to turn this situation around. The tenancy deeds included a clause

related to retaining the site as a sports ground and further detailed discussion was required on this aspect of the site.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Isobel Bowler, the Cabinet Member for Culture, Sport and Leisure. Councillor Bowler stated that it was absolutely not the intention that the Steel City Sports Ground would not be used as a sports ground and it was recognised as a valuable asset. She thanked all the people who put in time and effort in contributing to and supporting grassroots football in Sheffield. The Football Association had set up a national initiative to invest in grassroots football facilities. Sheffield was the first city in which the programme would be delivered and the first two new football hubs would be created with artificial pitches at Graves Leisure Centre and Thorncliffe Recreation Ground.

Councillor Bowler stated that whilst the pitches at the Steel City Ground were in relatively good condition, the buildings were poor. Councillors Peter Price, Alan Law and Pauline Andrews were all working in respect of a potential lease of the Steel City Ground and in securing future investment. Council officers would also continue to work with them in that regard.

4.1.5 Petition Requesting a Pelican Crossing at the Junction of Duke Street, Bernard Street and Talbot Street

The Council received a joint paper and electronic petition containing 158 signatures requesting a pelican crossing at the junction of Duke Street, Bernard Street and Talbot Street.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Graham Wroe, who stated that the junction of Duke Street, Bernard Street and Talbot Street was dangerous and older people were afraid to cross the road in the absence of a pedestrian crossing. According to information on the 'crash map' website, 16 incidents had been recorded at that location and one had involved serious injury. One lady had fallen on the junction and had received no help from other people. The left turn was not controlled and there was always moving traffic. Vehicles also mounted the pavement and drivers did not always signal.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene. Councillor Dunn referred to the fact that this issue had been raised with the Council in 2014 and the potential for a crossing had been assessed according to the relevant criteria. She would request that a further assessment was made of the request and noted that the Streets Ahead programme would be in that area in 2016.

4.1.6 Petition Objecting to any Proposals to Demolish Tinsley Youth Club

The Council received a petition containing 42 signatures objecting to any proposals to demolish Tinsley Youth Club.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Adil Mohammed, who stated that the Pavilion at Tinsley was the heart of the community. However, it had been suggested that the Pavilion may be demolished to make way for a car park

at the new school. He said that 40 young people attended each youth session and suggested that the activities undertaken at the Pavilion were expanded. The facility was something which the community did not want to lose and he asked if the Council would rule out any proposal to demolish the Pavilion.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jackie Drayton, Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families. Councillor Drayton thanked the Petitioners for submitting their petition and stated that she knew that young people appreciated the work which took place in the Pavilion. The Pavilion would remain in place and the plans for Tinsley Green and the new school were completely separate. She recognised that people have ideas for the future use of the Pavilion and it was felt that the building was underused at present and stated that its use might be expanded for the benefit of all members of the local community.

4.1.7 Petition Objecting to the Proposed Removal of Grit Bins in the Chancet Wood Area

The Council received a petition containing 80 signatures objecting to the proposed removal of grit bins in the Chancet Wood area.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Wendy Zealand who stated that the proposed removal of grit bins on the Chancet Wood estate would particularly affect the predominantly older population in the area, who may not be able to get out of their homes and may also affect access by carers and health services. Families had difficulty in supporting elderly relatives. The Council was asked to consider keeping the grit bins where they were and not to condemn older people to being housebound in the future. People were willing to help keep the estate accessible in the winter periods and community groups including the Tenants and Residents Association would encourage community spirit.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene.

4.1.8 Petition Requesting the Reinstatement of the Grit Bin for Residents of Grassington Way and Leyburn Grove

The Council received a petition containing 36 signatures requesting the reinstatement of the grit bin for residents of Grassington Way and Leyburn Way.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Mrs Stow who stated that Grassington Road and Leyburn Way had a majority of older people aged over 60 years. The roads were located on the brow of a hill and only a 4x4 vehicle would be able to access the road in wintry conditions. There was no windbreak and the windchill made it more difficult for people. In order to access bus routes and shops people had to exit the local roads, which often became icy in colder weather and residents had relied on grit from the bin which had previously been in place. There was concern that access by emergency services, and other services such as district nurses and carers would be compromised when some older residents needed daily care or medication for life threatening illnesses. The Council was asked to consider the additional costs to the NHS in cases where

people had accidents in winter conditions caused by a lack of surface gritting.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene.

4.1.9 Public Questions Concerning Winter Maintenance

Janet Halse stated that she believed the quality of winter management had deteriorated and she referred to the effect of recent snow on her own family. She asked why the commissioning and monitoring of winter management of highways had left the City in a dangerous state with the Council contact number at Streets Ahead no longer taking public requests to grit very dangerous side roads; shopping areas and main access footpaths never treated; grit bins not being filled as a matter of routine and reliance upon the public identifying a need for more grit; and non-gritting of side roads, meaning that a problematic map of gritting routes had been created. She suggested that a cross city network be created between valleys to help ease gridlock on routes in the valley bottoms.

She urged the Council to review the situation and if necessary create a cross party group including other partners and stakeholders to find a solution and if necessary seek supplementary funding.

Keith Crawshaw stated that he wished to reiterate and support the petition concerning the reinstatement of a grit bin on Grassington Way.

Councillor Jayne Dunn, the Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene, responded to the two petitions and questions on the subject of winter maintenance. Firstly, she stated that the grit bin on Grassington Way had not met the criteria which had been adopted for the provision of grit bins. The application of the criteria had meant that approximately 120 grit bins had been removed. Councillor Dunn said that a review would be taking place of the provision of grit bins once the winter period had ended and this might result in some bins being relocated. Grit required as dry a surface as possible in order for it to be effective. It took between 8 and 9 hours to grit the network in Sheffield. Grit was most effective where the depth of snow was between 2 to 4 centimetres. It did not work effectively where the depth of snow was much greater. On Boxing Day, the weather had turned quickly from rain to snow and there was not time to grit the whole of the City's network before heavier accumulations of snow occurred. Grit also needed to be worked into the surface and on Boxing Day there were also lighter levels of traffic, so the grit did not become worked in as quickly as it might have been.

4.2 Public Questions

4.2.1 Public Questions Concerning Land Adjacent to 265 Abbey Lane

Liz Jaques stated that the site of land adjacent to 265 Abbey Lane had been identified as being suitable for development for residential use and proposals and recommendations for the disposal of this site were outlined in a report concerning surplus land. She asked why the decision had been identified as being "Non Key"

and made without proper consultation with the local community, local residents, Beauchief Abbey Congregation Committee and Beauchief Environment Group.

Objections had previously been raised in relation to the development of this land in 2008 and the issues put forward at that time were still considered to be relevant. There would be potential loss of open space in a conservation area that is one of Sheffield's oldest Heritage sites and it was argued that the land should remain undeveloped to preserve the view of the Abbey. The Beauchief Environment Group carried out a lot of work, maintenance and conservation work in the area and organised working mornings and petitions were currently being signed opposing development or planning permission.

Pamela Hodgson stated that this area of land should be preserved for the future and it was not sensible to propose alternative use such as for housing. The land adjacent to 265 Abbey Lane provided an open view to one of the City's few heritage sites. The Conservation area abutted the Golf Course and when looking at the site it was clear that it was not suitable to build upon. She asked whether permanent protection could be given to the site.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, responded that a "non key" decision was the class of decision which had been used in this case due to the relatively low land values involved and because the decision was one which would not be considered to have a significant impact on an area of two or more wards. However, it was not a judgement on the heritage value of the site. Councillor Curran stated that local Councillor Roy Munn had raised the issue with him as Cabinet Member, so he was aware of the history and importance of the site. He had now made it clear to Council Officers that he was not content with the decision process in this case both in terms of outcome and consultation. He had instructed Officers not to proceed with the disposal of the site.

4.2.2 Public Question Concerning the Site of the Primary School in Tinsley

Muzafar Rahman expressed concerns at developments in Tinsley, including the siting of industry and the decision to permit the development of an IKEA store, all of which would give rise to increased pollution. There were also other transport developments which would affect the area such as the Bus Rapid Transit link road and High Speed Rail. He referred to the recent decision to create a school in the community park and stated that he felt that the community's voice was not being heard. The park was the only green and tranquil place in the Tinsley area and helped residents with bronchial or other respiratory conditions. He said that other sites were available for the location of the school and asked why the Council was persistent in wishing to build the school within the park.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, responded to the question from Mr Rahman. She thanked him for his question and said that she knew that he cared passionately about his community. There had been a long held wish for a new school in Tinsley, combining the existing infant and junior schools and moving the schools away from the M1 Motorway. All the sites in the area had been investigated in order that a proposal

could be developed. The Council had been pursuing an alternative site but had been told in writing by the owners that the site was not available. Building had to commence as soon as possible, otherwise the extra £1.4 million that was available through extra school places funding would be lost. Therefore a proposal had to be made. Tinsley School was one of the most improved in the country and it provided a wonderful education for its pupils and worked with parents, carers and the community. The proposal was not for a 'superschool' as had been referred to, but to expand the existing Tinsley Green building in the Park and to retain as much of the Park as possible. The school's outdoor areas would be multi-usage for both the school and the community's use and there would be continued community use of the building and community access to the school's amenities. When demolished, the site of the existing Junior School would be retained as green space. Although some people were not supportive of the proposals, it was considered to be the right thing to do for children now and in the future. As the proposals went forward, work with the local community would continue. Councillor Drayton stated that she hoped that Mr Rahman would continue to work for the people in his community.

4.2.3 Public Question Concerning TARA (Tenants and Residents Association)

Martin Brighton asked the following questions concerning a Tenants and Residents Association (TARA).

Mr Brighton asked for it to be noted that his questions were based upon Council public records and Council documents provided through use of the Freedom of Information Act.

He stated that when asked whether the treatment of a TARA was appropriate, the answer in this Chamber was that 'due process' had been followed. He said that disclosed Council documents show the opposite to be the case. Mr Brighton asked can this Chamber ever believe anything said by that person ever again.

Councillor Harry Harpham, the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, stated that Mr Brighton was mistaken in the claim made in the above question. He stated that TARAs were always treated in the appropriate manner. Councillor Harpham said that non-one had ever not been treated properly.

4.2.4 Public Question Concerning Racism Awareness Courses

Martin Brighton stated that when asked in this Chamber whether Racism Awareness Courses had been arranged, to much public fanfare to the attending press and TV cameras, the answer was that they had been arranged. A subsequent reason given for not having them was that holidays had prevented their arrangement. Disclosed information shows that there were never any plans to hold Racism Awareness Courses, and none of the providers had even been contacted. He asked why does this Council Chamber persistently allow such behaviour.

Councillor Harry Harpham, the Deputy Leader of the Council and Cabinet Member

for Homes and Neighbourhoods, stated that Racism Awareness formed part of the Council's equalities, diversity and inclusion training which was an online training programme and was mandatory for all staff. There were also special courses and e-learning available when particular service areas wished to do it.

4.2.5 Public Questions Concerning Answers to Questions and Behaviour

Martin Brighton stated that month after month in this Chamber, citizens – not only this citizen – have persistently complained that they have not had answers to their questions, and that unanswered questions are merely being parried. Answers are then promised, as recorded in the public record. He said that those answers, despite the repeated promises, have still not been provided.

He asked whether, on this basis any citizen could ever believe anything said in this Chamber, which is brought into disrepute by such behaviour.

Mr Brighton stated that when raising the subject of behaviour, reference is made to the Council's Constitution and the duty of the Monitoring Officer. He stated that given the above, and bearing in mind that all the requisite evidence is within Council documents, why is 'due process' not applied?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that she did try to understand the questions which Mr Brighton submitted. She said she was clear that he had answers to all of his questions. Where he believed he had not had answers it was in cases where the question was not clear. She said that if Mr Brighton asked a direct question, she would be able to give a direct answer.

Councillor Dore stated that, in relation to behaviour, the Council did make reference to the Council's Constitution and to the role and duties of the Monitoring Officer. Due process was applied and followed. If Mr Brighton believed that not to be the case, Councillor Dore said that he needed to point that out to the Council.

4.2.6 Public Question Concerning Combined Authority

Nigel Slack referred to report in the press that the Derbyshire Councils have reached an agreement with the Government concerning the creation of a combined authority. He asked where this left the Sheffield City Region; will North Derbyshire Councils be 'jumping ship' or will they attempt to operate with 'a foot in each camp'; and continue to benefit from the recent City Deal that the Sheffield City Region Combined Authority had agreed?

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that there had not yet been a clear decision taken about Derbyshire. There were ongoing discussions concerning the position of non-South Yorkshire local authorities in the City Region Combined Authority area. It was likely she said that Mr Slack would be able to find out about this issue relatively quickly as he was likely to attend meetings at which such issues were discussed.

4.2.7 Public Question Concerning Planning Permissions to National Chains

Nigel Slack referred to the application for planning permission for the former St John's Chapel on Sharrow Lane for signage under the Tesco Express name. He said that this would be the seventeenth such store opened in Sheffield in the last 5 years. He commented that chains of this kind took most of their income out of the local economy, as opposed to 85 percent of income retained in the local economy by independent stores and asked if the Council would press the urgent need for a more locally based economic plan alongside attempts to attract outside investment. He asked would it also press, through the Combined Authority, for planning powers to be urgently devolved to the Region to give local people and councils more say in the way development proceeds.

Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, responded that national planning policy stipulated these matters. An evidence base would be required to show a saturation of a particular use. There was he stated a case for devolving some planning powers to a local level. He said that, in Sheffield, a large proportion of businesses were independent. The Council was seeking to promote independent businesses through such initiatives as the RISE Graduate Programme and emphasis on small and medium size enterprises to help them grow. Other initiatives included an export pilot for small and medium size enterprises; the Chapel Walk scheme; the Moor Market; and the immanent launch of a retail policy to promote the use of empty shops. Councillor Bramall stated that a mixture of independent and large scale businesses were required. In Darnall for example, there had been a campaign to retain the Morrison's supermarket as it contributed to the footfall of other retailers. The Council would use its policies to achieve the best outcomes for the City, as far as possible.

Councillor Julie Dore added that through the Combined Authority, greater devolution of powers would be sought in relation to planning. Councillor Dore also referred to the importance of retail chains based locally. For example, there had been a petition to retain the Tesco store on Manor Top as it provided local employment.

5. MEMBERS' QUESTIONS

5.1 Urgent Business

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

5.2 Questions

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

5.3 South Yorkshire Joint Authorities

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

6. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

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

Central Area Lead Ward Member - Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley to replace Councillor Jillian Creasy

Appeals and Collective Disputes Committee - Councillor Brian Webster to replace Councillor Jillian Creasy

Healthier Communities and Adult Social Care Scrutiny and Policy Development Committee - Councillor Jillian Creasy to replace Councillor Brian Webster

(b) that David Baldwin (former Health Service Executive) be re-appointed to serve as a public sector representative on the Council's Independent Remuneration Panel for a full four year term ending 6th February 2019.

7. DESIGNATION OF MONITORING OFFICER

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, that this Council (a) notes that the Senior Officer Employment Committee, at its meeting held on 20th January 2015, appointed Gillian Duckworth to the post of Director of Legal and Governance, and (b) designates the Director of Legal and Governance as the Council's Monitoring Officer with effect from the date of the appointment.

8. HOUSING REVENUE ACCOUNT (HRA) BUSINESS PLAN UPDATE, HRA BUDGET AND RENT INCREASE 2015-16

It was moved by Councillor Harry Harpham, seconded by Councillor Mary Lea, that the following recommendations of the Cabinet at its meeting on 14th January 2015, in relation to a joint report of the Executive Directors, Communities, Place and Resources providing the 2015/16 update to the Housing Revenue Account (HRA) Business Plan and 2015/16 revenue budget for the HRA be approved.

RESOLVED: That this Cabinet recommends to the meeting of the City

Council on 4th February, 2015 that :-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2015/16 as set out in Appendix A to the report is approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget for 2015/16 as set out in Appendix B to the report is approved;
- (c) rents for Council dwellings are increased by 2.2% from April 2015;
- (d) rents for garages and garage sites are frozen at 2014/15 levels and not increased from April 2015;
- (e) Community Heating charges are not increased from April 2015;
- (f) the burglar alarm charge which is due to be amended during 2014/15 following a procurement is not increased from April 2015;
- (g) the Sheltered Housing service charge which is due to be amended during 2014/15 is not increased from April 2015;
- (h) charges for temporary accommodation and furnished accommodation are not increased;
- (i) the Director of Commissioning, Communities and the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, be granted delegated authority to authorise prudential borrowing as allowed under current government guidelines; and
- (j) the specific projects proposed in the report be brought forward for Member approval in accordance with the Council's Capital Approval process as business cases are developed."

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Steve Ayris, seconded by Councillor Penny Baker, as an amendment, that, with the exception of recommendation (e) relating to Community Heating charges, the recommendations made by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 14th January 2015, concerning the Housing Revenue Account Business Plan, HRA Budget and Rent Increase 2015/16, be approved with the following amendments:-

- (e)(1) that a community heating reserve of £1.5m be retained to address the impact of any future energy price increases and possible changes in demand resulting from the roll out of heating metering; and
- (2) that £0.2m be allocated to facilitate a reduction in the community heating charge to customers;

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

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

RESOLVED: That, as recommended by the Cabinet at its meeting held on 14th January, 2015:-

- (a) the HRA Business Plan report for 2015/16 as set out in Appendix A to the report now submitted be approved;
- (b) the HRA Revenue Budget for 2015/16 as set out in Appendix B to the report be approved;
- (c) rents for Council dwellings be increased by 2.2% from April 2015;
- (d) rents for garages and garage sites be frozen at 2014/15 levels and not increased from April 2015;
- (e) Community Heating charges be not increased from April 2015;
- (f) the burglar alarm charge which is due to be amended during 2014/15 following a procurement be not increased from April 2015;
- (g) the Sheltered Housing service charge which is due to be amended during 2014/15 be not increased from April 2015;
- (h) charges for temporary accommodation and furnished accommodation be not increased;
- (i) the Director of Commissioning, Communities and the Director of Finance, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, be granted delegated authority to authorise prudential borrowing as allowed under current government guidelines; and
- (j) the specific projects proposed in the report be brought forward for Member approval in accordance with the Council's Capital Approval process as business cases are developed.

9. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR LEIGH BRAMALL

Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District And Sheffield International Economic Commission

It was moved by Councillor Leigh Bramall, seconded by Councillor Chris Rosling-Josephs, that this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the ambitious proposals that have been brought forward by Sheffield and Rotherham to create the first Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District in the UK;

- (b) notes that the aim is to create an Advanced Manufacturing cluster of international scale as well as expertise and welcomes that the Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre will soon be enhanced by the development of Factory 2050 which is a key project for the city;
- (c) recalls that Innovation Districts are a geographic area that combines research institutions, innovative firms and business incubators with the benefits of urban living, and unlike traditional science parks, these districts cluster cutting-edge research in geographic areas that are liveable, walkable, bike-able, and transit connected, to create an environment that actively fosters innovation;
- (d) welcomes that the Innovation District was announced at the first part of the Sheffield International Economic Commission launched by the present Administration;
- (e) believes that attracting Bruce Katz, Vice President of the Brookings Institute and author of "The Rise of Innovation Districts" and Kelly Kline, Economic Development Director in the city of Fremont, California, is a big coup for the City and reflects the ambitions of the Commission;
- (f) welcomes the positive reception for the Innovation District and International Economic Commission in local, regional and national media, which is important to enhancing the City's reputation on a national and international stage to attract investment into the city;
- (g) welcomes the partnership working with Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, the University of Sheffield and the Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre for their work on the visit and the partnership working as part of the Innovation District;
- (h) thanks Sheffield Forgemasters, Alcoa and the Tata Proving Factory at Newburgh Precision for hosting visits as part of the event;
- (i) notes that work with Bruce Katz will continue to drive forward the Innovation District;
- (j) further thanks the Centre for Cities for their support over the coming year on the Commission; and
- (k) agrees to send a letter to Mr Katz and Ms Kline on behalf of the Council thanking them for visiting the city and their contribution to Sheffield's International Economic Commission.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Ian Auckland, seconded by Councillor Andrew Sangar, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (e) as follows, and the relettering of original paragraphs (b) to (k) as new paragraphs (f) to (o):-

- (b) welcomes the support of the Coalition Government and in particular the

Secretary of State for Business, Rt Hon Vince Cable MP, in enabling these developments to take place;

- (c) welcomes the fact that Sheffield is at the heart of a City Region reflective of our economic geography;
- (d) believes that City Regions will represent the future basis of devolved funding from central government;
- (e) notes that as a result of the Sheffield City Region Growth Deal the target is to establish approximately 30,000 more highly skilled jobs to create a more prosperous economy;

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) welcomes the ambitious proposals that have been brought forward by Sheffield and Rotherham to create the first Advanced Manufacturing Innovation District in the UK;
- (b) notes that the aim is to create an Advanced Manufacturing cluster of international scale as well as expertise and welcomes that the Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre will soon be enhanced by the development of Factory 2050 which is a key project for the city;
- (c) recalls that Innovation Districts are a geographic area that combines research institutions, innovative firms and business incubators with the benefits of urban living, and unlike traditional science parks, these districts cluster cutting-edge research in geographic areas that are liveable, walkable, bike-able, and transit connected, to create an environment that actively fosters innovation;
- (d) welcomes that the Innovation District was announced at the first part of the Sheffield International Economic Commission launched by the present Administration;
- (e) believes that attracting Bruce Katz, Vice President of the Brookings Institute and author of "The Rise of Innovation Districts" and Kelly Kline, Economic Development Director in the city of Fremont, California, is a big coup for the City and reflects the ambitions of the Commission;
- (f) welcomes the positive reception for the Innovation District and International Economic Commission in local, regional and national media, which is important to enhancing the City's reputation on a national and international stage to attract investment into the city;

- (g) welcomes the partnership working with Rotherham Metropolitan Borough Council, the University of Sheffield and the Advanced Manufacturing Research Centre for their work on the visit and the partnership working as part of the Innovation District;
- (h) thanks Sheffield Forgemasters, Alcoa and the Tata Proving Factory at Newburgh Precision for hosting visits as part of the event;
- (i) notes that work with Bruce Katz will continue to drive forward the Innovation District;
- (j) further thanks the Centre for Cities for their support over the coming year on the Commission; and
- (k) agrees to send a letter to Mr Katz and Ms Kline on behalf of the Council thanking them for visiting the city and their contribution to Sheffield's International Economic Commission.

(Note: Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson and John Booker voted for paragraphs (a) to (d), (f), (g), (h) and (j) and abstained on paragraphs (e), (i) and (k) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

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

Youth Issues

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

- (a) recognises that the young people of Sheffield played no part in creating the financial crisis and is therefore appalled at the deep levels of cuts that this Government is subjecting them to;
- (b) condemns this Government's huge reduction in support for young people in all kinds of education, including the tripling of university tuition fees, the removal of Educational Maintenance Allowance, the removal of National Careers Advice funding and deep cuts to funding for 18 year olds in further education;
- (c) further opposes the deep cuts from central Government which affect this Council's ability to fund youth services and activities for young people;
- (d) believes that broken promises made to young people by The Rt. Hon. David Cameron MP and The Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP on many of these issues has fundamentally undermined the faith in the political process for

many young people;

- (e) contrasts this Government's cuts to this Council's record of action for young people; creating apprenticeships, starting the innovative RISE internship scheme and helping match young people and local employers through the Skills Made Easy scheme;
- (f) supports the Labour Party's guarantee of a job for every young person out of work and plans for a transformation of vocational education;
- (g) resolves to campaign to highlight the gross unfairness of these cuts and urges all young people to register to vote in the upcoming general election in order to make their voices heard; and
- (h) welcomes that The Rt. Hon. Ed Miliband, MP, highlighted the problems the Government's mismanagement of Individual Electoral Registration is causing, resulting in many people, including students, falling off the register and praised the actions of local partners in Sheffield who have taken action to address this issue including the universities, student union and the Council, and reiterates its support for the work of these organisations.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, as an amendment, that the motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) condemns the record of the last Labour Government of spiralling youth unemployment, rising for 16-17 year olds from a low of 18.0% in 2001 to 36.5% by April 2010, and for 18-24 year olds from 9.9% in 2001 to 17.8% by April 2010, with much of this increase happening before the financial crisis, and believes this shows that Labour do not care about young people;
- (b) welcomes the fall in youth unemployment to 32.1% for 16-17 year olds and 15.1% for 18-24 year olds under the Coalition, recognising that there is much more progress still to be made;
- (c) is concerned at what this Council believes is Labour's populist, punitive "youth tax", which would remove benefits for young people, including "NEET"s, and increase family dependency, potentially coercing many young people into unsuitable training options, with little impact on the benefits bill;
- (d) believes that this turnaround in youth unemployment is due in no small part to the Liberal Democrat priority of boosting skill-rich apprenticeships;
- (e) further believes that Liberal Democrat policies such as increasing the personal tax allowance also have a positive effect on employment rates;
- (f) notes with sadness the extremely high youth unemployment rates in Greece, Spain and Italy, and therefore we should not be seduced by the

appeal of excessive borrowing;

- (g) condemns the hypocrisy of Labour's grandstanding against cuts while at the same time promising further cuts if elected;
- (h) welcomes that despite opposition scaremongering, record numbers of young people are going to university, including record numbers from deprived backgrounds; in 2014, 512,400 applicants were placed in Higher Education through UCAS , the first time the service has placed over a half million people and acceptances from the 18-19 year old age groups increased by 2% despite a falling population in that age group; and particularly welcomes the increase in entry to HE for disadvantaged young people in England, making this group a third more likely to enter university than five years ago;
- (i) notes that Labour's proposal on tuition fees has been condemned by university leaders as implausible, due to the £10bn needed to fund it not being found;
- (j) notes that under that proposal, a cut to the headline fees rate will only benefit higher-earning graduates because lower-earning graduates never repay the full amount, and that Labour's policy therefore only benefits higher earning graduates;
- (k) notes that the previous Labour Government introduced tuition fees and subsequently tripled them;
- (l) welcomes the introduction of the pupil premium, giving extra valuable support to many pupils;
- (m) welcomes free school meals for infant children, saving many hard pressed parents £400 per year; and
- (n) welcomes the Liberal Democrat commitment to protect education spending from cradle to college and ensure that children are taught by a qualified teacher.

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

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley, seconded by Councillor Brian Webster, as an amendment, that the motion now submitted be amended by the relettering of paragraph (h) as a new paragraph (o) and the addition of new paragraphs (h) to (n) as follows:-

- (h) notes that 5th February, 2015 has been designated by Bite the Ballot as National Voter Registration Day;
- (i) believes that it is essential that all those who are eligible to vote know how to register to vote and are not denied the opportunity to exercise this fundamental democratic right;

- (j) commends the work already undertaken by Council officers and partner institutions including the city's Universities and their Students' Unions, to give young people the information they need to register to vote;
- (k) believes that these efforts are particularly important this year, as the introduction of Individual Voter Registration (IVR) risks disenfranchising millions of people, including young people, across the country;
- (l) notes reports from the Electoral Commission that "areas with a high concentration of certain demographics – students, private renters and especially young adults" are at particular risk of seeing the number of registered voters fall significantly under IVR;
- (m) therefore calls upon officers to continue working with partner organisations to ensure that information about both the practicalities and the importance of registering to vote are publicised as widely as possible to all segments of Sheffield's population in the run-up to the 7th May elections and beyond;
- (n) further, calls upon Members of the Council to exercise their responsibility as community leaders by actively promoting voter registration and participation in the democratic process in the communities they represent;

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

Following a Right of Reply by Councillor George Lindars-Hammond, the original Motion, as amended, was put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) recognises that the young people of Sheffield played no part in creating the financial crisis and is therefore appalled at the deep levels of cuts that this Government is subjecting them to;
- (b) condemns this Government's huge reduction in support for young people in all kinds of education, including the tripling of university tuition fees, the removal of Educational Maintenance Allowance, the removal of National Careers Advice funding and deep cuts to funding for 18 year olds in further education;
- (c) further opposes the deep cuts from central Government which affect this Council's ability to fund youth services and activities for young people;
- (d) believes that broken promises made to young people by The Rt. Hon. David Cameron MP and The Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP on many of these issues has fundamentally undermined the faith in the political process for many young people;
- (e) contrasts this Government's cuts to this Council's record of action for young

- people; creating apprenticeships, starting the innovative RISE internship scheme and helping match young people and local employers through the Skills Made Easy scheme;
- (f) supports the Labour Party's guarantee of a job for every young person out of work and plans for a transformation of vocational education;
 - (g) resolves to campaign to highlight the gross unfairness of these cuts and urges all young people to register to vote in the upcoming general election in order to make their voices heard;
 - (h) notes that 5th February, 2015 has been designated by Bite the Ballot as National Voter Registration Day;
 - (i) believes that it is essential that all those who are eligible to vote know how to register to vote and are not denied the opportunity to exercise this fundamental democratic right;
 - (j) commends the work already undertaken by Council officers and partner institutions including the city's Universities and their Students' Unions, to give young people the information they need to register to vote;
 - (k) believes that these efforts are particularly important this year, as the introduction of Individual Voter Registration (IVR) risks disenfranchising millions of people, including young people, across the country;
 - (l) notes reports from the Electoral Commission that "areas with a high concentration of certain demographics – students, private renters and especially young adults" are at particular risk of seeing the number of registered voters fall significantly under IVR;
 - (m) therefore calls upon officers to continue working with partner organisations to ensure that information about both the practicalities and the importance of registering to vote are publicised as widely as possible to all segments of Sheffield's population in the run-up to the 7th May elections and beyond;
 - (n) further, calls upon Members of the Council to exercise their responsibility as community leaders by actively promoting voter registration and participation in the democratic process in the communities they represent; and
 - (o) welcomes that The Rt. Hon. Ed Miliband, MP, highlighted the problems the Government's mismanagement of Individual Electoral Registration is causing, resulting in many people, including students, falling off the register and praised the actions of local partners in Sheffield who have taken action to address this issue including the universities, student union and the Council, and reiterates its support for the work of these organisations.

(Notes: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely,

Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (h) to (n) and against paragraphs (a) to (g) and (o) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson and John Booker voted for paragraphs (a) to (n) and abstained on paragraph (o) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

11. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR VICKIE PRIESTLEY

Winter Maintenance

It was moved by Councillor Vickie Priestley, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, that this Council:-

- (a) condemns the current Administration for its ill-considered attempt to save money whilst putting lives and property at risk by reducing the gritting network on Priority 2 routes;
- (b) welcomes the u-turn to reinstate these routes following public pressure and a campaign led by the Liberal Democrats;
- (c) recognises that it is not possible to clear all roads in the first few hours after a snow fall;
- (d) recognises that citizens of Sheffield are willing to help themselves by clearing residential roads;
- (e) however, this task is made more difficult by the removal of 121 grit bins at a saving of only £82 per bin and the undermining of the snow warden scheme; this includes grit bins that have been removed from shopping parades and areas with high numbers of elderly population;
- (f) therefore calls upon the Administration to work with local residents to identify the optimum position for each bin; and
- (g) further calls upon the Administration to immediately reinstate the grit bins and provide the snow wardens with grit.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Jayne Dunn, seconded by Councillor Karen McGowan, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) regrets that Sheffield, like other councils across the country, was forced to find savings after the unprecedented level of cuts imposed on the Council by the Government, of which the Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP is Deputy Prime Minister;

- (b) notes reports of the following average reductions in gritting per region over the past 5 years - East Midlands 43.5 per cent, London 37 per cent, the North West 28.3 per cent, East of England 27.4 per cent and Yorkshire and the Humber 27 per cent, and can confirm that in Sheffield the cut is much less than average;
- (c) welcomes that the present Administration reversed cuts to gritting routes in response to the concerns that were raised;
- (d) thanks the people of Sheffield who made a fantastic effort in clearing roads and pavements;
- (e) notes that Sheffield has more grit bins than any other local authority that we are aware of and, despite reducing the number of grit bins by 121, Sheffield still has 1891 grit bins compared to Nottingham which has 180 grit bins, Manchester 180 grit bins and Leeds 1300;
- (f) is appalled at the hypocrisy of the main opposition group and recalls their incompetence in dealing with snow fall, when in 2010 they sold Sheffield's supplies of grit to Rotherham and then complained to the Government that they were running low; and
- (g) notes that issues raised by local people will be taken into consideration as part of the Winter Review, which will help to formulate the plan for next year's winter maintenance, as is the case every year.

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

(Note: 1. With the agreement of Council and at the request of Councillor Jayne Dunn, paragraph (f) of the Amendment as printed on the List of Amendments was altered by the deletion of the words "had run out" and their replacement by the words: "were running low".

2. Councillors Pauline Andrews, Jack Clarkson and John Booker voted for paragraphs (c) to (g) and against paragraphs (a) and (b) and asked for this to be recorded.)

Following a Right of Reply by Councillor Vickie Priestley, the original Motion was put as a Substantive Motion in the following form and carried:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) regrets that Sheffield, like other councils across the country, was forced to find savings after the unprecedented level of cuts imposed on the Council by the Government, of which the Rt. Hon. Nick Clegg MP is Deputy Prime Minister;
- (b) notes reports of the following average reductions in gritting per region over the past 5 years - East Midlands 43.5 per cent, London 37 per cent, the

North West 28.3 per cent, East of England 27.4 per cent and Yorkshire and the Humber 27 per cent, and can confirm that in Sheffield the cut is much less than average;

- (c) welcomes that the present Administration reversed cuts to gritting routes in response to the concerns that were raised;
- (d) thanks the people of Sheffield who made a fantastic effort in clearing roads and pavements;
- (e) notes that Sheffield has more grit bins than any other local authority that we are aware of and, despite reducing the number of grit bins by 121, Sheffield still has 1891 grit bins compared to Nottingham which has 180 grit bins, Manchester 180 grit bins and Leeds 1300;
- (f) is appalled at the hypocrisy of the main opposition group and recalls their incompetence in dealing with snow fall, when in 2010 they sold 200 tonnes of Sheffield's supplies of grit to Rotherham and then complained to the Government that they were running low; and
- (g) notes that issues raised by local people will be taken into consideration as part of the Winter Review, which will help to formulate the plan for next year's winter maintenance, as is the case every year.

(Notes: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (c) and (d) and against paragraphs (a), (b) and (e) to (g) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted for paragraphs (a) to (e) and (g) and abstained on paragraph (f) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

12. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JULIE DORE

Welfare Reform

It was moved by Councillor Julie Dore, seconded by Councillor Geoff Smith, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the recent report by the London School of Economics "Were we really all in it together? The distributional effects of the UK Coalition Government's tax-benefit policy changes";
- (b) notes that the analysis from the report shows:

- (i) the outcome for those in the bottom half of incomes is in contrast to those in the top half of incomes, who gained from direct tax cuts, with the exception of most of the top 5 percent – although within this 5 percent group, those at the very top gained, because of the cut in the top rate of income tax;
 - (ii) in total, the changes are cost neutral and have not contributed to cutting the deficit; rather, the savings from reducing benefits and tax credits have been offset by the costs of raising the tax-free income tax allowance and lowering the top rate of income tax allowance, giving tax cuts to millionaires; and
 - (iii) the analysis challenges the idea that those with incomes in the top tenth have lost as great a share of their incomes as those with the lowest incomes;
- (c) believes that this report conclusively proves that we are not all in it together and the Government has made these cuts not to reduce the deficit but to redistribute money from the poorest to the wealthiest in society;
- (d) is extremely concerned about the impact that these policies are having in Sheffield and is concerned that child poverty is rising as a result and inequalities are increasing;
- (e) notes the recent research commissioned by the Council and published by Sheffield Hallam University, about the impact of welfare reform on Sheffield, which highlighted that:
- (i) some local communities are hit by welfare reform five times harder than others;
 - (ii) just under half of the financial loss from welfare reform will fall on working households;
 - (iii) couples with children are losing an average of nearly £1,700 a year;
 - (iv) lone parents are losing over £2,000 a year; and
 - (v) men and women with health problems or disabilities are significantly disadvantaged;
- (f) believes this research proves conclusively that the cuts to welfare are hitting the poorest in our city the hardest;
- (g) notes that the report proves that the welfare reform impacts most on the poorest parts of the city, including Burngreave, Manor, Southey and Firth Park;
- (h) notes that proportionately, Sheffield is not hit harder than other big towns

and cities in the north of England by the cuts to welfare, so this is something that other comparable cities will also be experiencing, however the financial loss is far above the level in many parts of the south outside London, which is another example of the Government disproportionately targeting pain towards the north of England; and

- (i) believes it is clear that these welfare cuts are ideological; they are not about cutting the deficit but redistributing money away from some of the poorest people in our society to the richest.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Steve Ayris, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of paragraphs (b) to (i) and the addition of new paragraphs (b) to (h) as follows:-

- (b) notes however that this report did not take into account that there is less money available to spend in total because of the record public sector deficit in 2010, and that if more were to be spent on welfare, this would have to be found from other spending areas such as local government, health or education;
- (c) notes the Labour Party's risible attempts at cynical positioning on this issue of talking tough on welfare while opposing any specific measures and offering no alternatives;
- (d) notes that under the previous Government, fuel bills spiralled, Council Tax doubled, fuel duty increased on 12 occasions, inequality increased and the 10p tax rate was abolished - doubling income tax on the lowest paid;
- (e) welcomes the income tax cut of £800 for the typical tax payer, and taking 2.7 million of the poorest people out of paying any income tax at all;
- (f) welcomes free school meals for 4 to 7 year olds, saving parents £400 per year per child;
- (g) notes that in 2014, the country has seen the largest annual fall in unemployment on record, with the large majority of new jobs being full time; and
- (h) believes that there is a long way still to go in reducing unemployment and poverty and making the tax system fairer.

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

It was then moved by Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley, seconded by Councillor Jillian Creasy, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (j) to (u) as follows:-

- (j) notes from The Convenient Truth by Wilkinson and Pickett, published by the Fabian Society that " Although economic development is what has

transformed the real quality of life during the last couple of centuries.... evidence shows very clearly that in the rich countries economic growth no longer drives measures of wellbeing” and “Greater equality is then a key objective, not only because it reduces social dysfunction and improves health and wellbeing, but also because it makes it possible to overcome some of the main obstacles to sustainability”;

- (k) notes research from The Equality Trust, which states that the wealth of Britain’s richest 100 people now almost equals that of a third of all households put together;
- (l) notes Joseph Rowntree Foundation Research published in January which shows that eight million people are living on family incomes considered inadequate for a “socially acceptable standard of living”, a rise of almost a third since 2009;
- (m) notes the work which has been done to date in Sheffield to reduce inequality;
- (n) welcomes the fact that Sheffield City Council has a pay ratio of 1:10;
- (o) welcomes the launch of the “Our Fair City” campaign;
- (p) notes the Sheffield Fairness Commission recommendation that “substantial progress” be made on paying a Living Wage in the public sector by 2015 (including contractors) and for all employers in the city to be paying the Living Wage by 2023;
- (q) notes with concern that whilst Sheffield City Council has implemented a Living Wage for the staff it directly employs, work remains “on-going” with contractors and no firm overall or time-commitment has been made to ensure all contractors adopt the Living Wage;
- (r) praises Glasgow City Council for now obliging all its contractors to pay the Living Wage;
- (s) notes that Brighton & Hove City Council is accredited as a Living Wage Employer by the Living Wage Foundation, which means that they have a plan for ensuring that all contractors pay the Living Wage as and when contracts come up for renewal, and that new contractors pay the Living Wage;
- (t) makes a real commitment to reducing inequality in Sheffield by requesting that the Administration puts a plan in place to become accredited as a Living Wage Employer by the Living Wage Foundation; and
- (u) encourages its partners on the Sheffield First Partnership Board, including the Sheffield Universities, to commit to reducing inequality in Sheffield by ensuring that they have pay ratios of 1:10 or less.

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) notes the recent report by the London School of Economics “Were we really all in it together? The distributional effects of the UK Coalition Government’s tax-benefit policy changes”;
- (b) notes that the analysis from the report shows:
 - (i) the outcome for those in the bottom half of incomes is in contrast to those in the top half of incomes, who gained from direct tax cuts, with the exception of most of the top 5 percent – although within this 5 percent group, those at the very top gained, because of the cut in the top rate of income tax;
 - (ii) in total, the changes are cost neutral and have not contributed to cutting the deficit; rather, the savings from reducing benefits and tax credits have been offset by the costs of raising the tax-free income tax allowance and lowering the top rate of income tax allowance, giving tax cuts to millionaires; and
 - (iii) the analysis challenges the idea that those with incomes in the top tenth have lost as great a share of their incomes as those with the lowest incomes;
- (c) believes that this report conclusively proves that we are not all in it together and the Government has made these cuts not to reduce the deficit but to redistribute money from the poorest to the wealthiest in society;
- (d) is extremely concerned about the impact that these policies are having in Sheffield and is concerned that child poverty is rising as a result and inequalities are increasing;
- (e) notes the recent research commissioned by the Council and published by Sheffield Hallam University, about the impact of welfare reform on Sheffield, which highlighted that:
 - (i) some local communities are hit by welfare reform five times harder than others;
 - (ii) just under half of the financial loss from welfare reform will fall on working households;
 - (iii) couples with children are losing an average of nearly £1,700 a year;
 - (iv) lone parents are losing over £2,000 a year; and

- (v) men and women with health problems or disabilities are significantly disadvantaged;
- (f) believes this research proves conclusively that the cuts to welfare are hitting the poorest in our city the hardest;
- (g) notes that the report proves that the welfare reform impacts most on the poorest parts of the city, including Burngreave, Manor, Southey and Firth Park;
- (h) notes that proportionately, Sheffield is not hit harder than other big towns and cities in the north of England by the cuts to welfare, so this is something that other comparable cities will also be experiencing, however the financial loss is far above the level in many parts of the south outside London, which is another example of the Government disproportionately targeting pain towards the north of England; and
- (i) believes it is clear that these welfare cuts are ideological; they are not about cutting the deficit but redistributing money away from some of the poorest people in our society to the richest.

(Note: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraph (a) and against paragraphs (b) to (i) of the Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

13. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PAT MIDGLEY

Cathedral Archer Project

RESOLVED: On Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Sheila Constance, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the 25th anniversary of the Cathedral Archer Project was marked on 25th November last year;
- (b) pays tribute to the contribution that the Project has made to the city, providing a range of services for homeless people including:
 - Assessment and signposting to appropriate service providers
 - 1:1 support
 - In-house nurse and dental clinics
 - Access to hot food, drinks and food parcels
 - Showers and laundry
 - A programme of activities to help people learn skills and enjoy new experiences
 - The chance to gain accredited awards
 - A structured volunteer programme which helps people to gain

- structure in their lives.
 - Support to attend drug and alcoholic treatment services
 - Access to computers and telephones
- (c) welcomes that the work of the Project has evolved over the 25 years of work, and in the words of the Project itself “it’s not just food we give anymore. In fact the most important thing we give is a new opportunity. Year by year lives change and people move on.”;
- (d) notes that the success of the Project is dependent upon the contribution of Sheffield people through their voluntary work and donations and thanks local people for their contribution to making the Project successful; and
- (e) thanks everyone involved in the Project for their contributions and directs that a copy of this motion be passed on to the Cathedral Archer Project.

14. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOE OTTEN

Local Government Funding

It was moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Roger Davison, that this Council:-

- (a) notes the Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Rt. Hon. Ed Balls MP’s admission, in The Telegraph newspaper on 5th January 2015, that he would, given the chance, cut another £3.3bn from local government;
- (b) notes that Labour Councillors noted the Shadow Chancellor’s previous comments about having to “keep all these cuts” in passing an amendment to a motion on public spending reductions at the Council meeting in February 2012;
- (c) notes a number of resolutions passed by this Council blaming the Coalition Government for the response to the fiscal consequences of the record deficit of 2008 that was created under the Labour Government;
- (d) notes the frequent grandstanding on the subject of cuts to local government by members of the Administration, and fears that some people may be misled into thinking that the Labour Party would not make further cuts to local government; and
- (e) believes that, in spite of the rhetoric in this chamber, it is clear that any statements made that give the impression that the cuts would disappear if there was a change to a Labour Government, are unlikely to be true.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Ben Curran, seconded by Councillor Cate McDonald, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words “That this Council” and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) regrets that the present Government have made unfair cuts to local government funding, targeting cuts at Sheffield, and is appalled that the Liberal Democrats have allowed the Government to cut parts of the country with the highest levels of deprivation the most;
- (b) notes that this Government have comprehensively failed to eliminate the deficit and regrets that a future Labour Government would have to deal with the position it inherits from this Government;
- (c) regrets that the cuts of this Government have been overwhelmingly targeted at northern cities such as Sheffield at the same time as some of the wealthiest parts of the country have received a fraction of the cuts;
- (d) regrets that the Liberal Democrats have stood up for the Deputy Prime Minister at the expense of standing up for Sheffield and refused to back the Fair Deal for Sheffield Campaign calling for a fairer funding distribution, which has been supported by over 10,000 Sheffield people; and
- (e) welcomes the Labour Party's announcement that they will scrap the New Homes Bonus, to provide a fairer funding formula and notes that the New Homes Bonus is another Government policy that takes money away from Sheffield to redistribute it to some of the wealthiest areas of the country and believes that this is already a demonstration of intent for how Labour would give Sheffield a fairer deal.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) regrets that the present Government have made unfair cuts to local government funding, targeting cuts at Sheffield, and is appalled that the Liberal Democrats have allowed the Government to cut parts of the country with the highest levels of deprivation the most;
- (b) notes that this Government have comprehensively failed to eliminate the deficit and regrets that a future Labour Government would have to deal with the position it inherits from this Government;
- (c) regrets that the cuts of this Government have been overwhelmingly targeted at northern cities such as Sheffield at the same time as some of the wealthiest parts of the country have received a fraction of the cuts;
- (d) regrets that the Liberal Democrats have stood up for the Deputy Prime Minister at the expense of standing up for Sheffield and refused to back the Fair Deal for Sheffield Campaign calling for a fairer funding distribution,

which has been supported by over 10,000 Sheffield people; and

- (e) welcomes the Labour Party's announcement that they will scrap the New Homes Bonus, to provide a fairer funding formula and notes that the New Homes Bonus is another Government policy that takes money away from Sheffield to redistribute it to some of the wealthiest areas of the country and believes that this is already a demonstration of intent for how Labour would give Sheffield a fairer deal.

(Note: Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted for paragraph (c) and abstained on paragraphs (a), (b), (d) and (e) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

15. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR SARAH JANE SMALLEY

Living Wage

It was moved by Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley, seconded by Councillor Brian Webster, that this Council:-

- (a) notes from *The Convenient Truth* by Wilkinson and Pickett, published by the Fabian Society, that "Although economic development is what has transformed the real quality of life during the last couple of centuries.... evidence shows very clearly that in the rich countries economic growth no longer drives measures of wellbeing" and "Greater equality is then a key objective, not only because it reduces social dysfunction and improves health and wellbeing, but also because it makes it possible to overcome some of the main obstacles to sustainability";
- (b) notes research from The Equality Trust, which states that the wealth of Britain's richest 100 people now almost equals that of a third of all households put together;
- (c) notes Joseph Rowntree Foundation Research published in January which shows that eight million people are living on family incomes considered inadequate for a "socially acceptable standard of living", a rise of almost a third since 2009;
- (d) notes the work which has been done to date in Sheffield to reduce inequality;
- (e) welcomes the fact that Sheffield City Council has a pay ratio of 1:10;
- (f) welcomes the launch of the "Our Fair City" campaign;
- (g) notes the Sheffield Fairness Commission recommendation that "substantial progress" be made on paying a Living Wage in the public sector by 2015 (including contractors) and for all employers in the city to

be paying the Living Wage by 2023;

- (h) notes with concern that whilst Sheffield City Council has implemented a Living Wage for the staff it directly employs, work remains “on-going” with contractors and no firm overall or time-commitment has been made to ensure all contractors adopt the Living Wage;
- (i) praises Glasgow City Council for now obliging all its contractors to pay the Living Wage;
- (j) notes that Brighton and Hove City Council is accredited as a Living Wage Employer by the Living Wage Foundation, which means that they have a plan for ensuring that all contractors pay the Living Wage as and when contracts come up for renewal, and that new contractors pay the Living Wage;
- (k) makes a real commitment to reducing inequality in Sheffield by requesting that the Administration puts a plan in place to become accredited as a Living Wage Employer by the Living Wage Foundation; and
- (l) encourages its partners on the Sheffield First Partnership Board, including the Sheffield Universities, to commit to reducing inequality in Sheffield by ensuring that they have pay ratios of 1:10 or less.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Ben Curran, seconded by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the insertion, after the words “Fabian Society” in paragraph (a), of the words “which is affiliated to the Labour Party”;
2. the deletion of paragraphs (h) to (k) and the addition of new paragraphs (h) to (j) as follows:-
 - (h) welcomes the leadership demonstrated by the present Administration to implement the Living Wage within the Council at a time of unprecedented budget cuts;
 - (i) reaffirms that significant progress has been made in implementing the Living Wage with contractors, noting that the vast majority of the Council’s major contractors are now paying the Living Wage for staff employed as part of that contract;
 - (j) notes that the present Administration is already in dialogue with the Living Wage Foundation about Living Wage accreditation; and
3. the relettering of paragraph (l) as a new paragraph (k).

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

It was then moved by Councillor Joe Otten, seconded by Councillor Richard Shaw, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) believes that economic growth is vital in extending opportunity and giving everyone a chance to get on in life;
- (b) believes that if Sheffield were more successful in attracting big money investment employing highly paid workers, this would be good for the city's economy and people; and
- (c) is concerned that if economic growth was curtailed as a matter of policy, deficit financing of public spending would be much more difficult, and so a low growth policy would have to be accompanied by immediate swingeing cuts to public spending to prevent a debt crisis, and would forego the proceeds of a growing economy in the future being used to improve public services.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes from *The Convenient Truth* by Wilkinson and Pickett, published by the Fabian Society, which is affiliated to the Labour Party, that "Although economic development is what has transformed the real quality of life during the last couple of centuries.... evidence shows very clearly that in the rich countries economic growth no longer drives measures of wellbeing" and "Greater equality is then a key objective, not only because it reduces social dysfunction and improves health and wellbeing, but also because it makes it possible to overcome some of the main obstacles to sustainability";
- (b) notes research from The Equality Trust, which states that the wealth of Britain's richest 100 people now almost equals that of a third of all households put together;
- (c) notes Joseph Rowntree Foundation Research published in January which shows that eight million people are living on family incomes considered inadequate for a "socially acceptable standard of living", a rise of almost a third since 2009;
- (d) notes the work which has been done to date in Sheffield to reduce inequality;
- (e) welcomes the fact that Sheffield City Council has a pay ratio of 1:10;

- (f) welcomes the launch of the “Our Fair City” campaign;
- (g) notes the Sheffield Fairness Commission recommendation that “substantial progress” be made on paying a Living Wage in the public sector by 2015 (including contractors) and for all employers in the city to be paying the Living Wage by 2023;
- (h) welcomes the leadership demonstrated by the present Administration to implement the Living Wage within the Council at a time of unprecedented budget cuts;
- (i) reaffirms that significant progress has been made in implementing the Living Wage with contractors, noting that the vast majority of the Council’s major contractors are now paying the Living Wage for staff employed as part of that contract;
- (j) notes that the present Administration is already in dialogue with the Living Wage Foundation about Living Wage accreditation; and
- (k) encourages its partners on the Sheffield First Partnership Board, including the Sheffield Universities, to commit to reducing inequality in Sheffield by ensuring that they have pay ratios of 1:10 or less.

16. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JOHN BOOKER

Housing Development

It was moved by Councillor John Booker, seconded by Councillor Jack Clarkson, that this Council:-

- (a) regrets that housing services cannot cope with constantly rising numbers of people coming to live and work in the UK;
- (b) recognises that the infrastructure is being constantly stretched by the strain on sewers, drainage, road and rail links, local amenities, and power supplies;
- (c) is frustrated by constantly changing Planning announcements, and therefore requests that the Administration prepares, produces and funds a full and comprehensive report on all brownfield sites within the City Council boundary and that the results are made public for a conciliation period in line with local draft plans for development in the area;
- (d) (i) requests that the report includes the size of brownfield sites in hectares and the ratio of houses per hectare if applied for new development; in addition the associated cost for any reclamation to make these brownfield sites usable, versus the Capital Gains Tax (or equivalent) figures per acre

compared to earmarked designated green belt sites per acre; noting that this comparison will provide prospective developers with an alternative development consideration and (ii) notes that this motion is in line with National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) guidelines of using first any previously used land and preserving "Localism" by not joining well established communities into one urban landscape by destroying greenbelt;

- (e) is concerned that the NPPF can be misused by councils, giving them a free hand to redefine green belt boundaries and shelve brownfield sites, and that this allows Capital Gains Tax to be made on greenbelt land sales to developers in comparison to brownfield sites that may require reclamation in some way;
- (f) also notes that each County has its own unique system of available sites for development, and that South Yorkshire has the South Yorkshire Coalfield and the almost extinct steel industry, with hundreds of hectares of available land for redevelopment, and that these should not be left in the local government recycle bin;
- (g) agrees with local MP Clive Betts' recent statement that "The NPPF has brought welcome simplification to the planning system, but the Government must strengthen the planning framework to tackle emerging concerns about inappropriate and unsustainable development"; and
- (h) is concerned that the Government is now riding roughshod over local people's wishes, with mass house building that has become a Developers Charter, without the new services to go with it.

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

- (a) regrets the number of new homes being built across our country has steadily dwindled to the point where this Government is presiding over the lowest level of house building in peacetime since the 1920s;
- (b) further regrets that just 115,000 homes were completed over the past year, which isn't even half the number of homes the country needs to keep up with demand, and by 2020 there will be a shortage of over 2 million homes across the country;
- (c) believes that this Motion claims that the sewerage system and power supply is under strain due to immigration, and that this is reminiscent of the Leader of the UKIP Party, Nigel Farage's claim that increased traffic on the M4 is due to immigration, and believes that this completely fails to address the real causes of the housing crisis;
- (d) confirms that the Council already has a plan with all brownfield sites

available for development as part of the Local Plan and notes that under the National Planning Policy Framework, if the Council did not put a Local Plan in place, permission could be given for developers to build on any land; and

- (e) welcomes the Lyons Housing Report and welcomes that the Labour Party is committed to getting 200,000 homes built a year by 2020 and a long term goal that will see a doubling of the number of first-time buyers within a decade and meet housing need for the first time in fifty years.

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

(Note: Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted for paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) and abstained on paragraphs (c) and (e) of the above amendment and asked for this to be recorded.)

It was then moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Ian Auckland, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) notes the rise in new house building across the country over the past three years, but accepts there is still more to be done to reach the 250,000 new homes per year which many housing policy groups have been calling for over the past decade;
- (b) welcomes the Government's Affordable Homes Programme which is on track to deliver 170,000 new homes for rent and sale across the country by May 2015; and
- (c) supports Sheffield's long standing commitment to build the vast majority of new homes on brownfield land and re-affirms its commitment to this in the new Sheffield Local Plan currently being consulted upon.

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

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

<p>RESOLVED: That this Council:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">(a) regrets the number of new homes being built across our country has steadily dwindled to the point where this Government is presiding over the lowest level of house building in peacetime since the 1920s;(b) further regrets that just 115,000 homes were completed over the past year, which isn't even half the number of homes the country needs to keep up with demand, and by 2020 there will be a shortage of over 2 million homes across the country;(c) believes that this Motion claims that the sewerage system and power

supply is under strain due to immigration, and that this is reminiscent of the Leader of the UKIP Party, Nigel Farage's claim that increased traffic on the M4 is due to immigration, and believes that this completely fails to address the real causes of the housing crisis;

- (d) confirms that the Council already has a plan with all brownfield sites available for development as part of the Local Plan and notes that under the National Planning Policy Framework, if the Council did not put a Local Plan in place, permission could be given for developers to build on any land; and
- (e) welcomes the Lyons Housing Report and welcomes that the Labour Party is committed to getting 200,000 homes built a year by 2020 and a long term goal that will see a doubling of the number of first-time buyers within a decade and meet housing need for the first time in fifty years.

(Note: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (c) and (d) and against paragraphs (a), (b) and (e) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted for paragraphs (a), (b) and (d) and abstained on paragraphs (c) and (e) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

17. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR BRIAN WEBSTER

Voter Registration

It was moved by Councillor Brian Webster, seconded by Councillor Sarah Jane Smalley, that this Council:-

- (a) notes that 5th February 2015 has been designated by Bite the Ballot as National Voter Registration Day;
- (b) believes that it is essential that all those who are eligible to vote know how to register to vote and are not denied the opportunity to exercise this fundamental democratic right;
- (c) commends the work already undertaken by Council officers and partner institutions, including the city's Universities and their Students' Unions, to give people the information they need to register to vote;
- (d) believes that these efforts are particularly important this year, as the introduction of Individual Voter Registration (IVR) risks disenfranchising millions of people across the country;

- (e) notes reports from the Electoral Commission that "areas with a high concentration of certain demographics – students, private renters and especially young adults" are at particular risk of seeing the number of registered voters fall significantly under IVR;
- (f) therefore calls upon officers to continue working with partner organisations to ensure that information about both the practicalities and the importance of registering to vote are publicised as widely as possible to all segments of Sheffield's population in the run-up to the May 7th elections and beyond; and
- (g) further, calls upon Members of the Council to exercise their responsibility as community leaders by actively promoting voter registration and participation in the democratic process in the communities they represent

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Mazher Iqbal, seconded by Councillor Cate McDonald, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by

1.the addition of a new paragraph (c) as follows, and the relettering of original paragraphs (c) to (g) as new paragraphs (d) to (h);

- (c) welcomes the action taken by the present Administration, prioritising extra action for voter registration, including funding extra investment activity from the money set aside by the Administration to support the recommendations of the Fairness Commission;

2. the addition of a new paragraph (i) as follows:-

- (i) is therefore appalled by the lack of leadership shown by a senior Green Councillor who admitted that he did not vote in the recent Police and Crime Commissioner Election, and believes this sets an appalling example and is nothing more than cynical political positioning, and calls on any councillor who failed to vote to apologise.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that 5th February 2015 has been designated by Bite the Ballot as National Voter Registration Day;
- (b) believes that it is essential that all those who are eligible to vote know how to register to vote and are not denied the opportunity to exercise this fundamental democratic right;

- (c) welcomes the action taken by the present Administration, prioritising extra action for voter registration, including funding extra investment activity from the money set aside by the Administration to support the recommendations of the Fairness Commission;
- (d) commends the work already undertaken by Council officers and partner institutions, including the city's Universities and their Students' Unions, to give people the information they need to register to vote;
- (e) believes that these efforts are particularly important this year, as the introduction of Individual Voter Registration (IVR) risks disenfranchising millions of people across the country;
- (f) notes reports from the Electoral Commission that "areas with a high concentration of certain demographics – students, private renters and especially young adults" are at particular risk of seeing the number of registered voters fall significantly under IVR;
- (g) therefore calls upon officers to continue working with partner organisations to ensure that information about both the practicalities and the importance of registering to vote are publicised as widely as possible to all segments of Sheffield's population in the run-up to the May 7th elections and beyond;
- (h) further, calls upon Members of the Council to exercise their responsibility as community leaders by actively promoting voter registration and participation in the democratic process in the communities they represent; and
- (i) is therefore appalled by the lack of leadership shown by a senior Green Councillor who admitted that he did not vote in the recent Police and Crime Commissioner Election, and believes this sets an appalling example and is nothing more than cynical political positioning, and calls on any councillor who failed to vote to apologise.

(Notes: 1. Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a) to (h) and against paragraph (i) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.

2. Councillors Jillian Creasy, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Brian Webster voted for paragraphs (a) to (h) and against paragraph (i) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

18. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR PAULINE ANDREWS

Future Of Steel City Sports Ground

It was moved by Councillor Pauline Andrews, seconded by Councillor Jack Clarkson, that this Council:-

- (a) calls on the Administration to support Chapeltown Juniors Football Club, established in 1983, to enable them to take over the lease from the City Council for the Steel City Sports Ground and clubhouse on Shiregreen Lane;
- (b) notes that the lease of this site is available due to the previous tenant leaving in February 2014, and that although there are a few groups that still use the grounds to train, this isn't a problem as access could be negotiated;
- (c) recognises the need for good quality football training to take place and be increased, or our great sporting city of Sheffield will be left behind, and notes that Chapeltown Juniors play in Sheffield & District Junior Sunday League, which is possibly the biggest junior league in Europe;
- (d) notes that, for 29 years, the Football Club has played in Ecclesfield Park, which is a public park and is no longer suitable for the Club, as it is not big enough to meet the needs of 140 children, enabling them to move forward, play and progress, and also to develop the players;
- (e) believes that physical education is just as important as being academic and should be part of the learning and understanding skills for everyday life, and that physical development of young people promotes a healthy, moral, mental, positive attitude as well as self-discipline and self-worth;
- (f) calls upon the Administration to support the coaches and officials of the Football Club to carry on their great work in training these children and young people aged 5 to 18 years, noting that the Club officials are committed and deserve recognition for giving up their own free time which cannot be easy, when working full time;
- (g) welcomes that the site and the building would continue to be used, focusing on sport, and that the site could also be used for many other sporting activities such as cricket, bowls and other field sports, as well as the hub of community life, incorporating into the social club, activities such as lunch clubs, meeting places, weddings, parties, youth activities, older people's clubs, and back to work clubs;
- (h) further notes the backing of the Football Association, Children's Hospital Charity, Unison, Sheffield F.A., South Yorkshire Police and Fire and Rescue, and that funding is available to support the project, but it cannot proceed forward without the support of the Council and a proposed lease;
- (i) is concerned and bemused that, despite numerous meetings with Councillors and officers from the Parks and Countryside Service, the project seems to have come to a standstill, whereas officials of the Club are very keen to push this forward which would be a great asset to the

Shiregreen community, with the potential to bring jobs, but without the Council's support for the lease, applications for funding cannot proceed;

- (j) is further concerned that, as the months go by, the site may fall into further disrepair, being vandalised and trashed, costing more money to restore the grounds or repair the building; and
- (k) welcomes the Club's aim to start a girls/women's football team, and also a football team for people with disabilities, and, for the less active, a walking team aimed at the over 50s, to enhance their quality of life.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Alan Law, seconded by Councillor Peter Price, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the deletion of all the words after the words "That this Council" and the addition of the following words:-

- (a) notes that football is a major participation sport in the city, with over 800 teams, of which over 500 are junior/youth teams;
- (b) regrets that, in common with other core cities, Sheffield's football pitches and changing facilities are under severe pressure from Government budget cuts;
- (c) welcomes that the governing body for football in England, The Football Association, has recognised these pressures on grassroots football and in response has launched a national initiative to invest in grassroots facilities;
- (d) further welcomes the decision of the FA that Sheffield should be the first city in which they deliver their programme;
- (e) further welcomes the investment of £9.6 million to support grassroots football that this partnership will bring to Sheffield, as set out in the report to Cabinet on 12 November 2014;
- (f) recognises the importance of local football clubs across the city, including Chapletown Juniors, in providing sport and is pleased to take this opportunity to thank all the volunteers who make this possible;
- (g) notes that officers of the Council and local councillors have been working with Chapletown Juniors and the local community around the Steel City Ground to secure the immediate and long term future of the site and building;
- (h) notes that following a positive meeting on Wednesday 28th January 2015, there is a consensus between the different local interests now to work together to secure that future; and
- (i) instructs officers to continue to work with local elected Members, the football clubs who use the site and the community to seek a sustainable solution to the mutual benefit, and with the agreement of, interested parties.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) notes that football is a major participation sport in the city, with over 800 teams, of which over 500 are junior/youth teams;
- (b) regrets that, in common with other core cities, Sheffield's football pitches and changing facilities are under severe pressure from Government budget cuts;
- (c) welcomes that the governing body for football in England, The Football Association, has recognised these pressures on grassroots football and in response has launched a national initiative to invest in grassroots facilities;
- (d) further welcomes the decision of the FA that Sheffield should be the first city in which they deliver their programme;
- (e) further welcomes the investment of £9.6 million to support grassroots football that this partnership will bring to Sheffield, as set out in the report to Cabinet on 12 November 2014;
- (f) recognises the importance of local football clubs across the city, including Chapletown Juniors, in providing sport and is pleased to take this opportunity to thank all the volunteers who make this possible;
- (g) notes that officers of the Council and local councillors have been working with Chapletown Juniors and the local community around the Steel City Ground to secure the immediate and long term future of the site and building;
- (h) notes that following a positive meeting on Wednesday 28th January 2015, there is a consensus between the different local interests now to work together to secure that future; and
- (i) instructs officers to continue to work with local elected Members, the football clubs who use the site and the community to seek a sustainable solution to the mutual benefit, and with the agreement of, interested parties.

19. NOTICE OF MOTION GIVEN BY COUNCILLOR JILLIAN CREASY

Health Primary Care Funding

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

- (a) recognises that Sheffield suffers from health inequalities across the city and that good health care can help to mitigate and treat illness;
- (b) is therefore disturbed to hear that four General Practices in Sheffield are affected by the withdrawal of a fund, the Minimum Practice Income Guarantee (MPIG), designed by the last Government to support practices serving particularly needy populations which were adversely affected by the 2004 GP contract;
- (c) notes that whilst similar practices in London have been given a two year reprieve, cuts to practices outside London have already begun and MPIG will be phased out over seven years;
- (d) notes that MPIG was always seen as a stop-gap until a fairer funding formula could be found but is now being withdrawn without any replacement;
- (e) fears that practices serving some of the most needy people in the city, including Devonshire Green in the city centre, which has a high proportion of people suffering homelessness, mental health and addiction problems, face closure;
- (f) agrees that closure of such practices would directly affect the health of their patients and have knock on effects for surrounding practices as well as emergency and hospital services;
- (g) thanks the Clinical Commissioning Group, the local area team of NHS England and the colleagues in public health for their support, but notes that the funding comes from NHS England at national level;
- (h) therefore resolves to write to David Geddes, head of primary care commissioning at NHS England, to ask him to reverse this decision; and
- (i) requests that a copy of this motion be sent to all Sheffield MPs and to the Secretary of State for Health, The Rt. Hon. Jeremy Hunt MP.

Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Mary Lea, seconded by Councillor Mike Drabble, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by the addition of new paragraphs (h) and (i) as follows, and the relettering of original paragraphs (h) and (i) as new paragraphs (j) and (k):-

- (h) believes that this news makes a complete fallacy of the Government's claim that they are not cutting the NHS;
- (i) reiterates its objection, raised at previous meetings, of Government redistribution of NHS funding from areas with higher levels of deprivation and health inequalities to some of the healthiest and wealthiest areas of the

country;

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

It was then moved by Councillor Richard Shaw, seconded by Councillor Martin Smith, as an amendment, that the Motion now submitted be amended by:-

1. the deletion of paragraph (b) and the addition of a new paragraph (b) as follows:-
 - (b) recognises the difficulty some practices are placed in by the withdrawal of MPIG, but recognises that MPIG is not a needs-based payment, but merely a negotiated compensation for practices that lost out when the current needs-based formula was introduced;
2. the deletion of paragraph (d) and the addition of a new paragraph (d) as follows:-
 - (d) believes that a system of needs-based formula plus MPIG is not preferable to a pure needs-based formula, which recognises all the demands of age, deprivation, mental health, homelessness and addiction
3. the deletion of paragraph (h) and the addition of a new paragraph (h) as follows:-
 - (h) therefore resolves to write to David Geddes, head of primary care commissioning at NHS England, to ask him to back reform of the GP funding formula to take better account of the demands on GPs of deprivation, mental health, homelessness and addiction.

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

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:-

- (a) recognises that Sheffield suffers from health inequalities across the city and that good health care can help to mitigate and treat illness;
- (b) is therefore disturbed to hear that four General Practices in Sheffield are affected by the withdrawal of a fund, the Minimum Practice Income Guarantee (MPIG), designed by the last Government to support practices serving particularly needy populations which were adversely affected by the 2004 GP contract;
- (c) notes that whilst similar practices in London have been given a two year reprieve, cuts to practices outside London have already begun and MPIG will be phased out over seven years;

- (d) notes that MPIG was always seen as a stop-gap until a fairer funding formula could be found but is now being withdrawn without any replacement;
- (e) fears that practices serving some of the most needy people in the city, including Devonshire Green in the city centre, which has a high proportion of people suffering homelessness, mental health and addiction problems, face closure;
- (f) agrees that closure of such practices would directly affect the health of their patients and have knock on effects for surrounding practices as well as emergency and hospital services;
- (g) thanks the Clinical Commissioning Group, the local area team of NHS England and the colleagues in public health for their support, but notes that the funding comes from NHS England at national level;
- (h) believes that this news makes a complete fallacy of the Government's claim that they are not cutting the NHS;
- (i) reiterates its objection, raised at previous meetings, of Government redistribution of NHS funding from areas with higher levels of deprivation and health inequalities to some of the healthiest and wealthiest areas of the country;
- (j) therefore resolves to write to David Geddes, head of primary care commissioning at NHS England, to ask him to reverse this decision; and
- (k) requests that a copy of this motion be sent to all Sheffield MPs and to the Secretary of State for Health, The Rt. Hon. Jeremy Hunt MP.

(Note: Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley voted for paragraphs (a), (c), (e), (f), (g) and (k), against paragraphs (h) and (i) and abstained on paragraphs (b), (d) and (j) of the Substantive Motion and asked for this to be recorded.)

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 Friday 6 March 2015, at 2.00 pm, pursuant to notice duly given and Summonses duly served.

PRESENT

THE LORD MAYOR (Councillor Peter Rippon)
THE DEPUTY LORD MAYOR (Councillor Talib Hussain)

1	<i>Arbourthorne Ward</i> Julie Dore Mike Drabble Jack Scott	10	<i>Dore & Totley Ward</i> Joe Otten Colin Ross Martin Smith	19	<i>Mosborough Ward</i> David Barker Isobel Bowler Tony Downing
2	<i>Beauchief & Greenhill Ward</i> Simon Clement-Jones Roy Munn Richard Shaw	11	<i>East Ecclesfield Ward</i> Pauline Andrews Steve Wilson Joyce Wright	20	<i>Nether Edge Ward</i> Nikki Bond Qurban Hussain
3	<i>Beighton Ward</i> Helen Mirfin-Boukouris Chris Rosling-Josephs Ian Saunders	12	<i>Ecclesall Ward</i> Penny Baker Roger Davison Diana Stimely	21	<i>Richmond Ward</i> John Campbell Lynn Rooney Paul Wood
4	<i>Birley Ward</i> Denise Fox Bryan Lodge Karen McGowan	13	<i>Firth Park Ward</i> Sheila Constance Alan Law Chris Weldon	22	<i>Shiregreen & Brightside Ward</i> Peter Price Sioned-Mair Richards Peter Rippon
5	<i>Broomhill Ward</i> Jayne Dunn Stuart Wattam Brian Webster	14	<i>Fulwood Ward</i> Sue Alston Andrew Sangar Cliff Woodcraft	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> Steve Jones Cate McDonald Tim Rippon	24	<i>Stannington Ward</i> David Baker Katie Condliffe Vickie Priestley
7	<i>Central Ward</i> Jillian Creasy Robert Murphy Sarah Jane Smalley	16	<i>Graves Park Ward</i> Ian Auckland Steve Ayris Denise Reaney	25	<i>Stocksbridge & Upper Don Ward</i> Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther Philip Wood
8	<i>Crookes Ward</i> Rob Frost Anne Murphy Geoff Smith	17	<i>Hillsborough Ward</i> Bob Johnson George Lindars-Hammond Josie Paszek	26	<i>Walkley Ward</i> Olivia Blake Ben Curran 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> John Booker Adam Hurst Alf Meade
				28	<i>Woodhouse Ward</i> Mick Rooney Jackie Satur Ray Satur

1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Nasima Akther.

2. DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST OR INABILITY TO VOTE ON THE SETTING OF THE COUNCIL TAX

2.1 Dispensation relating to the setting of the Council Tax

2.1.1 Members were advised that under the Localism Act 2011 it was arguable that a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest (DPI) may arise, where the business relates to setting the Council Tax or precept. Therefore the Monitoring Officer had granted a dispensation under Section 33 2(a) of the Localism Act 2011 to all Elected Members to vote on this issue. All Members could therefore attend, debate and vote on motions or amendments which would result in the adoption of the annual budget. Members had been advised that, if they had a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest arising from any other aspect of the budget, it should be declared as normal and other personal interests would need to be declared if they become the subject of debate.

2.1.2 There were no declarations of interest by Members of the Council.

2.2 Prohibition from voting on the grounds of Council Tax arrears

2.2.1 Members were also reminded that Section 106 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 prohibited a Member from voting on the setting of the Council Tax charge where there are arrears of at least two months on a Council Tax account for which they were solely or jointly liable.

2.2.2 No Members declared an inability to vote on the setting of the Council Tax on the grounds explained above.

3. PUBLIC QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

3.1 Appointment of the Deputy Leader of the Council

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore, announced the appointment of Councillor Leigh Bramall, the Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, as Deputy Leader following the resignation of the previous Deputy Leader, Councillor Harry Harpham. Councillor Dore thanked Councillor Harpham, who would continue in the role of Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods, for his work as Deputy Leader.

3.2 Petition

3.2.1 Petition Regarding the Yemeni Community Association

The Council a received a petition containing 45 signatures relating to complaints about the Yemeni Community Association.

Representations on behalf of the petitioners were made by Fouad Almohamadi, who stated that the Yemeni Community Association did not represent the community's needs. He stated that the petitioners would like the Council to investigate the setting up of a new community interest organisation as an alternative group to the existing Association and which represented the interests of the entire Yemeni community. He referred to concerns regarding the finances of the Association.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health. Councillor Iqbal stated that it was not the Council's responsibility to investigate the establishment of organisations in the way requested by the petition. The Yemeni Community Association did receive a small grant from the Council related to adult learning. However, the Community Association was a registered charity and he suggested that concerns were raised with the Charity Commission. Councillor Iqbal said that he would be pleased to meet with the petitioners to discuss the issues which had been raised.

3.3 Public Questions

3.3.1 Public Question Concerning Voter Registration and Voting

Adam Butcher asked what the Council was going to do to make sure that all people with a disability can vote in the run up to the General and Local Elections in May 2015.

The Leader of the Council, Councillor Julie Dore responded that this was a very important issue. Since the introduction of individual voter registration, it had become more difficult for some people to make sure they could vote. Firstly, the Council needed to make sure that people with a disability were registered to vote as would be the case with other underrepresented groups, such as people in black and minority ethnic communities. Resources had been set aside to make sure that people understand how to vote and that people were registered to vote either at the ballot box or by post.

A call to action had been made to community organisations to ask people with a wider understanding of issues affecting particular groups to help the Council to make sure that people were able to register to vote and exercise their vote. She commented that pensioners exercised their right to vote and were effective at influencing policy as a result. In contrast, and for example, young people and people with disabilities may not register or use their vote and yet they were also affected by government policy and needed their respective voices to be heard.

3.3.2 Public Questions Concerning Inequalities and Child Sex Workers

Kutekwa Knowledge asked how inequality in Sheffield and Rotherham could be addressed.

He also asked how the issue of child sex workers could be addressed.

Councillor Mazher Iqbal, the Cabinet Member for Communities and Public Health stated, in relation to inequalities, that the Council, as with other public sector organisations, was in a fifth year of budget cuts. Inequalities were becoming more pronounced and had been affected by government policy, including the increase in university tuition fees the ceasing of the Education Maintenance Allowance and other welfare changes. He said that he could not answer the questions in respect of Rotherham. However, in Sheffield the City had tried to address inequalities through the establishment of the Fairness Commission which had made recommendations upon which the Council was making sure that it delivered, including the Sheffield apprenticeship scheme and implementation of a living wage. Nevertheless, inequalities were still apparent and evidenced by a growth in the number of food banks in the City and the numbers of people and in particular children who were living in poverty. The Council's Cabinet was to consider a tackling poverty strategy for Sheffield which had been developed in partnership with other stakeholders.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that it was not correct to use the term child sex workers. It was illegal to have sex with a child under the age of consent. The term abuse or child sexual exploitation was more accurate as they referred to perpetrators' use and abuse of children, something which was totally unacceptable. The Council and partner organisations did what they could to prevent, protect, pursue and ultimately prosecute perpetrators of child sexual exploitation. She stated that the City Council was not complacent and it would continue to monitor and review its services to see how they could be improved. The Council was conscious of the recent events relating to child sexual exploitation in Rotherham. Funding had been obtained for South Yorkshire to share good practice of the child sexual exploitation team in Sheffield and to work with therapeutic services for young people who had been abused; support young people and their families; raise the profile of child sexual exploitation so that people were aware of the signs that a child was being abused and knew how to report concerns; and to help young people through the criminal justice system.

3.3.3 Public Question Concerning Uncollected Council Tax

Heather Parys stated that she understood the Council had to make savings of £60 million. She asked if the Council could tell her how much was owed in the Housing Revenue Account and uncollected Council Tax and what the Council was proposing to do to recoup the losses which could go some way towards the shortfall.

The Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, Councillor Ben Curran, stated that there was £31 million outstanding in Council Tax. There was also £31 million outstanding when the current Administration took office from the previous Administration. These were debts that were owed to the Council and it was working hard to make sure the debts were collected. There were only a small proportion of the debts which were written off. Critics said that the Council had an increasing amount of uncollected Council Tax, but it did actually collect a large

amount of Council Tax and performed better than most of the other Core Cities and better than the average.

The Council issued 57,714 Summons, 39,000 liability orders and made 44,000 payment arrangements and 11,500 applications were made to deduct money from benefits. Research by the Local Government Association suggested that, if the HMRC collected tax as efficiently as local authorities like Sheffield, there would be £20 billion more in the public purse.

Councillor Harry Harpham stated that with regards to the Housing Revenue Account, the amount of rent owed to the Council fluctuated. The total amount owed at this time was £10.8 million, comprising rent owed by current tenants and including £5.4 million, which related to former Council tenants. Monies outstanding from former tenants were not simply written off but were collected from those tenants when they became Council tenants at a future point in time. The Council did everything possible to ensure that income from rent which was owed to it was collected.

3.3.4 Public Question Concerning Salaries for Senior Council Officers

Michael Barge asked how many Council officers were paid over £100,000 per annum.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources stated that there were seven officers paid over £100,000 per annum. This included the post of Director of Public Health, although the present post holder was due to retire shortly. The remuneration package for the Director of Public Health post (which had transferred from the NHS) would be reviewed.

Councillor Curran stated that he did not agree with proposals which suggested arbitrary pay cuts for posts earning above £100,000 and he believed that such proposals relating to pay should be subject to appropriate consultation through trades unions. The Council had saved £1 million on senior staff pay. There was a balance needed, both of making sure the right candidates were recruited to senior posts and, at the same time, ensuring value for money for Council Tax payers.

3.3.5 Public Question Concerning Dormitory Homes on the M1 Corridor

Andy Belt asked a question concerning a proposal for dormitory commuter homes on the M1 corridor and referred to a Notice of Motion at Council in February 2015 concerning housing. He asked why Sheffield believed it had a right to develop dormitory commuter homes on the M1 corridor in an area of Barnsley.

Councillor Harry Harpham, the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods stated that Sheffield would not be permitted to authorise the building of homes on land coming within the area of Barnsley Metropolitan Borough Council. He said that he was not aware of any such proposal and confirmed that he would look at this matter further.

3.3.6 Public Questions Concerning Openness and Transparency

Martin Brighton referred to issues of respect to openness and transparency. He asked the following questions:

1. Which Council department has purview over Capita to ensure that all contract requirements are met, and
2. How can a citizen inspect, subject to commercial sensitivities, the contracts with Capita from 2005 to 2014.

Councillor Ben Curran, the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, stated that the Resources Portfolio of which Eugene Walker was the interim Executive Director, had responsibility for the contract with Capita. The contract with Capita did include a number of commercially sensitive elements. There was information on the Council's website summarising the main points of the Capita contract. Councillor Curran stated that he would send Mr Brighton the link to the information concerning the contract on the Council's website. The Council would also comply with any requests about the contract under freedom of information legislation.

3.3.7 Public Questions Concerning Reporting of Abuse

Martin Brighton stated that in light of the announcement by David Cameron, and supporting argument from Yvette Cooper, concerning 5 years prison for those who fail to act appropriately when abuse is reported to them, would the Council agree that: ordering the destruction of CCTV evidence; extending the principle to abuse of adults, despite the council's ongoing denials that abuse occurred; and historic abuses without closure now be investigated, could be valid examples of applications of the proposed new law?

He asked whether, given the reports by Jay, Casey, and recently in Oxford, along with Cameron's statement, would the Council be prepared to look again at the answers given to him in this chamber on 5 November 2008, along with subsequent Council actions.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, responded that the Government had announced that it was to consult on extending the criminal neglect element of the law. The Council was clear about its procedure in relation to children and adult safeguarding. Councillor Drayton stated that she was not aware of any of the instances referred to in Mr Brighton's questions. She stated that if Mr Brighton believed that there was such a case, he should report the details, including the people involved and the time and place of the incident. If he provided the information, then then the matter would be investigated as appropriate.

Councillor Mary Lea, the Cabinet Member for Health, Care and Independent Living, stated that the Prime Minister had made a speech concerning child abuse. The City Council recognised adult abuse and adult safeguarding was a priority for the Council and partner organisations. Councillor Lea stated that in cases where it was suspected that criminal offences had occurred, the matter must be reported to the police.

Councillor Jackie Drayton, the Cabinet Member for Children, Young People and Families, stated that in reference to the questions which Mr Brighton asked in at Council in November 2008, whilst she had been in attendance she did not recall the detail. However, she had obtained the minutes of that meeting and she read aloud the question which Mr Brighton had asked relating to an unnamed third party. She then quoted the response which was that the Leader of the Council had responded that Mr Brighton should raise his concerns with the police, ombudsman or Information Commissioner as appropriate. The City had a Safeguarding Children Board and an Adult Safeguarding Board which would follow up allegations.

3.3.8 Public Questions Concerning Truthfulness

Martin Brighton asked what objection the Council could possibly have to the naming and shaming of elected members or senior council employees who do not answer questions in this or any other council meeting truthfully; and are not truthful to outside authorities investigating council behaviour.

Councillor Julie Dore, the Leader of the Council, stated that “truthfully” was the key phrase which she took from Mr Brighton’s question. She said that she was not aware of an untruthful response at any meeting or other forum. However, she said that if Mr Brighton did have evidence to the contrary then she requested that he provides this evidence to her.

3.3.9 Public Questions Concerning Representation of Tenants

Martin Brighton stated that the Council has said in answer to public questions that it would respect the tenants’ expressed opinion on who they decide should represent them. He asked why this principle is not being applied.

Councillor Harry Harpham, the Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods requested that Mr Brighton provide to him concrete examples of the concerns that he had alluded to in his question. Upon receipt of such information, he would be able look into the issue further.

3.4 Petition

3.4.1 Petition Requesting the Reinstatement of a Grit Bin on Matthews Fold or Matthews Lane

The Council received an electronic petition containing 12 signatures requesting the reinstatement of a grit bin on Matthews Fold or Matthews Lane. There was no speaker to the petition.

The Council referred the petition to Councillor Jayne Dunn, Cabinet Member for Environment, Recycling and Streetscene, who noted receipt of the petition. Councillor Dunn stated that the matter raised would be added to the review of the winter gritting service, including the criteria.

4. REPRESENTATION, DELEGATED AUTHORITY AND RELATED ISSUES

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

Overview and Scrutiny Management - Councillor Jack Scott to fill a vacancy Committee

Scrutiny Committee Substitute - Councillor Jack Scott to fill a vacancy Members

(b) it be noted that the Leader of the Council has appointed Councillor Leigh Bramall, Cabinet Member for Business, Skills and Development, as Deputy Leader of the Council following the resignation of the previous Deputy Leader, Councillor Harry Harpham, Cabinet Member for Homes and Neighbourhoods.

5. SUSPENSION OF PROCEDURAL RULES

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor David Baker, that as regards item 5 on the agenda for this meeting (Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2015/16), and in accordance with Council Procedure Rules 4 (Suspension and Amendment of Council Procedure Rules) and 11 (Motions which may be moved without notice):

(a) Council Procedure Rule 17.5 be suspended with regard to the time limit of 3 minutes per speaker for the movers and seconders of amendments (with all other speakers having 3 minutes) in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 11; and

(b) Council Procedure Rule 17.11(a) be suspended with regard to giving the mover of the motion the right of reply.

6. REVENUE BUDGET AND CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015/16

- 6.1 It was formally moved by Councillor Julie Dore and formally seconded by Councillor Ben Curran, that the following decisions taken by the Cabinet at its meeting on 11th February, 2015, arising from its consideration of (a) a joint report of the Chief Executive and the Interim Executive Director, Resources on the Revenue Budget 2015/16 and (b) a report of the Interim Executive Director, Resources on the Capital Programme 2015/16, be approved:

REVENUE BUDGET 2015/16

“RESOLVED: That the City Council, at its meeting on 6th March, 2015, be recommended to:-

- (a) approve a net Revenue Budget for 2015/16 amounting to £422.972m;
- (b) approve a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1308.28 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 1.99% ;
- (c) approve the Revenue Budget allocations and Budget Implementation Plans for each of the services, as set out in Appendix 2 of the report;
- (d) note the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner and the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority;
- (e) approve the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of council tax income in 2015/16 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 175;
- (f) note the latest 2014/15 budget monitoring position;
- (g) approve the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies as set out in Appendix 7 to the report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (h) approve the Minimum Reserve Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 to the report;
- (i) delegate authority to the Director of Finance to undertake Treasury Management activity, to create and amend appropriate Treasury Management Practice statements and to report on the operation of Treasury Management activity on the terms set out in those documents;
- (j) agree that the Members’ Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15 May 2013, and implemented for 2014/15, be also implemented for 2015/16, with the addition (to paragraph (h) of Schedule 2) of the following approved duty which was approved by Council at its meeting held on 3 December 2014 – “attendance at meetings of Local Housing Area

Forums”;

- (k) approve foregoing an annual increase in the Members’ Allowances in 2015/16;
- (l) approve a Pay Policy for 2015/16 as set out in Appendix 8; and
- (m) delegate authority to the Director of Public Health and the Interim Executive Director, Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, to approve the final allocation of Public Health grant to portfolios in 2015/16.”

CAPITAL PROGRAMME 2015/16

“RESOLVED: That the City Council, at its meeting on 6th March, 2015, be recommended to:-

- (a) approve those specific projects included in the years 2014-15 to 2019-20 programmes as at Appendix 9 of the report, with block allocations being included within the programme for noting at this stage and detailed proposals will be brought back for separate Member approval as part of the monthly monitoring procedures;
- (b) note the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2019/20 as per Appendix 9 to the report; and
- (c) approve the allocations from the Corporate Resource Pool (CRP) and the policy outlined in Appendix 4 to the report such that the commitment from the CRP is limited to 1 year and no CRP supported schemes are approved beyond 2015-16 unless explicitly stated, and if substantial capital receipts are realised within 2014-15 or 2015-16 a further report will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process.”

6.2 Whereupon, it was moved by Councillor Ben Curran, seconded by Councillor Julie Dore, that the recommendations of the Cabinet held on 11th February, 2015, as relates to the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2015/16, be replaced by the following resolution:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:

- (1) notes that in the original 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review, the Government outlined its plans to eliminate the deficit within four years, meaning that the 2014/15 budget was projected to be the year where the cuts would end;
- (2) regrets that due to the Government’s categorical economic mismanagement and the double dip recession which was a result of the Government’s

economic policy, cuts are now set to continue beyond this parliament and therefore is shocked that the Government continue to boast about their economic record;

- (3) notes that this year, the Revenue Support Grant will have been cut by 50% from what it was in 2010;
- (4) recalls comments by The Rt. Hon. Danny Alexander MP, Chief Secretary to the Treasury, that local government has “borne the brunt of deficit reduction”;
- (5) believes that no organisation could deal with the level of cuts the Council has faced over recent years without experiencing a significant impact and believes it is highly irresponsible to suggest otherwise;
- (6) notes that the Government’s own figures show that 63 councils are receiving an increase of spending power in the local government finance settlement; 47 Conservative-controlled, 13 recognised Conservative targets, 1 Labour-controlled, 1 Independent-controlled and the Isle of Scilly; and at the same time, the Government’s own figures show that Sheffield has had a reduction double the national average;
- (7) reiterates the opposition to the distribution of the cuts which continue to see the most deprived areas targeted with crippling cuts to their budgets at the same time as some of the wealthiest areas of the country have received increases in spending powers and reiterates support for the Fair Deal for Sheffield campaign which calls for the City to be given a fair funding settlement;
- (8) recalls that despite over 10,000 people signing the petition, it ultimately fell on deaf ears as the Government has stubbornly refused to change course and give cities like Sheffield a fair deal;
- (9) believes that the only prospect of Sheffield getting a fair deal lies with the possibility of the election of a Labour Government in May and welcomes the proposal from The Rt. Hon. Hilary Benn MP, Shadow Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, to distribute the funding currently allocated through the New Homes Bonus, to be done through a formula which is based on need, as the New Homes Bonus has proven to be a further example of a government policy designed to redistribute funding away from the areas with greatest need to some of the most affluent parts of the country;
- (10) notes that to pay for this year’s round of New Homes Bonus, Sheffield had £12 million taken from its core funding but only received just over £7.3 million back, meaning the Council lost nearly £4.7 million, whilst on the other hand, Surrey had £11.3 million taken away from them and received £24.3 million, meaning they gained £13 million;
- (11) regrets that the Government continue to attempt to spin the figures through

double counting different forms of funding and believes it is insulting for the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, The Rt. Hon. Eric Pickles MP, to attempt to state that local authorities have had to contend with modest cuts, quoting largely deflated figures for individual authorities;

- (12) notes that the latest example of the Government spinning the figures is its use of the Better Care Fund and highlights the comments of the budget report “contrary to what is implied in the Settlement figures, the Council will not receive £37.8m from the Better Care Fund; this figure represents the total amount of the pooled budget shared with the NHS, and the actual amount which the Council will receive from the BCF is subject to ongoing discussions with the Clinical Commissioning Group”;
- (13) is becoming increasingly concerned with the chaotic, haphazard and patchwork attempts of this Government in its dying days to create the impression that they are devolving resources to northern cities and believes that they are simply making it up as they go along in a desperate attempt to recover their position in the north of England after five years of consistently hammering cities like Sheffield with disproportionate cuts, the abolition of the Regional Development Agencies and redistributing European Union funding away from South Yorkshire and Merseyside to wealthier parts of the country;
- (14) believes that the rhetoric needs to be matched with tangible actions and calls upon the Government to urgently change its proposals on HS2 station location to give Sheffield a city centre HS2 station which would have a transformative effect on the long term future of the City’s economy, however, regrets this is another issue where the Deputy Prime Minister has categorically failed to stand up for Sheffield;
- (15) believes that this would complement the actions taken locally by the present Administration, partners and wider city region to transform the City’s economy and particularly welcomes the recent launch of the Innovation District and the visit of Bruce Katz to the City as part of the International Economic Commission;
- (16) notes that for the last three years, this Administration has frozen Council Tax, in spite of the unprecedented financial pressures facing the Council, which demonstrates that it has no desire to increase bills for local taxpayers, however, now the Council is in year five of the Chancellor’s four year plan for public spending cuts, believes that the proposed 1.99% increase in this year’s budget is unavoidable for two principle reasons, as follows:
 - (i) the continued impact of year upon year cuts that the Government has imposed on the Council has got to a level where services are being cut to the bone and to not increase Council Tax would have a detrimental impact on services and, as a result, the need to strike a balance to ensure the long term stability of services with a modest increase of 38p per week for most Sheffield households;

- (ii) the Government has sneakily changed the goalposts for the Council Tax Freeze Grant and has already taken last year's grant away from the Council with the new system of rolling the freeze grant into Revenue Support Grant, and, as suggested in the main budget report, this can no longer be guaranteed as a sustainable source of income and should be assumed as a mere one off fund, which would only lead to greater cuts in future years;
- (17) confirms as a matter of public record the intervention of Liberal Democrat Ministers to stop the lowering of the threshold for a referendum and notes the following comments in Danny Alexander's letter to Local Government Association Leaders "*Lowering the threshold will put unnecessary further pressure on local authorities and the much needed services they provide.*" and "*Lowering the threshold is a change of policy that puts an unnecessary further constraint on local authorities*", therefore clearly recognising the justification for raising the Council Tax above 1%;
- (18) is appalled at the cynicism and hypocrisy of the MP for Sheffield Hallam, who is happy to heavily cut funding for the Council, allow his own Ministers to insist on allowing local authorities to be able to increase Council Tax by up to 2% because in their own words "*Lowering the threshold will put unnecessary further pressure on local authorities and the much needed services they provide.*", and then criticising the Council for proposing to raise Council Tax by 1.99%;
- (19) recalls the previous blunders and factual inaccuracies of the Deputy Prime Minister's interventions in relation to the Council's budget and regrets that instead of using his position to help Sheffield, he is more interested in playing politics to do anything he can to deflect the blame for the huge cuts that he has stood by and allowed to happen over the past five years;
- (20) regrets that last year, the Green Group proposed to increase Council Tax by 2.95%, which was slightly above the Government threshold and would therefore have required a referendum and believes that this was simply playing politics with Council Tax and further believes that the present Administration's decision to not increase Council Tax above the referendum threshold is pragmatic and avoids hundreds of thousands of pounds of local taxpayers' money being wasted on a potentially pointless exercise, should local people vote against increasing Council Tax;
- (21) notes that in Brighton and Hove, despite having a Green administration since 2011 who have threatened to increase Council Tax above the referendum threshold, they have never followed through with this and therefore believes that the Sheffield Green Group are proposing an equally cynical tactic which in reality they would have no intention of implementing if they were in a position to;
- (22) welcomes that the Administration has consulted with the people of Sheffield on the budget through the number of consultation events in the Town Hall

and the acclaimed budget video published on the internet;

- (23) thanks all members of the public who have participated in the budget consultation, through the numerous events in the Town Hall, writing in, or through watching the budget video on the intranet;
- (24) believes that this video was a welcome addition to the consultation process this year and notes the recognition that the video has received in the national media and asks officers to consider other new innovative ways of consulting and connecting with the public as part of next year's budget process;
- (25) welcomes that at the start of the process, the Administration outlined its priorities of protecting front line services, particularly services for the most vulnerable in the city and believes that this is demonstrated by some of the actions in the budget including:-
 - (i) maintaining a £1.5 million Local Assistance Scheme, despite the Government scrapping its funding for the scheme entirely;
 - (ii) investing an additional £100,000 in the Council Tax Hardship fund;
 - (iii) protecting spending on frontline child safeguarding; and
 - (iv) prioritising the Council's flagship apprenticeship schemes which have given Sheffield the best record of all the core cities on delivering apprenticeships;
- (26) notes that since the reductions in Government funding started, the Council has saved £4.6 million in senior management posts above £50,000 and savings are continued to be made in areas that minimise the impact on front line services, such as the recent re-negotiation of the Capita contract;
- (27) welcomes the action taken by the present Administration to ensure the introduction of the Living Wage for all Council staff and the progress that has been made in ensuring that Council contractors pay the Living Wage and believes it should be a priority to work across the city with partners over the next year to ensure that substantive action is taken to encourage and support more employers throughout the city in the public, private and voluntary sector to pay the Living Wage;
- (28) notes that as a result of budget cuts there could be up to 200 Council posts affected during the financial year 2015/16, including job roles that could be lost through voluntary severance or voluntary early retirement, as well as any vacancies that have not been filled;
- (29) expresses sincere and heartfelt sympathy to those members of staff who are losing their jobs through compulsory redundancy and regrets that the Government's cuts agenda has made compulsory redundancies unavoidable;

- (30) places on record its thanks for the unfaltering commitment and dedication of staff who continue to serve the Council in these incredibly difficult times, which year on year leads to uncertainty about their own futures and that of their colleagues, many of whom are left to pick up an increased workload as a result of the cuts to staff numbers;
- (31) accordingly instructs the Interim Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2015/2016 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted;
- (32) notes those specific projects included in the years 2014/15 to 2019/20 Capital Programmes at Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, with block allocations being included within the Programme for noting at this stage and detailed proposals will be brought back for separate Member approval as part of the monthly monitoring procedures;
- (33) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2019/20 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme;
- (34) approves the Corporate Resource Pool (CRP) policy outlined in Appendix 4 of the report on the Capital Programme such that the commitment from the CRP is limited to one year and no CRP supported schemes are approved beyond 2015-16 unless explicitly stated, and if substantial capital receipts are realised within 2014-15 or 2015-16, a further report will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process;
- (35) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Interim Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2015/16, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2015/16 amounting to £424.060m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, as follows:-

Appendix 3

Original Budget 2014/15	<u>Summary Revenue Budget</u>	Original Budget 2015/16
£000		£000
	Portfolio budgets:	
70,624	Children Young People and Families	65,980
156,726	Communities	156,215
130,983	Place	126,520
2,358	Policy Performance and Communications	2,292
55,541	Resources	54,135
416,232		405,142

Corporate Budgets:

Specific Grants

-1,968	Council Tax Freeze Grant for 2014/15	0
-12,399	NHS Funding	-12,399
-71,116	PFI Grant	-73,442
-6,397	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-7,738
-1,079	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,916
0	Small Business Rates Relief	-2,500
0	Empty New Build Relief (ENBR)	-100
0	Retail Relief (RR)	-500
0	Local Support Services Grant	-53
0	Independent Living Fund	-2,216

Corporate Items

11,200	Redundancy Provision	8,200
9,750	Pension Costs	-17,289
500	Council Tax Hardship Fund	600
-250	Improved debt collection	0
5,036	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	6,391
0	Public Health Savings / re-investments*	-2,000
3,716	Contingency - Adults Social Care Pressures	3,000
24,747	Schools and Howden PFI	24,913
-1,300	Enhancements	0
400	Infrastructure Investment in NRQ / St Pauls Place	1,400
82	Payment to Parish Councils	34
0	ICT Refresh	300
0	CAPITA Contract Savings	-1,783
2,874	Other	2,727
37,282	Capital Financing costs	37,184
28,117	MSF capital financing costs	28,073
5,821	Contribution to Reserves	28,032

451,248	Total Expenditure	424,060
----------------	--------------------------	----------------

Financing of Net Expenditure

-157,460	Revenue Support Grant	-115,837
-100,898	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-105,661
-28,342	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-28,883
-164,377	Council Tax income	-170,379
-171	Collection Fund surplus	-3,300

-451,248	Total Financing	-424,060
-----------------	------------------------	-----------------

*Public Health savings / re-investments * - savings of £2.5m have been targeted from existing public health activities in order to avoid disinvestment in other Council services*

which promote health and wellbeing outcomes. Of the £2.5m, £0.5m is already included in the portfolio savings proposals figure.

- (36) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,308.28 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 1.99% on the level set for 2014/15;
- (37) approves the Revenue Budget allocations and Budget Implementation Plans for each of the services, as set out in Appendix 2 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (38) notes the latest 2014/15 budget monitoring position;
- (39) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (40) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (41) agrees that authority be delegated to the Director of Finance to undertake Treasury Management activity, to create and amend appropriate Treasury Management Practice Statements and to report on the operation of Treasury Management activity on the terms set out in these documents;
- (42) agrees that the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15th May, 2013, and implemented for 2014/15, be also implemented for 2015/16, with the addition (to paragraph (h) of Schedule 2) of the following approved duty which was approved by Council at its meeting held on 3 December 2014 – “attendance at meetings of Local Housing Area Forums”;
- (43) agrees to forego an annual increase in the Members’ Allowances in 2015/16;
- (44) approves a Pay Policy for 2015/16 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (45) delegates authority to the Director of Public Health and the Interim Executive Director, Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, to approve the final allocation of Public Health grant to portfolios in 2015/16;
- (46) notes that the Section 151 Officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003, and that further details are set out in Appendix 4 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (47) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the

loss of council tax income in 2015/16 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 176 of the Revenue Budget report;

- (48) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £492,737 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (49) notes the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner and the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority, together with the impact of these on the overall amount of Council Tax to be charged in the City Council's area;
- (50) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £424.060m set out in Appendix 3 of the Revenue Budget report, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2015/16, in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

Appendix 6a

CITY OF SHEFFIELD
CALCULATION OF RECOMMENDED COUNCIL TAX FOR 2015/16 REVENUE BUDGET

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. It be noted that on 15th January 2015, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2015/16
 - (a) for the whole Council area as:
130,231.44 (item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")); and
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as in the attached Appendix 6c.
2. Calculate that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2015/16 (excluding Parish precepts is:
£ 170,378,563.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2015/16 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - (a) **£1,417,154,816** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
 - (b) **£1,246,283,516** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.

- (c) **£170,871,300** being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year (item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).
- (d) **£1,312.0587** being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish Precepts).
- (e) **£492,737** being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per the attached Appendix 6b).
- (f) **1,308.2752** being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.
4. To note that the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Fire and Rescue Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.
5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2014/15 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	872.18	1,017.55	1,162.91	1,308.28	1,599.00	1,889.73	2,180.46	2,616.55
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,015.16	1,184.37	1,353.56	1,522.76	1,861.14	2,199.54	2,537.92	3,045.51

Bradfield Parish Council

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	872.18	1,017.55	1,162.91	1,308.28	1,599.00	1,889.73	2,180.46	2,616.55
Bradfield Parish Council	25.81	30.11	34.41	38.71	47.31	55.91	64.51	77.42
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,040.97	1,214.48	1,387.97	1,561.47	1,908.45	2,255.45	2,602.43	3,122.93

Ecclesfield Parish Council

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	872.18	1,017.55	1,162.91	1,308.28	1,599.00	1,889.73	2,180.46	2,616.55
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.06	11.74	13.41	15.09	18.44	21.79	25.15	30.18
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,025.22	1,196.11	1,366.97	1,537.85	1,879.58	2,221.33	2,563.07	3,075.69

Stocksbridge Town Council

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	872.18	1,017.55	1,162.91	1,308.28	1,599.00	1,889.73	2,180.46	2,616.55
Stocksbridge Town Council	19.65	22.93	26.21	29.48	36.03	42.58	49.13	58.96
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32

Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,034.81	1,207.30	1,379.77	1,552.24	1,897.17	2,242.12	2,587.05	3,104.47
---------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

6. The Council's basic amount of Council Tax is not excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, therefore no referendum is required.

Appendix 6b

Council Tax Schedule 2015/16	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	872.18	1,017.55	1,162.91	1,308.28	1,599.00	1,889.73	2,180.46	2,616.55
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,015.16	1,184.37	1,353.56	1,522.76	1,861.14	2,199.54	2,537.92	3,045.51
Bradfield Parish Council	1,040.97	1,214.48	1,387.97	1,561.47	1,908.45	2,255.45	2,602.43	3,122.93
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,025.22	1,196.11	1,366.97	1,537.85	1,879.58	2,221.33	2,563.07	3,075.69
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,034.81	1,207.30	1,379.77	1,552.24	1,897.17	2,242.12	2,587.05	3,104.47

Appendix 6c

Parish Council Precepts

Parish Council	2014/15					2015/16					Council Tax Increase
	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grant	Total Precept	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precepts	
Bradfield	5,556.10	210,853	37,9499	17,369	228,223	5,590.09	216,386	38,7089	12,506	228,892	2.00%
Ecclesfield	8,992.80	131,735	14,6489	17,432	149,167	9,031.42	136,269	15,0884	12,551	148,821	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,592.21	100,858	28,0768	12,542	113,399	3,595.35	105,993	29,4806	9,030	115,024	5.00%
Total/average	18,141.11	443,446	24,4443	47,343	490,789	18,216.86	458,649	25,1772	34,088	492,737	3.00%

--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--

Motion to move to next business

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that (in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.13) the Council does now move to the next item of business and that the question be now put.

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 (59) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Chris Weldon, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Tony Downing, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Jack Clarkson, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Alf Meade, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.
- Against the amendment (21) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayriss, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley.
- Abstained on the amendment (1) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon).

- 6.3 It was then moved by Councillor Andrew Sangar, seconded by Councillor Colin Ross, as an amendment, that the recommendations of the Cabinet held on 11th February, 2015, as relates to the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2015/16, be replaced by the following resolution:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:

- (1) confirms that thanks to the difficult decisions the Government have taken, the economy is growing, unemployment is reducing and the deficit is falling;
- (2) believes moves to build a stronger economy could not have been achieved without Liberal Democrats in Government;
- (3) applauds that despite tough financial constraints, Liberal Democrats in Government have been able to secure policies that will help build a fairer society, including:-
 - (i) raising the income tax threshold to give 24 million ordinary workers a £825 tax cut;
 - (ii) helping give every child the best start in life by introducing a £2.5 billion pupil premium, which includes £25 million for Sheffield this year, delivering 15 hours free childcare for disadvantaged two years olds and committing to free school meals for all infant pupils;
 - (iii) supporting young people by creating more apprenticeships than ever before and improving vocational education through investment in University Technical Colleges; and
 - (iv) tackling climate change and helping to create jobs by investing in renewable energy and home insulation;
- (4) in particular, highlights the following Government investments, which have helped to build a stronger economy and a fairer society in Sheffield:-
 - (i) £15.704 million to help freeze Council Tax for a fifth consecutive year, saving families around £200 in the fifth year;
 - (ii) over £40 million for the fourth year of the Streets Ahead programme, which will see every road, pavement and streetlight in the City repaired;
 - (iii) £5.4 million to provide Free Early Learning for disadvantaged two-year-olds, £25 million for Sheffield schools through the Pupil Premium and £5 million for Sheffield City Region to support young people into jobs;

- (iv) millions of pounds invested in Sheffield's trams, trains and buses, alongside commitments to electrify the Midland Mainline and a new High Speed Rail station in Sheffield; and
 - (v) ongoing support for the local economy by devolution of resources and decisions to Sheffield City Region through the Regional Growth Fund, enterprise zones, and the Sheffield City Deal;
- (5) believes that this evidence of investment in Sheffield confirms that the Administration's claims that Sheffield has been treated unfairly, do not stand up to serious scrutiny;
- (6) thanks the Government for the historic reform of business rates, which gives local councils control over the funding they raise locally;
- (7) contrasts this evidence with dangerous propaganda of local Labour politicians, who predicted a 'post-soviet meltdown' and riots in the streets of Sheffield, and notes:-
- (i) Labour have admitted they will not reverse any local reductions in funding, based upon The Shadow Chancellor of the Exchequer, The Rt. Hon. Ed Balls MP's admission that he would, given the chance, cut another £3.3bn from local government;
 - (ii) Labour's South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner, Alan Billings' statement on cuts to Police funding that 'whatever the Government after the general election, the financial position will be little different';
 - (iii) the frequent grandstanding on the subject of cuts to local government by members of the Administration, and fears that some people may be misled into thinking that the Labour Party would not make further cuts to local government; and
 - (iv) in spite of the rhetoric in this Chamber, it is clear that any statements made that give the impression that the cuts would disappear if there was a change to a Labour Government are unlikely to be true;
- (8) adds this to the long-list of failings of the current Administration, centralising decisions and mismanagement of Council budgets;
- (9) furthermore, condemns the missed opportunities overseen by the current Administration, which have forced the Council into irreversible positions, noting in particular:-
- (i) that this City remains saddled with the debt run up by previous Administrations, including around £25 million next year to pay off the facilities built for the disastrous World Student Games, despite the fact that the Don Valley Stadium has now been demolished; and

- (ii) that the Administration have splashed out millions on high paid consultants, Council offices and political pet projects, funds which can never be regained for local taxpayers;
- (10) regrets that the current Administration refuse to accept responsibility for their own failures simply because they think they can get away with blaming someone else;
- (11) recommends that the Administration stop playing the blame game and investigate the following sensible savings in order to protect the services the local people care for most:-
- (i) reducing budgets for Trade Unions officials, which have been consistently protected to the detriment of front-line services;
 - (ii) reducing posts in communications, policy and research, political support and performance;
 - (iii) the deletion of four senior management posts through a restructuring; and
 - (iv) a small reduction in pay for the top earners in the Council, to produce a more equal structure and protect low-paid front line staff such as care workers;
- (12) confirms that by agreeing these savings, the Council could continue to provide the front-line services that local people care most about, such as:-
- (i) supporting hard-working Sheffield families suffering in the cost of living crisis, by freezing Council Tax;
 - (ii) supporting business by reducing this Administration's parking hikes and reducing parking permit prices for residents;
 - (iii) restoring the number of grit bins across the city;
 - (iv) supporting Associate libraries by employing professional librarian support;
 - (v) making best use of the Government's New Homes Bonus to protect Sheffield's Green Belt by investing in empty homes and supporting brownfield development; and
 - (vi) giving local people a greater say in how money is spent on highway schemes in their area by giving more control to Local Area Partnerships;
- (13) therefore instructs the Interim Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2015/2016 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget

and Capital Programme now submitted, but with the following amendments:-

General Fund			
Savings	£'000	Investments / spending proposals	£'000
Reinstatement of Council Tax Freeze Grant	1,972	Loss of income from 1.99% Council Tax increase	3,300
Remove Leader's policy officer post	30	Reduce city centre parking prices	100
Delete 4 senior manager posts	200	Reduce car parking permit prices	50
Reduce the number of trade union convenors	260	Additional grit bin provision	12
Delete Special Responsibility Allowances for Cabinet Advisors	45	Renovations to Whirlow Hall Farm	20
Set a modest savings target for shared services between Sheffield trusts	50	Professional librarian support for associate libraries	70
Reduce posts within the policy team	100		
Pay review - 5% reduction for staff on a salary of >£39k (assume 6 months saving)	768		
Set a modest savings target for shared services with other Local Authorities in Sheffield City Region	100		
Withdraw funding from Sheffield First Partnership	27		
Savings total	3,552	Investments total	3,552

<u>New Homes Bonus</u>			
Savings	£'000	Investments / spending proposals	£'000
Use of uncommitted New Homes Bonus	2,000	Cobnar Cottage project in Graves Park	70
		Tripling investment for bringing empty homes back into use	941
		Investing in brownfield sites to bring them up to economically deliverable standard	596
		Increasing investment in local high streets through the Successful Centres programme	393
Savings total	2,000	Investments total	2,000

<u>Local Transport Plan</u>			
Savings	£'000	Investments / spending proposals	£'000
Nil		Re-allocate decision making over £1.7 million of transport funding away from Cabinet Member and to Local Area Partnerships	Cost neutral
Savings total		Investments total	

- (14) accepts that a report will need to be brought forward on a Council pay review and therefore notes that some proposed investments are dependent on this report or alternative savings;
- (15) notes those specific projects included in the years 2014/15 to 2019/20 Capital Programmes at Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital

Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph 13 above, with block allocations being included within the Programme for noting at this stage and detailed proposals will be brought back for separate Member approval as part of the monthly monitoring procedures;

- (16) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2019/20 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph 13 above;
- (17) approves the Corporate Resource Pool (CRP) policy outlined in Appendix 4 of the report on the Capital Programme such that the commitment from the CRP is limited to one year and no CRP supported schemes are approved beyond 2015-16 unless explicitly stated, and if substantial capital receipts are realised within 2014-15 or 2015-16, a further report will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process;
- (18) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Interim Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2015/16, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2015/16 amounting to £420.735m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, and subsequently amended in the light of paragraph 13 above, as follows:-

Appendix 3

Summary Revenue Budget

Original Budget 2014/15		Proposed Budget 2015/16
£000		£000
	Portfolio budgets:	
70,624	Children Young People and Families	65,930
156,726	Communities	156,235
130,983	Place	126,602
2,358	Policy Performance and Communications	2,115
55,541	Resources	53,700
416,232		404,582
	Corporate Budgets:	
	Specific Grants	
-1,968	Council Tax Freeze Grant for 2014/15	0
0	Council Tax Freeze Grant for 2015/16	-1,972
-12,399	NHS Funding	-12,399
-71,116	PFI Grant	-73,442
-6,397	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-7,738
-1,079	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,916
0	Small Business Rates Relief	-2,500
0	Empty New Build Relief (ENBR)	-100

0	Retail Relief (RR)	-500
0	Local Support Services Grant	-53
0	Independent Living Fund	-2,216
	Corporate Items	
11,200	Redundancy Provision	8,200
9,750	Pension Costs	-17,289
500	Council Tax Hardship Fund	600
-250	Improved debt collection	0
5,036	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	6,391
0	Public Health Savings / re-investments*	-2,000
3,716	Contingency - Adults Social Care Pressures	3,000
24,747	Schools and Howden PFI	24,913
-1,300	Enhancements	0
400	Infrastructure Investment in NRQ / St Pauls Place	1,400
82	Payment to Parish Councils	34
0	ICT Refresh	300
0	CAPITA Contract Savings	-1,783
2,874	Other	2,702
	Pay Adjustments	-768
37,282	Capital Financing costs	37,184
28,117	MSF capital financing costs	28,073
5,821	Contribution to Reserves	28,032
451,248	Total Expenditure	420,735
	Financing of Net Expenditure	
-157,460	Revenue Support Grant	-115,837
-100,898	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-105,661
-28,342	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-28,883
-164,377	Council Tax income	-167,054
-171	Collection Fund surplus	-3,300
-451,248	Total Financing	-420,735

*Public Health savings / re-investments * - savings of £2.5m have been targeted from existing public health activities in order to avoid disinvestment in other Council services which promote health and wellbeing outcomes. Of the £2.5m, £0.5m is already included in the portfolio savings proposals figure.*

- (19) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,282.75 for City Council services, i.e. at the same level as 2014/15;
- (20) approves the Revenue Budget allocations and Budget Implementation Plans for each of the services, as set out in Appendix 2 of the Revenue Budget report, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph 13

above;

- (21) notes the latest 2014/15 budget monitoring position;
- (22) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (23) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (24) agrees that authority be delegated to the Director of Finance to undertake Treasury Management activity, to create and amend appropriate Treasury Management Practice Statements and to report on the operation of Treasury Management activity on the terms set out in these documents;
- (25) agrees that the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15th May, 2013, and implemented for 2014/15, be also implemented for 2015/16, with the addition (to paragraph (h) of Schedule 2) of the following approved duty which was approved by Council at its meeting held on 3 December 2014 – "attendance at meetings of Local Housing Area Forums", and subject to the amendment outlined in paragraph 13 above relating to the deletion of Special Responsibility Allowances for Cabinet Advisors;
- (26) agrees to forego an annual increase in the Members' Allowances in 2015/16;
- (27) approves a Pay Policy for 2015/16 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (28) delegates authority to the Director of Public Health and the Interim Executive Director, Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, to approve the final allocation of Public Health grant to portfolios in 2015/16;
- (29) notes that the Section 151 Officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003, and that further details are set out in Appendix 4 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (30) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of council tax income in 2015/16 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 176 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (31) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £492,737 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (32) notes the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire

Police and Crime Commissioner and the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority, together with the impact of these on the overall amount of Council Tax to be charged in the City Council's area;

- (33) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £420.735m set out in paragraph 13 above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2015/16, in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

Appendix 6a

CITY OF SHEFFIELD
CALCULATION OF RECOMMENDED COUNCIL TAX FOR 2015/16 REVENUE
BUDGET

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. It be noted that on 15th January 2015, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2015/16
 - (a) for the whole Council area as:
130,231.44 (item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")); and
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as in the attached Appendix 6c.
2. Calculate that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2015/16 (excluding Parish precepts is:
£ 167,053,755.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2015/16 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - (a) **£1,413,830,007** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
 - (b) **£1,246,283,516** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
 - (c) **£167,546,491** being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year (item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).
 - (d) **£1,286.5287** being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by item T

(1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish Precepts).

- (e) **£492,737** being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per the attached Appendix 6b).
- (f) **1,282.7452** being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.
4. To note that the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Fire and Rescue Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.
5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2014/15 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	855.16	997.69	1,140.22	1,282.75	1,567.80	1,852.85	2,137.91	2,565.49
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	998.14	1,164.51	1,330.87	1,497.23	1,829.94	2,162.66	2,495.37	2,994.45
Bradfield Parish Council								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	855.16	997.69	1,140.22	1,282.75	1,567.80	1,852.85	2,137.91	2,565.49
Bradfield Parish Council	25.81	30.11	34.41	38.71	47.31	55.91	64.51	77.42
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64

South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,023.95	1,194.62	1,365.28	1,535.94	1,877.25	2,218.57	2,559.88	3,071.87
Ecclesfield Parish Council								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	855.16	997.69	1,140.22	1,282.75	1,567.80	1,852.85	2,137.91	2,565.49
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.06	11.74	13.41	15.09	18.44	21.79	25.15	30.18
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,008.20	1,176.25	1,344.28	1,512.32	1,848.38	2,184.45	2,520.52	3,024.63
Stocksbridge Town Council								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	855.16	997.69	1,140.22	1,282.75	1,567.80	1,852.85	2,137.91	2,565.49
Stocksbridge Town Council	19.65	22.93	26.21	29.48	36.03	42.58	49.13	58.96
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,017.79	1,187.44	1,357.08	1,526.71	1,865.97	2,205.24	2,544.50	3,053.41

6. The Council's basic amount of Council Tax is not excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, therefore no referendum is required.

Appendix 6b								
Council Tax Schedule 2015/16	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	855.16	997.69	1,140.22	1,282.75	1,567.80	1,852.85	2,137.91	2,565.49

South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	998.14	1,164.51	1,330.87	1,497.23	1,829.94	2,162.66	2,495.37	2,994.45
Bradfield Parish Council	1,023.95	1,194.62	1,365.28	1,535.94	1,877.25	2,218.57	2,559.88	3,071.87
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,008.20	1,176.25	1,344.28	1,512.32	1,848.38	2,184.45	2,520.52	3,024.63
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,017.79	1,187.44	1,357.08	1,526.71	1,865.97	2,205.24	2,544.50	3,053.41

Appendix 6c

Parish Council Precepts

Parish Council	2014/15					2015/16					Council Tax Increase
	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grant	Total Precept	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precepts	
Bradfield	5,556.10	210,853	37,9499	17,369	228,223	5,590.09	216,386	38,7089	12,506	228,892	2.00%
Ecclesfield	8,992.80	131,735	14,6489	17,432	149,167	9,031.42	136,269	15,0884	12,551	148,821	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,592.21	100,858	28,0768	12,542	113,399	3,595.35	105,993	29,4806	9,030	115,024	5.00%
Total/average	18,141.11	443,446	24,4443	47,343	490,789	18,216.86	458,649	25,1772	34,088	492,737	3.00%

Motion to move to next business

RESOLVED: On the Motion of Councillor Pat Midgley, seconded by Councillor Gill Furniss, that (in accordance with Council Procedure Rule 17.13) the Council does now move to the next item of business and that the question be now put.

On being put to the vote the amendment was negated.

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

- For the amendment (18) - Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe

and Vickie Priestley.

Against the amendment (62) - The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Brian Webster, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Pauline Andrews, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Chris Weldon, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Tim Rippon, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Tony Downing, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.

Abstained on the amendment - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon).
(1)

6.4 It was then moved by Councillor Robert Murphy, seconded by Councillor Brian Webster, as an amendment that the recommendations of the Cabinet held on 11th February, 2015, as relates to the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2015/16, be replaced by the following resolution:-

RESOLVED: That this Council:

- (1) deplores the cuts to local authority funding being imposed by Central Government and applauds the efforts of politicians and campaigners calling for an alternative to austerity;
- (2) recognises that the major parties have not promised to reverse these cuts and have committed to further austerity;
- (3) believes that however difficult the crisis we face, this Council has a responsibility to do the best it can for the people of Sheffield, prioritising the available resources to protect communities and the most vulnerable and working towards a more equitable and resilient city;
- (4) accepts the projections from the Local Government Association that the

revenue support grant will continue to dwindle and that, although the Coalition Government favours freezing Council Tax, this is not sustainable;

- (5) believes that a majority of Sheffield people are willing to pay tax in order to support services for the common good and is willing to test this in a referendum;
- (6) therefore proposes to raise Council Tax by 2.95% (48p a week for the majority of households) in order to:
 - (i) increase the money available for short stay beds for people with dementia in order to sustain a quality service delivered by decently paid staff, fully integrated with mental health services in the community and hospital sectors; noting that the investment in community based care will reduce the need for more expensive options in the long run and reflects the new ethos of integrated health and social care;
 - (ii) reduce cuts to services for the elderly and disabled and help ensure decent pay and conditions for care staff, putting an extra £499k into adult social care;
 - (iii) increase the support to communities and mitigate some of the cuts to South Yorkshire Police by funding another 10 Police Community Support Officers in the city; and
 - (iv) double the hardship fund available to the 30,000 households affected by the loss of Council Tax benefit;
- (7) will ensure that funding reserved to cover consequential costs of a referendum is used to support voluntary sector advice services, provided the referendum is carried;
- (8) will cut political spin emanating from the Town Hall by cutting the posts of Group Policy Officers and requiring politicians to do their own research work;
- (9) will install a 10:1 pay ratio between the highest and lowest paid Council officers; closing the gap by reducing the pay of those on the highest salaries, tapering the cuts for those on middle grades, and protecting those on less than £40k;
- (10) will put resources into turning empty properties into much needed homes by investing a small amount of New Homes Bonus in further enforcement work in this area, which will in turn generate increased NHB as homes are brought back into occupation;
- (11) will reduce the price of permits in parking permit zones to 2010 levels, which more closely reflects the true cost of running the schemes and means that people living in some of the most congested and polluted areas

of the city are not subsidising other parking services;

- (12) will invest £40k of the Local Growth Fund (New Homes Bonus) to install solar panels on the Ellesmere and Park Centres as part of their roof renovations, thereby reducing fuel bills and increasing the sustainability of the buildings;
- (13) will prioritise the installation of 20 mph speed limit zones in areas with the worst accident statistics, and therefore will re-prioritise Local Transport Plan Programme funding into a default 20mph speed limit in the city centre;
- (14) will re-prioritise the funding set aside for the M1 Gateway project into establishing a Community Shop, offering discount food, empowering individuals and building stronger communities;
- (15) therefore instructs the Interim Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2015/2016 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted, but with the following amendments:-

Substantive budget proposal			
Council tax proposals	(£'000)	Spending proposals	(£'000)
2.95% net additional Council Tax increase (above 1.99%)	1,603	Council Tax hardship fund increased to compensate for Council Tax increase, plus additional support	400
		Funding an additional 10 Police Community Support Officers	310
		Increase funds available for short stay beds for people with dementia	250
		Supporting the review of individual care packages to maintain quality of care across Communities	499
		Hold referendum - spend on local people and businesses	144

Council tax sub-total	1,603		1,603

<u>Substitute Calculations (if referendum rejects substantive proposal)</u>			
Savings proposals	(£'000)	Spending proposals	(£'000)
<i>Permanent reduction in spending:</i>		<i>Permanent additions to budget:</i>	
Use of New Homes Bonus (to fund enforcement officer to bring empty homes back into use)	35	Additional enforcement officer post to bring empty homes back into use	35
Reduce pay on employees paid over £150,000 by 20% (assume 6 month saving)	19	Parking permit fees reduced to 2010 levels	288
Reduce pay on employees paid over £100,000 by 15% (assume 6 month saving)	57	Reserve for rebilling costs if referendum lost	500
Reduce pay on employees paid over £50,000 by 10% (assume 6 month saving)	466	Hold referendum - spend on local people and businesses	144
Reduce pay on employees paid over £40,000 by 3% (assume 6 month saving)	263		
Remove all group policy officer posts	83		
Remove special responsibility allowances for Cabinet Advisors	45		
Savings sub-total	967	Spending sub-total	967

<u>Capital proposals</u>			
Capital spending proposal	(£'000)	Financing of capital	(£'000)

		proposals	
20's Plenty City Centre scheme	262	Re-prioritise Local Transport Plan Programme set aside for 20mph speed limit schemes	262
Establishment of a Community shop	150	Re-prioritise use of unringfenced funding set aside for M1 Gateway project to invest in Community Shop	150
Install solar panels as part of roof replacement programmes at Park Centre and Ellesmere Centre	40	Use of New Homes Bonus to cover cost of solar panel installation	40
Capital spending total	452	Financing of capital proposals total	452

- (16) accepts that the proposed investments in the substantive budget proposal are dependent on a positive result in a local referendum;
- (17) agrees that, if the substantive budget proposals in paragraph 15 are rejected in a local Council Tax referendum, those investment proposals be withdrawn, but the substitute calculations identified in paragraph 15 above are still to be implemented;
- (18) notes those specific projects included in the years 2014/15 to 2019/20 Capital Programmes at Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph 15 above, with block allocations being included within the Programme for noting at this stage and detailed proposals will be brought back for separate Member approval as part of the monthly monitoring procedures;
- (19) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2019/20 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph 15 above;
- (20) approves the Corporate Resource Pool (CRP) policy outlined in Appendix 4 of the report on the Capital Programme such that the commitment from the CRP is limited to one year and no CRP supported schemes are approved beyond 2015-16 unless explicitly stated, and if substantial capital receipts are realised within 2014-15 or 2015-16, a further report will

be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process;

- (21) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Interim Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2015/16, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2015/16 amounting to £425.663m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, and subsequently amended in the light of paragraph 15 above, as follows:-

Appendix 3

Summary Revenue Budget

Original Budget 2014/15		Original Budget 2015/16
£000		£000
	Portfolio budgets:	
70,624	Children Young People and Families	65,980
156,726	Communities	156,964
130,983	Place	126,830
2,358	Policy Performance and Communications	2,436
55,541	Resources	54,135
416,232		406,345
	Corporate Budgets:	
	Specific Grants	
-1,968	Council Tax Freeze Grant for 2014/15	0
-12,399	NHS Funding	-12,399
-71,116	PFI Grant	-73,442
-6,397	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-7,738
-1,079	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,916
0	Small Business Rates Relief	-2,500
0	Empty New Build Relief (ENBR)	-100
0	Retail Relief (RR)	-500
0	Local Support Services Grant	-53
0	Independent Living Fund	-2,216
	Corporate Items	
11,200	Redundancy Provision	8,200
9,750	Pension Costs	-17,289
500	Council Tax Hardship Fund	1,000
-250	Improved debt collection	0
5,036	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	6,391
0	Public Health Savings / re-investments*	-2,000
3,716	Contingency - Adults Social Care Pressures	3,000
24,747	Schools and Howden PFI	24,913
-1,300	Enhancements	0
400	Infrastructure Investment in NRQ / St Pauls Place	1,400

82	Payment to Parish Councils	34
0	ICT Refresh	300
0	CAPITA Contract Savings	-1,783
2,874	Other	2,727
37,282	Capital Financing costs	37,184
28,117	MSF capital financing costs	28,073
5,821	Contribution to Reserves	28,032
451,248	Total Expenditure	425,663
Financing of Net Expenditure		
-157,460	Revenue Support Grant	-115,837
-100,898	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-105,661
-28,342	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-28,883
-164,377	Council Tax income	-171,982
-171	Collection Fund surplus	-3,300
-451,248	Total Financing	-425,663

*Public Health savings / re-investments * - savings of £2.5m have been targeted from existing public health activities in order to avoid disinvestment in other Council services which promote health and wellbeing outcomes. Of the £2.5m, £0.5m is already included in the portfolio savings proposals figure.*

- (22) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,320.59 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 2.95% on the level set for 2014/15;
- (23) approves the Revenue Budget allocations and Budget Implementation Plans for each of the services, as set out in Appendix 2 of the Revenue Budget report, subject to the amendments outlined in paragraph 15 above;
- (24) notes the latest 2014/15 budget monitoring position;
- (25) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (26) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (27) agrees that authority be delegated to the Director of Finance to undertake Treasury Management activity, to create and amend appropriate Treasury Management Practice Statements and to report on the operation of Treasury Management activity on the terms set out in these documents;

- (28) agrees that the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15th May, 2013, and implemented for 2014/15, be also implemented for 2015/16, with the addition (to paragraph (h) of Schedule 2) of the following approved duty which was approved by Council at its meeting held on 3 December 2014 – “attendance at meetings of Local Housing Area Forums”, and subject to the amendment outlined in paragraph 15 above relating to the removal of Special Responsibility Allowances for Cabinet Advisors;
- (29) agrees to forego an annual increase in the Members' Allowances in 2015/16;
- (30) approves a Pay Policy for 2015/16 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (31) delegates authority to the Director of Public Health and the Interim Executive Director, Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, to approve the final allocation of Public Health grant to portfolios in 2015/16;
- (32) notes that the Section 151 Officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003, and that further details are set out in Appendix 4 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (33) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of council tax income in 2015/16 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 176 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (34) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £492,737 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (35) notes the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner and the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority, together with the impact of these on the overall amount of Council Tax to be charged in the City Council's area;
- (36) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £425.663m set out in paragraph 15 above, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2015/16, in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (37) notes that, in accordance with Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, a 2.95% increase in Council Tax is excessive and would require that a referendum be held in relation to that amount;
- (38) in accordance with the Local Government Finance Act 1992, is required to make “substitute calculations” for a Council Tax which does not exceed the excessiveness principles and therefore the following substitute budget

and the Council Tax determinations set out in Appendix 6 of the Revenue Budget report are to apply;

Appendix 3

Summary Revenue Budget

Original Budget 2014/15		Original Budget 2015/16
£000		£000
	Portfolio budgets:	
70,624	Children Young People and Families	65,980
156,726	Communities	156,215
130,983	Place	126,843
2,358	Policy Performance and Communications	2,308
55,541	Resources	54,635
416,232		405,981
	Corporate Budgets:	
	Specific Grants	
-1,968	Council Tax Freeze Grant for 2014/15	0
-12,399	NHS Funding	-12,399
-71,116	PFI Grant	-73,442
-6,397	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-7,738
-1,079	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,916
0	Small Business Rates Relief	-2,500
0	Empty New Build Relief (ENBR)	-100
0	Retail Relief (RR)	-500
0	Local Support Services Grant	-53
0	Independent Living Fund	-2,216
	Corporate Items	
11,200	Redundancy Provision	8,200
9,750	Pension Costs	-17,289
500	Council Tax Hardship Fund	600
-250	Improved debt collection	0
5,036	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	6,356
0	Public Health Savings / re-investments*	-2,000
3,716	Contingency - Adults Social Care Pressures	3,000
24,747	Schools and Howden PFI	24,913
-1,300	Enhancements	0
400	Infrastructure Investment in NRQ / St Pauls Place	1,400
82	Payment to Parish Councils	34
0	ICT Refresh	300
0	CAPITA Contract Savings	-1,783
2,874	Other	2,727

0	Pay Adjustment	-804
37,282	Capital Financing costs	37,184
28,117	MSF capital financing costs	28,073
5,821	Contribution to Reserves	28,032
451,248	Total Expenditure	424,060
Financing of Net Expenditure		
-157,460	Revenue Support Grant	-115,837
-100,898	NNDR/Business Rates Income	-105,661
-28,342	Business Rates Top Up Grant	-28,883
-164,377	Council Tax income	-170,379
-171	Collection Fund surplus	-3,300
-451,248	Total Financing	-424,060

*Public Health savings / re-investments * - savings of £2.5m have been targeted from existing public health activities in order to avoid disinvestment in other Council services which promote health and wellbeing outcomes. Of the £2.5m, £0.5m is already included in the portfolio savings proposals figure.*

Appendix 6a

CITY OF SHEFFIELD
CALCULATION OF RECOMMENDED COUNCIL TAX FOR 2015/16 REVENUE BUDGET

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. It be noted that on 15th January 2015, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2015/16
 - (a) for the whole Council area as:
130,231.44 (item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act")); and
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as in the attached Appendix 6c.
2. Calculate that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2015/16 (excluding Parish precepts is:
£171,981.839.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2015/16 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:

- (a) **£1,418,758,092** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.
- (b) **£1,246,283,516** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
- (c) **£172,474,576** being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year (item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).
- (d) **£1,324.3697** being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish Precepts).
- (e) **£492,737** being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per the attached Appendix 6b).
- (f) **1,320.5862** being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.

4. To note that the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Fire and Rescue Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.

5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2014/15 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	880.39	1,027.12	1,173.85	1,320.59	1,614.05	1,907.51	2,200.98	2,641.17

South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,023.37	1,193.94	1,364.50	1,535.07	1,876.19	2,217.32	2,558.44	3,070.13

Bradfield Parish Council								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	880.39	1,027.12	1,173.85	1,320.59	1,614.05	1,907.51	2,200.98	2,641.17
Bradfield Parish Council	25.81	30.11	34.41	38.71	47.31	55.91	64.51	77.42
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,049.18	1,224.05	1,398.91	1,573.78	1,923.50	2,273.23	2,622.95	3,147.55

Ecclesfield Parish Council								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	880.39	1,027.12	1,173.85	1,320.59	1,614.05	1,907.51	2,200.98	2,641.17
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.06	11.74	13.41	15.09	18.44	21.79	25.15	30.18
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,033.43	1,205.68	1,377.91	1,550.16	1,894.63	2,239.11	2,583.59	3,100.31

Stocksbridge Town Council								
Valuation Band								
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	880.39	1,027.12	1,173.85	1,320.59	1,614.05	1,907.51	2,200.98	2,641.17
Stocksbridge Town	19.65	22.93	26.21	29.48	36.03	42.58	49.13	58.96

Council								
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,043.02	1,216.87	1,390.71	1,564.55	1,912.22	2,259.90	2,607.57	3,129.09

6. The Council's basic amount of Council Tax is excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, therefore will require a referendum.

Appendix 6b								
Council Tax Schedule 2015/16	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	880.39	1,027.12	1,173.85	1,320.59	1,614.05	1,907.51	2,200.98	2,641.17
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,023.37	1,193.94	1,364.50	1,535.07	1,876.19	2,217.32	2,558.44	3,070.13
Bradfield Parish Council	1,049.18	1,224.05	1,398.91	1,573.78	1,923.50	2,273.23	2,622.95	3,147.55
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,033.43	1,205.68	1,377.91	1,550.16	1,894.63	2,239.11	2,583.59	3,100.31
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,043.02	1,216.87	1,390.71	1,564.55	1,912.22	2,259.90	2,607.57	3,129.09

Appendix 6c

Parish Council Precepts

Parish Council	2014/15					2015/16					Council Tax Increase
	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grant	Total Precept	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precepts	

Bradfield	5,556.10	210,853	37.9499	17,369	228,223	5,590.09	216,386	38.7089	12,506	228,892	2.00%
Ecclesfield	8,992.80	131,735	14.6489	17,432	149,167	9,031.42	136,269	15.0884	12,551	148,821	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,592.21	100,858	28.0768	12,542	113,399	3,595.35	105,993	29,4806	9,030	115,024	5.00%
Total/average	18,141.11	443,446	24,4443	47,343	490,789	18,216.86	458,649	25,1772	34,088	492,737	3.00%

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

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

For the amendment (4) - Brian Webster, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley and Pauline Andrews.

Against the amendment (76) - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon), The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Simon Clement-Jones, Roy Munn, Richard Shaw, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Rob Frost, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Chris Weldon, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Tim Rippon, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie Paszek, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Tony Downing, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, John Booker, Adam Hurst, Mick

Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.

Abstained on the amendment - The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon).
(1)

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

RESOLVED: That this Council:

- (1) notes that in the original 2010 Comprehensive Spending Review, the Government outlined its plans to eliminate the deficit within four years, meaning that the 2014/15 budget was projected to be the year where the cuts would end;
- (2) regrets that due to the Government's categorical economic mismanagement and the double dip recession which was a result of the Government's economic policy, cuts are now set to continue beyond this parliament and therefore is shocked that the Government continue to boast about their economic record;
- (3) notes that this year, the Revenue Support Grant will have been cut by 50% from what it was in 2010;
- (4) recalls comments by The Rt. Hon. Danny Alexander MP, Chief Secretary to the Treasury, that local government has "borne the brunt of deficit reduction";
- (5) believes that no organisation could deal with the level of cuts the Council has faced over recent years without experiencing a significant impact and believes it is highly irresponsible to suggest otherwise;
- (6) notes that the Government's own figures show that 63 councils are receiving an increase of spending power in the local government finance settlement; 47 Conservative-controlled, 13 recognised Conservative targets, 1 Labour-controlled, 1 Independent-controlled and the Isle of Scilly; and at the same time, the Government's own figures show that Sheffield has had a reduction double the national average;
- (7) reiterates the opposition to the distribution of the cuts which continue to see the most deprived areas targeted with crippling cuts to their budgets at the same time as some of the wealthiest areas of the country have received increases in spending powers and reiterates support for the Fair Deal for Sheffield campaign which calls for the City to be given a fair funding settlement;
- (8) recalls that despite over 10,000 people signing the petition, it ultimately fell on deaf ears as the Government has stubbornly refused to change course

and give cities like Sheffield a fair deal;

- (9) believes that the only prospect of Sheffield getting a fair deal lies with the possibility of the election of a Labour Government in May and welcomes the proposal from The Rt. Hon. Hilary Benn MP, Shadow Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, to distribute the funding currently allocated through the New Homes Bonus, to be done through a formula which is based on need, as the New Homes Bonus has proven to be a further example of a government policy designed to redistribute funding away from the areas with greatest need to some of the most affluent parts of the country;
- (10) notes that to pay for this year's round of New Homes Bonus, Sheffield had £12 million taken from its core funding but only received just over £7.3 million back, meaning the Council lost nearly £4.7 million, whilst on the other hand, Surrey had £11.3 million taken away from them and received £24.3 million, meaning they gained £13 million;
- (11) regrets that the Government continue to attempt to spin the figures through double counting different forms of funding and believes it is insulting for the Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, The Rt. Hon. Eric Pickles MP, to attempt to state that local authorities have had to contend with modest cuts, quoting largely deflated figures for individual authorities;
- (12) notes that the latest example of the Government spinning the figures is its use of the Better Care Fund and highlights the comments of the budget report "contrary to what is implied in the Settlement figures, the Council will not receive £37.8m from the Better Care Fund; this figure represents the total amount of the pooled budget shared with the NHS, and the actual amount which the Council will receive from the BCF is subject to ongoing discussions with the Clinical Commissioning Group";
- (13) is becoming increasingly concerned with the chaotic, haphazard and patchwork attempts of this Government in its dying days to create the impression that they are devolving resources to northern cities and believes that they are simply making it up as they go along in a desperate attempt to recover their position in the north of England after five years of consistently hammering cities like Sheffield with disproportionate cuts, the abolition of the Regional Development Agencies and redistributing European Union funding away from South Yorkshire and Merseyside to wealthier parts of the country;
- (14) believes that the rhetoric needs to be matched with tangible actions and calls upon the Government to urgently change its proposals on HS2 station location to give Sheffield a city centre HS2 station which would have a transformative effect on the long term future of the City's economy, however, regrets this is another issue where the Deputy Prime Minister has categorically failed to stand up for Sheffield;

- (15) believes that this would complement the actions taken locally by the present Administration, partners and wider city region to transform the City's economy and particularly welcomes the recent launch of the Innovation District and the visit of Bruce Katz to the City as part of the International Economic Commission;
- (16) notes that for the last three years, this Administration has frozen Council Tax, in spite of the unprecedented financial pressures facing the Council, which demonstrates that it has no desire to increase bills for local taxpayers, however, now the Council is in year five of the Chancellor's four year plan for public spending cuts, believes that the proposed 1.99% increase in this year's budget is unavoidable for two principle reasons, as follows:
- (i) the continued impact of year upon year cuts that the Government has imposed on the Council has got to a level where services are being cut to the bone and to not increase Council Tax would have a detrimental impact on services and, as a result, the need to strike a balance to ensure the long term stability of services with a modest increase of 38p per week for most Sheffield households;
 - (ii) the Government has sneakily changed the goalposts for the Council Tax Freeze Grant and has already taken last year's grant away from the Council with the new system of rolling the freeze grant into Revenue Support Grant, and, as suggested in the main budget report, this can no longer be guaranteed as a sustainable source of income and should be assumed as a mere one off fund, which would only lead to greater cuts in future years;
- (17) confirms as a matter of public record the intervention of Liberal Democrat Ministers to stop the lowering of the threshold for a referendum and notes the following comments in Danny Alexander's letter to Local Government Association Leaders "*Lowering the threshold will put unnecessary further pressure on local authorities and the much needed services they provide.*" and "*Lowering the threshold is a change of policy that puts an unnecessary further constraint on local authorities*", therefore clearly recognising the justification for raising the Council Tax above 1%;
- (18) is appalled at the cynicism and hypocrisy of the MP for Sheffield Hallam, who is happy to heavily cut funding for the Council, allow his own Ministers to insist on allowing local authorities to be able to increase Council Tax by up to 2% because in their own words "*Lowering the threshold will put unnecessary further pressure on local authorities and the much needed services they provide.*", and then criticising the Council for proposing to raise Council Tax by 1.99%;
- (19) recalls the previous blunders and factual inaccuracies of the Deputy Prime Minister's interventions in relation to the Council's budget and regrets that instead of using his position to help Sheffield, he is more interested in playing politics to do anything he can to deflect the blame for the huge cuts

that he has stood by and allowed to happen over the past five years;

- (20) regrets that last year, the Green Group proposed to increase Council Tax by 2.95%, which was slightly above the Government threshold and would therefore have required a referendum and believes that this was simply playing politics with Council Tax and further believes that the present Administration's decision to not increase Council Tax above the referendum threshold is pragmatic and avoids hundreds of thousands of pounds of local taxpayers' money being wasted on a potentially pointless exercise, should local people vote against increasing Council Tax;
- (21) notes that in Brighton and Hove, despite having a Green administration since 2011 who have threatened to increase Council Tax above the referendum threshold, they have never followed through with this and therefore believes that the Sheffield Green Group are proposing an equally cynical tactic which in reality they would have no intention of implementing if they were in a position to;
- (22) welcomes that the Administration has consulted with the people of Sheffield on the budget through the number of consultation events in the Town Hall and the acclaimed budget video published on the internet;
- (23) thanks all members of the public who have participated in the budget consultation, through the numerous events in the Town Hall, writing in, or through watching the budget video on the intranet;
- (24) believes that this video was a welcome addition to the consultation process this year and notes the recognition that the video has received in the national media and asks officers to consider other new innovative ways of consulting and connecting with the public as part of next year's budget process;
- (25) welcomes that at the start of the process, the Administration outlined its priorities of protecting front line services, particularly services for the most vulnerable in the city and believes that this is demonstrated by some of the actions in the budget including:-
 - (i) maintaining a £1.5 million Local Assistance Scheme, despite the Government scrapping its funding for the scheme entirely;
 - (ii) investing an additional £100,000 in the Council Tax Hardship fund;
 - (iii) protecting spending on frontline child safeguarding; and
 - (iv) prioritising the Council's flagship apprenticeship schemes which have given Sheffield the best record of all the core cities on delivering apprenticeships;
- (26) notes that since the reductions in Government funding started, the Council has saved £4.6 million in senior management posts above £50,000 and

savings are continued to be made in areas that minimise the impact on front line services, such as the recent re-negotiation of the Capita contract;

- (27) welcomes the action taken by the present Administration to ensure the introduction of the Living Wage for all Council staff and the progress that has been made in ensuring that Council contractors pay the Living Wage and believes it should be a priority to work across the city with partners over the next year to ensure that substantive action is taken to encourage and support more employers throughout the city in the public, private and voluntary sector to pay the Living Wage;
- (28) notes that as a result of budget cuts there could be up to 200 Council posts affected during the financial year 2015/16, including job roles that could be lost through voluntary severance or voluntary early retirement, as well as any vacancies that have not been filled;
- (29) expresses sincere and heartfelt sympathy to those members of staff who are losing their jobs through compulsory redundancy and regrets that the Government's cuts agenda has made compulsory redundancies unavoidable;
- (30) places on record its thanks for the unfaltering commitment and dedication of staff who continue to serve the Council in these incredibly difficult times, which year on year leads to uncertainty about their own futures and that of their colleagues, many of whom are left to pick up an increased workload as a result of the cuts to staff numbers;
- (31) accordingly instructs the Interim Executive Director, Resources to implement the City Council's Revenue Budget and Capital Programme 2015/2016 in accordance with the details set out in the reports on the Revenue Budget and Capital Programme now submitted;
- (32) notes those specific projects included in the years 2014/15 to 2019/20 Capital Programmes at Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme, with block allocations being included within the Programme for noting at this stage and detailed proposals will be brought back for separate Member approval as part of the monthly monitoring procedures;
- (33) notes the proposed Capital Programme for the 5 years to 2019/20 as per Appendix 9 of the report on the Capital Programme;
- (34) approves the Corporate Resource Pool (CRP) policy outlined in Appendix 4 of the report on the Capital Programme such that the commitment from the CRP is limited to one year and no CRP supported schemes are approved beyond 2015-16 unless explicitly stated, and if substantial capital receipts are realised within 2014-15 or 2015-16, a further report will be brought to Members as part of the monthly approval process;

- (35) after noting the joint report of the Chief Executive and the Interim Executive Director, Resources now submitted on the Revenue Budget 2015/16, approves and adopts a net Revenue Budget for 2015/16 amounting to £424.060m, as set out in Appendix 3 of that report, as follows:-

Appendix 3

<u>Summary Revenue Budget</u>		
Original Budget 2014/15		Original Budget 2015/16
£000		£000
	Portfolio budgets:	
70,624	Children Young People and Families	65,980
156,726	Communities	156,215
130,983	Place	126,520
2,358	Policy Performance and Communications	2,292
55,541	Resources	54,135
416,232		405,142
	Corporate Budgets:	
	Specific Grants	
-1,968	Council Tax Freeze Grant for 2014/15	0
-12,399	NHS Funding	-12,399
-71,116	PFI Grant	-73,442
-6,397	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	-7,738
-1,079	Business Rates Transitional Grant	-1,916
0	Small Business Rates Relief	-2,500
0	Empty New Build Relief (ENBR)	-100
0	Retail Relief (RR)	-500
0	Local Support Services Grant	-53
0	Independent Living Fund	-2,216
	Corporate Items	
11,200	Redundancy Provision	8,200
9,750	Pension Costs	-17,289
500	Council Tax Hardship Fund	600
-250	Improved debt collection	0
5,036	New Homes Bonus (LGF)	6,391
0	Public Health Savings / re-	-2,000

	investments*	
3,716	Contingency - Adults Social Care Pressures	3,000
24,747	Schools and Howden PFI	24,913
-1,300	Enhancements	0
400	Infrastructure Investment in NRQ / St Pauls Place	1,400
82	Payment to Parish Councils	34
0	ICT Refresh	300
0	CAPITA Contract Savings	-1,783
2,874	Other	2,727
37,282	Capital Financing costs	37,184
28,117	MSF capital financing costs	28,073
5,821	Contribution to Reserves	28,032
451,248	Total Expenditure	424,060
	Financing of Net Expenditure	
-	Revenue Support Grant	-115,837
157,460	- NNDR/Business Rates Income	-105,661
100,898	- Business Rates Top Up Grant	-28,883
-28,342	- Council Tax income	-170,379
164,377	- Collection Fund surplus	-3,300
-171	- Total Financing	-424,060
451,248		

*Public Health savings / re-investments * - savings of £2.5m have been targeted from existing public health activities in order to avoid disinvestment in other Council services which promote health and wellbeing outcomes. Of the £2.5m, £0.5m is already included in the portfolio savings proposals figure.*

- (36) approves a Band D equivalent Council Tax of £1,308.28 for City Council services, i.e. an increase of 1.99% on the level set for 2014/15;
- (37) approves the Revenue Budget allocations and Budget Implementation Plans for each of the services, as set out in Appendix 2 of the Revenue

Budget report;

- (38) notes the latest 2014/15 budget monitoring position;
- (39) approves the Treasury Management and Annual Investment Strategies set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report and the recommendations contained therein;
- (40) approves the Minimum Revenue Provision (MRP) Statement set out in Appendix 7 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (41) agrees that authority be delegated to the Director of Finance to undertake Treasury Management activity, to create and amend appropriate Treasury Management Practice Statements and to report on the operation of Treasury Management activity on the terms set out in these documents;
- (42) agrees that the Members' Allowances Scheme for 2013/14 and onwards, approved on 15th May, 2013, and implemented for 2014/15, be also implemented for 2015/16, with the addition (to paragraph (h) of Schedule 2) of the following approved duty which was approved by Council at its meeting held on 3 December 2014 – "attendance at meetings of Local Housing Area Forums";
- (43) agrees to forego an annual increase in the Members' Allowances in 2015/16;
- (44) approves a Pay Policy for 2015/16 as set out in Appendix 8 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (45) delegates authority to the Director of Public Health and the Interim Executive Director, Resources, in consultation with the Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources, to approve the final allocation of Public Health grant to portfolios in 2015/16;
- (46) notes that the Section 151 Officer has reviewed the robustness of the estimates and the adequacy of the proposed financial reserves, in accordance with Part 2 of the Local Government Act 2003, and that further details are set out in Appendix 4 of the Revenue Budget report;
- (47) approves the proposed amount of compensation to Parish Councils for the loss of council tax income in 2015/16 at the levels shown in the table below paragraph 176 of the Revenue Budget report;

- (48) notes the precepts issued by local parish councils which add £492,737 to the calculation of the budget requirement in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;
- (49) notes the information on the precepts issued by the South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner and the South Yorkshire Fire and Rescue Authority, together with the impact of these on the overall amount of Council Tax to be charged in the City Council's area;
- (50) notes that, based on the estimated expenditure level of £424.060m set out in Appendix 3 of the Revenue Budget report, the amounts shown in Appendix 6b below would be calculated by the City Council for the year 2015/16, in accordance with Sections 32 to 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992;

Appendix 6a

CITY OF SHEFFIELD
CALCULATION OF RECOMMENDED COUNCIL TAX FOR 2015/16 REVENUE
BUDGET

The Council is recommended to resolve as follows:

1. It be noted that on 15th January 2015, the Council calculated the Council Tax Base 2015/16
 - (a) for the whole Council area as:
130,231.44 (item T in the formula in Section 31B of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, as amended (the "Act"));
and
 - (b) for dwellings in those parts of its area to which a Parish precept relates as in the attached Appendix 6c.
2. Calculate that the Council Tax requirement for the Council's own purposes for 2015/16 (excluding Parish precepts is:
£ 170,378,563.
3. That the following amounts be calculated for the year 2015/16 in accordance with Sections 31 to 36 of the Act:
 - (a) **£1,417,154,816** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council

estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(2) of the Act taking into account all precepts issued to it by Parish Councils.

- (b) **£1,246,283,516** being the aggregate of the amounts which the Council estimates for the items set out in Section 31A(3) of the Act.
- (c) **£170,871,300** being the amount by which the aggregate at 3(a) above exceeds the aggregate at 3(b) above, calculated by the Council in accordance with Section 31A(4) of the Act as its Council Tax requirement for the year (item R in the formula in Section 31B of the Act).
- (d) **£1,312.0587** being the amount at 3(c) above (Item R), all divided by item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 31B of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year (including Parish Precepts).
- (e) **£492,737** being the aggregate amount of all special items (Parish precepts) referred to in Section 34(1) of the Act (as per the attached Appendix 6b).
- (f) **1,308.2752** being the amount at 3(d) above less the result given by dividing the amount at 3(e) above by Item T (1(a) above), calculated by the Council, in accordance with Section 34(2) of the Act, as the basic amount of its Council Tax for the year for dwellings in those parts of its area to which no Parish precept relates.

4. To note that the Police and Crime Commissioner and the Fire and Rescue Authority have issued precepts to the Council in accordance with Section 40 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992 for each category of dwellings in the Council's area as indicated in the table below.

5. That the Council, in accordance with Sections 30 and 36 of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, hereby sets the aggregate amounts shown in the tables below as the amounts of Council Tax for 2014/15 for each part of its area and for each of the categories of dwellings.

Sheffield City Council (non-parish areas)

Valuation Band							
A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H

Sheffield City Council	872.18	1,017.55	1,162.91	1,308.28	1,599.00	1,889.73	2,180.46	2,616.55
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,015.16	1,184.37	1,353.56	1,522.76	1,861.14	2,199.54	2,537.92	3,045.51

Bradfield Parish Council

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	872.18	1,017.55	1,162.91	1,308.28	1,599.00	1,889.73	2,180.46	2,616.55
Bradfield Parish Council	25.81	30.11	34.41	38.71	47.31	55.91	64.51	77.42
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,040.97	1,214.48	1,387.97	1,561.47	1,908.45	2,255.45	2,602.43	3,122.93

Ecclesfield Parish Council

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	872.18	1,017.55	1,162.91	1,308.28	1,599.00	1,889.73	2,180.46	2,616.55
Ecclesfield Parish Council	10.06	11.74	13.41	15.09	18.44	21.79	25.15	30.18
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police & Crime	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32

Commissioner

Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,025.22	1,196.11	1,366.97	1,537.85	1,879.58	2,221.33	2,563.07	3,075.69
---------------------------------------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------	----------

Stocksbridge Town Council

	Valuation Band							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
Sheffield City Council	872.18	1,017.55	1,162.91	1,308.28	1,599.00	1,889.73	2,180.46	2,616.55
Stocksbridge Town Council	19.65	22.93	26.21	29.48	36.03	42.58	49.13	58.96
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police & Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32
Aggregate of Council tax requirements	1,034.81	1,207.30	1,379.77	1,552.24	1,897.17	2,242.12	2,587.05	3,104.47

6. The Council's basic amount of Council Tax is not excessive in accordance with the principles approved under Section 52ZB of the Local Government Finance Act 1992, therefore no referendum is required.

Appendix 6b

Council Tax Schedule 2015/16	Band A	Band B	Band C	Band D	Band E	Band F	Band G	Band H
Sheffield City Council	872.18	1,017.55	1,162.91	1,308.28	1,599.00	1,889.73	2,180.46	2,616.55
South Yorkshire Fire & Rescue Authority	44.21	51.58	58.95	66.32	81.06	95.80	110.53	132.64
South Yorkshire Police and Crime Commissioner	98.77	115.24	131.70	148.16	181.08	214.01	246.93	296.32

Total charge for non-parish areas of Sheffield	1,015.16	1,184.37	1,353.56	1,522.76	1,861.14	2,199.54	2,537.92	3,045.51
Bradfield Parish Council	1,040.97	1,214.48	1,387.97	1,561.47	1,908.45	2,255.45	2,602.43	3,122.93
Ecclesfield Parish Council	1,025.22	1,196.11	1,366.97	1,537.85	1,879.58	2,221.33	2,563.07	3,075.69
Stocksbridge Town Council	1,034.81	1,207.30	1,379.77	1,552.24	1,897.17	2,242.12	2,587.05	3,104.47

Appendix 6c

Parish Council Precepts

Parish Council	2014/15					2015/16					Council Tax Increase
	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grant	Total Precept	Tax Base	Council Tax Income (£)	Council Tax Band D (£)	CTS Grants	Total Precepts	
Bradfield	5,556.10	210,853	37.9499	17,369	228,223	5,590.09	216,386	38.7089	12,506	228,892	2.00%
Ecclesfield	8,992.80	131,735	14.6489	17,432	149,167	9,031.42	136,269	15.0884	12,551	148,821	3.00%
Stocksbridge	3,592.21	100,858	28.0768	12,542	113,399	3,595.35	105,993	29,4806	9,030	115,024	5.00%
Total/average	18,141.11	443,446	24,4443	47,343	490,789	18,216.86	458,649	25,1772	34,088	492,737	3.00%

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

For the Motion (56)

- The Deputy Lord Mayor (Councillor Talib Hussain) and Councillors Julie Dore, Mike Drabble, Jack Scott, Roy Munn, Helen Mirfin-Boukouris, Chris Rosling-Josephs, Ian Saunders, Denise Fox, Bryan Lodge, Karen McGowan, Jayne Dunn, Stuart Wattam, Jackie Drayton, Ibrar Hussain, Anne Murphy, Geoff Smith, Harry Harpham, Mazher Iqbal, Mary Lea, Steve Wilson, Joyce Wright, Sheila Constance, Alan Law, Chris Weldon, Steve Jones, Cate McDonald, Tim Rippon, Bob Johnson, George Lindars-Hammond, Josie

Paszek, Jenny Armstrong, Terry Fox, Pat Midgley, David Barker, Isobel Bowler, Tony Downing, Nikki Bond, Qurban Hussain, John Campbell, Lynn Rooney, Paul Wood, Peter Price, Sioned-Mair Richards, Leigh Bramall, Tony Damms, Gill Furniss, Richard Crowther, Philip Wood, Olivia Blake, Ben Curran, Neale Gibson, Adam Hurst, Mick Rooney, Jackie Satur and Ray Satur.

Against the Motion(24)

- Councillors Simon Clement-Jones, Richard Shaw, Brian Webster, Robert Murphy, Sarah Jane Smalley, Rob Frost, Joe Otten, Colin Ross, Martin Smith, Pauline Andrews, Penny Baker, Roger Davison, Diana Stimely, Sue Alston, Andrew Sangar, Cliff Woodcraft, Ian Auckland, Steve Ayris, Denise Reaney, David Baker, Katie Condliffe and Vickie Priestley, Jack Clarkson and John Booker.

Abstained on the Motion (1)

- The Lord Mayor (Councillor Peter Rippon).

This page is intentionally left blank

REVISED PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH STANDARDS COMPLAINTS

At its meeting on 22 January 2015, the Standards Committee considered a report of the Interim Director of Legal and Governance containing a revised Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints.

The relevant extract from the minutes of the meeting is attached, together with the report submitted to the Standards Committee and the Parish/Town Councils' Joint Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints.

Bradfield Parish Council and Stocksbridge Town Council have approved the revised Procedure. Ecclesfield Parish Council is due to consider the Procedure on 2 April 2015.

As there are a small number of complaints that are being dealt with under the existing Complaints Procedure, it is proposed that these are concluded under those existing arrangements.

Recommendation

That the Council considers:-

- (a) the adoption of the Revised Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints, as set out in Appendix A of the report now submitted and that the Constitution is amended accordingly;
- (b) notes the proposed establishment of Consideration and Hearing Sub-Committees of the Standards Committee, as set out in the report; and
- (c) that any complaints received before 25 March 2015 are dealt with under the existing Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints adopted in July 2012.

John Mothersole
Chief Executive

This page is intentionally left blank

EXTRACT FROM THE MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE STANDARDS COMMITTEE 22 JANUARY 2015

9. REVISED PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH STANDARDS COMPLAINTS

9.1 The Interim Director of Legal and Governance introduced a report that contained a draft revised Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints that had been developed following a recent review. The revised Procedure incorporated both the City Council and Joint Parish and Town Councils' Procedures and provided greater clarity of the process for the complainant and the Member who was the subject of the complaint. Appended to the report were the existing and revised Procedures.

9.2 The Interim Director indicated that the main proposed changes and features of the revised Procedure were:-

- Having one Procedure for complaints relating to the City, Parish and Town Councils and Co-opted members.
- Providing a complaint form that would include the opportunity for the complainant to indicate any remedy they were seeking in submitting the complaint.
- Asking the Member to submit a statement of fact in response to the complaint at the start of the process.
- The Leader of the relevant political Group, Group Whip and Chair of the Standards Committee would be informed that a complaint has been received.
- Where necessary, seeking or clarifying information from both parties earlier in the process.
- Including timescales for each stage of the process.
- Clarifying the process for an investigation.
- Having a Consideration Sub-Committee to consider investigation reports.
- A Hearing Sub-Committee comprising three Councillors and one non-voting co-opted Independent Member.
- Providing both parties with information on the pre-hearing process and procedure at a hearing.
- There would be no right of appeal.

9.3 In response to questions from Members of the Committee relating to there being no right of appeal, the Interim Director indicated that there was no right of appeal within the process, however a complainant always has a right to ask the Local Government Ombudsman to investigate if they felt that the Council had not dealt with their complaint properly.

9.4 **Resolved:** That:-

(a) the Committee recommends to Full Council:-

- (i) the adoption of the Revised Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints, as set out in Appendix A of the report now submitted;

- (ii) the establishment of Consideration and Hearing Sub-Committees of the Standards Committee, as set out in the report and
 - (iii) that the Constitution is amended accordingly;
- (b) the revised Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints is referred to the Parish and Town Councils for consideration; and
- (c) if the revised Procedure is adopted by Full Council, the Director of Legal and Governance is requested to review the operation of the new Procedure in 12 months' time.



Standards Committee Report

Report of: Monitoring Officer/Interim Director of Legal and Governance

Date: 22 January 2015

Subject: Revised Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints

Author of Report: Dave Ross, Democratic Services

Summary:

Following a recent review, a draft revised Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints has been developed that incorporates both the City and Joint Parish and Town Councils' Procedures and provides greater clarity of the process for the complainant and Member who is the subject of the complaint.

Recommendations:

1. That Members comment on the draft Revised Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints;
 2. With the inclusion of any additional revisions arising from this meeting, the Committee recommends to Full Council the adoption of the Revised Procedure and the establishment of Consideration and Hearing Sub-Committees of the Standards Committee and that the Constitution is amended accordingly;
 3. The revised Procedure is referred to the Parish and Town Councils for consideration; and
 4. The Interim Director of Legal and Governance is requested to review the operation of the new Procedure in 12 months' time.
-

Background Papers:

Category of Report: OPEN

Statutory and Council Policy Checklist

Financial Implications
NO Cleared by:
Legal Implications
NO Cleared by:
Equality of Opportunity Implications
NO Cleared by:
Tackling Health Inequalities Implications
NO
Human rights Implications
NO:
Environmental and Sustainability implications
NO
Economic impact
NO
Community safety implications
NO
Human resources implications
NO
Property implications
NO
Area(s) affected
None
Relevant Cabinet Portfolio Member
Councillor Ben Curran, Cabinet Member for Finance and Resources.
Is the item a matter which is reserved for approval by the City Council?
YES
Press release
NO

REVISED PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH STANDARDS COMPLAINTS

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Following a recent review, a draft revised Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints has been developed that incorporates both the City and Joint Parish and Town Councils' Procedures and provides greater clarity of the process for the complainant and Member who is the subject of the complaint.

2.0 BACKGROUND

2.1 Arising from the requirements of the Localism Act 2011, the Council at its meeting on 4 July 2012 approved the Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints. The Parish and Town Councils also approved a separate Joint Procedure.

2.2 The meeting of the Standards Committee on 24 July 2013 reviewed the City Council Procedure and the Members' Code of Conduct and proposed no changes.

2.3 The current Procedure is based on the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Independent Person, taking steps to mediate and resolve issues with only the more serious matters being investigated and referred to the Standards Committee.

2.4 Since the new Standards arrangements were introduced in July 2012, 21 complaints were received in 2013 and 11 in 2014. One hearing was arranged in 2013 but the complaint was withdrawn and the hearing cancelled. Only three complaints have been referred for investigation and these are due to be completed shortly.

3.0 REVISED PROCEDURE

3.1 The Procedure has been reviewed in light of the learning from the complaints that have been dealt with over the last year and comparison with other local authorities' procedures. The views of the Independent Persons and the Parish and Town Councils were also sought.

3.2 The aim is to provide greater clarity for the complainant and Member on the process and ensure that complaints are dealt with in a timely manner. The main proposed changes and features of the revised process are:-

- Having one Procedure for complaints relating to the City, Parish and Town Councils and Co-opted members.
- Providing a complaint form that will include the opportunity for the complainant to indicate any remedy they are seeking in submitting the complaint. This will assist with the assessment of the complaint.
- Asking the Member to submit a statement of fact in response to

the complaint at the start of the process. Again this will assist with the assessment of the complaint.

- The Leader of the relevant political Group, Group Whip and Chair of the Standards Committee will be informed that a complaint has been received.
- Where necessary, seeking or clarifying information from both parties earlier in the process.
- Including timescales for each stage of the process.
- Clarifying the process for an investigation.
- Having a Consideration Committee to consider investigation reports. This is to build in more Member involvement in the process.
- A Hearing Sub-Committee comprising three Councillors and one non-voting co-opted Independent Member.
- Providing both parties with information on the pre-hearing process and procedure at a hearing.
- There is no right of appeal.

3.3 Members are asked to comment on the draft revised Procedure that is attached at Appendix A. The original Procedure is attached at Appendix B.

4.0 LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

4.1 As the Procedure is included in the Constitution, any changes would require approval at Full Council. The revised Procedure would also need to be approved by the Parish and Town Councils.

5.0 FINANCIAL IMPLICATIONS

5.1 There are no financial implications.

6.0 RECOMMENDATIONS

6.1 That Members comment on the draft Revised Procedure for Dealing with Standards Complaints;

6.2 With the inclusion of any additional revisions arising from this meeting, the Committee recommends to Full Council the adoption of the Revised Procedure and the establishment of Consideration and Hearing Sub-Committees of the Standards Committee and that the Constitution is amended accordingly;

6.3 The revised Procedure is referred to the Parish and Town Councils for consideration; and

6.4 The Interim Director of Legal and Governance is requested to review the operation of the new Procedure in 12 months' time.

Monitoring Officer/Interim Director of Legal and Governance

SHEFFIELD CITY COUNCIL - PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH COMPLAINTS REGARDING CITY, PARISH AND TOWN COUNCILLORS AND CO-OPTED MEMBERS

1. Introduction

1.1 Under the Localism Act 2011, the Council has duty to promote and maintain high standards of conduct for its elected and co-opted members and have arrangements in place to deal with complaints.

1.2 This Procedure sets out how the Council will deal with a complaint alleging a breach of the Members' Code of Conduct by:-

- Sheffield City Councillors or co-opted members of the Council
- Bradfield Parish Councillors
- Ecclesfield Parish Councillors
- Stocksbridge Town Councillors

(In this Procedure the term 'Member' is used to describe a Councillor or Co-opted Member)

1.3 In dealing with complaints we will be fair to both the complainant and Member and progress matters in accordance with the timescales set out in the Procedure. Complaints will be handled in the strictest confidence at all times.

2. Monitoring Officer

2.1 Gillian Duckworth, Interim Director of Legal and Governance, is the Council's Monitoring Officer. This is a statutory role, responsible for ensuring that the Council, its Members and officers carry out their functions in a lawful and ethical manner. The role includes supporting the Standards Committee and the three Independent Persons in dealing with complaints alleging a breach of the Members' Code of Conduct.

3. Independent Persons

3.1 The Council appoints Independent Persons from outside the Council to assist the Monitoring Officer and Standards Committee in considering complaints. Sheffield currently has appointed three Independent Persons - Stuart Carvell, Marvyn Moore and David Waxman.

3.2 The Independent Person must be consulted at various stages in the complaints process and also before the Standards

Committee makes a finding as to whether a member has failed to comply with the Code of Conduct and decides on action to be taken in respect of a Member.

4. Making a Complaint

4.1 Complaints alleging a breach of the Members' Code of Conduct should be made in writing using the complaint form and sent to Gillian Duckworth, Monitoring Officer, Sheffield City Council, Town Hall, Sheffield S1 2HH or email gillian.duckworth@sheffield.gov.uk. The complaint form is available from:-

- Website - www.sheffield.gov.uk/standardscommittee
- Email - committee@sheffield.gov.uk
- Phone - 0114 273 5033

4.2 If you need advice or assistance in submitting a complaint please contact Dave Ross in Democratic Services (email dave.ross@sheffield.gov.uk or phone 0114 273 5033).

4.3 Details of the complaint, including the name of the complainant, will be shared with the Member. The complainant can request on the complaint form that their identity is kept confidential. Requests for confidentiality will be considered by the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Independent Person.

4.4 Anonymous complaints will not be considered.

5.0 Acknowledging the Complaint/Informing the Member

5.1 The Monitoring Officer will acknowledge receipt of the complaint in writing within 5 working days and provide the complainant with a copy of this Procedure and the Code of Conduct.

5.2 The Member will be informed in writing within 5 working days that a complaint has been made about them. This will include the name of the complainant and details of the complaint. They will also receive a copy of this Procedure and the Code of Conduct. To assist the Monitoring Officer in assessing the complaint, the Member will be invited to submit within 10 working days a written statement of fact in response to the complaint.

5.3 The Monitoring Officer will also inform the Leader of the relevant political Group, Group Whip and Chair of the Standards Committee that a complaint has been received and provide a summary of the complaint.

5.4 Where a complaint relates to a Parish or Town Councillor, the

Monitoring Officer will also inform the Clerk of that Council of the name of the Member and details of the complaint. The Clerk will also be kept informed of the progress and the outcome of the complaint.

6. Assessment by the Monitoring Officer

6.1 Before assessment of the complaint, it may be necessary for the Monitoring Officer to request further information or clarification from the complainant and/or Member.

6.2 The Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Independent Person, will consider the complaint, any remedy sought by the complainant, any written statement of fact submitted by the Member and any other information obtained. In assessing the complaint, the Monitoring Officer will take into account:-

- The seriousness of the allegation.
- The effectiveness of the remedies available.
- If a significant amount of time has elapsed since the events which are the subject of the complaint.
- If the allegation relates to a cultural or recurring issue relating to standards within the Council.
- If the matter should be dealt with by some other method, e.g. police investigation.
- If complaints have been made about the Member relating to similar issues in the past.
- The impact on the complainant or reputation to the Council caused by the conduct.
- If the complaint appears to be trivial or vexatious or is part of a series of complaints from the complainant.
- Whether the conduct occurred during political debate or could be regarded as a political expression of views or opinion.

6.3 Following consultation with the Independent Person, the Monitoring Officer will then consider if the allegation constitutes a potential breach of the Code of Conduct and take one of the following courses of action:-

- (1) Take no action or
- (2) Take other action through informal resolution or

(3) Refer the matter for investigation

6.4 The complainant and the Member will be informed in writing within 5 working days of the outcome and the reasons for the decision.

6.5 Where a complaint is not referred for investigation, the Monitoring Officer will seek to deal with the matter within 8 weeks.

7. Informal Resolution by the Monitoring Officer

7.1 Where the Monitoring Officer has decided to take other action this will seek to resolve the complaint informally and without determining if an actual breach of the Code has taken place. Both the complainant and Member will have to agree to the outcome of any informal resolution.

7.2 The Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Independent Person, may take any of the following actions:-

- Take such steps as they think appropriate to prevent a future potential breach of the Code including training, guidance and introducing or amending policies/protocols.
- Ask the Whips to address the issue raised within their political parties or with an individual Member.
- Mediate between the parties involved to resolve the issues.
- Seek an apology from the Member.
- Any other action capable of resolving the complaint.

7.3 The complainant and Member will be informed in writing of the outcome of any informal resolution within 5 working days. The Chair of the Standards Committee and relevant Group Leader and Group Whip will also be informed that the complaint has been resolved.

7.4 Where a complaint relates to a Parish or Town Councillor, the Monitoring Officer will also inform the Clerk of that Council that the complaint has been resolved.

7.5 Where it has not been possible to agree an informal resolution, the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Independent Person, will refer the matter for investigation and inform the complainant and Member within 5 working days.

8. Investigation

- 8.1 If a complaint has been referred for investigation, the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Independent Person, will appoint a person to undertake the investigation and this may be either a Council Officer or an outside agent, depending on the complexity and subject of the complaint.
- 8.2 The Investigating Officer will inform the complainant and Member of the process and proposed timescale of the investigation. The investigation may involve interviewing both parties and possibly other witnesses, together with reviewing any relevant documentation or paperwork.
- 8.3 The Investigating Officer will prepare a draft report on the outcome of the investigation and provide the complainant and Member with a copy for review and comment.
- 8.4 The Investigating Officer will submit a final version of the report to the Monitoring Officer that will make a finding that either (a) there has been a failure to comply with the Code of Conduct or (b) there has not been a failure to comply with the Code of Conduct. The final report will also be sent to the complainant and Member.
- 8.5 The Monitoring Officer will submit the Investigating Officer's report to the Consideration Sub-Committee.
- 8.6 An investigation will be completed within 12 weeks of a referral by the Monitoring Officer. The Consideration Committee will meet within one month of the final report being submitted to the Monitoring Officer.

9. Consideration Sub-Committee

- 9.1 The Sub-Committee will consider the Investigating Officer's report and, after taking the views of the Independent Person into account, can:-
- (a) take no action where there is no evidence of a failure to comply with the Code of Conduct or
 - (b) take no action where there is no evidence of a failure to comply with the Code of Conduct but make a recommendation to the authority with a view to promoting and maintaining high conduct of standards in general (e.g. proposed changes to internal procedures or training for Members) or
 - (c) ask the Monitoring Officer, where possible, to seek a local resolution to the complaint or

(d) refer the matter to a Standards Committee Hearing.

9.2 The complainant and Member will be informed in writing within 5 working days of the outcome and the reasons for the decision.

10. Local Resolution

10.1 Where the investigation finds evidence of failure to comply with the Code of Conduct, the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Independent Person, may attempt a local resolution, avoiding the necessity of a hearing, and take any of the following actions:-

- Take such steps as they think appropriate to prevent a future potential breach of the Code including training, guidance and introducing or amending policies/protocols.
- Ask the Whips to address the issue raised within their political parties or with an individual Member.
- Mediate between the parties involved to resolve the issues.
- Seek an apology from the Member
- Any other action capable of resolving the complaint

10.2 Both the complainant and Member will have to agree to the outcome of any local resolution.

10.3 The Monitoring Officer will inform the complainant and Member in writing within 5 working days of the outcome of any agreed local resolution.

10.4 If a local resolution has not been possible, the Monitoring Officer, in consultation with the Independent Person and Chair of the Standards Committee, will refer the matter to a Standards Committee Hearing and inform the complainant and Member in writing within 5 working days.

11. Standards Committee Hearing

11.1 The Standards Committee Hearing Sub-Committee comprises 3 Councillors and 1 non-voting co-opted Independent Member.

11.2 The Sub-Committee will meet within two months of a referral by the Consideration Sub-Committee to consider the allegation and Investigating Officer's report and make clear findings as to

the facts of the matter and whether a breach of the Code of Conduct has occurred.

- 11.3 The Hearing Sub-Committee will meet in public unless it decides that all or part of the meeting should be held in private in accordance with the Access to Information Procedure Rules in the Council's Constitution.
- 11.4 In advance of the Hearing there will be a pre-hearing process to allow matters at the Hearing to be dealt with more fairly and economically.
- 11.5 The complainant and Member will be given the opportunity to attend the Hearing and present witnesses. The Monitoring Officer, Investigating Officer and Independent Person will also attend. The procedure at the Hearing will include:-
- Making findings of fact
 - Deciding if there has been a breach of the Code of Conduct
 - Consider the remedies/sanctions available if there is a finding that the Member has breached of the Code of Conduct
- 11.6 Full details of the pre-hearing and hearing process are set out in the Procedure at Hearings. The Member and complainant will be provided with a copy of the Procedure.
- 11.7 A Finding of No Breach of the Code of Conduct
- 11.7.1 If the Sub-Committee finds that the Member did not breach the Code of Conduct no further action will be taken in respect of the complaint. However, the Sub-Committee can make a recommendation to the authority with a view to promoting and maintaining high standards of conduct in general (e.g. proposed changes to internal procedures or training for Members).
- 11.8 A Finding of a Breach of the Code of Conduct
- 11.8.1 If the Sub-Committee finds that a breach of the Code of Conduct has occurred they may make any of the following recommendations and may specify to whom they wish them to be directed:-
- Recommending to the Member's Group Leader (or in the case of un-grouped members, recommend to Council or to Committees) that he/she be removed from any or all Committees or Sub-Committees of the Council or Shadow Portfolio responsibilities.

- Recommending to the Leader of the Council that the member be removed from the Cabinet, or removed from particular Portfolio responsibilities.
- Instructing the Monitoring Officer to arrange training for the member.
- That policies/procedures are amended.
- That a briefing/information note be issued.
- That an apology be given.
- That the Member is censured in writing and a copy of the letter is published on the Council's website.
- Take no action where it is not considered appropriate in the circumstances to impose a sanction.

11.9 The Monitoring Officer will inform the complainant and the Member of the outcome from the Sub-Committee hearing in writing within 5 working days.

11.10 The findings and decision of the Sub-Committee will be also be available on the Council's website and copies will be supplied to the Chief Executive, Leaders of all the political Groups and the Group Whips.

11.11 Where the matter relates to a Parish or Town Councillor, the Clerk of that Council will be informed of the outcome of a Hearing.

12. Appeals

12.1 There is no right of appeal for the complainant or Member against a decision of the Monitoring Officer, Consideration Sub-Committee or Hearing Sub-Committee.

12.2 If the complainant feels that the Council has failed to deal with their complaint properly, they can make a complaint to the Local Government Ombudsman.

13. Reports

13.1 A quarterly report will be presented to meetings of the Standards Committee on the complaints received and how they were dealt with. An annual report will also be submitted to Full Council with a summary of all Standards Complaints.

14. Data Protection

14.1 Complaints will be handled in the strictest confidence at all times. We will ensure that any information received as part of the handling of the complaint is disclosed only to those who can demonstrate a valid need to know it. However, when a complaint is considered at a Standards Committee Hearing then any information will be dealt with in accordance with the Access to Information Procedure Rules in the Council's Constitution.

14.2 Complaints records will be stored safely and securely.

This page is intentionally left blank

PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH STANDARDS COMPLAINTS

Complaints

- 1 Allegations of breaches of the Code of Conduct should be made in writing to the Monitoring Officer (MO) by any Elected Member, Officer, and partner of the Council or resident of Sheffield.
- 2 The MO will decide if this allegation is a potential breach of the code. If the matter complained of does not constitute a potential breach of the code the MO will inform the complainant.
- 3 If the MO believes there may be a potential breach of the Code they may take the following actions in consultation with the Independent Person without determining if an actual breach has taken place:-
 - Take such steps as they think appropriate to prevent a future breach of the Code including training, guidance, introducing or amending policies/protocols.
 - Ask the Whips to address the issue raised within their political parties or with an individual Member.
 - Mediate between the parties involved to resolve the issues.
 - Obtain further information from the complainant or other relevant individual/body.
- 4 The MO, after taking the above steps as appropriate, will decide, in consultation with the Independent Person, if the matter should be investigated.
- 5 The MO will take into account when deciding if the matter should be investigated :-
 - The seriousness of the allegation.
 - The effectiveness of the remedies available.
 - If a significant amount of time has elapsed since the events which are the subject of the complaint.
 - The benefits of an independent consideration of the allegation.
 - If the allegation relates to a cultural or recurring issue relating to standards within the Council.

- If the matter should be dealt with by some other method, e.g. police investigation.
 - If complaints have been made about the Member relating to similar issues in the past.
 - The impact on the complainant or reputation to the Council caused by the conduct.
 - If the complaint appears to be trivial or vexatious or is part of a series of complaints from the complainant.
 - The conduct occurred during political debate or could be regarded as a political expression of views or opinion
- 6 It is expected that only a minority of potential breaches will be referred to the Standard Committee.

Procedure for Investigations

7. If the matter is to be investigated, the complainant and subject of the complaint will be informed by the MO. The Elected Member will be given full details of the allegation and have 14 days to submit a response, witness statements and any relevant information. The Member will be asked to express a preference for a written or oral hearing should the matter be referred to the Standards Committee.
8. The MO will supply the complainant with copies of any documents produced in accordance with paragraph 3 or 7 above. The complainant may provide a written response and further evidence if they choose to do so. They must respond within 14 days of receipt of the information. The MO or Independent Person may advise and assist either party with the written information to be supplied.
9. The Independent Person and the MO will consider the complaint and responses to decide if any further information should be obtained by the MO or if an internal or independent investigation is required on all or any aspect of the complaint.
10. The MO in consultation with the Independent Person shall decide when the investigation process set out in 7 to 9 above is complete and if evidence of a breach is found. If no evidence is found no further action will be taken and the MO will inform the complainant.
11. Where the investigation finds evidence of failure to comply with the Code of Conduct, the MO, in consultation with the Independent Person, may attempt a local resolution, avoiding the necessity of a hearing by identifying other appropriate remedial action. It would only be appropriate for the MO to agree a local resolution after consultation with the Independent Person and subject to a summary report for

information being submitted to the Standards Committee.

Standards Committee

12. If evidence of a breach is found on investigation and the matter cannot be resolved, the MO will refer the matter to the Standards Committee. The Standards Committee will meet within two months of the referral to consider the allegation and make clear findings as to the facts on the matter and whether, in its opinion, a breach of the Code of Conduct has occurred. This decision will be made upon the papers submitted if the Member agrees. If the member does not agree to a paper consideration he/she will be asked to attend the Standards Committee to give oral representations and present their evidence. The Member may, with the consent of the Committee obtained prior to the meeting, present witnesses.

The Committee will meet in public unless the Chair decides all or some of the meeting should be held in private subject to the Access to Information requirements. The MO will attend the meeting and can provide advice to the Committee.

13. The Committee shall decide if a breach of the Code has taken place and what sanction, if any, it should recommend. The Committee will give reasons for its decision.
14. The MO will inform the complainant and the Member of the outcome in writing within 7 days.
15. The findings and decision of the Standards Committee will be publicly available on the Council's website and copies will be supplied to the MO, Chief Executive and Member concerned, Leaders of the political party concerned, the Whips and the complainant.

Remedies

16. If the Standards Committee finds a breach of the Code has occurred they may make any of the following recommendations and may specify to whom they wish them to be directed:
 - Recommending to the member's Group Leader (or in the case of ungrouped members, recommend to Council or to Committees) that he/she be removed from any or all Committees or Sub-Committees of the Council or Shadow Portfolio responsibilities
 - Recommending to the Leader of the Council that the member be removed from the Cabinet, or removed from particular Portfolio responsibilities;
 - Instructing the Monitoring Officer to arrange training for the member;

- That policies/procedures are amended;
- That a briefing/information note be issued;
- That an apology be given;
- That the member is censured in writing and a copy of the letter is published on the Council's website.

Appeals

17. It is not intended that an Appeal procedure would be used as a matter of course. If, however, the Standards Committee Chair and MO agree that the nature of the decision may have a significant impact on the member against whom findings are made or has important implications for the Council as a whole, they may allow an appeal to the Standards Committee of another authority with whom a reciprocal agreement exists. The views of one of the IPs not involved in the case would be taken into account in any appeal. If no suitable Committee is available the appeal will be dealt with by the Council's Chief Executive.

Reports

18. A bi-annual report will be presented to Members of the Standards Committee on the complaints received and how they were dealt with. An annual report will be prepared for Council in relation to all Standards Complaints.

July 2013

SHEFFIELD PARISH/TOWN COUNCILS JOINT PROCEDURE FOR DEALING WITH STANDARDS COMPLAINTS

Complaints

- 1 Allegations of breaches of the Code of Conduct should be made in writing to the Clerk to the Council.
- 2 The Clerk will refer the complaint to the Monitoring Officer (MO) who will decide if this allegation is a potential breach of the code. If the matter complained of does not constitute a potential breach of the code the MO will inform the complainant.
- 3 If the MO believes there may be a potential breach of the Code they will refer it back to the relevant Clerk to mediate and try to effect a satisfactory resolution of the matter.
- 4 The relevant Clerk to offer such steps as they think appropriate to prevent a future breach of the Code including recommending training, guidance, introducing or amending policies/protocols.
- 5 If the matter remains unresolved the Joint Parish Standards Panel (see below) is convened.
- 6 The Joint Parish Standards Panel to comprise of 2 member representatives from each Parish/Town Council advised by the Clerks to each Parish/Town Council plus an Independent Person and the MO, both of whom can be called if required.

For the purposes of hearing a complaint the Panel will consist of 4 members who are not members of the Council receiving the complaint; advised by a Clerk, again who is not from the Parish/Town Council of the member being complained about.

Procedure for Investigations

7. If the matter is to be investigated, the complainant and subject of the complaint will be informed by the Clerk. The Elected Member will be given full details of the allegation and have 14 days to submit a response, witness statements and any relevant information. The Member will be asked to express a preference for a written or oral hearing should the matter be referred to the Joint Parish Standards Panel.
8. The Clerk will supply the complainant with copies of any relevant documents.
9. The Joint Parish Standards Panel will consider the complaint and responses to decide if any further information should be obtained by the Clerk.

10. The Joint Parish Standards Panel, in consultation with the Independent Person, shall decide when the investigation process set out in 7 to 9 above is complete and if evidence of a breach is found. If no evidence is found no further action will be taken and the Clerk will inform the complainant.
11. Where the investigation finds evidence of failure to comply with the Code of Conduct, the Joint Parish Standards Panel, in consultation with the Independent Person, may attempt a local resolution.
12. The Clerk may seek the guidance of the Monitoring Officer of Sheffield City Council at any time. The Joint Parish Standards Panel reserves the right to request the Monitoring Officer to refer the matter to the Sheffield City Council Standards Committee.

Remedies

13. If the Joint Parish Standards Panel finds a breach of the Code has occurred they may make one or more of the following recommendations and may specify to whom they wish them to be directed:
 - Recommend to Council or to Committees) that he/she be removed from any or all Committees or Sub-Committees of the Council.
 - Instructing the Clerk to arrange training for the member;
 - That policies/procedures are amended;
 - That a briefing/information note be issued;
 - That an apology be given;
 - That the member is censured in writing and a copy of the letter is published on the Council's website.

Appeals

14. It is not intended that an Appeal procedure would be used as a matter of course. If, however, the Standards Committee Chair and MO agree that the nature of the decision may have a significant impact on the member against whom findings are made or has important implications for the Council as a whole, they may allow an appeal to the Standards Committee of another authority with whom a reciprocal agreement exists.